

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, October 13, 1986

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 8, 1986, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Monday, October 13, 1986 at 7:30 p.m. at the Eugene City Hall.

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

Absent: Joyce Nichols
Larry Parducci

CALL TO ORDER: After calling the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m., Ms. Calvert stated that there was one major item for discussion that evening. After a presentation by the Eugene Development Department staff, the Board would discuss draft criteria for selecting a permanent downtown transit station.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: There was no participation from the audience.

PERMANENT DOWNTOWN TRANSIT STATION:

Presentation by City of Eugene Staff on Urban Renewal Plan:
Ms. Loobey introduced Bob Hibschan and Greg Byrne of the Eugene Development Department staff, who were present that evening in response to the Board's desire to know about plans for downtown and what might affect the siting of a permanent downtown station. The first step for the Board would be to submit criteria to be included in the Urban Renewal Plan.

Ms. Loobey explained that staff had been working with City staff for the last six months, and that the examination of sites for a downtown transit station has been almost as extensive as the site selection process for the new maintenance facility. However, the Board had not been involved in that process before this point.

Mr. Byrne discussed the Urban Renewal Plan and specific projects that may have an affect on LTD's site selection process. He mentioned the City's general plan and a refinement plan for specific neighborhoods adopted by the City Council. The central area of downtown is governed by

the Urban Renewal Plan, but Mr. Byrne said this plan has always been out of sync with the City's planning process, since it used to be a federal program and administered by a separate agency. The City is now in the process of bringing the Urban Renewal Plan in conformance with state law, and is leaving behind the federal program. He further explained that the Plan operates only within the boundaries of the Urban Renewal District, and there cannot be an intermingling of funds.

The financing technique to pay for public improvements within the Urban Renewal District is a tax increment program, which will become part of the updated plan. The future focus of the Urban Renewal Plan is different than the federal program, which was involved in condemnation. The present plan uses existing assets, and emphasizes getting property that the renewal agency owns back into private hands.

Mr. Hibschan discussed the draft Urban Renewal Plan Update with the Board, and handed out copies of the Downtown Plan adopted by the City Council in October, 1984, after a two-year process. The Downtown Plan was the driving document for the Urban Renewal Plan Update. Another important document is the Central Area Transportation Study (CATS), which lends a larger view to the planning of the downtown area, and includes recommendations to the Urban Renewal Plan Update.

Mr. Hibschan discussed a land use map and a map of the Eugene Downtown Plan. He said that no street direction changes were anticipated, other than the converting of Willamette between 11th and 13th to a two-way street, and consideration of converting 13th through 20th to two-way.

CATS looked at the recommendation that part of Olive Street also be converted to two-way, but the change is unlikely because of the traffic on that street. There is a possibility that a third parking garage will be built at the west end of the mall (Lincoln/Broadway). A central plaza or public square at Broadway and Willamette is planned.

Ms. Calvert wondered how much shopping would have to increase to fill the two current parking structures. Mr. Byrne's answer was 15 to 25 percent. He explained that the City owns about 40 percent of the parking garages. The Overpark is nearing capacity and the Parcade is used about 30 percent or more, and the performing arts garage is about 25 percent full during the day when there are no events. The centrally located surface lots are at 90 to 95 percent capacity.

Mr. Hibschan also discussed a report document which had not yet been adopted. It describes the conditions which exist in the area, including land use, zoning, infrastructure, social conditions, etc. Chapter 6 of the document details projects that are expected to be undertaken by the renewal district, and includes the best estimates possible for projects, costs, and timing. However, two projects were included without cost or timing estimates: (1) central transit facility improvements, which does include language as to the willingness of the City to help with the project in the renewal district; and (2) the public library, which includes

the same kind of language. Mr. Hibschan stated that the new expansion area for urban renewal should not have an impact on the transit district, except that population intensity will occur, mainly to the north.

