

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
EUGENE STATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

Monday, February 10, 1992

LTD Board Room
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene
(off Glenwood Blvd.)

7:00 a.m.

AGENDA

- 7:00 a.m. I. CALL TO ORDER - Gerry Gaydos, Committee Chairman
- II. ROLL CALL
- | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Debra Ehrman _____ | Jef Faw _____ | Gerry Gaydos _____ |
| Dave Kleger _____ | Jesse Maine _____ | Mike Schwartz _____ |
| Jonathan Stafford _____ | | |
- 7:05 a.m. III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Action Requested) - Gerry Gaydos
- Minutes of the December 16, 1991, meeting are attached for Committee review and approval.
- 7:10 a.m. IV. BOARD DESIGN DIRECTION - Stefano Viggiano
- At the meeting, the direction provided by the LTD Board of Directors on various design issues will be discussed with the Committee.
- 7:15 a.m. V. PREFERRED TRANSIT STATION SITE (Action Requested) - Stefano Viggiano
- The Committee is asked to recommend to the LTD Board a preferred site for a new Eugene Transit Station. Included in the packet is a staff evaluation of the two sites under consideration.
- 7:40 a.m. VI. SHOULD A PARKING STRUCTURE BE INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT? - Phyllis Loobey
- Parking issues have played a pivotal role in the examination of virtually every potential transit station site. It is possible to tie the development of a new downtown parking structure with the development of a new station.

7:50 a.m. VII. PREFERRED PARKING REPLACEMENT/EXPANSION OPTION (Action Requested) - Phyllis Loobey

A presentation will be made on options that have been developed for addressing the parking problem.

8:15 a.m. VIII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

8:25 a.m. IX. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING

Please bring your calendars

8:30 a.m. X. Adjournment

MINUTES OF EUGENE STATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

Monday, December 16, 1991

The fourth meeting of the Lane Transit District Eugene Station Advisory Committee was held on Monday, December 16, 1991, at 7:00 a.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Gerry Gaydos, Chairman, representing Eugene Planning Commission
Jef Faw, representing at-large position (Lane County)
Dave Kleger, representing at-large position (bus rider)
Jesse Maine, representing Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce
Jonathan Stafford, representing Eugene Downtown Commission
Phyllis Loobey, LTD General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Debra Ehrman, representing Eugene City Council
Mike Schwartz, representing Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Gaydos called the meeting to order at 7:05 a.m. He asked for introductions from those present. In the audience were Mark Pangborn, Stefano Viggiano, Tim Dallas, Connie Bloom Williams, and Tamara Weaver, of LTD; Bob Hibschman of the City of Eugene; and Eric Gunderson, architect with Wilson Bryant Gunderson Seider, PC.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Stafford asked to change a sentence on page 4 of the December 2, 1991, minutes, in the third paragraph under "Programming," which read, ". . . it would be nice if the station did not smell like diesel fumes; and it should be technologically sound, to muffle the sound of the buses as they go out of the station," to . . . "it would be nice if the station did not smell like diesel fumes, and there should be a technological solution to the noise problem, to muffle the sound of the buses as they go out of the station." He then moved that the minutes be approved as amended. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, and the amended minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

DESIGN GUIDELINES (review): Mr. Gaydos said that the design guidelines recommended by the committee would go before the LTD Board of Directors between 6:30 and 6:45 p.m. on Wednesday, December 18. He planned to attend that meeting to make a presentation to the Board.

LTD Planning Administrator Stefano Viggiano called the committee's attention to the revised Design Guidelines for Eugene Station on page 9 of the agenda packet. At the committee's request at the December 2, 1991, meeting, a guideline to "encourage appropriate multiple-use development of the site" had been added under the heading "qualitative." The amended design guidelines had been approved at the last meeting.

PROGRAMMING: Mr. Gunderson first reviewed the programming questions that had been discussed by the committee on December 2. Those comments were summarized in the minutes and on page 10 of the agenda packet.

