

Jb

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Tuesday, March 31, 1987  
12:00 - 1:30 p.m.  
LTD Operations Conference Room  
1944 West 8th, Eugene

BOARD MEMBERS:

Janet Calvert \_\_\_\_\_ Janice Eberly \_\_\_\_\_ Gus Pusateri \_\_\_\_\_

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

Bruce Hall \_\_\_\_\_ Jim Ivory \_\_\_\_\_

A G E N D A

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Action Item - Attachment)

Minutes from the January 13, 1987 Facilities Committee meeting are attached.

II. LAND ACQUISITION UPDATE (Information Item - No Attachment)

The Facilities Committee will be informed of significant developments, if any, on the land acquisition. If necessary, the Committee may move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(e) to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions; and/or pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h) to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.

III. REVIEW OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT (Information Item - No Attachment)

The facility is currently in the design development phase. This phase consists of the design and engineering of principal materials, methods, and systems, and their integration into the schematic design. Among the decisions to be made during this phase is the design of the buildings on the site.

The Facilities Committee will be presented with the recommended design for information purposes only. Action by the Facilities Committee and the Board of Directors will occur next month. At that time, an updated budget estimate and an amendment to the Section 3 grant will also be considered.

V. NEXT MEETING TIME AND PLACE

It is necessary to schedule a meeting of the Facilities Committee during the week of April 20 to develop recommendations on the design and Section 3 grant amendment for the Board meeting on April 29. A meeting to discuss and make decisions on land acquisition will also be necessary, although the timing of that meeting is not known at present.

VI. ADJOURNMENT (by 1:30 p.m.)

1987 10 10 11 1  
8 00-1

MINUTES  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
FACILITIES COMMITTEE  
JANUARY 13, 1987

Pursuant to notice given to the Register-Guard for publication on January 9, 1987, the Facilities Committee of the Board of Directors of Lane Transit District met on Tuesday, January 13, 1987, at 6:00 p.m. at the Red Lion in Springfield, Oregon.

Present:

Board Members:	Janet Calvert Gus Pusateri
Community Representatives:	Bruce Hall Jim Ivory
Staff Members:	Phyllis Loobey Mark Pangborn Stefano Viggiano Ed Bergeron Shannon Evonuk, Recording Secretary
Consultant:	Eric Gunderson
District Legal Counsel:	Richard Bryson

Absent:

Board Member:	Janice Eberly
---------------	---------------

Ms. Calvert brought the meeting to order. It was noted that Louis Arnold, representative for Moyer Theatres, wanted to make some comments at the meeting. Ms. Calvert asked for corrections or omissions to the minutes of the last meeting of the committee. Ms. Calvert noted two changes: 1) On Page 1, Paragraph 2, "wetland improvements" should read "site improvements"; and 2) Page 5, Paragraph 2, "1986" should read "1987". Mr. Pusateri then moved to approve the minutes, Ms. Calvert seconded, and the motion carried.

Ms. Calvert asked for general public comments. James I. Spicer, 880 East 43rd Avenue, Eugene, asked to speak. He commented that the District is getting ready to build for a 20-year site, and said that it should be building from a more operationally cost-effective standpoint. Tom Hoyt, lawyer for Mr. and Mrs. Spicer, said he wanted to comment on the

letter he wrote to the Facilities Committee. Mr. Hoyt related that the Burlington Northern site, the Spicers believe, is the preferable site of those being looked at by the District. He added that noise levels are not a factor at the Burlington Northern site. He quoted a section from the Eugene City Code which deals with decibel levels, and said he had talked to the person in charge of noise levels at the City of Eugene, who had described how the noise level requirements work. He said that, during 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., a bus cannot be run continually for a 15-minute, or longer, period at the Glenwood sites.

Mr. Hoyt reiterated Mr. Spicer's point that operating costs should be the primary objective, and that costs to local citizens should be the primary concern of the District. He then passed out copies of the letter he had sent earlier to the Board members. He said the current County appraisal for the Moyer property is \$725,820, and pointed out that the District would have to relocate the buildings on that property, along with an estimated 50 tons of personal property.

Mr. Hoyt said he had met with City of Eugene personnel, who told him that the railroad spur at the Burlington Northern site is rarely used and access would not be a problem. He also said that the Burlington Northern site is in close proximity to the existing District site. He talked further about lottery funds to be used for the new facility, and said that, if the funds were not needed this year, they could be traded for future years' funds. He felt that time factors should not "penalize" consideration of the Burlington Northern site. He pointed out that the Spicers have been willing to work with staff, and thanked the members for their consideration.

Stefano Viggiano passed out a written response to the Spicer letter. He went on to summarize what was hoped to be accomplished at the meeting that evening: the site selection process, including a reconsideration of the alternative sites; site purchase; and site-specific design.

Mr. Viggiano said he wanted to go back through the process which originally determined that the East Glenwood site was the preferable one. Staff started out with an initial site selection of 328 possible sites, then went to a first screening, which reduced that number to 40 sites. After a second screening, this number was reduced to four sites. The best site was selected, and was approved by the Facilities Committee on April 30, 1985.

Mr. Gunderson then went over the screening of the final four sites. He said that it was important not to focus on just one facet of site selection, and that there were many factors to be considered. He said that preliminary drawings were done for each of the four sites. After looking at all factors, his staff put together a matrix which compared site costs for each of the four sites. He said it was important to look at the total costs for each site, not just the individual costs in each

category. He added that factors that have come into play since that time were well anticipated.

