

## M I N U T E S

Eugene Transit Station Site Selection Committee  
LTD Board Room

November 15, 1990  
7:30 a.m.

PRESENT: H. Thomas Andersen, Gerry Gaydos, John Brown, Debra Ehrman, members; Phyllis Loobey, Stefano Viggiano, staff; Bob Hibschan, City of Eugene staff; Mike Weishar, Eric Gunderson, Charles Thompson, guests.

### I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gaydos moved, seconded by Ms. Ehrman, to approve the October 8, 1990, minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

### II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Andersen noted that there were letters of concern regarding preliminary site selections in the agenda packet.

### III. FIRESTONE SITE ANALYSIS

Mr. Andersen reviewed the results of the last meeting, noting that the committee had moved to have staff consider only those lots that were larger than one-half block. This narrowed site selection to the Firestone lot and the elections lot. He explained that consultants had made preliminary studies of these sites.

Mr. Viggiano introduced Mike Weishar, a traffic consultant from JRH Engineering. Mr. Viggiano said that Mr. Weishar would present a preliminary site analysis which incorporated closing a portion of 10th Avenue to the committee. Mr. Viggiano also noted that further efforts would most likely concentrate on the elections site, according to recommendation.

Mr. Weishar outlined the preliminary concept, which depicted the closing of 10th Avenue west of Pearl. He briefly reviewed preliminary traffic flow analyses. He explained the predicted limitations and the effects of the rerouting of traffic and pointed to two alternatives for diverted traffic to the north described in the agenda packet.

Mr. Weishar stated that limitations included possible conflicts with pedestrian traffic, inhibiting space, and possible adverse effects on nearby cafes at Broadway between Oak and Pearl.

#### IV. ELECTIONS LOT SITE ISSUES

Mr. Hibschan gave a summary of site considerations. He explained that City staff discussed conceptual designs and ideas regarding a station at the Elections lot. He said that the focus was on the impact a station in that location would have on the surrounding area. Some considerations were: an image which would blend with historical aspects of the 5th Avenue area; that buses would enter/exit from Oak and Pearl rather than on 5th and 6th; that the design would recognize the downtown core; that, if there were a parking structure, it should blend in visually with the existing area; and that retail or services for commuters could be located on the 5th Avenue side.

A brief discussion followed concerning how this site design would affect parking. Mr. Hibschan noted that there was a possibility of gaining spaces using the preliminary design configuration.

Mr. Gunderson noted that the preservation of certain existing trees might be an issue.

Consideration of the provisions of the 5th Avenue Special Development District was discussed, as it related to development standards.

#### V. POTENTIAL SITE LAYOUTS FOR ELECTIONS LOT

Mr. Viggiano reiterated the charge of the committee, noting that they were to make a recommendation on a site, not necessarily a design, although review of preliminary site design layouts would aid in determining a cost estimate, as well as determining, basically, if the site was workable. He asked the committee to try to determine which site designs they would recommend to be used in developing a cost estimate.

Mr. Viggiano introduced Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. Gunderson explained that three different design schemes had been drawn up after an initial investigation of utilities showed no major problems in terms of potential relocation of existing utility fixtures. He said that the focus was on bus maneuvering as well on as how it fits into the larger context of the downtown area and its future design. He outlined these three schemes, noting that Scheme A contained a drawback with its directional flow of buses. He added that Scheme A did create a potential for retail, with a customer service center along the south edge. He explained that Scheme B attempted to allow for the preferred directional flow, concentrated the passenger traffic on a single island, and allowed for some space for commercial services. The drawback was that the customer service center appeared isolated. He explained that Scheme C was similar to Scheme B, but that the service center was located along a street edge.

Mr. Gunderson presented a more detailed outline for Scheme C to the committee.

A brief discussion followed concerning parking. Mr. Gunderson explained that there were a few options concerning the replacement as well as the addition of parking spaces. The construction of a full-block underground parking structure was one option he presented.

