

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION

Wednesday, May 15, 1996

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 13, 1996, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, May 15, 1996, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, Vice President  
Rob Bennett  
Patricia Hocken, President, presiding  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary  
Mary Murphy  
Roger Saydack  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: ---

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken.

**COMMUTER SOLUTIONS PRESENTATION:** Connie Bloom Williams, LTD's Commuter Resources Coordinator, discussed LTD's Commuter Solutions program, which expanded the transportation services offered to the community. She explained that Commuter Solutions often was referred to as LTD's transportation demand management (TDM) program. She described TDM as the management of transportation based on user need or demand, and said that different strategies could be used to manage the transportation resources. TDM strategies were incorporated into planning documents, such as TransPlan and TRIP, and all could involve land use measures. Commuter Solutions offered programs to provide employees with alternative mode choices to reduce the vehicle miles traveled in the area, which was one of the goals of the transportation demand management strategies. Ms. Bloom Williams said that alternative modes were basically anything other than the single-occupant vehicle, and could include walking, biking, car pooling and van pooling, and the use of transit. She added that many TDM strategies, particularly biking and car pooling, brought commuters one step closer to getting on the bus and using transit.

Ms. Bloom Williams stated that the Clean Air Act was passed by Congress in 1992 in response to concerns in the nation for cleaner air and water. Federal, state, and municipal guidelines were established, and funding was made available for action plans, with transportation rating very high on this list. The regulations, mandates, and programs

trickled down from a federal, to a state, to an MPO, to a city level, for cities the size of Eugene/Springfield. This meant that cities like Eugene and Springfield were required to create and execute their transportation plans. LTD had been working with both cities and the Lane Council of Governments on the planning documents, particularly TransPlan.

Ms. Bloom Williams said that a piece of the planning process included defining and developing TDM strategies to assist in the local efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), and that was one of the niches that Commuter Solutions was filling. As the transportation leader in Lane County, LTD had taken a very proactive role in establishing a regional transportation management program that met the criteria of the Clean Air Act. In support of LTD's vision, the District had partnered with local planning staff and other agencies, as well as with the business community and governmental agencies, and had taken a leadership role within the local jurisdiction of establishing a transportation demand management program.

Ms. Bloom Williams stated that the main mission of Commuter Solutions was to develop voluntary transportation options for organizations and their employees. LTD worked with local businesses and organizations to execute transportation programs that benefit both the employees (actual employee benefits) and their employees (tax incentives), as well as the community as a whole, while at the same time meeting the state and federal mandates. She said that everyone benefited from a successful transportation management program, because there would be cleaner air, less congestion, responsible use of public moneys, healthier lifestyles, and improved quality of life in the area. Commuter Solutions supported LTD's strategic vision by positioning the District as a leader in transportation and its management for the area. In addition, the program created a natural opportunity for building quality partnerships between LTD and the business community. These partnerships were a perfect vehicle to keep key business leaders informed of the District's goals, accomplishments, and major priorities.

Through Commuter Solutions, the District also built partnerships with state, county, and city governments and the business community, to create custom programs for the employees. These program elements could include on-site services, where LTD staff visited an employer's work site to help people learn how to ride the bus, use a car pool if the bus did not work for them, or find walking or biking partners to get to work. Staff also answered questions about compressed work weeks, flexible schedules, and telecommuting. Public transportation coordination actually involved working with an employee transportation coordinator, called an ETC, who normally was an existing staff person at a work site who became LTD's main contact. LTD was responsible for training and educating the ETC, who then helped the District disseminate information to the work force. LTD also relied on the ETC to gather input on what the District could be doing better to meet their transportation needs.

Ms. Bloom Williams explained that parking management included cost analyses and comparisons on transportation costs to encourage employers to provide more transportation options and alternative programs for their employees. Commuter Solutions offered car pool matching services, and could do same-site matching, to try to match employees who worked at the same work site in car pools or van pools. There were trip reduction and peak

hour reduction programs that included compressed work weeks, telecommuting, and flexible work schedules. The question to be answered for employers was what option would work best based on the employees' needs and the nature of the job; Commuter Solutions helped in this analysis. Employee incentive programs showed employees how to run contests or encourage participation at the work site. Commuter Solutions also supplied bike and walk route information, talked about bicycle safety, and helped facilitate the acquisition of bike racks for employers at the work site. Other programs included group pass and discount bus programs.

