

DTOP Sub Area Plan
Steering Committee Meeting
August 30, 2005, 6:30 p.m.
Oak Park Village Hall

Present: Chair Bob Tucker, Greg Marsey, Ray Johnson, Ilhan Avcioglu, Doug Gilbert, Sonny Ginsberg, Colette Lueck, Rich Carollo, Vince Michael, Steve Rouse, Carolyn Saxton
Absent: Lisa DiChiera

Village staff: Craig Failor, Doug Kaarre

Motion by Carollo to approve the revised minutes of August 9, 2005 and the minutes of August 23, 2005. Second by Rouse. Motion approved.

Planner Failor went through the meeting packet, which included the following:

- a response from the Forestry Commission on questions in the downtown survey. They discussed issues they have with the Marion Street mall trees.
- A letter to the editor from Galen Gockel regarding the downtown plan.
- A letter from Kathryn Jonas dated August 16.
- An email from Kathryn Jonas dated August 24 in regards to this evening's meeting.
- An email from Ilhan Avcioglu regarding this evening's meeting.
- A follow-up email from Ilhan Avcioglu regarding this evening's meeting.
- Response from Trustee Marsey.
- Copies of the approved minutes from August 2 and August 16.
- Downtown preference survey results for review.

Ms. Saxton, a facilitator from the Oak Park & River Forest Community Foundation, provided an introduction to the meeting. She thanked Stacy Taxman and Tim Hague for opening their buildings for the public last week. The public comment will occur first and each speaker will be given five minutes. She reviewed the policies and procedures.

Mike Reust, 607 Belleforte, asked the Committee to consider people's motivations when they speak. He does not represent any organization. He wants to enhance the quality of life in Oak Park. Others do have a financial interest in what they say. He has four concerns:

- 1) Traffic congestion on Lake Street – no matter what you do traffic will spread throughout Oak Park unless something can be done on Harlem.
- 2) He's opposed to Station Street, but if it's done the consultants said traffic would go either way without problems. Why put more vehicles on Lake Street?
- 3) Concern about businesses. Need to generate more foot traffic and exposure so people can see the stores. He wants to keep the mall and give it a makeover.
- 4) Where people get off the train is west of Marion Street. Better signage or landscaping is needed to direct people to Marion. Enhance the walkway west of the Colt Building.

Chair Tucker reminded everyone that comments in writing may always be submitted to the Committee.

Barton Faist asked why they were giving public testimony before the presentations. How can you comment when you haven't heard the presentation?

Chair Tucker stated that the public comments were scheduled for the beginning of this meeting. They will take it under advisement. Written comments may always be submitted afterwards.

Barton Faist, Chicago resident, stated that he lived at Tree Studios. He's sad about these presentations. Oak Park is internationally famous. People are troubled internationally by these conflicts. LPCI has taken money from developers here today. Joe Antunovich used to be the chair. People don't understand the conflict. They did the same thing to Tree Studios. He doesn't understand how this can happen. He'd be happy to share his information with anyone who is interested.

Tony Munno, 1035 Woodbine, owner of 1111 Westgate, provided a handout. Westgate was an alley named William Street and was transformed from garages and dairy uses into storefronts the 1930s. They advertised all over, but 30 years later it was a failure. By the 1960s retail was gone from the street. They tried offices, but they are failing. The buildings are 50% vacant. We can't repeat the past mistakes. We can't preserve buildings just to preserve them. They're pretty facades, but that's all it is. His building was built as a furniture store in 1948. By 1959 it was offices. We have an opportunity to turn the superblock into a retail and residential economic engine to help all of downtown. People want to live near transit. Quality retailers will follow the money.

Kathryn Jonas, 124 S. East, asked about the progress on creation of the 3-D model of downtown that was approved with the Crandall Arambula plan.

Chair Tucker stated that they will address the model later this evening.