Mr. Hall said the land costs at the time of the comparison of these sites did not take into consideration the purchase of the Spicer property. Mr. Gunderson agreed with this, although he said that the total costs would not change much due to this.

Ms. Calvert said she remembered that there was some concern about the ground at the Burlington Northern property, and wondered if that was still a concern; Mr. Gunderson replied that it was, and explained that part of it was used for a mill pond. Although new fill has been put in since that use, he was unsure of what kind of condition it was in, and when it was installed. Ms. Calvert asked where the traffic flow would go to at the Burlington Northern site. She was told there would be a connection at the new Chambers Connector from West 2nd Street. Mr. Gunderson said that the site study did not factor in any delay costs either from the railroad spur or access from or to West 2nd Street.

On noise levels, Mr. Gunderson said there are some cumulative effects, although decibels can be increased somewhat. He felt the noise level requirements on the West Glenwood property can be met, and, after reviewing District practices in this area, added that there should not be a problem with keeping engine idling below the 15-minute restriction.

Mr. Viggiano asked the members if there were any other questions for Mr. Gunderson. In additional public testimony, Mr. Arnold said he objected strenuously to the separation of the Glenwood properties, and would not be as cooperative, were the choice for the purchase of the two properties to be made. The strip left over on the West Glenwood property would be a difficult one to sell, he said. The property has been assessed at approximately \$725,000, he added.

He thought it was interesting that staff at the City of Eugene thought the noise might be considered a problem, because the operation of the Drive-In has never created a noise problem for the Moyers. He indicated he was anxious to begin negotiations on the entire piece, and said he would like to avoid condemnation proceedings.

Ms. Calvert expressed the appreciation of the committee to the Spicers for allowing drilling on their property on January 14. Drilling would also be done on the Moyer property, Mr. Viggiano added, and said those owners, too, have been very cooperative about this.

In response to the Hoyt letter, Mr. Viggiano said there were some increased costs that would be incurred were the District to change its choice of sites. For one, it would set back the process about one year. Also, the lottery money would be lost if the District did not have a site work contract by June 30, 1987. Mr. Viggiano stressed that the District

would lose approximately \$200,000 of this money if it did not stay with the currently-proposed site. Phyllis Loobey pointed out that staff had researched this, and found that there was not another transit property that could trade those funds this year with the District so that the District could use the equivalent funds in another year.

Mr. Viggiano added that another factor to be considered is that the South Glenwood property is a wetland habitat. Because of this, there would be more problems and costs associated with obtaining this site. He then asked if there were other questions on the response to the Hoyt letter; there were none.

Mr. Viggiano turned the discussion to a comparison of the East and West Glenwood sites. He said the development of the East Glenwood site would add approximately \$280,765 to the cost of the project. Two other factors to be considered are: 1) the possibility of different soil conditions on the two sites, which could result in additional costs; and 2) property owner acceptance. He added that the latter is more of a policy issue, and that staff, in their recommendation, only take into account the measurable factors, not the policy decisions to be made.

Ms. Calvert asked Mr. Spicer if his property is presently under farm deferral, and also zoned for industrial use; Mr. Spicer responded that it was. Ms. Calvert asked if a home-moving business, which is currently operated on that property, is an acceptable business under farm deferral. Mr. Spicer replied that, with this particular farm deferral, local officials have been lenient about what is operated there.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Mr. Hoyt asked what was making the East Glenwood noise barrier so expensive. Mr. Gunderson explained the mechanics of putting up a "berm" (a long strip of built-up earth). Mr. Ivory asked what, in the property owners' views, is the most advantageous plan. Mr. Arnold said that it is the East site. He added that he had heard that the acoustical engineer said the noise factor was not a problem, but that someone else had said that it was.

Ms. Calvert asked for further questions. Seeing that there were none, Mr. Pusateri made a motion for the committee to move into Executive Session per ORS 192.660(1)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions; pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(f), to consider records that are exempt by law from public inspection; and/or pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:

After moving back into regular session, Ms. Calvert reminded those present that the committee members are the only ones allowed to vote on actions of the committee--the community representatives are unable to vote. Mr. Pusateri moved that the Facilities Committee recommend to the Board the selection of the West Glenwood site for the development of the new operations facility. The motion was seconded by Ms. Calvert, and passed unanimously. Mr. Viggiano explained that the full Board would need to give approval to proceed with acquisition. Mr. Pusateri then moved that the Facilities Committee recommend to the Board of Directors that authorization be given to the State Highway Division to proceed with property acquisition on the selected site. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Viggiano suggested discussion of the site-specific design be postponed to another meeting. After discussion among the committee members, it was decided to proceed with this topic.

Mr. Viggiano said there are two options for proceeding with the site-specific design: 1) Begin site-specific design when the site is selected; or 2) Begin site-specific design after the site is purchased and annexed to the City of Eugene. If the District begins now, there is a risk of losing \$45,000 to \$100,000 in design work. This figures varies with the possible change in sites. Additional costs of inflation of \$125,000 would be incurred if the District delays the site specific design. Concerning lottery funds, if the District begins now with site specific design, it could use all the lottery funds promised to it. Part of this could be lost--\$100,000 to \$200,000--if the District waits until beginning site-specific design until after the purchase of the land. Staff are recommending the first option for proceeding with site-specific design.

Mr. Ivory said he did not see much of a risk in the first option; Ms. Calvert said it seems like a logical recommendation. Mr. Pusateri moved that the Facilities Committee authorize staff to proceed with site-specific design work after the Board of Directors makes a decision on the site on January 1, 1987. Ms. Calvert seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Pusateri moved to end the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Calvert and passed unanimously.