#### VI. COST ESTIMATE FOR ELECTIONS LOT

Mr. Viggiano distributed a cost sheet and then introduced Mr. Thompson. Mr. Thompson explained the cost estimates for: 1) the acquisition of the land; 2) the three existing structures on the site; 3) asphalt, and 4) possible damages, which assumed that parking would not be replaced or would not be as desirable. The cost estimate range was \$1,633,000 to \$2,035,000, the range of parking was \$400,000 to \$800,000.

A brief discussion followed concerning the cost estimates and whether LTD would purchase the full block or resell a portion of the full block.

Mr. Andersen asked if the committee had any more questions concerning the cost estimates.

#### VII. COMMITTEE ACTION

Mr. Brown moved, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, that on staff recommendation, the committee no longer considered the Firestone lot for recommendation.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Andersen noted that, in effect, this motion, without stating it, points to a recommendation by the committee for the elections lot.

Mr. Andersen said that in light of the committee's decision, unless things are referred back from the board, this committee need not reconvene.

Mr. Gaydos moved, seconded by Ms. Ehrman, that the board should consider the final four options still as options but that it is the committee's recommendation that the elections site is the primary site that the board should consider.

The motion passed unanimously.

A brief discussion followed concerning the station site selection and the link with this project to other downtown projects. Ms. Loobey emphasized that although the site selection might be controversial, it was important to stress LTD's track record for constructing facilities which were aesthetically pleasing as well as taking into consideration the surrounding area's needs.

The committee recognized that it would not need to reconvene again, unless called on by the board.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Untz)  
mnetsss111590

## MINUTES

Joint Meeting  
Eugene Transit Station Site Selection Committee  
Lane County Board of Commissioners  
LTD Board Room--3500 East 17th Avenue

July 10, 1990  
Noon

PRESENT: Janet Calvert, Bill Rogers, Co-Chairs; Peter Brandt, John Brown, members of the Eugene Transit Station Site Selection Committee (ETSSS); Bill Rogers, chair; Steve Cornacchia, Ellie Dumdi, Jack Roberts, Jerry Rust, Lane County commissioners; Phyllis Loobey and Stefano Viggiano, Lane Transit District; Jim Johnson, Lane County.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Ms. Calvert welcomed the County Commissioners to the new Lane Transit District facility. She explained the purpose of the meeting, saying the ETSSS wanted County input on two possible transit station sites that would require the purchase of County land. She noted that the meeting would include only discussion and no decision-making.

### II. REVIEW OF THE BUTTERFLY AND ELECTIONS LOTS

Mr. Viggiano reviewed both the butterfly and elections lots, explaining that the butterfly lot was a half-block in size and the elections lot was a full-block. He described the advantages of the butterfly lot mostly in terms of its location. He said the lot had a downtown central location, which would put the transit station close to employment and retail centers and within the urban renewal district. The lot's disadvantages, he said, included its small size, its potential impact on the Saturday Market and Farmer's Market, a possible loss of parking, and possible traffic problems on Seventh Avenue.

Mr. Viggiano next described the advantages of the elections lot. He said it was a larger lot that allowed more options for mixed-use development, and it was close to the Fifth Street Public Market. He described its disadvantage as its location, which is on the periphery of downtown and outside of the urban renewal district.

### III. DISCUSSION

Mr. Rogers called the Lane County Board of Commissioners' meeting to order.

Mr. Rust asked Mr. Viggiano to explain the advantages of a site being located in the urban renewal district. Mr. Viggiano said being within the district allowed the option of using urban renewal funds for the mixed-use project and perhaps for the transit station itself. He explained that the district could possibly be expanded to include the elections lot site.

Mr. Rust asked if staff had worked with the Eugene planning and zoning staff during its site research. Mr. Viggiano responded that the ETSSS consisted of several members who were also on planning or zoning committees and who have carried ETSSS discussion back to those groups.

