

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
ADJOURNED MEETING
STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION

Wednesday, August 13, 1986

Pursuant to notice given at the July 16, 1986 regular meeting and to *The Register-Guard* for publication on August 7, 1986, an adjourned meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, August 13, 1986 at 7:00 p.m. at the Red Lion Motor Hotel, Springfield.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Janet Calvert, President, presiding
Janice Eberly, Vice President
Gus Pusateri, Secretary
Rich Smith
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

News Media Representative:

Jim Boyd, *The Register-Guard*

Absent: Joyce Nichols
Larry Parducci

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION: During dinner, the Board members discussed the informational items on the agenda for that evening.

Value Engineering: Ms. Calvert stated that value engineering workshops were scheduled for the following Tuesday through Thursday, and invited any interested Board members to drop by the District offices to observe the process.

Tri-Met Light Rail Grand Opening: Staff were planning to take a bus to Tri-Met's grand opening ceremonies for its new light rail system. Interested Board members were invited to attend, as well.

Bus Auction: All the 300 and 400 series buses were sold at auction. Ms. Loobey stated that the District did well to sell all of them at the prices they sold for, considering their age and mileage.

McKenzie Bridge Service Request: It is anticipated that residents of the McKenzie Bridge area will attend the September 17 Board meeting to request Saturday service.

Commendation from Eugene Aging Commission: Ms. Calvert commented that it was very nice to receive a letter of commendation for LTD's

services to the elderly and handicapped from the Eugene Aging Commission. The letter had been included in the agenda packet.

Quarterly Reporting: Ms. Loobey stated that staff were pleased with the year-end ridership and revenue statistics, as reported in the agenda packet. Mr. Brandt stated that the statistics were ahead of the goals for the year, and Ms. Calvert commented that this was achieved in spite of the declining price of gasoline.

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Calvert called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m. She introduced the two newly-appointed Board members, who have not yet been confirmed by the Senate, and asked them to tell about themselves.

Keith Parks said that he has served as the County administrator, and was the general manager of the Eugene Water and Electric Board for 11 years. He was also on the Lane County Fair Board for 12 years. He is now retired from EWEB.

Dean Runyan said he has been a university instructor in Hawaii and at the University of Oregon. He is presently working as a consultant in planning and public analysis; he worked for two and a half years with Dick Ragatz and now has his own office. His emphasis is on transit and tourism research.

Ms. Calvert also introduced Abe Farkas and Bob Hibschi of the Eugene Development Department, who were present for the discussion on a permanent downtown transit station.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No members of the public were present.

MOTION APPROVAL OF MINUTES: It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the June 18 regular meeting be approved as distributed. There were no corrections or additions, and the minutes were unanimously approved.
VOTE

MOTION SALARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Brandt moved that the Board adopt the recommendation of the Salary Committee for the General Managers salary and benefits package, which had been distributed to the Board members. The recommendation included provisions for Fiscal Year 1986-87 for an increase in salary from \$47,762 to \$50,000; an increase from \$2,600 to \$3,000 for supplemental benefits for long-term disability and deferred compensation; and continuation of the annual car allowance of \$2,400. After seconding by Mr. Pusateri, the motion carried by unanimous vote.
VOTE

Ms. Calvert commented that the Board does appreciate the contribution that Ms. Loobey gives to the Board and the District, and that the operating and ridership statistics reflect her ability to choose the right people as well as her leadership skills.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON TRANSFER STATION:

Increase in Construction Grant Funds: Ms. Loobey stated that staff had asked for an amendment to the grant for construction of the University of Oregon (UO) transfer station at the last meeting because of design changes which were due to the construction of the Chiles Building on campus. Ms. Loobey said that, after the bids were opened, she had talked to a few Board members individually to let them know about the differences in the bids from what had been anticipated.

Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, said that construction of the station entailed a \$5,000 difference. Mr. Brandt wondered if the money was guaranteed to LTD, to which Mr. Viggiano replied that it is available, and would involve \$4,400 in federal funding and \$600 in local match. Mr. Brandt then said he thought LTD would run into trouble in the community because of all the fancy bus stops being constructed. He wondered if the extra costs for this station were caused by the UO wanting to "dress up" the station a little. Ms. Calvert commented that this particular bus stop handles the largest number of patrons, and Mr. Viggiano explained that the brickwork, dome, etc., are similar to the Chiles Building in quality and design. The UO is coordinating the flat work, and LTD is building the structure. Mr. Pusateri commented that it appeared that the City is putting in new curbs and sidewalks in that area, which will have to be taken out in a couple of months for construction of the transfer station.

Mr. Brandt again expressed his concerns about a fancy station. Ms. Loobey stated that it looks nice, and will be built to last a long time and entail low maintenance. She added that it is an important station for the District, as the gateway to the University of Oregon, and that staff have not been and would not be able to do anything else, since LTD has worked with the UO for years and University administration has rejected other ideas placed before it for consideration.

MOTION Ms. Eberly moved that the Board approve an increase of \$5,000 in the
VOTE Federal Aid Urban grant for construction of the University Transit Station at 13th and Kincaid. Dr. Smith seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Increased Funding for Additional Windscreens: Mr. Viggiano explained that the station just approved will serve patrons well. Two windscreens, to which display cases will be attached, were included in the base bid. Staff were asking that the Board also approve an additional \$12,000 in the FAU grant (\$1,440 in local funds) for the addition of seven windscreens to the University Station. Five additional windscreens would be added along the east wall, and two on the west. Wind in that area is primarily from the southwest, and wind and rain enter from the east side. The advantage to adding the windscreens now would be to have them done before winter. The advantage to waiting would be to see how the shelter works without them. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff believe the windscreens to be

important, since patrons continue to complain about the lack of protection from the weather at the River Road Transit Station.

Ms. Eberly wondered if costs would be higher if windscreens were installed at a later date. Mr. Viggiano replied that they probably would be higher later, since the contractor is now on the site and there would be no additional overhead if done at this time. However, he said, the additional costs for waiting would probably not be great. Mr. Brandt wondered why the architect did not think about the windscreens in the original plan. Mr. Viggiano explained that the windscreens were included in the bid as an optional component of the project. Mr. Pusateri wondered if the windscreens would have cost less if they had been included in the base bid, but Mr. Viggiano stated they would not, since the contractor bid the cost as if he would have built the entire structure.

Ms. Calvert wondered about the three-foot space between the shelter and the Chiles Building. Mr. Viggiano said that a retaining wall is located in that space. Board members wondered how much wind would really come through a three-foot space. Ms. Eberly wondered also how much it would cost for the two windscreens on the west side. Mr. Viggiano thought it would cost about \$3,000. Dr. Smith, Mr. Brandt, and Ms. Eberly agreed that they would be interested in providing the two windscreens on the west side.

MOTION

Dr. Smith moved that the Board approve the inclusion of up to \$3,000 in the FAU grant application for the University Station project, for two windscreens on the west side of the University Station, and that if costs for the two windscreens are higher than \$3,000, the costs be brought back to the Board in a poll of Board members for their approval. After seconding by Mr. Brandt, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

WORK SESSION ON DOWNTOWN STATION: Ms. Loobey called the Board's attention to the results of the Downtown Eugene Transit Center Site Evaluation which had been distributed earlier. The cost of the study had been shared between the City of Eugene and LTD. Ms. Loobey said that recommendations were included in the study, and staff were asking the Board to discuss criteria for a permanent downtown transit station. Mr. Viggiano added that the goals listed on page 16 of the agenda packet were set in cooperation with the City and the consultant, and the study was fairly well detailed.

Mr. Viggiano went on to say that it would be difficult to overstate how important a central transit station is to the District. He explained that LTD runs on a radial system, like the spokes of a wheel, radiating out from a central transfer facility. The dual purposes of a central downtown facility are that (1) downtown Eugene is a major destination point, and (2) the station serves as a transfer point for many patrons. Approximately two-thirds of the District's riders go through the station on an average weekday, either to transfer or as their final destination. Mr. Viggiano explained that most other transit stations are destination

points, such as the University of Oregon, and a few are solely transfer points, such as the new Parkway Station.