Ms. Bloom Williams discussed several case studies, describing how the District had worked with Symantec, Peace Health, the University of Oregon, and the 4J School District to encourage alternate modes use. She handed out the information packets she used when she received inquiries from employers. The public education plan had involved television and print ads and direct mail, which included a return postcard. More than 300 postcards had been returned, and more were still trickling in. Ms. Bloom Williams recently had launched a direct mail program to employers with fifty or more employees, and had heard back from four of them within the first two weeks.

Ms. Bloom Williams said that the District would continue to work with state and local agencies toward effective tracking and measurement methods to be used on a regional basis, and with Lane Community College, Sony, and Hyundai to improve alternative modes use. She also would continue to participate in and monitor regional growth activities, and continue a proactive leadership role in managing the community's transportation needs and helping set the future direction of transportation planning.

Mr. Bennett asked Ms. Bloom Williams to clarify if the District actually was impacting 27,000 employees. She replied that 27,000 people were signed up on the program, but that did not mean that there were 27,000 bus riders because of the program. Mr. Bennett asked how Ms. Bloom Williams could determine whether she was making progress and had been successful. She replied that the work sites were surveyed annually to measure how many people were using alternative modes. Based on previous research, staff could tell how many VMTs were being saved. She added that they were making some good headway, starting with the large employers.

Mr. Bailey asked if there were other group pass programs similar to Symantec's. Ms. Bloom Williams said that the City of Eugene had a smaller program but a large bus riding population. Mr. Bailey then asked if there was any research to show how much group pass holders were using their passes for non-commute trips. Ms. Bloom Williams replied that there was no research yet, but the ability to use the pass for sports shuttles, fair service, etc., was a high selling point with employers. Mr. Kleger said he had observed employee card use at times that did not seem to be commute hours.

Mr. Bennett said he would be interested in learning more about how LTD had to adjust its service to meet group pass holder criteria, and whether there was a tradeoff in trying to attract people or enhancing the service at possibly a higher price. He said he was not sure that reducing the price was always the answer; maybe some people were more convenience-sensitive, and would pay more for increased service. Ms. Bloom Williams said

that when staff talked with people regarding the group pass program, they took the current ridership and location into account. If service had to be added, service that benefited only that company would be added into the group pass price. The program was a revenue-neutral program. She added that she found the use of small buses intriguing, because maybe that would allow the District into smaller neighborhoods.

Ms. Hocken asked if staff were given listings of where employees lived. Ms. Bloom Williams replied that staff conducted employee surveys and plotted employee homes on the map, in order to determine where the service was and what would work for those employees. As the community grew, there also would be the option to provide subscription service. Currently, however, there were not enough bus operators and vehicles to provide that kind of service.

Ms. Hocken also wondered if the data from all employers was combined, to determine employees who lived close together but worked for different employers. Ms. Bloom Williams replied that it was; that was how car pools were matched, as well.

**WORK SESSION ON BUS RAPID TRANSIT:** Transit Planner Lisa Gardner first provided an update on the corridor selection process. She reviewed the corridors that staff had discussed with the Board in April. The four segments under consideration were West 11th, as far west as Seneca or Bertelson; Coburg Road, either to Crescent or Gateway; east on Franklin/Main to the Springfield Station or to 58th and Main; and south to 29th and Willamette. The idea was to select two pieces to make an entire corridor approximately seven to eight miles in length. The data collected on the corridors included route length, population and employment per mile, bus travel time, and signal and passenger delays. There were a couple of problems with the Willamette Street corridor: limited right-of-way potential and the short length of the corridor. Currently, the bus was competitive with the auto; both faced the same delays, mainly caused by traffic signals. Coburg Road issues included the fact that the Ferry Street Bridge would be under construction for three years, beginning in 1997. It seemed problematic to try to implement a pilot corridor while there was construction on the bridge. Based on those findings, the east and west corridors, from Springfield out to West 11th, seemed to be probable corridors to consider.

Ms. Gardner said that following the April Board meeting, staff met with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which was comprised of staff members, mostly engineers, from the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, and the Lane Council of Governments. They reviewed the same information the Board saw in April, and the Committee agreed with the preliminary conclusion that West 11th to East Springfield seemed to be the most probable corridor to start with. There was concern about the problem of trying to take a lane or removing parking along West 11th. Ms. Gardner said that the Springfield staff were enthusiastic about a Springfield corridor. The main recommendation that they made was advocating that the corridor be extended to 58th and Main and include the Park and Ride there.

