

# MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, July 17, 1996

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on July 12, 1996, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, July 17, 1996, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Thomas Montgomery, Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. by Board President Patricia Hocken.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Ms. Hocken opened the meeting for public comment on any topic. There was no one in the audience who wished to address the Board.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Hocken introduced the July Employee of the Month, Bus Operator John Dahl. Mr. Dahl had been an LTD employee since December 1991. He received a certificate and award for his outstanding contribution to the District.

Ms. Hocken introduced the August Employee of the Month, Transit Operations Clerical Assistant, Michelle Gilles. Ms. Gilles had been an LTD employee since July 1994. She was given a certificate and award for her outstanding contribution to the District.

**PROPOSED LANE COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED TRANSPORTATION ISSUES:** Lane County Fair Manager Mike Gleason was present to discuss his plans for the Fairgrounds and other related transportation issues. He thanked LTD for its participation in Fair and other events. He thought that if not for LTD, there would not be a Country Fair, as the Fairgrounds parking lot was overrun with vehicles during the weekend. He said that in a large way, the fair's success was dependent upon the relationship it had with LTD. He stated that the

Fair relied upon its relationship with LTD, and he expected that partnership to grow significantly.

Mr. Gleason said that he had been working on opening up Jefferson Street at 13<sup>th</sup> so that instead of having to make the abrupt left and right turns where Jefferson meets 13<sup>th</sup>, it would be extended straight through the east end of the Fairgrounds, providing an entrance to the Fairgrounds. People who were coming off the freeway system could travel straight into the Fairgrounds instead of having to travel down 11<sup>th</sup> to Polk and back up 13<sup>th</sup>, as was the current practice. He noted that the Fairgrounds property was about 55 acres in size, and accommodated 50 to 60 events per month. He thought that most people saw the Fairgrounds as the Fair, and while that was the biggest event, there were a lot of other events that were very large. Making the change to Jefferson Street would improve the Fairground's orientation in terms of getting traffic on and off the grounds.

The next phase of the project would be to rebuild 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue to include bus lanes and deceleration lanes. Mr. Gleason wanted to work closely with the LTD Board and staff to ensure that the Fairground facility was successful for LTD as well, not only for the events that were there, but also to be used as a Park and Ride facility.

He noted that the Fairgrounds was not only a celebratory space for the entire county, but also an exposition location for major presentations and business interchange. The Fairgrounds had about 300,000 square feet and about 3,000 parking spaces which made it a very good location for events of large magnitude. Thirdly, he noted that the Fairgrounds also was a sports venue. Currently, there was an ice hockey program, and plans were underway for an indoor soccer program. He thought the potential was there for a professional ice hockey team. There were other possible areas of expansion that were being discussed that included land as well as use.

In order for the Fairgrounds to become all of this, Mr. Gleason thought that partnerships with LTD, Fairground neighbors, schools, churches, and other public agencies would be vitally important.

Mr. Gleason then stated the connection of the use of the Fairgrounds to LTD. In his observations of bus-only transit agencies across the nation, transit was serving a marketing niche from about 2.6 percent to a high of about 3.75 percent of the total trips taken. He was referring to the ridership that was fairly dependent on transit. He noted that that market was the same market that had been served at least for the last 30 years. He did not think that there was much that could be done, at least with the route system or the quality of the ridership or headways, that could change that market. He thought that it was important for any community to begin thinking about their transit system as an entirely different asset, and begin to penetrate different markets that were not currently available.

Mr. Gleason thought that Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) was a great idea for this community, because it was more flexible than light rail, and because it could be added to and modified in increments to target different market niches. LTD, in its current structure, was missing one of the larger market opportunities available in the area.

The market niche that he wanted the Board to consider was the transient (convention/visitors) niche. The metropolitan area of Eugene and Springfield had a potential that had not yet been realized with regards to the visitor and convention industry. Mr. Gleason thought that the biggest stumbling block for the Eugene Springfield area to be able to attract larger events to the area was the fact that there was no way to block or group hotel rooms so that participants could be located in one area. In the metropolitan area, there were about 4,500 rooms. He thought that if those rooms could be blocked and event venues could be connected in an effective way, Eugene and Springfield could compete more effectively to attract events into the area. Having to factor transportation costs into an event proposal usually put the Eugene/Springfield area out of contention. Mr. Gleason said that in spite of that, this area was doing well, but losing ground to the other cities that had their venues in one place.