Mr. Viggiano then discussed the five goals listed on page 16 of the agenda packet for Board discussion. Mr. Brandt expressed concern about the fourth goal, to establish a permanent home for transit downtown, since the history in this area has not been good. He was concerned that any downtown station would only be "permanent" until it is decided what will be happening with the downtown area. He used the current downtown transfer station as an example, since LTD was only there two or three years before the City opened Willamette Street, right through the middle of the transit station, without compensation or consideration to the District. He said he couldn't see spending any money for a new transit station until he hears that things are settled and permanent, but that it would be fine if the City wanted to spend money to relocate the transit station. Mr. Pusateri was concerned that the current bus station is not actually a "station," since it is on the street.

Ms. Calvert commented that the "butterfly lot" just west of the Public Service Building seemed to be the best option because it could be purchased by the District. However, Mr. Brandt said he would want to know whether or not the City had plans to close off any streets in that area in the next five years.

Abe Farkas of the Eugene Development Department (EDD) stated that the City is currently going through an update of the original Urban Renewal Plan developed in 1968, in order to reconcile it with the Downtown Plan. In this process, they are identifying future land development over the next several years, including transit and public space. However, he said, this document is not a guarantee. He added that the EDD would very much like to negotiate which sites are compatible to mass transit.

Bob Hibschrann, also of the EDD staff, stated that a more powerful determinant is in place--the Metro Plan. Mr. Brandt wondered how it happened last time that Willamette Street between 10th and 11th was closed, and LTD spent \$550,000 on a station that was totally destroyed when the street was opened soon after, with a resulting loss of taxpayers' money. He thought that the City needs more than a plan before LTD spends a lot more money on a transit station; he wanted hard assurances that carry some monetary responsibility if the plan is changed within a certain amount of time. He said it would be premature to pick a site until the City says what buildings, streets, etc., would be there for the next ten years; then, he thought, LTD could start talking about spending \$3 million.

Ms. Calvert asked why it was essential to choose a site, and what would happen if it were not done. Ms. Loobey replied that a study, titled, "Downtown Eugene Transit Center Site Evaluation," by Don Miles, evolved as part of the process of continuing discussions between District staff and the City on the problems caused to LTD by the opening of Willamette Street. City and LTD staff had spent about six months looking

at ways to do what the Miles study says should be done: pulling the two "brown duck" stations to a location west of Willamette Street. The site selection process was elevated to the current level, she said, because of the update to the Urban Renewal Plan. She said the important issue from staff's perspective is that they want the problem to be taken care of, and part of that process is to update the Urban Renewal Plan to include a permanent downtown site for LTD. It is important to be involved, she said, and to have a choice of sites in the Urban Renewal Plan, which will lend greater assurance that the District will have a permanent home downtown than if these discussions missed the update. The issues involved in the present site will not go away, and if the District comes back to the City to request a permanent site at a later date, LTD may have to pursue the issue of further updates to the Urban Renewal Plan alone. Working within the update time line gives LTD the opportunity to have the two policy-making bodies discuss the pertinent facts and relevant issues. She admitted that this is a somewhat rushed time line, but said that not meeting that time line could leave the District vulnerable, both by trying alone to make changes in the plan at a later date, and by prolonging the situation at 10th and Willamette. She said the Board needs to determine its goals and objectives for a permanent downtown site in order to continue discussions with the City and the Eugene Downtown Commission (EDC).

Mr. Brandt said he agreed with setting priorities, and thought that if those priorities could be met, then the Board should talk to the City.

Ms. Loobey stated that staff had just discovered that there are some deed restrictions on the butterfly lot which might make it unavailable as a transit site. She said it was not relevant in her mind to know what the downtown plan is going to say; rather, LTD should state what its needs and objectives are and then if sites satisfy those needs, that is the basis for conversations or negotiations with the Downtown Commission. She said it would be very productive and useful for the Board to be very clear when discussing this issue with the Downtown Commission, or the EDC might decide the issue for them.

Ms. Eberly also expressed concern that the Board's decisions on what is best for the District, i.e., the riders, could be altered if there are some drastic changes to the Downtown Plan that could affect the whole flow, and everything the Board has in mind for meeting LTD's goals.