Ms. Dumdi asked if the committee had eliminated any of the several sites originally considered. Mr. Viggiano answered that a recent addition, the Firestone site, had joined the original five sites under consideration. He explained the status of the original five sites, saying that the City Hall site had been eliminated, and the Sears block had been eliminated because of its possible use for the Library. He said there appeared to be no great interest in the Greyhound site. He explained that the committee had reduced the sites to the elections lot, the butterfly lot, the Firestone site, and perhaps the City property at 8th Avenue and Willamette Street. He said a Request For Proposals now out for the City property could contain a proposal for a transit station.

Mr. Cornacchia asked for the square footage of the existing County building on the elections lot. He also asked how the County was using the building, how many parking spaces were in the structure, and how those spaces were being used. Mr. Faw said the building contained 12,500 square feet on each of its two stories. He said the County housed elections staff there, as well as a number of Health and Human Services offices. Mr. Johnson added that the building only housed County offices. Mr. Faw explained that the structure contained 144 parking spaces, a few of which were devoted to customer parking. Most of the spaces are leased monthly to County employees. Mr. Faw noted that the parking spaces earned about \$35,000 in annual revenue.

Mr. Rogers, noting that the County owned both the half block on the site as well as another eighth of a block, asked if the 144 parking spaces were a combination of both spaces. Mr. Faw said it was.

Mr. Cornacchia inquired about the condition of the building. Mr. Faw said the 30-year-old building was still in good shape. Mr. Johnson noted that the building was structurally sound but was not a favorite of employees. Mr. Faw added that a 1987 appraisal estimated the building and land value at about \$1.2 million. He noted that the amount included both parcels and the building, which adds up to about three-fourths of a block.

Mr. Rogers, noting that the commissioners had shown reluctance for using the butterfly lot during a previous discussion, asked Ms. Calvert if the ETSSS had discussed the commissioners' reluctance. Ms. Calvert said there had been some talk. Mr. Rogers stated his assumption that the butterfly lot would have been eliminated by now. He noted that the commissioners had yet to discuss the elections lot.

Ms. Calvert said the purpose of the meeting was to get a final picture of which lots the County would definitely eliminate.

Mr. Brown noted that the Eugene Downtown Commission had selected the butterfly lot as its first-choice site for the transit station. Mr. Rust asked why. Mr. Brown explained that it was chosen for its location. He said Downtown Commission members had been concerned about the elections lot because pedestrians would have to cross major arterials to get into downtown proper. He added that the Downtown Commission saw the project as primarily a transit station, with mixed-use only an added benefit if possible.

Mr. Rust asked if a pedestrian tunnel or overpass would alleviate Downtown Commission concern over the elections lot. Mr. Brown said he did not think so because of safety issues and because a transit station on the periphery of downtown could discourage ridership.

Ms. Calvert noted that almost all the sites considered had elicited "not in my backyard" opinions. Mr. Brown added that the butterfly lot was surrounded by public right-of-way. Mr. Cornacchia asked if the Downtown Commission was concerned overall with the viability of downtown. Mr. Brown said it was, adding that the commission would like the station downtown for the benefit of businesses and the benefit of riders.

Mr. Brandt suggested that staff review the ranking of the lots. Mr. Viggiano first explained the technical criteria on which the lots were ranked, then gave the rankings: 1) butterfly lot, mixed use; 2) City Hall, mixed use; 3) Sears, mixed use; 4) butterfly lot, station only; 5) Greyhound, mixed use; 6) existing site; 7) Sears, station only; 8) Greyhound, station only. He added that three options for the elections lot had been ranked 9, 10, and 11 primarily because of the lot's location on the periphery of downtown.

Mr. Cornacchia noted that the commissioners' main problem with the butterfly lot was the use of Oak Street. He asked if it were possible to structure the lot so no buses would travel on Oak Street. Mr. Viggiano referred to a chart that showed bus access to the station was on 7th and 8th avenues, not on Oak Street.