Kathryn Jonas inquired as to whether an infrastructure study was being completed. One was not done during the Crandall Arambula plan. Regarding this planning process, the Village went from planning in secrecy with Taxman, and Village is buying downtown lots and assembling them. The Village hasn't spent a dime on Westgate and Marion. That very likely is why there is deterioration there. There is no planner leading this Committee. Citizens are expected to come every week through October. This is a flawed process. URS will analyze development costs, including TIF funds. We need to know how TIF funds were spent in the past so we know how to spend it in the future. Consider some kind of marketing effort outside of what has been done, because it hasn't been very successful. Look at the Main Street program or something similar and adopt their principles. This is retail, not residential.

Gene Armstrong, 1111 South Blvd. owner, stated that the Village has planners on staff who are deeply involved and committed. They have access to Crandall Arambula,

whether its beneficial or not, and others. Someone stated that preserving Westgate might increase visitors. We can't forget the need to attract more shoppers. It should be a retail area, and residential is compatible. The reality of Tree Studios is that it was going to be demolished. A developer bought it, renovated it at great price, and created an adaptive reuse. It is award-winning. It is better that it has been saved rather than keep its original use. It is appropriate for the Village to assemble property for development sites. We can improve traffic flow on Harlem and Lake by putting the traffic underground, including the intersection, and leave the ground level for access.

Gene Reisinger, 118 S. Kenilworth, apologized for arriving late. He asked where the models of the Crandall Arambula plan were. It's a legal condition to the plan approval. Estes Park, CO has an inside mall that everyone enjoys. The Colt Building promenade that used to be there with little shops reminds him of that. Traffic flow could work better if you put ramps over the intersections or over Lake Street to River Forest. He's seen them work. Rochester, MN has walkways over the street with elevators and they connect to all the major buildings. These are just ideas. He is disturbed that no other builders besides Taxman are here. It would be nice if everything's out in the open – who benefits, where does the money go, the use of TIF funds, etc.

Planner Kaarre reviewed the results of the preference survey. There are 92 survey responses that have been reviewed. Several more were submitted earlier today and will be added to the final survey results. These will be posted on the Village website. Each of the questions is listed with the agree/disagree/neutral responses below it, followed by specific comments on that question. At the end of the survey is the ranking of issues. First, the issues are ranked in order of how many total votes they were given (1-5). Second, each of the issues are calculated based upon which rank they were given – those issues that were ranked number one, and how many votes, etc.

Planner Failor stated that the resolution that was approved by the Village Board for the creation of a model was of the existing downtown. It will not be a model of the proposed Crandall Arambula plan. The model is to be used for public display and to determine the appearance of proposed new development the context of downtown. Requests for Proposals were sent out for the models. It asked for proposals on creating a physical model, as well as a GIS-based model (Geographic Information Systems), which would allow for seeing the model electronically. Two responses were received. The first was for the full proposal at \$50,000. The second was for the physical model only at \$2,400. The Board reviewed the proposals and was leaning towards the full proposal, but asked for comparables. Staff has been talking with consultants is currently working on the request. The physical models would take about 6-9 weeks.

Mr. Marsey stated that the model would not be available for use in this process, but any plan created here would be able to use the model.

Mr. Johnson, as a response to an earlier question regarding the context of the put/call agreement with the Taxman Corp. and how it relates to this process, stated that he spoke with former trustees Trapani, Gockel and Ebner. They told him that the Village

had tried to buy the Colt Building but they felt the price was too high. Taxman bought the building and proposed several plans for this area. A put/call agreement was discussed rather than approve those plans, because it was an opportunity to assemble property if no agreement could be reached, or to move in another direction. It was felt it was a "B" class building and could not be used for modern retail. The Village could either buy the building or allow its development by Taxman. The idea behind the put/call agreement was to keep Taxman interested without any upfront Village costs and have some Village control. It was extended several times due to the downtown master planning process. The put/call agreement currently expires on October 31. The Village can opt to purchase the Colt Building at the same price Taxman purchased the building in 2001 (with no appreciation). Trustee Gockel's comments on his vote were in a letter he sent to the newspaper. It's important to get comments from Trustees Kostopulos, Hodge-West and Turner as they voted against the put/call agreement. Trustee Kostopulos was opposed based upon the purchase price amount.