Mr. Gleason proposed that the Board and staff consider a loop route for BRT that would link all or most of the convention and visitor venues in the area, including Gateway, Valley River, and Franklin. He thought that most of the routing could be accomplished by using current right-of-way.

He noted that all of the bike bridges that crossed the Willamette were capable of handling fire trucks, and could therefore carry a bus. He thought they could be redesigned fairly easily to carry both pedestrians and buses. This would result in four different locations for transit-, bike-, and pedestrian-only crossings. There was right-of-way along the parkway that could be set aside for BRT. Headways would not be a major problem with regards to other utilization, and construction would be relatively easy. He thought that propane or electric buses could be used that were quiet and inexpensive to operate. The routes could be designed to utilize gate drops or priority lighting when crossing streets.

An important factor for all of this would be that the community would unite around the building of a new convention facility. All venues would participate, and the key would be LTD. This service could also coincide with the location of recreational facilities, and it would support the general public. It would also develop the foundation that the land use program would be able to support.

Mr. Gleason stated that the visitors industry would pledge room-tax money to build a convention facility, and they realize that LTD would be the key. He thought they would be willing to work very hard to promote this plan to the agencies.

In closing, Mr. Gleason stated he had talked to several local officials, and that there was strong interest in the concept. He thought that would put LTD in very good stead with regards to the politics around the Surface Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP).

Mr. Bennett thought that this concept was somewhat new and interesting. However, the attempt to gain a larger market share was not new. So, the question was how to do that, and what would be the logical first step. He stated that it was vitally important that a mistake not be made the first time around. He wondered what would be the potential for commuter and other market share.

Mr. Gleason suggested the following routing: Fairgrounds to downtown, along the river to Franklin, crossing the Willamette at Autzen, along the river to VRC and Marist, then to Gateway and the Game Farm area. He thought that the route would follow the right-of-way along the bicycle routing with priority lighting or drop gates where it crossed the major arterials. He thought it would pass near all the major schools, parks, and shopping and business areas. He agreed that the system could not be built on the transient market, but that market was no longer an insignificant part of the area's industry. He thought this routing would be very attractive to people. He noted that Park and Ride lots could be located at key points along the route.

Ms. Murphy wondered which parkway Mr. Gleason had referred to. He replied that he was referring to the public right-of-way along the Willamette. He noted that the public owned almost all of the right-of-ways along the major water courses.

Ms. Murphy expressed her concern about the priority lighting that Mr. Gleason had mentioned. She was aware that the EMS systems use priority lighting, and she was concerned about the possibility of accidents.

Mr. Gleason noted that he was suggesting that LTD not use the Opticon or emergency routing, but rather use other routes that would cross the side streets. He thought that if a bus were to cross every fifteen minutes, as an example, it would not cause a problem for using the priority lighting system each time.

Mr. Kleger stated that he had heard from people who were concerned about the regular LTD routing leaving people two blocks away from the Fairgrounds. Assuming the resources were in place, he wondered if Mr. Gleason would have a problem with continuing the regular weekday service into the Fairgrounds.

Mr. Gleason replied that his staff would like to participate with LTD in the route planning. He wanted to be flexible. As far as the Park and Ride issue, and recognizing that there were often four or five events going on at once at the Fairgrounds, rarely were all 3,000 parking spaces in use. There only were four or five times per year that all parking was used.

Mr. Kleger asked if Mr. Gleason would be willing to work with LTD to continue the downtown shuttle using the Fairgrounds as a Park and Ride, after the completion of the Eugene Station construction. Mr. Gleason replied that he would. He thought that the routing to include the Fairgrounds would entice people to travel out that way during their lunch hour or other times of the day to ice skate or to attend an event.