A. Should the CSC include an enclosed, climate-controlled passenger waiting area?
Mr. Gunderson asked for the committee's thoughts on whether the Customer Service Center (CSC) should include an enclosed, climate-controlled passenger waiting area, rather than only an outside covered area for seating.

Mr. Gaydos asked if there would be a significant incremental cost to make the CSC larger, such as a difference in a 25-seat CSC and a 50-seat CSC. Mr. Gunderson explained that the original estimate for the CSC was that it would cost between \$80 and \$100 per square foot. Seating spaces would take seven to 15 square feet each, so the cost could be between \$700 and \$1,500 per seat, or \$1,000 as a rough estimate. Mr. Stafford said that it would then cost \$30,000 to \$40,000 to go from 20 to 50 seats, which was not a lot of money in the overall scheme, although costs would add up. Mr. Gunderson added that the CSC costs would vary according to designated use; restrooms would probably cost from \$150 to \$200 per square foot, while the seating area would be at the lower range of costs.

Mr. Stafford said he thought the committee should be looking at what would work best for the whole project, and make a recommendation based on that, and see if it falls out somewhere because of expenses.

Mr. Kleger said that if there were sight vision from the CSC to the bus departure points, there would be some increased demand for riders for a warm place. Generally, he said, riders did not seek comfort and warmth at the risk of missing their buses. He thought the size of the CSC depended on where it would be located on the site.

Mr. Viggiano pointed out that as service grows, buses would run more often. In five or six years, most of the major destinations would be served every ten minutes, so the waiting time should become shorter, on the average, although some riders may still have to wait up to 30 minutes. Most people did not use the CSC unless their waiting time was at least five to ten minutes, except maybe during colder weather.

Mr. Gaydos said that if people saw that riding the bus was relatively comfortable, they might be more likely to ride, but if they perceived that they may be standing in the snow, they might be less likely to ride, even if they never used the CSC. Mr. Kleger commented that senior citizens are more sensitive to extreme weather conditions, and would risk missing their buses in order to go to the CSC and avoid becoming badly chilled. For the reasons stated above, as well as anticipated increases in ridership, Mr. Kleger said he would not want the indoor waiting area to be any smaller than at the current CSC.

Ms. Loobey said it was not just an issue of seats, but also of the capacity to handle peak loads, such as at the first of the month, when people are buying their monthly passes, doing their trip planning, etc. The CSC would have to do more than just provide enough chairs; it would need to have the capacity to handle the other functions, as well. Mr. Gunderson said

that customers need room in the waiting area to organize their packages, etc., before getting on the bus.

Mr. Viggiano said that peak use of the CSC seemed to be in the afternoon rather than the morning, but did tend to be fairly consistent throughout the day. Mr. Pangborn, LTD's Director of Administrative Services, thought the highest use of the CSC was between 1:00 and 5:00 p.m. Shoppers tend to use the CSC more than commuters, who normally just transfer to another bus. Mr. Kleger said that relatively few people try to buy passes during their transfer time, because the time is so short. Mr. Stafford said that another function of the waiting area is for people whose trips start downtown, such as after work. They might be late leaving work and have to wait for a later bus.

Mr. Gaydos asked if there would be covered shelter in addition to the CSC. Mr. Gunderson said it was staff's vision that there would be covered outdoor seating areas. Approximately 20,000 riders are projected to be using the station in the future, with approximately 1,000 at the peak boarding times. Half of the people using the station would originate their trips there, and half would transfer there.

Mr. Gaydos thought that if the current CSC waiting area was being used to capacity, then a larger CSC might be used more. Mr. Kleger said that the quality of the windbreaks and the unheated areas would also make a difference in CSC use. There were currently between 30 and 40 seats in the CSC, which Mr. Kleger called "quite modest." Ms. Loobey thought that with restrooms available, the CSC would be used more, especially for those whose trips are discriminatory, such as shoppers. Mr. Gaydos wondered how well the current CSC accommodated wheelchairs. Mr. Kleger said that it was most crowded in bad weather, when there is standing room only, because wheelchairs take the space of one and a half to two people.