Ms. Gardner then discussed a matrix in the agenda materials that was developed after meeting with the TAC. It was a summary of the pros and cons of each of the corridor pieces, based on the data collection. The benefit of the Ferry Street Bridge/Coburg Road

corridor out to Crescent was that there was a lot of development in that area, with a lot of ridership. There was fairly good potential for right-of-way acquisition, as well. The cons for that corridor were the bridge construction delays and low ridership compared with some other corridors. On the Coburg Road segment, on Harlow to Gateway, the possibility of a transit lane on the bridge was seen as a benefit; there was a connection with Springfield that using Crescent did not have; and there was a lot of development in the Gateway area. On the con side, there was not a large congestion problem; there was a low number of land use development nodes, and there was the bridge construction.

Mr. Kleger said that he had pointed out before that the future developing nodes category did not list the ones that were already there, and that could be very misleading. If staff went out to Gateway from Harlow north to Beltline, they would believe there was a node there already. He said there was a lot of congestion there at times, and that on a number of occasions he had left Gateway on the inbound #12 route on time and gotten downtown Eugene quite late, simply because of the traffic along the way. Ms. Gardner said that staff were considering this on a comparative basis with some of the other corridors, and the percent of delay was less along this part of the corridor. Mr. Kleger added that it bothered him somewhat that the District would not be serving an existing residential and commercial node.

Mr. Montgomery asked if anyone had considered taking the bus down Pioneer Parkway rather than to Coburg Road via Harlow. Ms. Gardner said they did not consider it for the current corridor selection, but had considered it for the future.

Ms. Gardner stated that the #11 Thurston between Eugene and east Springfield currently had the highest ridership of any route. There were a large number of land use nodes; there were a lot of existing lanes; there was very high population and employment along that corridor, especially concentrated at the University of Oregon (UO); and because of the length of the corridor and signal priority potential, there was room for improvement of travel times. Additionally, including Springfield in the pilot corridor was an attractive aspect of this proposal. Some more difficult points were that this route would require relocating the Springfield Station, because where it was currently located it would require a significant jog and delay to reach it; and there was a lack of development in the Glenwood area.

Willamette to 19th had high ridership and was densely populated, had high employment, and was the historical center of Eugene. Negative aspects included the fact that it was a very short route with constrained rights-of-way, few land use nodes, and very little signal and preemption potential.

Along West 11th, a lot of land use nodal activity was projected; there was a high number of existing lanes; and the potential for reducing travel time was great, with a large disparity between auto and bus travel time. There also was a lot of existing ridership, with more projected with increasing employment activity. Two drawbacks for this corridor were parking removal and possible contra-flow lanes, which would be an engineering challenge.

Ms. Gardner said that staff were not asking for a final decision on the corridor at that point, but would like to move ahead with the preferred corridor. Staff would conduct more

research, including whether the West 11th corridor would have to jog down to 13th Avenue; where the Springfield Station would be relocated on Main Street; and whether the eastern terminus of the corridor would be at the Park and Ride location. Staff were in the process of trying to locate a Park and Ride location on West 11th, so that would be the likely western terminus.

Ms. Murphy said that if staff were collecting additional data and doing research, she would like to suggest that the Pioneer Parkway be given more in-depth study. Willamalane was not currently developing that property, and she saw the concentration of businesses and low ridership, the apartments and condos, and the employment as heavy concentrations of potential riders, especially in the professional clientele.

Mr. Bennett had the same general comments, in terms of housing accessibility in that area, and thought it was worth considering. Whether it currently had high ridership or not, the key was to make a much larger dent in the overall commuter and transportation market by getting new riders. He thought that one of the major criteria should be the probability of obtaining the right-of-way.

Ms. Hocken said that the issue of right-of-way was why she thought the extension of the corridor to 58th and Main rather than other things made the most sense. To go from downtown Springfield to 58th and Main, there was a lot of undeveloped land and there were already several lanes, so she thought it had a lot more potential for right-of-way and using signal prioritization.

Mr. Bennett wanted to know the probability of obtaining a complete, unobstructed right-of-way other than signal prioritization, to get along the chosen corridor. He wasn't sure if that had been done.