Mr. Avcioglu asked for further explanation of the dialogue that took place in June between Taxman Corp. and the Board and if any ultimatums were issued and why the put/call agreement was extended.

Mr. Johnson stated that some elements of the approved downtown plan were controversial, including whether to open Marion Street, and the creation of Station Street. And they concern this superblock area. Also, how do you situate a parking facility with regards to those additional streets. They were not just about relieving Lake Street traffic, but how do you provide sufficient access to the parking and provide retail revitalization. Can they look at improving the Shops of Downtown in relationship to the property next door, so it made sense to have discussions with Taxman. He didn't hear any ultimatums. It was a conversation on how to move forward in a public process to enhance downtown.

Mr. Marsey stated that it was a financial decision for him. There is a financial cost to purchase the Taxman buildings. Mr. Taxman made it clear that if the Village bought back the Colt Building he would be interested in leaving downtown Oak Park. It would behoove the Village to have as much control over the building as possible. The Colt Building is \$4.9 million and it is almost as much for the others. He was not ready to spend this much money and the idea behind this approach is to have everyone collaborate on how to move forward. It was suggested by David Pope to include the Shops of Downtown. Taxman was initially opposed to that, but their position has softened.

Mr. Avcioglu stated that drawings that go back to 2000 that Antunovich was apparently involved with that show the shops, a Cineplex and parking garage. That contradicts the information he's seen.

Mr. Marsey stated that there have been at least three plans on the table. Regardless, that was their position in 2000, but it has softened somewhat and it gives them a bigger palate to work with.

Mr. Avcioglu asked if the Board had asked for more than 120 days if Taxman was ready to walk.

Mr. Marsey stated that he didn't recall discussing anything longer than 120 days. It seemed a reasonable amount of time to get this done.

Mr. Johnson stated that the original agreement was signed in June 2001, and it's in everyone's interest to move forward and make a recommendation one way or the other.

Mr. Rouse asked if anyone voted against the extension of the put/call agreement and why.

Mr. Johnson stated that no one voted against the extension.

Planner Failor introduced the consultants.

Diane Williams introduced the firm of Business Districts, Inc. (BDI). They are based out of Evanston. She works with Bridget Lane, who could not be present this evening. They were asked to help the Committee make their decisions based on good economics and good preservation principles. She was once an 18-year resident of Oak Park and currently resides in Evanston. She is also the downtown manager in Evanston. She was a banker for 24 years and has a masters degree in historic preservation. She worked with the Illinois Main Street program for 5 years. Bridget Lane will bring a lot to the process, especially on retail and the market piece. Bridget has a planning degree from the University of Illinois and an MBA from Harvard. Bridget has a lot of experience working with retail and was executive with a major national jewelry chain. Bridget also worked for the National Trust for Historic Preservation and has spent a lot of time with independent retailers. BDI has been around for 20 years and provide business district-related services to mid-sized communities. Business districts are economic, emotional and social entities. In addition to retail support and training, they provide corridor plans, strategic plans, downtown market studies, and projects like this with retail, market, commercial and historic preservation issues. Their focus is implementation. They are just now starting on this project. They are in the process of setting up interviews with individuals, organizations and business owners. They will look at market and financial considerations and work closely with the other consultants.

Andrea Terry introduced the firm of Bauer Latoza Studio, Inc. They are an architecture firm in Chicago that specializes in historic preservation and rehabilitation, master planning and landscape architecture. The majority of their work is on older buildings, though not always landmark buildings. Her expertise is mainly in "bricks and mortar" building exteriors, building and condition assessments. They provide a lot of building inspections and condition assessments for small buildings to large buildings up to 35 stories. They will look at the architecture of the existing buildings, and how its structure

and systems might be retained or adaptively reused to coincide with recommendations from other consultants or the Committee.

Lisa Lyons of URS Corporation (formerly Trkla, Pettigrew, Allen & Payne - TPAP), stated that her role in the downtown master planning process was to work on a parallel track with the TIF plan amendment process. They updated the redevelopment project document, which is independent from the downtown master plan but coordinates with and is consistent with it in several ways. They analyzed the TIF performance since its adoption and looked at the tax increment scenarios under the Crandall Arambula development scenarios. They developed a detailed financial model and a working model that is less detailed. She is transitioning out of URS over the next month and Ken Busse will be coordinating with her. He has additional expertise in development pro forma analysis.