Mr. Stafford said there were other solutions for keeping people warm without bringing them into the CSC, such as radiant heaters in the outdoor waiting areas, which had been done at some restaurants. Mr. Kleger said that effective windbreaks and radiant heaters would definitely spread people out more at the station. Mr. Stafford said that the District would want to determine whether the cost of outdoor heated areas would outstrip the capital costs over time.

Mr. Gaydos summarized that the answer to the question about the CSC was "yes," and that the committee had also talked about some of the desired features for the CSC.

B. How extensive should the shelters be? Mr. Gunderson discussed the range of cover which could be used in the passenger boarding areas. Currently, for every four bus parking positions, there was one 10x30' shelter. This meant that the customers walked to the bus and from one boarding area to another without a roof. The other extreme would be similar to the Elections Lot design, which included a shelter over the central platform, so passengers could walk from the door of any bus to any other bus without going out in the weather. The question for the committee was whether the new Eugene Station should have shelters similar to those at the current station, or whether a larger portion of the station should be covered, to cover the transfer areas.

Mr. Kleger said that, from a rider's perspective, it would be nice to not get wet, but riders generally did not use the bus without rain gear, so the need for cover might be more psychological than necessary. Mr. Stafford said that before and after people ride the bus, they will get wet, but at the central transfer facility, they should feel that they can transfer without getting wet. He thought there should be a central cover because that was the way a central transfer station should be, not because people would get really wet without it. Mr. Gunderson suggested that amenities such as bicycle racks and trash cans could be under cover. Mr. Gaydos commented that the bicycle committee always was asking for covered bicycle parking. There was some discussion about whether amenities should be covered, because too many items under the cover would take room away from wheelchairs and walkers. Mr. Stafford said it was not important to cover trash cans, but they needed to be close to the people, so they would be used. Mr. Gunderson added that timetables, route maps, etc., needed to be on the platform for customers, and it would be nice if they could be under cover.

Mr. Kleger said that people moving from one bus to another tend to do so in clumps, not at a steady flow. Therefore, the station should have wide walkways for groups to move through. Also, he said, the more covered area there was, the less pressure there would be on the CSC seating area.

Mr. Gaydos asked about the long-term maintenance impact of having a cover. Mr. Gunderson wasn't sure if the paved area would wear better with a cover, but maintenance of the roof would be a necessity.

Ms. Loobey said that snow and ice at the current station along 10th Avenue caused the sidewalks to be treacherous, creating a large liability for the District. She said it would be nice to have a station where the pavement did not become icy. Mr. Kleger thought a discontinuous cover would be the most treacherous, because the moisture from people's boots would be brought onto the dry, covered pavement, and would increase the number of hazardous locations. He thought the design should cut down on the number of these transition zones. Mr. Gaydos said going into the rain between covered areas would provide the same transition zones. He said he did not care about the rain if he was going home, but he did care about getting wet if he was on his way to work. People using umbrellas might be opening them in other people's faces as they go between covered areas.

Mr. Gunderson asked if there was consensus that a large portion of the station and transfer areas should be covered. Mr. Faw and Mr. Kleger said yes, if the District can afford to do so. Mr. Stafford said costs for heat coils or radiant heaters could be saved if the station were covered, and Mr. Gaydos added that employees wouldn't have to be at the station deciding the walkways or putting up signs to warn people.

C. Should mixed-use development be considered? Mr. Kleger said that at the last meeting the committee indicated that they would like to keep open the option for mixed-use development, whatever space and costs would permit. Mr. Gaydos asked the committee for their ideas about parking as a mixed-use at the station. He said staff were not talking about park and ride parking, but parking which would help other developments.