Mr. Montgomery said that going to east Springfield would best show what could be done with BRT, but the corridor that gave the best possibility of unobstructed right-of-way was Pioneer Parkway out to Gateway, which was an old railroad road bed that went all the way to the city of Coburg. It was in the center of Pioneer Parkway, and not a lot of signals would be required to cross streets. He said he would hate to see this opportunity lost, and thought that the District should be talking to Willamalane about obtaining this property.

Mr. Viggiano said that Mr. Bennett was correct; the opportunity for exclusive bus lanes was a key factor. Staff had looked at the amount of right-of-way that currently existed for the various options, and in the discussions with the TAC, that was a major topic. The east/west corridors presented the most opportunities for that. Mr. Viggiano said that Mr. Montgomery also was correct, that the Pioneer Parkway right-of-way was a great opportunity for exclusive right-of-way. He thought it could be a nice connection, but not something that should be put in right away, because he thought the first corridor should go through downtown Eugene and the UO area, because 35 percent of the area's employment was there. The Pioneer Parkway connection would be much more valuable if it could connect with an east/west corridor. He added that there probably were not a lot of origin and destination trips that fell in the Pioneer Parkway area.

Mr. Kleger said the reason he raised the Gateway node was that his impression was that it was the largest concentration of rental housing in the urban area, as well as one of the larger concentrations of commercial activity in the area, and it did not show up on the maps as a node. He imagined a rapid route from Gateway to downtown Springfield, then past the UO. He said it would be nice to tap the traffic from the Gateway residential area to the UO, at the point where staff deemed that it should be done. Mr. Viggiano agreed, and added that the number of land use nodes was one small piece of the information reviewed for this project. Information also was collected on residential and employment activity within each corridor, so the apartments and Gateway-area employment did show up in the data.

Ms. Hocken asked if staff had resolved how the UO students were included or counted in the study. She also wondered how the downtown employment was counted on the routes--whether it was counted equally on all of them, since they all went through downtown. Ms. Gardner said that each route included a quarter-mile band, so all the employment within that band through downtown was counted on each route. An extra 1,000 residents per mile had been added to include the missing piece within the quarter-mile band of the UO, and staff believed that was pretty accurate. The number might be higher, but definitely would not be lower.

Mr. Viggiano reiterated that the Board was not being asked to make a final decision on the corridor. Rather, staff would be looking at it more closely and concentrating their efforts on the proposed corridor. He said they could look at the Pioneer Parkway corridor a little more closely, as well, but their intention would be to concentrate their efforts and the community outreach effort on the West 11th to Main Street corridor.

Ms. Murphy said she had looked at the node development map and noted that the Sony employment center followed along the Pioneer Parkway corridor. She thought there appeared to be as much if not more marketing potential there than on the east/west corridor going through Main Street. Mr. Viggiano said that it was a significant node and was developing.

Ms. Hocken wondered about the danger of the railroad right-of-way going away, compared with some of the danger of private development along the right-of-way of some of the other areas. Maybe obtaining the private right-of-way was more urgent than obtaining the Pioneer Parkway land, if it was not in danger of being used for other reasons. Mr. Kleger said it was difficult to determine which pieces of that right-of-way were owned by the railroad and which were easements from the adjacent property owners, because the records were lost. At the north end, there was a big push to close the right-of-way and revert it to the individual property owners, so that there would be no corridor through the residential area north of Hayden Bridge Road. He thought that if the District were going to do something about that land, it should be done soon, although he did not believe LTD necessarily had to operate on it right away. However, he thought the District might consider tying up a portion of it to keep the passageway open for the future, and concentrate efforts on other areas. Mr. Viggiano said that staff could check with the City of Springfield to find out more about it.

Engineering consultant Graham Carey said he had been doing some work in that area, and there seemed to be some friction between the politicians and the engineering staff, with a big political push to put in the Pioneer Parkway. However, from an engineering point of view, it actually made a lot more problems for Springfield than it solved, because it would divert trips from I-5 through Springfield, and the Gateway/Beltline intersection would collapse under the pressure.