Mr. Runyan asked about plans for parking garages. Mr. Byrne said that parking at 8th and Willamette and 11th and Willamette are both planned in the second year. Parking at 11th and Willamette is planned because there has been a significant public investment at that end of downtown. Ms. Calvert asked if the cost of parking structures would be provided primarily by Urban Renewal Funds. Mr. Byrne answered that it would be, using tax increment fund bonds to create the structures, then enterprise funds to maintain them.

Mr. Runyan asked Mr. Hibschan to identify roughly where they think action will be in the next ten years. He replied that there is tremendous potential at 10th and Broadway, across from the performing arts parking garage, between downtown and 5th Street, which continues to be a highly developed retail and entertainment district. He added that any more street closures would be a major policy decision and are not proposed, since it is not seen as a good idea to limit street access to the mall area. The plan is, rather, to strive to increase linkage between areas of intense development.

In response to further questions regarding development of 11th and Willamette and parking at 10th and Oak, Mr. Byrne said it depends a large part on the intensity of development at 11th and Willamette. The Development Department would like to see a major development there, but in six or seven years, the present parking would be inadequate to service this future construction. Developers, he said, want to see some commitment or ability to accommodate their needs in the future. Mr. Runyan thought there would be design problems with a multi-level parking structure on that size parcel. Mr. Byrne agreed that this is a possibility, with tighter ramps, etc. Mr. Runyan wanted to know if there was an alternative site, possibly outside the Urban Renewal boundaries, that could be used for parking to serve 11th and Willamette. Mr. Byrne thought not.

Dr. Smith asked about the property between Oak and Pearl and 6th and 7th. It is owned by the County and there is a possibility of future development, but it is not being looked at as a potential expansion area for Urban Renewal. Mr. Brandt wondered what will happen to the Ferry Street Bridge area in the future, but Mr. Byrne did not know. In the T-2000 Plan there are plans to rebuild the Ferry Street Bridge, but Mr. Parks stated that where, when, the cost, or how to pay for it are not known. He added that decisions about the bridge will drive and change the character of traffic. Ms. Loobey didn't think the Ferry Street Bridge was discussed in the six-year plan.

Mr. Parks also thought the options for a downtown LTD facility seemed to be singling in on the Urban Renewal area. Mr. Byrne said there had been an evaluation of publicly owned property which is immediately available, but no study of private property had been done.

Mr. Byrne also stated that the Planning Commission, the Downtown Commission, and the City Council were all in the throes of trying to digest the same information the Board was studying. He encouraged the individual Board members to call the Development Department staff to ask questions, and to contact the individual Downtown Commission members.

Adopt Criteria: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, called the Board's attention to page 2 of the agenda packet for that evening. Listed there were draft criteria and objectives based on the Board's policy statement which had been adopted at the last meeting.

1. The station is to be located near the employment and retail centers in downtown Eugene: In explaining the first criterion, Mr. Viggiano stated that the station must function as a destination point which is located to minimize walking distance for shoppers and workers. In response to Mr. Runyan's question regarding a destination study downtown, Mr. Viggiano stated that 12 percent of the riders system-wide are public employees. This does not include the University of Oregon employees, however. Some of the larger downtown employers will be the government offices, which may be building in the same general downtown area; LCC Downtown Campus; Eugene Water and Electric Board; and the Riverfront Project.

Staff propose that, as the system grows, LTD concentrate on the commuter market. Eugene Public Works, as a part of CATS, is looking at present and future employment as a result of Metro plan development. Most development is expected to occur in the north and east areas of downtown.

2. The station must function conveniently for transferring patrons: Mr. Viggiano stated that more than 3,500 transfers per day now occur downtown. The maximum distance for walking between transfers is three blocks, although two blocks is more than staff would prefer. Ideally, he said, everything would be contained within one-half block.