Mr. Bailey noted that he really appreciated Mr. Gleason taking the time to talk with the Board about his concept. He wondered about the political feasibility of using the parkways. Mr. Gleason replied that there was a confluence of interest in needing to have a transit system beyond the 3 percent market share ridership. He also thought that people realized the need to develop the industry base. He thought that those two issues represented a very strong political potential. He thought that there would be very little economical argument against using the parkways.

Mr. Saydack wondered if the feasibility of some of the suggested routing had been looked into, such as using the existing bridges. Ms. Hocken added her question of whether or not buses would be allowed to use the routing (green streets) that was designated as bike routes. Mr. Gleason understood that the definition for the green street designation was that it was for alternative modes of travel only. He thought that LTD qualified as an alternate mode.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken thanked Mr. Gleason for his presentation and ideas. She stated that the Board would have LTD staff look into this idea.

Motion

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved the adoption of the Consent Calendar for July 17, 1996. Mr. Bailey seconded. Mr. Bennett wondered if he should abstain from voting on the approval of the minutes as he had not been at the June 17 meeting. Ms. Loobey replied that he could abstain, but that the rule stated that when a voting member abstained, he or she must state the reason for that abstention. Ms. Hocken called for the vote. The motion carried by a vote of 5 in favor (Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack); none opposed. Mr. Bennett abstained on the grounds that he had not been in attendance at the June 17 meeting. Items on the Consent Calendar were: minutes of the June 17, 1996, special meeting/work session; the June 17, 1996, regular Board meeting minutes; and Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Appointments.

Vote

**CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF MR. GLEASON'S PROPOSAL:** Mr. Bennett stated that LTD was pretty far along in the development of the east-west pilot corridor for BRT. He wondered how far along the technical committee was in studying the east-west corridor, and if they would be able to stop what they were doing to look at this new idea. Ms. Loobey stated that many of the documents that were already in place as background material, such as TransPlan, Urban Rail Feasibility, and the Ferry Street Bridge study, talked about the concept of BRT. Anything that would be separate from those would at least have to be part of TransPlan, and the Transportation Improvement

Plan, among others, since STP funds were to be used. Ms. Loobey stated that staff could look at how to use the Fairgrounds for routing that was different from what currently was in place. She believed that the routing and features of the BRT route that Mr. Gleason was suggesting had to be analyzed by the TPC to determine whether it fit in the current TransPlan update.

Mr. Bennett thought that there were two issues. One was whether or not LTD would be able to reach a significantly broader market on a regular basis. He was not sure how significant the transient or visitors market was. The other issue was whether that particular routing would attract more than just the transient users.

Ms. Loobey stated that the Gateway area was considered earlier in the BRT analysis, and staff could refer back to that. She thought that the area conference stakeholders should meet to discuss the feasibility of investing in a new convention center. Mr. Bennett asked the technical staff to make a assessment of Mr. Gleason's proposal and some political, conceptual, and administrative people to look at it as well, and come back to the Board with a recommendation as soon as possible. It was thought that the Board should respond as quickly as possible.

Ms. Loobey asked if Mr. Bennett wanted that information prior to the walkabout. Mr. Bennett replied that the initial walkabout was not scheduled to be corridor specific, so that would not be necessary.

Mr. Saydack concurred with Mr. Bennett. Mr. Kleger concurred and suggested that staff also look into the practicality of mixing the local, regular public with the convention attendees. Mr. Bailey concurred as well. He thought that there were some pieces of Mr. Gleason's suggestion that possibly ought to be included in the TransPlan process. He restated his concern about the political aspect of the proposal and thought that those community issues may not have come up in conversations about this proposal. Ms. Hocken said that she had not yet heard that LTD could use the bike bridges, nor that there was a possibility of using the right-of-way along the bike paths, but that if those were possible, she wanted it looked into.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Schwetz if he knew anything about those right-of-ways or the possible use of the bike bridges. Mr. Schwetz had not been involved in any conversations about that, but knew that Mr. Gleason had talked with Mr. Jim Carlson of LCOG. He stated that he thought it sounded exciting.