Ms. Hocken asked where the BRT line on West 11th would be. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff would be investigating that further, to determine where along the corridor it would be. The Technical Advisory Committee had some concerns about a contra-flow lane, so it needed to be examined closely in order to present some proposals to the City engineering staff. Ms. Hocken said she was concerned about the big maple trees along there. Mr. Viggiano said that staff hoped to use a parking lane, not actually take out trees. Ms. Hocken wondered if a bus would be able to get under the trees. Mr. Viggiano said that it appeared so. Staff had walked that corridor a week or so ago, and found that at a time when one would expect a lot of parking along the street, there wasn't much, so he thought there were some options.

**BRT Decision Model:** Mr. Viggiano explained that this tied in with some of the discussions about decisions such as what to do with right-of-way. Staff recognized that this project required a great deal of interagency coordination, particularly with the Cities of Eugene and Springfield. Therefore, staff were suggesting an approach that had final decisions on some of the major BRT decisions by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) rather than by the LTD Board. That would ensure buy-in by the other agencies. While LTD could do a lot of the BRT elements by itself, there were some things that the District would have a hard time doing without that cooperation.

Mr. Viggiano showed a suggested decision-making model and asked for the Board's reaction. One element of the model would be an LTD project team, made up primarily of staff, with a multi-dimensional employee team that would coordinate the input from other employees, consultants, the TAC, and the community. Recommendations would go from there to a Board/community committee, consisting of some LTD Board members and some representatives from other groups, and then to the LTD Board. Some decisions might be made by the committees, and the Board would make decisions about internal operating issues, such as whether to have a prepaid fare collection system. Questions regarding corridor selection, exclusive rights-of-way or contra-flow lanes would be answered by the multi-jurisdictional body, the MPC. It would be up to the Cities as to whether and how much they wanted to involve their city councils.

Mr. Viggiano explained that the MPC consisted of two city councilors from Eugene and Springfield, two Lane County commissioners, two LTD Board members, and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) regional manager as an ex officio member. Their role would be to make decisions on key BRT issues, such as pilot corridor selection, and some others that required the support of the cities. Staff saw a need to involve others from the community on the proposed Board/community committee, so were suggesting that in addition to three Board members, or two Board members and a Budget Committee member, there also would be a Eugene city councilor and Springfield city councilor. Ideally,



those would be councilors whose wards covered the BRT corridor. Two community representatives also were suggested, and should be community leaders who could help get the word out and represent the project to the community. If the proposed corridor were suggested, it would be important to have an ODOT representative, because some state highway would be involved, on Main Street and parts of West 11th. This committee's role would be to direct the project team, review and discuss major issues, and make recommendations to the Board. The project team would be an LTD team to coordinate the information and the work of the consultants, work with the Technical Advisory Committee, and do community outreach. The TAC already had been formed and had met several times to discuss pilot corridor data. It included staff from Eugene Public Works and Planning, Springfield Public Works and Planning, Lane County Public Works, and the Lane Council of Governments; the local ODOT planner; a professor from Oregon State University; and the District's consultants.

Ms. Hocken asked about the MPC role and how it fit in with the whole TransPlan issue. She asked if the District's goal was to get at least conceptual approval of BRT in the TransPlan, and to go one step further, to actually pin down the corridor. Mr. Viggiano said that one of the advantages staff saw with using MPC was that MPC had been working on the TransPlan Update, so this was a way of tying the two together. Some things would have to be worked out, since LTD was moving ahead with the BRT pilot corridor at the same time as trying to integrate the BRT concept into the future TransPlan. He thought the District would be moving on both tracks at the same time, and it was hoped that MPC, as the members became educated about BRT, would like the concept and support it as part of TransPlan.

Ms. Hocken asked how the pilot corridor selection fit into the local TIP. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff saw BRT as not being inconsistent with the current TransPlan. Based on the current plan, LTD could implement much of the BRT plan. It was not necessary to hold off until the TransPlan Update was finished before the District had a mandate to move ahead with BRT. Rather, he thought the District could start moving ahead with it. The part that might be inconsistent was the concept of exclusive bus lanes; it was not clear in the current plan whether the plan would support this concept. Staff believed that the District should move ahead.