Ken Busse, Busse Consulting, Inc., stated that he is located in Glen Ellyn. He has 20+ years of experience in urban planning consulting, concentrating in economic development, economic impact analysis and real estate management and tax financing. He serves the public and private sectors in situations like this. He worked in development management services for five years and spent 12 years with TPAP. They will evaluate the redevelopment options and strategies that come out of this process. They will determine how they may impact the TIF district.

Planner Failor introduced Don O'Hara, with the traffic consulting firm of KLOA. He will not be presenting this evening as he made a presentation at the August 9 meeting, but would be available for questions.

Mr. Avcioglu asked how the previous TIF money has been spent in the past.

Ms. Lyons stated that an analysis is available, but she does not have it with her tonight. It can be brought to the Committee at the next meeting. The redevelopment plan has a generalized budget that the Village must comply with. The total costs are \$105 million to be spent over the remaining TIF term. Public works and improvements, such as street improvements, the public plaza and parking improvements, are budgeted at \$70 million; property assembly, including acquisition, site preparation, demolition and environmental remediation at \$20 million; and various remaining items such as a façade program, rehabilitation of buildings, relocation costs, job training and TIF analysis and administration and potential subsidies at \$15 million.

Chair Tucker stated that the consultants will benefit from any direction from the Committee.

Mr. Marsey stated that there is about \$8 million left in the downtown TIF, which is probably earmarked for Whiteco. The financial analysis should be based on the performance of the plan without determining if TIF money can be used, because it's not available. They shouldn't use that as a factor.

Mr. Johnson stated that the Whiteco amount is spread out over four years, not paid out all at once. The Committee shouldn't be constrained without the use of those funds.

Mr. Rouse asked if they were working under a budget. It was agreed that they did not have a budget.

Mr. Michael stated that he is representing Lisa DiChiera from LPCI. Crandall Arambula presented four alternatives for the superblock area and projected revenue stream. Was the one that was adopted the option that called for more acquisition?

Ms. Lyons stated that there is not much detail in the TIF plan. The development program and land use plan is more generalized. The largest redevelopment amount was used for the potential revenue that could be generated in the TIF model. Their estimate for this area included new retail of approximately 56,000 s.f., rehab of 27,000 s.f., 371 parking units.

Mr. Rouse asked if the model is based on potential redevelopment scenarios.

Ms. Lyons stated that the model could be adjusted according to the amount of square footage that is intended for various areas within the downtown plan.

Mr. Rouse asked if the plan shows what can TIF revenue can be generated if you open Station Street or Marion Street?

Ms. Lyons stated that their estimate for full redevelopment scenario for the superblock area and how much property tax increment would be generated and the sales tax that could be generated from retail that could go there.

Mr. Rouse asked if the model assumes the Colt Building is demolished or retained.

Ms. Lyons stated that it assumes Station Street is constructed.

Mr. Ginsberg asked if that number is actually the budget.

Mr. Marsey stated that some of the figures are tied to the Village's responsibility to the school district. It could be looked at as a budget figure if its useful. He would rather have the plan dictate what they spend based on the fact they think it's the best plan.

Mr. Rouse stated that the most efficient plan is the most effective plan for the most amount of money spent. They have no mandate.

Mr. Ginsberg asked where the \$4.9 million will come from if the Village purchases the Colt Building.

Mr. Marsey stated that they hadn't discussed it, but he would assume it would be bonded out of future TIF earnings.

Mr. Johnson added that it could also come out of the TIF balance.

Mr. Rouse asked if the quality and quantity of the development would affect how much bonding they could get. Does something splashy give them a better deal.

Mr. Ginsburg stated that the only way they can effectively fund the purchase is to development that site. The only reason they'd have to pay the money is to not development the site. Their either locked into a deficit or locked into coming up with some development plan.