Mr. Viggiano recalled that the committee was interested in ground-level development, not air rights development. The committee members' comments had ranged from allowing space for food carts to permanent space for a restaurant on the site, or ground floor retail around the site, facing the street, etc.

Mr. Kleger said the site should meet the transit station's needs. Once that was done, any space without a current or identifiable future use should be available for commercial development. He said there were businesses that could benefit from being near a heavy flow of this kind of traffic, and that development should be encouraged.

Mr. Gaydos said that somehow the street had to be pedestrian-friendly, and that mixed-use development sometimes helped, because of the activity. He said the mixed use did not have to be retail; it could be a park, etc., just so it was not a "no-person's land."

Mr. Stafford said that one of the purposes of mixed use was to provide amenities for the bus riders. He suggested a small convenience grocery store, where a rider could pick up a gallon of milk or other supplies on the way home. Mr. Kleger thought that a video rental store would do well, or other stores where the bus rider could stop in, skip one bus, and be ready to take the next bus. Mr. Stafford wanted to be sure that the District would not be subsidizing this kind of development, and thought that the number of people passing through would make a convenience-type business anxious to be there.

There was some discussion about whether LTD should own the space and be a landlord. Owning the space or including a covenant upon sale of a parcel would allow the District some control over how that space is used, and would allow the property all to be developed as a unit, to meet the concerns about the right street face and development.

DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS TO ADDRESS PARKING REPLACEMENT AND EXPANSION: Ms. Loobey stated that the transit district was not in the business of building parking structures, but would have to deal with parking issues no matter where the station was located in the downtown Eugene core. Three-quarters of the Elections lot was used for code-required parking, for which the District would have to pay replacement costs, either by paying damages or providing replacement parking.

A dense urban core would increase ridership and use of the transit station. Ms. Loobey mentioned a recent article in the Portland *Oregonian*, which discussed how a mix of private and public sector uses worked, because the public sector brought in private sector development. There currently were no more parking spaces in downtown Portland than there were ten to twenty years ago, and parking was concentrated in particular areas, so people knew they would have to walk when they went downtown.

Ms. Loobey discussed parking issues at the IHOP site. Replacement parking for the First Baptist Church could be built under the station, but it would be very expensive, and would not benefit much of anyone other than the church. If the urban renewal boundaries could be extended and a parking structure built on the Greyhound lot, it would provide replacement parking for the Register-Guard building. It would also allow the people who built the Citizen's Building to do further building on their lot, and would provide parking relief for the Hult Plaza.

etc. If a parking structure were built near the IHOP site, a covenant could be made with First Baptist Church that it could use the structure over the long term, into the future. Ground-floor retail could be included in a parking structure. These kinds of infrastructure improvements would provide for other development on current parking lots, creating a denser urban core in Eugene.

Ms. Loobey stated that the District would have to pay to replace any parking it would take away, and that would be expensive. At the Elections lot, a low estimate was \$1 million, but that amount could be used as seed money for a parking structure, in cooperation with the City or private development. Ms. Loobey said it made sense to her to take care of parking in a wider area at the Elections lot. Building up on the County lot, for instance, would help the Hilton, the Fifth Street Market, etc. She stated that there was an opportunity for a development partnership between the City and LTD no matter what lot the District selected for the transit station.

Mr. Faw asked if federal Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) money could be used to build parking. Ms. Loobey said it was staff's understanding that it could not, but there was a new funding act, the Federal Transportation Act, and some of the details were still being worked out. Mr. Viggiano said there may be an opportunity to pay the costs for parking damages to another entity to build a parking structure.

Mr. Stafford asked if staff had ruled out building a parking structure above the transit station, if the look and feel of the station could be maintained. Ms. Loobey explained that a structure above the station would take a lot of ramping space, but Mr. Stafford thought the District should still consider this an opportunity to look into. Mr. Viggiano said staff would have a lot more information about parking alternatives at the next committee meeting, including options for parking above or below the station, and the implications for design and costs.