Mr. Bennett asked about discussing the operating and service side of BRT in conjunction with TransPlan. He said he saw BRT as a major increase in the amount and kind of service in selected areas. He was not sure he saw it as increasing service generally. Mr. Viggiano said that in the short run, LTD would be concentrating efforts in certain parts of the community. If BRT proceeded as planned, the 20-year system was fairly encompassing. Mr. Bennett recalled that when Portland put in light rail, they cut back on regular service. There were only so many operating dollars, and in getting started, if the farebox to operating cost ratio was about the same and other adjustments were not made, he had less confidence in that. He wondered if the District had to speak to that in terms of the TransPlan and BRT. Mr. Viggiano said that staff were working with the Finance Committee for TransPlan to review projections for operating costs and capital expenditures. BRT was much more capital intensive than operating intensive. Even though projections showed fairly frequent service along the corridors, it was not that much more than current

service. By making improvements in travel time, the bus would travel through the corridor faster, so less total service would be needed to achieve ten-minute frequency than currently would be needed. Parts of the corridor already did have ten-minute service. Therefore, he thought that BRT would have much more impact on the capital budget than on the operating budget. That might mean that the District would not have to make as significant of tradeoffs, in terms of taking service from other areas, as might initially have been thought.

Mr. Bailey said he thought it was very important to make sure that the BRT concept had a fair amount of community support, but the only place with community representatives was the Board/community committee. He thought that a little more grassroots support for projects such as this would be helpful, especially at the technical advisory level, at the ground floor of the project. Mr. Viggiano said there could be more opportunities, and staff actually had planned to spend a fair amount of time in community involvement. There would be focus groups to start out with, and then some ongoing contact. He added that the TAC usually was very technically oriented and may not be of interest to a lay citizen.

Mr. Bennett mentioned the community outreach and walkabout, where the Board members would go out to the community and try to make a case. He said that he would appreciate having as much specific information as possible. He thought the District was moving in that direction with the selection of a corridor; then he would want more understanding of the corridor before going out on the walkabout--what the issues and real problems were going to be. He said that his approach would be to talk to people about what the problems really were and not have them develop later, after initial support.

Mr. Viggiano commented that there were two options: either to let people know early what would be happening, or to wait until there was more specific information after further research, but the concern was that this might be "old news" at that point, if people heard about it elsewhere. Also, people could have concerns about LTD doing a lot of work on BRT without letting them know what was coming. He thought there were some tradeoffs, and suggested possibly making the initial contacts with the information available, then providing additional information later.

**Walkabout:** Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron said that, so far, the track that the District was on had been to gently roll out the concept so that the community could see that the District was moving in this direction because it made sense, and that LTD was continuing to study the issues. Part of the message was that the goal was to make transit as competitive as possible with the automobile, and to let the community know how BRT fit with TransPlan and the District's strategic plan. He handed out the most recent iteration of the general brochure that staff had been working on in partnership with the TAC staff, which began to introduce some of the benefits that they thought were in BRT, some of the potential costs, and some of the tradeoffs. Staff had thought that beginning after the Board's permission that evening, they would begin to gently roll out this concept to the community and begin to get the community's reaction in order to fine-tune the message along the way. Unfortunately, the process was not far enough along yet to know what some of those big, specific issues were that Mr. Bennett had mentioned. It would take more time and research on a particular corridor to ferret those out and have the kinds of answers that people would want.

Mr. Bennett asked how fast staff could get the answers. Mr. Bergeron said that once the corridor was selected, the energy would go into those kinds of details.

Mr. Bennett said he had talked to a lot of people in the community about BRT, and he had not anyone say they thought it was a bad idea. This included his business friends and a number of conservative people in the community who might look very carefully at the allocation of public dollars. It was only when the issue of money and who would be disrupted that people would start to "get off the train," and he thought that a discussion of the problem, approach, and solution would be appreciated by the people to whom the Board would be speaking.

Ms. Hocken said that she and Ms. Loobey had discussed the need for a community outreach Board committee. It would be charged with planning the walkabout, timing, information, etc. She said that if the Board agreed, this would be something the committee would look at in the next month or so, including what information the Board would need in order to answer the community's questions. On one level, she said, it was nice to get people to buy into the concept first.

Mr. Kleger thought that it was important to lay the groundwork in concept, but no matter how well that was done, there would be people whose approval changed when it got down to the actual case; as long as it did not look like it would affect them, they would be happy, but if it changed something they were used to, they were not happy. He thought that however the Board did this, he would rather it be done with as much information as LTD had at every step of the way. He said he was concerned about anything that someone could turn into a claim that the District made all the decisions before involving the public.