Mr. Marsey stated that those are important points to consider for factoring in what the plan generates in property and sales tax down the road. The agreement with Taxman is that if they agree to build what they want or if they agree to participate in an adaptive reuse, they will go forward. If they decide not to, the Village will exercise it's right to buy the building. It's depending on what we decide is going to go here. URS was looking specifically at square footage to determine potential property and sales taxes generated by new development in the plan.

Ms. Lyons agreed. The Village has to work within the budget in the plan. The type of development will impact the potential revenue generated. Denser, higher priced units will generate more sales tax. It does impact what you can bond against. Their analysis and the EAV that would be generated was meant to show a revenue stream that would generate funds to pay for public projects and to be in compliance with the intergovernmental agreement with the school and other taxing districts. EAV is equalized assessed valuation and the total to be released in \$101 million. The initial carve out released \$20 million. A TIF boundary was established based on various criteria and an intergovernmental agreement was created with the other taxing districts. It carves out property already redeveloped and brings those taxes back to the taxing districts in their annual levy. The TIF schedules EAV carve outs, which are scheduled based on the assumption that new development will occur. It is not tied to specific geographic locations and is evaluated each year. The carves outs are annual from 2007-2012 and another two carve outs in 2014 and 2015 and one in 2018.

Mr. Marsey stated that if they could back with a plan that is considerably smaller than Crandall Arambula proposed, then it may become a consideration. That may be how they evaluate the potential financial impact will be to compare numbers for the superblock in the plan versus the numbers in the plan the Committee generates. If they make an amendment based on the plan, the other taxing bodies would have to approve it.

Ms. Lueck stated that their work with the consultants will be fluid. They can't do their analysis until a plan is formulated. Their plan may impact the analysis. The analysis of the plan may impact the redesign of their plan. And they have a very short timeline. What they give them will change over time. Getting traffic, financial, and retail information back on the initial plan will require us to go back and redesign.

Mr. Carollo asked Ms. Terry her general thoughts of the Colt Building in terms of historic preservation and what could it be turned into.

Ms. Terry stated that she will be looking at the potential for retail, residential and office uses. The building seems sturdy and there is a potential for reuse. The question is can the existing square footage hold the proposed use. It will include economics. They will look at the physical budgets. Residential conversion would cost more than an office conversion. They will look at physical costs.

Mr. Ginsburg asked if tearing down the building and rebuilding the same square footage would be more or less expensive.

Ms. Terry stated that it's a difficult question to answer. If you tore it down you probably wouldn't go back to the same square footage. It would be larger.

Mr. Ginsburg stated that he's trying to find out how much more expensive adaptive reuse would be. Is it more expensive?

Chair Tucker asked if that was something Bauer Latoza would be analyzing for them.

Ms. Terry said yes, in combination with the other consultants. They will not be looking at new construction costs.

Mr. Michael asked if they will be looking at any potential for increasing density.

Ms. Terry stated that it was a possibility. They were asked to look at the existing building in conjunction with BDI.

Chair Tucker stated that the Committee should provide the consultants with direction.

Mr. Carollo asked if the façade could be moved.

Ms. Terry stated yes.

Mr. Marsey stated that the building has a basement and two stories. If you decide that the basement is suited for office, the first floor for retail and the second floor for residential. Then you have square footage you could use to find comparables for new construction. Opening the atrium may determine that you need larger retail stores.

Mr. Gilbert stated that they need proformas looking at different options of the buildings. It will require all the consultants working together. You can restore the building, rehab it the way it is, turn it to retail, etc., and tie that to the market side and create a work plan. I'm sure Taxman would be interested in that as well.

Chair Tucker stated that he would be interested in hearing how the division of lots – either smaller or larger – would affect the plan.

Ms. Williams stated that there will be some basis for that, but it's a bit beyond what we're looking at here. We're looking at basic uses and local versus national retailers.