Mr. Cornacchia asked if the facility would be enclosed. Mr. Viggiano explained that examples looked at had only covered part of the site, and that parking could possibly go one level underground. He added that parking could go above ground, with the building cantilevering to allow for open space at the outside edges. He noted that engineering questions were yet to be answered.

Mr. Rust, referring back to the ranking of sites, asked how much proximity to downtown was weighted in the ranking. Mr. Viggiano explained the ranking process, noting that 100 points had been allocated for future employment estimates within a three-block area of the sites. The butterfly lot ranked high in this category while the elections lot ranked low.

Mr. Rust objected to the concept that the location of the elections lot was a hindrance to its selection for a transit station. He pointed out that the lot was about 1.5 blocks away from downtown, while the current transit station spanned three blocks. He added his belief that the convenience factor would change greatly over time as gas and parking prices rose. He expressed his concern that the butterfly lot would be too small for the amount of development being proposed. He reiterated his belief that too much emphasis was being placed on the Election lot's location several blocks outside of the downtown core. He said he wanted to encourage the committee to consider the elections lot over the butterfly lot.

Ms. Dumdi noted that it appeared that the mixed-use option had been ruled out for the butterfly lot. Ms. Calvert replied that parking was being considered, but the lot's size excludes much mixed-use development.

In response to a request from Ms. Calvert, Lew Bowers explained that the Eugene City Council had discussed the sites, talking mostly about the City Hall lot. He said that council members had not encouraged the consideration of the City Hall site for a transit station. He added that individual City Council members spoke on different sites.

Mr. Rogers suggested that commissioners individually offer opinions about the sites, starting with the butterfly lot.

Mr. Roberts, noting that his concerns were valid for both sites, raised the issue of parking spaces, saying that any parking lost would need to be replaced. He also expressed his concern over how a butterfly lot station would affect its County neighbor. He said the County should be careful not to allow something that would be a detriment to the local ambiance and environment. Additionally, he said the County should ensure that the station should do nothing that would be contrary to the greater good of the community. He expressed the feeling that the County could probably live with a transit station as a neighbor. He said he would not rule out the site if his concerns could be answered.

Ms. Dumdi expressed her concern over the proposed project design, saying that an open-air structure could destroy the area ambiance. She noted that the Park Blocks and the Saturday Market existed in the area. She expressed the belief that the butterfly lot did not need to be ruled out, but that she would like to see a structure that would be totally enclosed. She said the lot would not be high on her list with the current project proposal because of the impact on the surrounding area.

Mr. Cornacchia, who noted his previous stance of being opposed to the butterfly lot as a transit station, said he was no longer as strongly opposed if issues could be taken care of. He said there would have to be an equal return of parking spaces for any lost. Differing from Ms. Dumdi, Mr. Cornacchia expressed the opinion that a butterfly lot station would destroy the character of the area because major traffic already passes by the area. He noted, however, that any project design should enhance the ambiance. He summarized his views by describing the things he would like resolved in order

to consider the butterfly lot: 1) a design amenable to user groups; 2) a return to the County of parking spaces lost; 3) LTD responsibility for building a rest room for the Saturday Market. He expressed the opinion that staff and others should be able to figure a way to use the butterfly lot to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. Rust echoed the comments of the other commissioners and said any plan for the butterfly lot would have to echo those concerns. He reiterated his opinion that the elections lot had been unfairly ranked. He said it would be somewhat of a risk to put money into studying the butterfly lot, but that he would not rule out the site.

Mr. Rogers stated that he would have no problem with selling the lot. He said he would require a full recovery of parking spaces in any deal agreed upon. He expressed the belief that issues mentioned could be handled with the proper design.

Mr. Cornacchia suggested that there would be merit in holding a meeting for everyone involved in discussions about parking and other related issues.