Mr. Bergeron said that staff's original thinking was to have the Board pick a first corridor, as a decision point, that would give LTD the freedom to focus its energy on studying the details and getting as much detailed information as possible along the corridor.

However, staff backed away from that for the reason just mentioned by Mr. Kleger: the concern about making a decision on a corridor before the community really understood the concept. Therefore, the way that staff suggested presenting BRT, in addition to the general information that the Board had, was to suggest that the District have a preferred corridor based on a purely technical analysis, including potential ridership, population, etc., for more research and study, and ask the community members what they needed answers to in order to feel comfortable that LTD was moving in the right direction about the alternative corridors, the potential impact on parking loss, home owners who might feel threatened, etc.

Mr. Bergeron said that LTD would have to deal with the balance between the benefit to the community as a whole and those who might be unhappy to have this development in their backyard.

Mr. Bergeron stated that, for those reasons, staff believed this would be a healthy approach to take; to stick with the concept as a whole; be honest that the District was leaning in a certain direction, based on the analysis thus far; continue to obtain more detailed information about the corridor; and obtain feedback from the community at the same time.

Mr. Bergeron mentioned the different audiences the District needed to satisfy in order to make BRT work, including LTD employees, current bus riders, and the residents and business along the target corridor, as well as the public policy agency partners and staff partners already discussed. At this point in the process, staff suggested beginning to focus their energies not only in the analysis area, but also in the outreach area along the target corridor, unless the Board needed more information before beginning that process. If that were the case, it might be better for the District to continue to focus its energies on the community as a whole and the key opinion leaders and decision makers, so there would be more time for additional technical analysis.

Ms. Hocken thought it might make sense to have the Board committee look at this and make a recommendation to the Board regarding the walkabout: what should be done, when, who should be contacted, what kinds of materials were needed, etc. She recommended delegating this activity rather than having the whole Board working on it.

Ms. Hocken said that she would like to appoint Ms. Murphy to the committee, as well as Mr. Bennett, because of his interest in BRT, and Mr. Bailey, because of his interest in community outreach, as well. If the committee needed additional input from the Board, that would be fine, but she asked that they meet to discuss this within the next month or so. She added that she thought it would be at least a year before the District would be able to answer all the questions that might be asked.

Mr. Kleger commented that whenever the District went to the public with unanswered questions or issues, it would seem to him to be a good political move to state those in fairly simple terms and ask for input. The District probably would not receive a lot of practical answers, but people at least would know that they had the opportunity to be involved and contribute their comments.

Mr. Bergeron mentioned that, in response to a Board suggestion at a prior meeting, focus groups had been scheduled. Those would occur on June 10, 11, and 12, and staff would have a preliminary report of what they had learned in time for the June Board meeting. The focus group qualitative research process would target four different groups: business people from Eugene and Springfield; users of the particular corridor; and bus riders along that corridor. Staff would like to gather input from a lot of other audiences, as well, but thought that these four would be a good starting point. The focus group participants would be asked questions relative to the community at large, as well, in the hope that their perceptions and attitudes upon hearing about this project also would be useful to LTD in communicating with people along any other corridor that might be chosen. These focus groups would provide some research information to use in designing future leave-behinds and communication strategy from that point forward.

Mr. Kleger said that while he was asking questions about issues like access to Gateway, he had no sense of criticism for the staff preference for the east/west linkage. He thought that was the proper place to start because it had a substantial, already-present market, and it would be a good deal easier to get that market to shift from a pretty good service to a better service and make a good impression for future development. He thought

BRT should be done where it was going to succeed the first time, because that would make it easier to sell the next time. He added that he would like to see a map that contained both the projected and the existing development, so that the District did not present the appearance of overlooking something that may have not been designed as a node, but became one.

Ms. Hocken said that Mr. Bergeron would like feedback about the handouts, and asked Mr. Viggiano what he would like to know about the decision model he presented, and if he wanted to make copies for the Board for their review and comment. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff would like to begin educating MPC on BRT. Whether or not the proposed decision model was used, staff would like to begin providing information times for MPC meetings on a regular basis, beginning, perhaps, in June.

Ms. Hocken asked about Lane County involvement in the process, and wondered if any County road money might be available for this project. Mr. Viggiano replied that Lane County had given up its jurisdiction on urban area roads to the cities, although the County could participate as a member of MPC.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

C:\WPDATA\BDMN515W.DOC