Ms. Lueck stated that in some ways the answer to the Colt Building may answer issues elsewhere in Oak Park. Some of the issues are the same. What is the cost to build new versus rehab; what is that cost translate into per square foot of rent; what kind of use do you need to support that kind of rent; what kind of parking do you need to support that use.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that if you modify the square footage it would seem that it would cost more to do an adaptive reuse than to build new. There is another cost to losing historic buildings, but we need to balance those costs. There are limited TIF funds. They will need some balance.

Mr. Avcioglu stated that if the Committee agrees on a new plan as the best idea he hopes it would be pulled just based on cost. He's anxious to see how the past TIF money has been used. It's obvious not much has been spent on Lake Street or Westgate.

Chair Tucker asked Ms. Lyons to bring the information regarding past TIF funds to next week's meeting.

Ms. Lueck asked if the Committee had consensus on having retail on the first floor of the Colt Building. Are we comfortable giving that direction?

Mr. Ginsberg stated that part of the process is to try to tie the retail on Lake Street together with other sections.

Mr. Rouse stated that every building on Westgate has to become retail on the first floor if their sold.

Mr. Carollo asked if the Colt Building would have the same recognition if it had the same façade on both sides as on Lake Street.

Mr. Gilbert stated that "facadism" is a controversial topic that has pros and cons. There are some who are very opposed and some who think it's appropriate. What you're saying is that you save the façade and tear down the rest of the building. Some find it inappropriate because you're not saving the building. Some find it appropriate because you only see the façade. It often comes down to circumstances. If there are significant interiors then it may be inappropriate. If it's just a box then just saving the façade may be appropriate. There are examples in Indianapolis with giant boxes tacked onto the back of facades. The Harris-Selwyn Theaters, now the Goodman Theater, were mostly

gone on the inside. There are examples on Wabash in the Loop. You can put anything behind it. It depends on how sensitively the project is designed.

Mr. Carollo asked if there were other examples of the English Tudor architecture.

There are other Tudor Revival examples in Oak Park and downtown. Mr. Marsey lives in one of them. One of the things the Historic Preservation Commission has recognized about Westgate is the grouping of one style together.

Ms. Lueck asked if the proposed Downtown Design Commission deal with these issues. Could there be particular standards for a new building restoring a façade.

Mr. Gilbert stated that you could if you built them into the requirements. The existing downtown guidelines don't address the issue. They were just a starting point. You could recommend maintaining the styles on Westgate.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that it can be a difficult thing to do, such as Soldier Field.

Ms. Lueck stated that if there is no new development there will be no money in the TIF.

Mr. Gilbert stated that is true to a certain extent, but you can't isolate one section of downtown and say it has to be developed.

Mr. Rouse stated that parking will drive what we will decide. We should talk about that first. What needs to be done and how its implemented may drive whether we do other certain things. Integration of the parking to revitalize the retail was a good point. Applying the parking to what we do is key.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that we don't know how much marking we need or where it needs to be.

Mr. Rouse stated that there are 600 in the Crandall Arambula plan.

Mr. AVciouglu asked how much parking currently exists in the superblock.

Jim Budrick, Village Engineer, stated that there are fewer than 200 spaces.

Mr. Marsey stated that they don't have to think about the Colt Building atrium as retail. It could be possible to make the basement a garage and use the atrium as a way to get into the garage. They shouldn't be put in a box during the visioning process.

Mr. Carollo asked if they decide to retain the Colt Building, does that mean that there will be no Station Street?

Mr. Johnson stated that they need to frame the discussion around the movement of people. How do they get the people from the intermodal station into downtown. Also

consider pedestrian and bicycle movement. They all have to be balanced. How do they move in and out of the superblock and what are the impacts.

Chair Tucker asked the consultants if they were sure of their mission. The Committee can answer questions.

Planner Failor stated that they need to know which buildings the Committee wants to be reviewed. The cost is per building and they have a limited budget.

Mr. Avcioglu stated that they should include any of the buildings "in play" or proposed for demolition in the superblock. He doesn't know how many that would be.

Planner Failor stated that every building on either side of the proposed Station Street. Nothing on Marion Street.

Mr. Gilbert would propose adding 1145 Westgate to the Colt Building.