Ms. Murphy thought that there would be a greater likelihood of local riders using the east-west corridor where there were commercial and business establishments, versus traveling along the bike lanes or residential streets where there were very few of those establishments. However, she felt that Mr. Gleason would be an advocate in helping to design the linkage between the Fairgrounds and the rest of that corridor. Mr. Bailey noted that Mr. Gleason, in mentioning the linking of Gateway and Valley River Center, identified two market niches: the transient trips and the recreational trips.

In Mr. Bailey's work with the TDM committee, those locations comprised a large number of the total number of trips in the community. He thought that the current proposed east-west corridor may only capture, more efficiently, the current bus riders, and not another market segment, which was something that LTD had not considered.

#### **BOARD COMMUNITY OUTREACH COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

**REGARDING WALKABOUT:** Mr. Bailey reported that the Community Outreach Committee (COC) had met on July 8. A written recommendation had been distributed to the Board at the July 17 meeting. The committee built on the focus group information that Mr. Bergeron had presented in June. Several factors that were reported from the focus groups included the community's desire to be involved in the process, the participants' concerns about details such as how much BRT would cost, where it would go, etc., and that they needed more general information about what LTD does and where it's going. The major discussion that took place in the COC meeting was about what information would be discussed in the walkabout; i.e., whether to talk conceptually about BRT or to talk about the specifics, such as the route, exclusive right-of-ways, etc.

Mr. Bailey stated that the committee decided to recommend to the Board that any BRT corridor-specific walkabout should not be held until the Board had identified the pilot corridor and any dedicated right-of-ways so that they could adequately respond to any issues, anticipate what those issues would be, and be able to talk about those during the walkabout. What the committee would suggest was that the Board conduct a community-wide walkabout covering LTD general themes, what LTD was currently doing, highlighting LTD accomplishments, and generally talking about the concept of BRT as a way of introducing it to the community as a whole.

The committee also recommended that five to ten contact names be established for each member of the Board. Those contacts would be based on their natural affiliations, organizations, and groups that they currently had contact with and existing relationships.

A document would be prepared, similar to what was prepared for the last walkabout, that would answer questions about potential issues and provide resource information for the Board to convey during their meetings.

Ms. Hocken asked if a timeline had been established. Mr. Bailey stated that the committee thought that the community walkabout would take place as soon as possible, then a decision would be made about holding a walkabout for the pilot corridor, depending on the technical advisory group's decisions and recommendations.

Ms. Murphy mentioned that consultants Kathy Wiltz and Jenny Ulum had talked about generating a list of potential contacts for the Board to use. Ms. Murphy thought that the Board could utilize that list to select their contacts.

Mr. Bennett said that, with respect to the timing, the summer months would be difficult for some Board members. He stated that he would be out of town much of the month of August. He thought that others could get started, but that he would not plan to begin contacting people until immediately following the Labor Day holiday. He was concerned about the community walkabout and the BRT-specific walkabout occurring too close together.

Mr. Bailey did not think that they would fall too close to each other. He wondered how the decision about the pilot corridor would be made; in one meeting or stated in one meeting and voted on at the following meeting. Ms. Hocken thought that Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano would be able to answer that upon his return from vacation.

Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn stated that he did not think that Mr. Viggiano had the definitive answer. Mr. Viggiano was working toward a time line where the data would be available for the Board to look at, such as potential ridership and some of the problems that might arise. However, that data would not resolve any of the political issues that arose, in terms of talking to the two city councils or the people along the corridor who would be directly affected. He thought that there was a sequence in which LTD would talk about the general idea, build some support, then come back with the preferred pilot corridor. Mr. Pangborn stated that during the community walkabout, the Board might be asked about the routing, and it would be all right to say that they were thinking about the West <sup>11<sup>th</sup></sup> to Thurston corridor. That would help the Board get a sense of what some of the issues might be that could arise.