3. The station must be efficient and safe to operate: Mr. Viggiano mentioned the need for direct access from Ferry Street Bridge, the south, and the west. Mr. Runyan asked about the proportion of riders from the University of Oregon, to which Mr. Viggiano replied that they account for 9 or 10 percent. Mr. Runyan then talked about the projected employment from the research park to the east, and said that the Riverfront Project has rather high goals for alternative mode use, with limited access across the railroad tracks.

4. The station is to have sufficient capacity for buses and passenger waiting and boarding areas: Staff believe that the passenger waiting areas should be at least the same as present areas. Mr. Runyan wanted to know how the District would control loitering. Mr. Viggiano stated that this is a difficult issue, and that loitering could best be controlled on private property or in an off-street location. It is more difficult to do on a public site by a public agency. One option, he said,

would be for LTD to hire private security guards; some transit districts do have their own police forces. He added that loitering could more likely be discouraged than eliminated.

5. The Customer Service Center is to be conveniently located near the station: Mr. Pusateri thought the Customer Service Center (CSC) should be included as part of the transit station rather than being adjacent to it. Mr. Viggiano agreed that this would be ideal, but the District would have to give up quite a bit of land in a half-block area for a 2,000 square foot CSC. Ms. Loobey explained that the CSC includes a public waiting area, offices, telephone information answering, and driver restrooms, in addition to the sales and information counter.

6. The station is to be consistent and compatible with current and future development

7. The station is to be cost-effective: Mr. Viggiano stated that the \$100,000 per year of programmed life for the facility was a subjective figure, chosen under the assumption that, if 416 bus riders bought passes during the year, it would result an additional \$100,000 during that year, which would be a 7 percent system-wide increase. The goal, he said, is not to minimize the cost, but to make the facility as cost-effective as possible, weighing the benefits against the cost.

Mr. Viggiano stated that staff recommended that the Board adopt these criteria for use among themselves in evaluating sites, and to recommend that the City of Eugene include them in the Urban Renewal Plan Update.

MOTION

Dr. Smith moved that the Board approve the criteria provided for in the memorandum in the agenda packet for that evening. Ms. Eberly seconded the motion.

Mr. Runyan said that he would be interested in a couple of changes, but could not vote, since his appointment had not been confirmed by the Senate. His first concern was with the explanation of the third criteria; it would be his preference to minimize the concern with locating an off-street site, since he does not share the perspective that this is as important as it appears to be in the statement of objectives. He thought that locating some portion, or perhaps all, off-street would be appropriate, but he thought the statement that the station should be primarily off-street makes it too important. He suggested saying "to some extent off-street" rather than "primarily." He thought that an off-street facility might induce more loitering, but that trying to minimize loitering by the design of the facility sounded fine. Dr. Smith said he agreed with Mr. Runyan on both concerns. Mr. Brandt suggested eliminating the part of the sentence that said, "primarily off-street."

Mr. Pusateri said he liked the emphasis on an off-street location, and did not like having buses lined up in competition with cars. Ms. Calvert was concerned that an on-street station places the buses in

front of something and offends someone. However, it was Mr. Brandt's concern that the District not limit itself by stressing the need for an off-street location. He said he can see that an off-street station would be beneficial, but no one had convinced him that it had to be that way.

Dr. Smith wanted to know if the criteria became inflexible if approved. Ms. Loobey stated that they are meant to be guidelines. The situation is in a sufficient state of flux, she said, so that there is a need for enough specificity so that LTD retains its presence downtown efficiently and effectively. With an on-street location and the grid location of downtown, LTD would be trading one stretched-out station for another, unless some curb-side loading could be provided. In any case, she said, the criteria are guidelines to give clear signals to the City of Eugene about what the District's needs are.

Ms. Eberly thought that Mr. Brandt's wording suggestion would not take away the Board's intent, since the Board knows what it is looking for in a downtown transit station. She said she would rather talk about minimizing loitering than striking the statement completely, because she believed it to be a genuine concern.