Mr. Farkas said the Eugene Development Department could give the Board a basic direction and a strong indication of which sites are likely to be developed. Mr. Hibschiemann said there are two plans, and it is important to distinguish between them. The Downtown Plan was adopted in 1984, and the Urban Renewal Plan is a subset of the Downtown Plan, or more like an implementation document. He said that most of the major decisions have been made, and this is an update in implementation. The opening of Willamette between 8th and 10th Streets was not included in the original plan, and would require a modification to the plan.

There was more discussion about the area near the butterfly lot, and the fact that the County, Federal, and City offices, which comprise large numbers of the downtown ridership, are not scheduled to be moving.

Ms. Eberly asked to discuss the paragraph about financing options on page 19. Ms. Loobey explained that the Board would decide which options to choose. She said she did not know what the need for local funds for the maintenance facility would finally be, but she saw the opportunity to leverage local money for federal funds in the 75 to 80 percent range. She explained that the improvements at the current transit site downtown involved no federal funds; the City and LTD shared the costs, and only local funds were used. If LTD finds that only local funds would have to be used for a new site, she said, it would behoove the Board to talk to the City about sharing the costs. Ms. Eberly expressed concern about getting involved in costly projects when the District knows it is going to need local dollars for the new maintenance facility. Board members agreed that a sixth goal for the downtown station was appropriate: the cost of the station should be minimized.

In discussing the opportunity to purchase the butterfly lot, Ms. Loobey stated that staff were told in initial conversations with the County that a title search had been made and no restrictions were found by the title company on the deed. However, further research by the County staff shows that there may be restrictions on the half of the property that borders on 8th, but they were not sure what that meant for LTD at that time.

Mr. Parks explained what he knew of the situation. He said the original deed stated that the land must be used for County purposes. There is no title because it was a donation. The heirs could sue for violations of deed restrictions, and 80 acres of downtown could return to the heirs. Ms. Loobey said staff were waiting for an opinion from County counsel.

Mr. Pusateri stated that he would like to add a seventh goal to the goals found on page 16 of the agenda packet. He thought the site should be off the street, so that the buses are not stopped in the main street. Ms. Eberly commented that this goes back to the need to know what is going to happen downtown before selecting a site.

Mr. Farkas then spoke about some of the development which has been proposed for downtown Eugene for the next several years. At 11th and Willamette, a proposal has been received but not yet acted upon for a mixed use project of four to five stories, with one floor of parking below ground. He thought that if a bus station were to go in that area, an attempt would have to be made to integrate it with this project, if approved. Ms. Eberly stated that this proposal affects two of the proposed sites already.

Mr. Farkas also stated that the long-term intent for the lot on Charnelton is for mixed use development and possibly housing--possibly

within three years. Willamette Street is also being considered as part of the Urban Renewal Plan update, but he was not sure which direction that development would take. Eighth and Willamette is scheduled for future mixed use development on a one-half block site. He said the EDD staff are hoping that people will be taking mass transit, and added that more parking will also be needed. They are looking closely at the property at 10th and Olive. Ms. Eberly stated that two of the recommended sites are at 10th and Olive, so the Board could be prioritizing sites and goals and then find out that the sites really are not appropriate or available.

Mr. Farkas stated that both parking lots at 10th and Olive were acquired for future development, with the most realistic being development on the east side of Olive, adjacent to the McDonald Theatre building.

Ms. Loobey said that there are now as yet unclear restrictions on the butterfly lot; if the property next to the McDonald Theatre is not available, the lot on the other side of Olive would not be adequate for the District's needs and is slated for development, anyway, none of the sites recommended in the study are available for the District's needs. Ms. Eberly wondered why the consultant wasn't aware of all this when preparing the study.

Mr. Farkas went on to say that there are restrictions on the 11th and Willamette site which state that all of the land available at that site must be available to that developer. If the developer wants to use that land, it would not be available. He said that the developer has only recommended that 10th and Olive be looked at for additional parking, but there are no restrictions yet. The intent of the Urban Renewal Plan, he said, is for urban development, and the City would have to use the land for that purpose if it had the opportunity.