Mr. Bennett stated that when the committee met, he had raised the issue of how much information the Board would need to have in order to conduct the walkabout. The general consensus at the end of the meeting was that they would not need to have all of the information, but that there would come a time when the Board would need to have a lot of specific information if they were to go out and try to gather support for it. He wondered if it would be too late to wait until after the first of the year. He noted that there would be newly-elected officials at that time.

Ms. Loobey asked if it was envisioned that the five to ten contact names would be for the community walkabout, and perhaps those five to ten would not necessarily be the ones that would be contacted during the BRT-specific walkabout. Mr. Bailey said that not knowing the corridor at this time, some of the people who would be contacted could not yet be identified. Mr. Bennett wondered if the Board would be talking to the same people twice, and Ms. Hocken said that they would, because those contacts would be the community opinion leaders; however, in the corridor-specific walkabout, the Board would be contacting a broader base that could include neighborhood groups and people along the corridor.

Mr. Kleger thought that the Board could ask the people who were initially contacted if they would like to be contacted for the more corridor-specific conversation.



Ms. Hocken wondered if the Eugene Station would be one of the topics that would be discussed during the community walkabout. Mr. Bailey replied that the committee anticipated an update on the station to be one of the issues for Board members to discuss during the walkabout.

Ms. Murphy mentioned that the committee also had discussed having visuals to use during their discussions with the community. She thought the computer-generated visual of the Eugene Station would be a good thing to have. She stated that Mr. Bennett had described the possible BRT bus, and she said that she liked the idea of having visuals of that sort. She also thought that another market the committee had discussed was the local groups, such as Rotary or Kiwanis, and placing a demo BRT bus at one of the shopping centers along the pilot corridor to reach even more people. The committee also discussed contacting the educators, principals, and administrators of the schools.

Motion Ms. Hocken asked for formal action on the recommendation. Mr. Saydack  
Vote moved that the Board approve the recommendation of the Community Outreach Committee. Mr. Bailey seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote with Ms. Hocken, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Saydack, Mr. Kleger, and Ms. Murphy voting in favor.

**PRESENTATION OF TRANSPLAN VIDEOS:** Mr. Tom Schwetz of Lane Council of Governments was present to show two TransPlan videos that had been discussed at the June Board meeting. He stated that the videos were part of an ongoing effort to flush out land use strategies that were identified around nodal development. Those land-use principles were based on four principles: access, design, density, and proximity. The first video, *Building for the Future*, was more conceptually based, describing the land-use strategies. The second video, *Transportation-Effective Development: An Eyewitness Report*, was filmed in a news report style that creatively described some of the real-life examples of nodal development.

Following the videos, Mr. Schwetz explained that the focus was to try to address some of the feasibility issues around the nodal development program. Additionally, LCOG staff were developing a more rigorous study of the market for this type of development, and that material would be presented to the Board in the coming months.

Ms. Murphy inquired as to why the University of Oregon/Sacred Heart area was not mentioned. Mr. Schwetz replied that it was considered part of the downtown area.

Ms. Hocken then thanked Mr. Schwetz for his presentation.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:**

- a. Metropolitan Policy Committee: Ms. Hocken reported that the July MPC meeting had not yet been held, and that she would not be able to attend. Mr. Bennett would attend that meeting.
- b. TransPlan Update Symposia Process: Nothing to report.
- c. High-Speed Rail Siting Committee: Mr. Bailey reported that Senator Hatfield had indicated that pledges for transportation equity funds were currently due. The City of Springfield had decided not to pledge any equity funds to high speed rail. Ms. Hocken would be addressing the Lane County Commissioners on July 25 to gain their support.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Bailey to report on his recent trip to Washington, D.C. Mr. Bailey had traveled to Washington, D.C., with Ms. Loobey and Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron to pitch BRT as a demonstration project under the reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), which would take place next year in Congress. They met with Senators Wyden and DeFazio, as well as with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) staff. He thought that all three groups were supportive of the concept and thought it fit well with the ISTEA demonstration project. Senator Wyden was supportive and suggested ways to make the project work. One suggestion was that LTD work with the State Division of the U.S. Department of Transportation, to get BRT on their priority list. Senator DeFazio was very supportive. Overall, Mr. Bailey felt that it had been a very successful trip.

