

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION

Monday, May 11, 2015

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 7, 2015, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special meeting/work session on Monday, May 11, 2015, beginning at 6:45 p.m., at the LTD Next Stop Center, 1099 Olive Street, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: Gary Wildish, President
Carl Yeh, Vice President
Julie Grossman, Secretary
Ed Necker, Treasurer
Gary Gillespie
Angelynn Pierce

Ron Kilcoyne, General Manager
Jeanne Schapper, Clerk of the Board
Lynn Taylor, Minutes Recorder

Vacant Position 3

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: Mr. Wildish convened the meeting and called the roll.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Mr. Wildish welcomed those present.

COMMENTS FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER: Mr. Kilcoyne introduced Don Nordin, who had been appointed to fill the Subdistrict 3 vacancy on the LTD Board. He said that he anticipated confirmation by the Senate shortly and that Mr. Nordin's first Board meeting would be in June.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA: None.

WORK SESSION:

Main-McVay: Recommendations for Preferred Solutions — Senior Project Manager John Evans said that the Main-McVay Transit Study was being co-managed with the City of Springfield. He introduced Tom Boyatt from the City of Springfield and project consultants Linda Wannamaker and Stefano Viggiano, who would assist in the presentation. He also introduced Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) members Emma Newman, Brett Rowlett, and Randy Hledik. He said that the project was funded in 2011; and since that time, a governance team and SAC were formed. The SAC made recommendations, based on data and analyses they were provided, to the governance team, which then passed those recommendations on to the Springfield City Council and LTD Board of Directors.

Mr. Boyatt illustrated the scope of the project with a map of the study area. He said that the study area was divided into two segments: the Main Street corridor and the McVay Highway; each had different characteristics and land development. He said that the problems to be solved on Main Street were overcrowded buses, increased travel times and operating costs, vehicle congestion, and safety and security of riders accessing transit stops. He said that projected employment and residential growth in the area and in the community as a whole were likely to worsen those conditions.

Mr. Boyatt noted that the McVay Highway had similar issues; and, additionally, there were no sidewalks and bike lanes, making pedestrian access poor. He said that service demand was different than Main Street, with the Lane Community College (LCC) schedule being a primary factor. There also was an unfunded need to improve the Interstate 5 southbound exit to the 30th Avenue ramp. As with Main Street, problems were likely to worsen in the future.

Mr. Boyatt said that the project had five goals, which were developed by the SAC and reviewed and approved by the governance team:

1. Improve corridor transit service
2. Meet current and future demand in a cost-effective and sustainable way
3. Support economic revitalization and redevelopment opportunities
4. Enhance safety and security
5. Enhance other modes of travel in the corridor

Mr. Evans stated that the process for making recommendations began with examination of a broad range of transit solutions, including modes, locations, and stations. The SAC then narrowed those to a range of solutions that made the most sense based on the purpose and need the group had developed. That list was further reduced to the most promising and feasible solutions for the community. He said that if recommendations were approved by the City Council and LTD Board, they would be moved to the environmental process and project development.

Mr. Evans reviewed the extensive public input process. In addition to the SAC, which represented diverse groups and interests, listening sessions were held and comments could also be made on the project website. He emphasized that the City Council and LTD Board were not being asked to make final decisions, but to only determine which solutions should be investigated further. He defined the three options considered for each corridor:

1. No change in current service
2. Enhanced bus (between regular service and bus rapid transit)
3. Bus rapid transit (BRT)

Mr. Evans said that the recommendation, details of which were included in the agenda packet, were as follows:

McVay Highway corridor:

- No change option
- Enhanced bus option

Main Street corridor:

- No change option
- Enhanced bus option
- Bus rapid transit

Mr. Gillespie asked if a Springfield Station transfer was being considered if BRT was only on one section of the route. Mr. Viggiano replied that if BRT was included, efforts would be made to connect it with the existing system. He noted that there were several options for doing that, including severing the connection between Franklin and Gateway so that Gateway would operate as an independent segment. Enhanced bus service would not be connected to BRT service and would require a transfer at the Springfield Station.

Mr. Evans said that the SAC was recommending advancing the options set forth for each corridor to the next phase of the corridor, along with a recommendation for additional safety and lighting improvements as part of the project. He said that SAC recommendations would be considered by the Springfield City Council on May 18 and the LTD Board on May 20.

Mr. Hledik said that he represented property owners on the SAC and listed the other interests represented by members. He described the SAC process and commended members for their commitment to a challenging task. Conclusions and recommendations by the SAC were not unanimous, but were supported by an overwhelming majority of members.

Mr. Rowlett said that he represented LCC staff and students on the SAC. He said that LCC concerns involved more options on the Springfield route and safer pedestrian routes to the school. The McVay corridor was particularly hazardous for pedestrians and bicyclists, so safety improvements were a top priority. He commended SAC members for approaching their task with open minds and no preconceived ideas of what solutions should be considered; all options were on the table.