MOTION
TO
AMEND/
VOTE

Ms. Eberly moved that the Board amend the motion to strike "primarily off-street in order to" from criterion #3. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion. A vote was then taken on the amendment, and the motion to amend carried by a vote of 3 to 2, with Calvert and Pusateri voting against the motion, and Brandt, Eberly, and Smith in favor.

MOTION
TO
AMEND/
VOTE

Dr. Smith then moved that the main motion be amended to change the word "control" to "minimize" in the objectives for criterion #3. After being seconded by Mr. Brandt, the motion to amend carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Parks and Ms. Eberly wanted to know if the criteria would definitely be included in the Urban Renewal Plan Update. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, stated that LTD would be recommending to the Downtown Commission and the Urban Renewal Board that the criteria be included in the Update, based on a recommendation made to the LTD Board by Abe Farkas, Development Department Director. Although there is no promise that the criteria will be included, that is the intent. Mr. Viggiano added that this is a decision which will be made by the City Council, which is also the Urban Renewal Board.

Mr. Pusateri was concerned that if the Board knows what it wants but does not specify that in the criteria, once the Update is adopted, it is not really part of the Urban Renewal Plan. After some discussion, Dr. Smith commented that there is no consensus among the Board members about an on- or off-street facility. Mr. Pangborn added that Mr. Farkas had mentioned to him that the Update may not include all statements included with the criteria, in order to keep the document flexible. Mr. Runyan was concerned that the staff memo containing the draft criteria

might also have a life of its own, and he didn't want to put specificity in it if it isn't representative of Board consensus.

VOTE Dr. Smith called for the vote on the initial motion, as amended. With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

MOTION/ NO SECOND Evaluate Specific Sites: Ms. Calvert asked for the Board's input on weighting the criteria for site selection. Mr. Brandt thought the criteria should be specifically un-weighted. He moved that the Board not weight the criteria, and state that they are all equally important. The motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION Dr. Smith then moved that the Board approve the Butterfly Lot as the preferred site for a downtown transit station and direct staff to work with legal counsel and Lane County staff to determine its availability. The motion was seconded by Ms. Eberly.

Ms. Eberly wondered where the Board would go as far as the City is concerned if the Butterfly Lot is not available, considering that everything else has been ruled out except private property. Mr. Brandt thought the Board would be jumping the gun dramatically to say that the Butterfly Lot is the best site. However, Ms. Calvert stated that if the Board wants to ask for any ruling on the Butterfly Lot, it would first have to indicate that it is interested in that site. Mr. Brandt said he thought the Butterfly Lot was too small and would not work. He was concerned that the Board hadn't even talked about how to develop the lot and how the bus flow would work, and said there was no basis to select it as a preferred site.

Mr. Brandt also saw a problem with criteria #7 and the Butterfly Lot; he thought the cost of the Butterfly Lot was going to be very high and would have to last for 50 years at \$100,000 per year, and said the District couldn't justify 50 years. He also thought the Butterfly Lot was too far away from where people will be going, and said it would be important to talk about the Riverfront Project and growth at the University of Oregon.

In response to a question from Ms. Eberly, Mr. Viggiano said that the City of Eugene Traffic Department looked at primary sites for traffic flow and capacity. The capacity for the Butterfly Lot is 23 buses; presently, the maximum number of buses at the transit station at one time is 17. As the system grows, emphasis would not be on more routes, but on increased frequency of service. This would mean that more buses would go through the station, but not at one time.

Ms. Loobey stated that concerns about the Riverfront Park, whether Agripack stays or not, etc., can often be handled as a minor node, such as at 13th and Kincaid, rather than part of a central transit facility.

Ms. Eberly wanted to know the repercussions of giving criteria but holding off on choosing a primary site. Ms. Loobey thought the issue for

the City is that they have prime development lots downtown, and one barrier to those lots is LTD's present location. If the City wants to help the District find another location to help eliminate some of the impediments, this is only one alternative. The Butterfly Lot is not City-owned property.