Mr. Stafford said it was his personal opinion that this was an opportunity for the District to work with others to provide parking that could act as a generator in development. Mr. Kleger agreed, saying that since the District had to spend the money for replacement parking, it would be good to see it going into something which would lead to more concentrated development.

ADJOURNMENT: The next meeting was scheduled for January 20, 1992, at 7:00 a.m. at LTD. There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 a.m.

Committee Chairman

SELECTION OF PREFERRED TRANSIT STATION SITE

In August 1991, the LTD Board reviewed a number of potential Eugene Station sites and selected two sites for further investigation. The two sites are the "I-HOP" location between Broadway, High, 8th, and the off-ramp from the Ferry Street Bridge, and the "Pasta Plus" location between 11th, High, 10th, and Mill Streets. Staff have completed a more detailed investigation of these two sites.

The two sites have been evaluated on the basis of size, location, operational characteristics, cost, and parking displacement/damages.

Size

The Pasta Plus site is a full city block, while the I-HOP site is approximately 85 percent of a full city block. This would seem to give an advantage to Pasta Plus site. However, site plans developed for each site are basically identical, so that the additional land available on the Pasta Plus site is not utilized. The Pasta Plus site does provide more flexibility for future expansion, assuming that the additional land is retained and not sold.

SLIGHT ADVANTAGE: PASTA PLUS

Location

The I-HOP site, while on the eastern edge of downtown, is located in close proximity to City Hall, the Public Service building, and the Federal building, which are major markets for LTD services. In addition, development of the downtown area seems to be shifting toward the east, which would place the I-HOP site in a more central location in the future.

The Pasta Plus site would seem to be centrally located between downtown Eugene and the Sacred Heart/University area. However, since it is not very close (within comfortable walking distance) to either of those two major markets, it does not serve either one very well.

While access to employment is considered the single most important factor in locating the station, access to retail is also important. The I-HOP site is closer to the three largest retail centers in the downtown area, the Fifth Street area, the Broadway and Pearl area, and the Eugene Mall.

ADVANTAGE: I-HOP

Operational Characteristics

Operational characteristics include bus access to, through, and from the site, and the operation of the passenger platform itself. Since the station design of the two sites is very similar, the operation of the passenger platform and bus loading area is virtually identical. However, there

are some significant differences regarding access between the site and major corridors and bus ingress and egress from the site.

The following provides an overview of the advantages/disadvantages for service to and from each site.

<u>Routes</u>	<u>Comments</u>
SE Eugene (inc. UO)	Access to both sites would be primarily via 11th to High. Access from the I-HOP site to the southeast would be either via Broadway to Patterson or Broadway to Pearl. From the Pasta Plus site, buses to the southeast would need travel 10th to Pearl or High to Broadway to Patterson
SW Eugene	Access to both sites would be via 10th Avenue (with a turn onto High for the I-HOP site). Access from I-HOP would be Broadway to Pearl to 11th, while access from the Pasta Plus site would be via 11th.
Bethel/River Rd	Buses from Bethel or River Road area would access both sites via 10th. Buses traveling to the Bethel or River Road areas would travel on 8th.
Ferry St. Bridge	Service from the Ferry Street Bridge is very direct to the I-HOP site, but somewhat circuitous for the Pasta Plus site (via either Pearl or Patterson). Service to the Ferry Street Bridge would be from High Street for either site.

Bus ingress for each site appears equivalent. However, bus egress onto High Street, required for the Pasta Plus site, appears problematic.

SLIGHT ADVANTAGE: I-HOP

Cost

Cost estimates for the construction of a transit station at the I-HOP and Pasta Plus sites is shown on following page. For comparison, the cost estimates developed earlier for the development of a station at the Elections site are also included. As the table demonstrates, the Pasta Plus site would be somewhat more expensive to develop than the I-HOP site.