Chair Tucker stated some buildings won't have the same level of detail as the Colt Building.

Mr. Gilbert stated that you could focus on the other buildings on Westgate and just adjust for square footage on the other buildings to reduce the cost and have less detail in the report.

Mr. Michael stated that he was struck by the increasing complexity and interest of the facades on Westgate as you got closer to Marion Street. The one that is not in play is the most complex. The one on the north the tour went it had a lot of nice elements.

Mr. Avcioglu mentioned that some people were wondering if you took some things off if there were original facades underneath.

Mr. Rouse asked if the façade on the Colt Building is still there.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the question will be is it there, what kind of shape will it be in, can it be restored.

Mr. Rouse asked how they can answer that question without destructive testing.

Ms. Terry stated that she could take a stab at it, literally.

Mr. Ginsburg asked if Station Street is something the Village wants to do, would Westgate still retain its historical value or become an eyesore.

Mr. Gilbert stated that it depends. One of the important things about Westgate is the collection of Tudor Revival buildings. You feel the old English character. You will affect the character if you begin to deduct from that.

Mr. Ginsberg asked if they need to consider this as an “all or nothing” project. Do you want to preserve anything if a street goes through.

Mr. Gilbert stated they have to discuss that, especially if a street divides it. That will impact the character. If you just take off the end, it may be less of an impact.

Mr. Marsey stated that it sounds like a good time to start drawing. Figure out the parking situations, try pedways and bike lanes and see where it leads.

Mr. Rouse stated that you need four or five different plans for discussion.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that existing parking lots are older. There’s no data that the garages aren’t safe. You’re limited in how well you can do it.

Ms. Terry stated that existing plans of any of the buildings would be helpful.

Planner Failor stated that they looked through the plans in the Colt Building and did not have blueprints for the building.

Mr. Busse stated that he has worked with municipalities and developers on creating plans. There is a broad range of analysis you can bring. The Committee is struggling with how the community wants this block developed. Sooner than later he will need general guidelines on the contents of the plans their considering. Developers can spends hundreds of thousands of dollars on one building. They need to come up with broad scenarios of development.

- A) Preserve Streetscape and Right of Way (ROW) with Adaptive Re-use
- B) Preserve Streetscape and ROW with redevelopment
- C) Install / Dedicate new ROW for Station Street while preserving pockets of buildings.
- D) Install/Dedicate new ROW with redevelopment of everything.

The Committee could come up with other options or scenarios. The sooner that the Committee can nail down some general approach, the better for them.

Mr. Ginsberg stated that there are many diversions. They should break it down into categories. That may be a good place to start.

Mr. Marsey asked is what information they need to give the consultants so they can run their analysis.

Mr. Busse stated that their analysis is driven by the options chosen.

Mr. Marsey stated that they should give the Committee the parameters they need.

Ms. Lueck stated that it will be complex. They will end up a plan guided by some good information that will need to be refined and may not actually work. None of it is a guarantee that it will happen exactly as designed.

Mr. O'Hara discussed the need for additional parking on North Blvd. How high will that parking be? You'll need to think about that. It's important to traffic, parking and circulation in downtown. One suggestion was improvements to Harlem. It's a state route and changes would be difficult. You can't avoid traffic. Success brings traffic; you hope you have a lot of traffic and then it should be monitored and moved around as best you can. They were hired at the same time as Crandall Arambula, but they weren't asked for their input until the option was chosen for them to review.

Mr. Gilbert asked what kind of footprint they need – minimum or maximum – for a parking garage. Is the existing parking lot an appropriate footprint for a garage or do we need more room.

Planner Failor stated that the Crandall Arambula plan believes that a parking garage would be appropriate there and they have a minimum footprint/best case scenario for a parking garage. Crandall Arambula recommended 60-foot bays as being optimal.

Mr. Gilbert stated that the plan showed an optimal footprint. But we need to know what will work.

The next meeting on September 13 will be held at Brooks Middle School, Room E101 at 6:30 p.m.

Motion by Tucker to adjourn. Second by Rouse. Motion approved.
Adjourn at 9:10 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Doug Kaarre