Mr. Brandt observed that he did not have an idea in his mind that LTD is regarded as an important element in downtown Eugene. A study which recommended certain sites for one reason or another had been presented to the City and the Board. The highest priority site is not owned by Urban Renewal and may have restrictions. The priority for Urban Renewal is to turn property over for development. The recommended options are not really options for LTD, which leaves the District not being downtown at all or having a transfer station in the street. He said that if the number one goal of Urban Renewal is to turn property over for development, he could not see the City Council turning the property over to LTD. There is presently no statement that the City needs to set aside space to retain transit downtown.

Ms. Calvert stated that if Urban Renewal is concerned with the elimination of parking lots due to downtown development, it would seem that transit should at least be as important as a parking garage. Mr. Farkas said that this is exactly why the decision on station location needs to be incorporated with the Urban Renewal Plan update, and there are advantages to working together. He said that the EDD's preference had been for the County's butterfly lot, since it was reasonably close to

retail, hotel facilities, the Hult Center for the Performing Arts, and employees, all seen as secure inducements to support ridership.

There was some discussion about retaining air rights above any property which is chosen as a bus transfer site. Mr. Dallas said there could be some financial advantage to being able to use air space, but there are also disadvantages in trying to operate under a structure, due to noise and pollution problems.

Dr. Smith suggested that the Board needed some understanding from the Downtown Commission on how they feel about LTD being downtown, and also needed to put in writing the District's needs and views on the issue. Ms. Calvert stated that she had some strong concerns about waiting to see what property might be left over for LTD to use. Mr. Brandt reiterated that he would like the Board to pick a site and obtain a signed agreement saying what changes would occur in the near future, in order to be able to recover the District's investment over a period of time. Mr. Pusateri thought that no good alternative to the butterfly lot had been suggested in the study. Mr. Farkas said that none of the sites were totally out of the realm of possibility. He said that any mutually agreed-upon site would be mutually agreed upon with mutual commitments.

During discussion of ranking goals for a downtown transit station, Mr. Brandt stated that the suggested goals for a downtown station were too superficial and could not be separated and ranked because none of them were complete. He thought the Board would have to say that the primary goal is that LTD needs a site which is compatible with the downtown plan and can be accomplished with reasonable cost and be assured of being there for a reasonable amount of time. He thought the goals should be put together in a policy statement, and the District should tell the EDC that if they want LTD to be part of the plan, the District needs to be included in the discussions and the EDC needs to take into account the District's concepts of what LTD is looking for in a long-term site. He also thought that when the EDC comes up with its plan, then the Board and the EDC can start working together.

MOTION

Mr. Brandt moved that the staff develop a singular comprehensive statement that includes all criteria which should be included in the downtown plan and, if staff believed it would be useful, that the Board meet with the EDC to present it in person and explain the District's position. Dr. Smith seconded the motion. After further discussion, the Board decided it was important to have a site included in the Urban Renewal Plan, meaning that when the Urban Renewal Plan is updated and adopted, a choice will have been made for site selection for the District, and will be an integral part of the plan. If this does not happen, it could mean that the District would have to have the Urban Renewal Plan amended in the future. Mr. Brandt and Dr. Smith agreed to add to the motion a specific statement about a site being included in the Urban Renewal Plan. With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

Mr. Farkas stated that the EDC had looked at the study but was waiting for the meeting with the LTD Board before it takes any formal action on the study. Dr. Smith and Mr. Brandt stated that they believed the District was "shortchanged" on the expense for this study, and wondered if the Board could take action against Mr. Miles for recommending sites which were not available or appropriate. Mr. Pangborn stated that the people in charge at the County did not know there were deed restrictions on the butterfly lot, so Don Miles did not have all the information available, and was operating in good faith that the information he received was correct.

Board members decided to meet again on Wednesday, September 10 to prepare for the joint LTD/EDC meeting, which was tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, September 16. Ms. Loobey stated that a special meeting would be called for that date.

CONFIRMATION HEARINGS FOR TWO NEW BOARD MEMBERS: The Board asked staff to call the appropriate office in Salem to find out when the two new Board members would be confirmed, in the hopes of having them confirmed at the earliest possible date.

MOTION
VOTE

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Eberly moved that the meeting be adjourned. After seconding, the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:25 p.m.



Board Secretary

bdmn0813.jhs