SLIGHT ADVANTAGE: I-HOP

Parking Displacement/Damages

It is difficult to determine the cost impact of damages for the displacement of code-required parking. What is easy to determine is the number of parking stalls that are displaced. It can be assumed that the cost to replace or pay damages for loss of parking is directly related to the number of parking spaces that are displaced. The Pasta Plus site displaces about three times the number of stalls as does the I-HOP site.

ADVANTAGE: I-HOP

Summary

	<u>I-HOP</u>	<u>Pasta Plus</u>
Size		+
Location	++	
Oper. Characteristics	+	
Cost	+	
Parking Displacement	++	

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend that the I-HOP site be selected as the Committee's preferred transit station site.

Eugene Transit Station Cost Comparison
February, 1992

Item	I-HOP	Pasta Plus	Elections
Construction - 1994 costs			
Sitework	\$1,039,792	\$984,394	\$1,444,900
Shelter	\$1,684,041	\$1,684,041	\$2,636,738
CSC	\$1,439,000	\$1,439,000	\$1,955,307
Other (1)	\$0	\$0	\$394,492
Subtotal-Construction (2)	\$4,162,833	\$4,107,435	\$6,431,438
Associated Costs (3)	\$727,087	\$928,269	\$1,036,406
Land & relocation	\$1,635,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,735,000
Contingency & Damages (4)	\$2,609,968	\$2,734,282	\$3,681,137
TOTAL (5)	\$9,134,888	\$9,569,985	\$12,883,980

Notes:

(1) This item includes the clock tower and two mini stations.

(2) Construction costs for either the I-HOP site or the Pasta Plus site are approximately 35 percent lower than they are for the Elections site. This is primarily due to less shelter area, lower quality shelters, lower quality CSC, and simplified paving on the passenger platform. It should be noted that of project costs, the District has direct control only of the construction costs.

(3) Associated costs include construction permits, traffic improvements, and fees for design and other services. The I-HOP site requires fewer traffic improvements and thus has a lower cost than the Pasta Plus site for this line item.

(4) Contingency and damages are computed at 40 percent of the project cost. This high total is necessary due to uncertainties regarding damages for parking removal and unknowns regarding design and construction.

(5) I-HOP total project costs are estimated to be about 30 percent lower than for the Elections site.

POSSIBLE EASTSIDE PARKING STRUCTURE

OPTION	TRANSIT COST (Millions)	GARAGE COST ** (Land)	# SPACES	NET NEW SPACES	COST PER SPACE (Const. Only)
(A) Transit Station Only	\$9.1*	0	0	(92)	N/A
(B) Transit-IHOP/Pasta Garage-Greyhound	\$9.1	\$7-\$12.0* (1.0)*	544	292	\$13,000-\$22,000
(C) Transit-IHOP Garage-Over Station	\$8.1	\$10-\$13.0 (0)	509	417	\$18,000-\$24,000
(D) Transit-IHOP Garage-Under Station	\$9.1	\$8-\$11.0 (0)	497	405	\$15,000-\$20,000

* Cost includes estimate of damages for parking removal.

** Variation in cost depends on whether retail is included, whether the structure is convertible to office, and what quality is desired.

Costs are estimated for construction in 1994.

Prepared by City of Eugene Development Department.

COMPARABLE GARAGE COSTS

<u>FACILITY</u>	<u>YEAR CONSTRUCTED</u>	<u>CONSTRUCTION COST PER SPACE</u>	<u>COST PER SPACE IN 1994 DOLLARS (Inflated 4% Yr)</u>
Parcade	1976	\$8,000	\$16,206
Overpark	1969	\$4,600	\$12,263
EPAC	1981	\$8,700	\$14,486
Portland 1st/Davis	1988	\$12,000	\$15,184
Portland 4th/Yamhill	1989	\$15,000	\$18,250
Sacred Heart	1989	\$11,449	\$13,929