Ms. Newman, representing the school district on the SAC, said that the recommendations were broad concepts that would be refined during the next phase of the project to determine how best to address current problems and future growth. She said that safety was a common theme during SAC discussions, as was connectivity within the system. She said that the transit study was part of a Main Street vision initiative that encompassed a number of other projects. SAC members were encouraged to participate in all those projects as well in order to have a context for transit issues.

Mr. Necker asked if a transfer at McVay Station had been considered. Mr. Viggiano said that there were too many unknowns at this point, but most transfers were likely to occur at the Springfield Station. Mr. Evans said that those types of details would be addressed during future design studies.

Mr. Rowlett said that there were still many uncertainties around the McVay corridor as Eugene and Springfield refined their respective plans.

Mr. Gillespie expressed concern that ridership was contingent on LCC enrollment. Mr. Rowlett said that LCC enrollment was dependent on the condition of the economy; in difficult times enrollment increased; and when people went back to work, enrollment declined. He said that he felt that more students would elect to travel by bus if it was a convenient option.

Mr. Hledik said that the SAC also considered the City's recently adopted refinement plan that called for a multi-modal transportation corridor and a trunk sewer line being placed along the McVay Highway that could be instrumental in future development. He said that the corridor was not as developed as other routes, which could make it easier to plan for enhancements before development occurred.

Ms. Grossman asked about the nature of dissent on the SAC to the recommended options. Ms. Newman expressed that some members wanted to keep BRT as an option for the McVay segment because of the potential for changes in land use designations and increased residential development, although the timeline for that was unknown. She said that other members did not want to see anything along that segment except the current service. Mr. Hledik added that the reasons for no votes, particularly with respect to BRT, were not well articulated by the dissenters.

Mr. Rowlett said that the SAC did not want to be in a situation where it would be difficult to qualify for federal funding and took a regional perspective that identified options that would increase ridership along the corridor.

Mr. Evans said that the Board would be provided details of options at its next meeting and asked to take action on the SAC's recommendations.

Economic Analysis: Mr. Kilcoyne said that a finding of economic recovery was necessary prior to the Board taking action to adjust the payroll tax rate. The Board decided last year to defer that action for one year.

Governmental Relations Manager Edward McGlone stated that in November 2013, LTD commissioned a study by ECONorthwest regarding economic recovery in the region. He said that the study was necessary in order to consider a payroll tax increase as authorized by the legislature. The study included both the criteria required by statute and other discretionary criteria requested by the Board that would provide a more comprehensive picture of the community's economic status. He said that the data had been refreshed since the report was presented to the Board in May 2014.

Mr. McGlone introduced Senior ECONorthwest Economist Andrew Dyke, Ph.D. to present a summary of the updated report entitled *Recent Economic Performance of the Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Statistical Area*. Dr. Dyke stated that the purpose of the report was to support the Board's decision-making process; it provided information about current economic conditions, but did not make a determination of economic recovery or forecast future economic conditions. He said that data related to the following economic indicators had been analyzed:

- Total employment
- Employment in selected industries
- Unemployment rate and labor force participation rate
- Personal income by place of residence and by place of work
- Selected components of personal income
- Residential and commercial construction permits
- Number of business establishments

Dr. Dyke characterized current conditions as a continued improvement over the previous year, with more positive trends than in the previous report. He reviewed the methodology

used in the analysis and discussed the summary of findings and detailed findings for the economic indicators as set forth in the report, using line charts to illustrate growth and trends from 1991 to 2014 in each category.

Ms. Grossman asked if any of the indicators showing a downward trend were more significant than those with upward trends. Dr. Dyke expressed that lack of jobs remained a concern, as did the lack of increase in earnings, although there had not been a significant increase in earnings at the national level either. He said that overall, the trends at the local level were reasonably positive and indicated a growing confidence in the economy.

In response to a question from Mr. Gillespie, Dr. Dyke said that the inflation rate remained at about 2 percent.

EXECUTIVE (NON-PUBLIC SESSION): Mr. Wildish announced that the Board would now meet in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

MOTION Ms. Grossman moved that the LTD Board of Directors meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions. Mr. Gillespie provided the second.

VOTE The motion was approved as follows:

AYES: Gillespie, Grossman, Necker, Pierce, Wildish, Yeh (6)

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

EXCUSED: None


The Board entered Executive Session at 8:05 p.m. LTD staff present during executive session included Service Planning Manager Tom Schwetz, Director of Administrative Services Roland Hoskins, Human Relations Manager David Collier, Director of Operations and Customer Satisfaction Mark Johnson, Internal Auditor Cheryl Munkus, Senior Project Manager John Evans, and Government Relations Manager Edward McGlone.

RETURN TO REGULAR (OPEN) SESSION: The Board returned to regular session at 8:21 p.m.


ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Mr. Wildish adjourned the meeting at 8:21 p.m.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT:

ATTEST:



Julie Grossman
Board Secretary



Jeanne Schapper
Clerk of the Board

Approved: June 17, 2015