**EUGENE STATION**: Facilities Services Manager Charlie Simmons reported that LTD had signed a contract with Eugene Sand and Gravel for phase I of construction. A critical piece of that was the vacation of the alley, which would be considered by the City Council on July 22. Possession of those alleys was needed before phase I could begin. Mr. Simmons also reported that there was soil contamination in the Hammer Site on the southwest corner. Hammer's consultants were performing additional testing. Mr. Simmons stated that this part of Phase I was not as critical as the vacation of the alleys. Work on Phase I could continue without the possession of the Hammer site.

Mr. Bennett wondered what could delay the vacation of the alley. Ms. Hocken stated that the City Council had to order the vacation of the alley by ordinance. They would take action on it on July 22, but that would only be the first reading of the ordinance, so they would have to attach an emergency clause to the ordinance in order for it to be immediately enacted. In order for the ordinance to be adopted, a two-thirds majority vote would need to support the emergency clause. Mr. Bailey had spoken with Councilwoman Nancy Nathanson, and she indicated that there probably would be little opposition, but that one of the questions that might come up was why LTD had waited so long to request the alley vacation.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Hammer land representatives were taking care of the environmental issue. Mr. Simmons replied that they were, but that it had not yet been completed. They had found additional problems involving PCBs. Mr. Bennett asked if there was a certain time frame for cleaning the soil. Mr. Simmons stated that both parties were anxious to finish the transaction.

Mr. Pangborn stated that there was a potential that a certain level of contamination on that site would not be feasible to clean up. In that case, the transfer of the property would be conditional on a Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) determination, and the property would be monitored over time. Mr. Bennett wondered how deep the site needed to be dug. Mr. Simmons replied that there was a limit. He stated that the site had been dug down 13 feet to ground water, which was as far as required. Once ground water level was reached, the excavators would dig in a horizontal direction from there. He stated that clean was just relative; while a consultant may or may not declare a site clean, the DEQ determination may need to be made.

Mr. Bennett wondered if funding would be affected. Ms. Loobey replied that with the proper certifications in place, it would not be a problem. Mr. Saydack wondered if staff knew where the source of contamination was. Mr. Simmons replied that at one time, there were five vehicle hoists in that area, and it was determined that they were the cause. Mr. Saydack had heard about contamination migrating from the cleaners located across the street, and wondered if that had been determined. Mr. Simmons replied that had not been identified. He further stated that the northwest quadrant of the site had not been scraped off, and that area could have downstream pollutants.

**LTD RESPONSE TO COURT RULING ON MEASURE 8:** Ms. Hocken noted that the recommendation from staff on the latest court decision on Ballot Measure 8 was to do nothing at this time, but wait to see what happened.

**NEW EUGENE CITY LIBRARY:** No one had anything to report at this time.

**PROMISE KEEPERS SPECIAL SERVICE:** Ms. Hocken stated that LTD would not be providing any type of shuttle or special service for this event. Mr. Bailey wondered if LTD should have some sort of contingency plan in place, just in case the Promise Keepers realized that they needed the service. Ms. Hocken stated that there would not be the buses or people available to drive them. Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated that there was a possibility that some buses could be spared, except during Friday peak hour. However, on Saturday, the bus capacity would not be the issue, but more that days off would need to be canceled for the bus operators, and it would be a very costly thing to do. He further stated that LTD had made a proposal to the Promise Keepers, but they were not interested. Ms. Hocken and Ms. Loobey had discussions about getting something written into TransPlan that placed the responsibility on organizers of community events to provide a crowd movement plan of some sort. For instance, it would be the responsibility of the

UO or the convention center, as an example, to require its contracted event coordinators to provide a plan for transportation as part of any permit they might be issued. Ms. Hocken and Ms. Loobey discussed making a formal presentation to the MPC about this.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he had met with UO Vice President Jan Oliver to discuss LTD's concerns about the Promise Keeper event, the lack of success in working cooperatively with them, and the suggestion that perhaps the UO needed to take the lead from this point forward to ensure that, as police services were required, so would be transportation services. He felt that she had responded favorably to that suggestion.