In response to a request from Mr. Johnson, Mr. Rogers explained that he had some concerns over deed restrictions to the south end of the butterfly lot. Mr. Rogers said deed restrictions referred to the land as an area of recreation. He said the County and City could use vacation proceedings on the land, but that he also advised that the jurisdictions file for declaratory judgment to get the issue resolved.

The commissioners next considered the elections lot.

Mr. Rust noted the irony of possibly building a parking garage to mitigate the spaces removed to build a transit station. He expressed his support for the elections lot and his desire for the committee to take another close look at it.

Mr. Cornacchia noted that his considerations for the elections lot were the same as for the butterfly lot, with the exception of the need for a bathroom. He added that he would like the County's finance staff to investigate possible future need for the property to make sure the County would not be selling something it would later need. Mr. Rogers asked his opinion about losing County office space if the elections lot were sold. Mr. Cornacchia said he expected an equal amount of office space to be returned to the County.

Ms. Dumdi expressed her opposition to the elections lot because of the impact the sale would have on the County. She said the site was too valuable to the County to let it go. She noted her concern about losing parking spaces.

Mr. Roberts said he would apply the same requirements to the elections lot as he did to the butterfly lot, with the addition of concerns about the building. He said that it would be the County's responsibility, and not LTD's responsibility, to find replacement office space. He expressed the opinion that he saw the elections lot as a less desirable alternative than the but-

terfly lot, partly because of the relocation that would be necessary. He added his belief that it was critical to get all players involved to make sure a good resolution is found to the siting problems.

Mr. Rogers noted that his position on the elections lot was the same as on the butterfly lot. He said the County would have to resolve the issue of replacing office space. He mentioned again the need to mitigate lost parking.

Mr. Rogers summarized the discussion, saying the majority of board members would consider the elections lot if issues raised were resolved.

Mr. Cornacchia noted that he did not have any particular enthusiasm for the sites, but that the door was being left open. Ms. Calvert said she had not heard great enthusiasm for any of the sites, but that mass transit was important. She said the committee sought a solution that would be convenient and encourage people to use mass transit. She told commissioners that she appreciated their comments, which she interpreted as directing the committee to not yet eliminate the sites but study them further.

Mr. Brandt expressed his disappointment that more committee members were not at the meeting. He said he interpreted the commissioner's comments as saying the committee should eliminate the two sites. He expressed his frustration over what he called little support from the community on the project, and he advocated keeping the transit station at its present site.

In response to a question from Mr. Rust, Mr. Brandt said the commissioners' concerns were reasonable, but that he was becoming frustrated with trying to site the station without much community support. Mr. Rust said he understood Mr. Brandt's frustration and asked how the County could help further. He echoed Mr. Cornacchia's idea of getting different agencies and interests together to discuss issues.

Ms. Dumdi asked if it were necessary to have a transfer station in the middle of downtown. She suggested the station be on the periphery, with buses then carrying people into the heart of downtown. Ms. Calvert said studies showed that riders want the station within two to three blocks of their destination. Mr. Viggiano explained that requiring riders to transfer from one bus to another would be a disincentive to use the mass transit system and could affect ridership.

Mr. Brown disagreed with Mr. Brandt's interpretation of the commissioners' comments, saying that he heard no definitive charge to eliminate the butterfly and elections lots. He noted that he only heard concerns that any private or public agency would have.

Ms. Calvert said she agreed with Mr. Brandt that there was not great enthusiasm for either site, but she expressed the belief that the commissioners had not ruled out either site.

Mr. Rust expressed his enthusiasm for a downtown transfer station.

Mr. Brandt noted that the siting issue was a difficult one, and with his previous comments he had only meant to say that he had expected more community interest.

Ms. Dumdi asked about the feasibility of the Firestone lot. Ms. Loobey noted that the portion of 10th Avenue near the lot would have to be vacated.

Ms. Calvert thanked commissioners for their input.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Catherine Van Horn)  
MNETSSS 071090