Mr. Parks added that the City would like to move LTD away from the land it wants to market and put on the City's tax roles. Ms. Loobey stated that the Butterfly Lot has been tax exempt and would remain so, which means that LTD would not be taking any private property currently on the tax roles and making it tax exempt.

Ms. Loobey added that the cloud for LTD is that there is not a preferred alternative if the Butterfly Lot is not available, so focus has been on the criteria and asking that they be included in the Urban Renewal Plan Update. She said there will be some pressure for the District to make some kind of move within a three- to five-year time frame, and the Board will need to know its parameters for the kind of station, design, etc. It will take at least that long for the federal funding process to be completed, and that cannot begin without some kind of idea about where the site will be and what the Board wants to do.

Mr. Parks wanted to know if the District was at its present site at the sanction of the City Council. Ms. Loobey said that it is, and that no time element has been stated for a move, but the District would not be asked to leave that site without prior notice.

Mr. Brandt still thought the Board and staff were rushing the issue. He wanted more detail on what is needed, and felt that, since it was only the second time this issue had been discussed, the Board was being pushed to see if it can acquire the Butterfly Lot. He thought the Board should see what the City is going to do, and that there will be plenty of sites, since Eugene isn't going to change overnight. He also thought that, if LTD is forced to move, it could move a couple of blocks away and it would not be "the end of the world." However, Ms. Calvert was concerned about loss of ridership that can occur with a number of temporary lots. She said the Board did not have to decide on the Butterfly Lot right away, but if it is not available, there are not many half-block sites available in that area. Mr. Brandt stated that there is a lot of private property available, and he thought the District had a long-term study on its hands. Dr. Smith disagreed, however, saying that he didn't think this was as big a deal as a new service facility. He thought the Board needed to have a site chosen fairly soon, and if the Board dragged its heels, it would drag things out for the rest of the City. He added that designs for the lots are in the study prepared by Don Miles. Dr. Smith also thought the Board should find out if the District could legally acquire the Butterfly Lot, but the Board would have to show some interest in the lot, first. Mr. Brandt said he would not say it was the preferred site, but would not mind saying the Board wanted staff to work with legal counsel to determine the lot's availability.

MOTION

Ms. Eberly moved that the Board approve the Butterfly Lot as a lot it is interested in, and direct staff to work with legal counsel to see if it is available. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion.

Mr. Parks said that in order to have the issue litigated, the Board needed to be very specific about why it wants the lot, etc. Ms. Calvert thought that if the motion passed as it stood, it would direct staff to find out if the Board needs to be more specific in order to have a court case.

Mr. Pangborn stated that it is known that there are deed restrictions, and legal counsel sees at least two ways to pursue the issue: (1) a declaratory judgment, which would require adjudication; and (2) vacation of the site, which would require that the County remove the restrictions. Dr. Smith commented that the District needed to start simply.

MOTION
TO
AMEND/
NO
SECOND

Mr. Brandt moved that the motion be amended by adding that the cost of this particular directive not exceed \$25,000. He thought the District would spend at least \$15,000 to find out what would have to be done. The motion died for lack of a second.

VOTE

The Board then voted on the main motion, to approve the Butterfly Lot as a lot it is interested in, and direct staff to work with legal counsel to see if it is available. The motion carried unanimously.

MOTION

Ms. Eberly expressed some concern that the Board not drop all activity in terms of looking at private property while this legal review is going on. She then moved that the Board direct staff to continue to be involved with the study of various sites, both private and public, which could be utilized for a downtown transit station. After seconding by Mr. Brandt, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

Mr. Runyan commented that he liked the attempt to identify the criteria and to be organized and specific. He said it gave him a good work sheet for identifying his own priorities.

MOTION
VOTE

Ms. Eberly then moved that the Board adjourn. Mr. Pusateri seconded the motion, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:40 p.m.



Board Secretary