**BOARD CORRESPONDENCE:** Ms. Hocken stated that there had been a letter from Senator Wyden about the United Front visit to Washington, D.C. Ms. Loobey stated that the Senator had been very helpful in securing funding for the Eugene Station project.

**EUGENE STATION GROUNDBREAKING:** Ms. Hocken reported that the groundbreaking event was scheduled for November 8, 1996. The date was set based on Senator Hatfield's schedule, and letters of invitation were being sent to Senator Wyden and Representative DeFazio. Mr. Bennett thought that Governor Kitzhaber should be invited as well. Mr. Kleger thought that the Eugene and Springfield elected officials should be invited as well as the County Commissioners.

**1996 EMPLOYEE PICNIC:** Ms. Hocken reminded the Board that the LTD picnic would be held on Sunday, July 28, at Jasper Park. Shuttle buses would depart from the Glenwood Facility. Mr. Kleger noted that he had received an invitation from the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) to their picnic which was being held on the same day in Portland. Ms. Hocken reminded the members to let Michelle Gilles know if they would attend or not and if they would be taking the shuttle bus to the park.

**CANCEL AUGUST BOARD MEETING:** The regularly scheduled Board meeting for August was canceled due to the lack of a quorum.

**OREGON TRANSIT ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE:** Ms. Hocken noted that there was another notification of the Oregon Transit Association (OTA) conference that would be held in October.

**MONTHLY STAFF REPORT AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT:** Staff reports and the financial statements were distributed with the Board packet. Ms. Hocken pointed out that the preliminary year-end report had been included in the packet. Finance Manager Diane Hellekson explained that traditionally, the Board did not receive the June report until their August meeting, but since there would not be an August meeting, the report contained in the packet was strictly preliminary, to give the Board an idea of

what to expect when the full report was given in September and the audit and financial report at the October meeting.

**APTA CONFERENCE REPORT:** Ms. Loobey reported that she and Mr. Bergeron attended the State and Federal Affairs Committee of American Public Transit Association (APTA) in Portland, Maine, earlier in the week. The purpose of the meeting was to talk about the reauthorization of ISTEA. The most encouraging news from that was that the Senate Subcommittee on Public Works, which deals with Transportation Funding, had marked up the committee report and sent it to the full committee, which froze transit funding at last year's levels. Ms. Loobey thought that this meant that there was a shift in sentiment in Congress about transit funding. It was good news and spoke well of LTD's potential for a demonstration project.

Mr. Bennett wondered if Ms. Loobey and Mr. Bergeron had heard any new ideas from other transit agencies. Ms. Loobey replied that what they heard from the planning staff at the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was that LTD was out in front, again. Most transit systems in this country were in a retrenchment mode, due to the decline in federal money, and they were just now dealing with the implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, which was very expensive. Mr. Bergeron mentioned that one of the areas where LTD was out in front was in meshing transit and land use and the fact that LTD had active employer partnerships that could be demonstrated. Also, LTD was blending existing technologies that were in use all over the country into a more comprehensive package called Bus Rapid Transit. It was noted by FTA that it was good that LTD was talking about BRT early on in the process, and they suggested that LTD contact the FTA Region X staff in Seattle to work with them in partnership to carry BRT through and ensure that all federal guidelines were met.

Mr. Bennett noted the Board had watched the videos on nodal development, and they were hearing about it in larger metropolitan areas. He thought that it was one thing to talk about taking a major initiative with respect to LTD's ability to compete, doing the due diligence and the research, and then proceeding from the outcome of the research. He thought it was important to note that land use issues were more difficult to get around. He wanted to suggest that the Board had quite a challenge ahead to ensure that the right balance was achieved, and that it would be important for LTD to have partnerships in Junction City, Veneta, Coburg, etc.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further discussion, the meetings was unanimously adjourned at 10:00 p.m.



Board Secretary

H:\WPDATA\BOARD\7-17BDMN.DOC