

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 18, 1996

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 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, September 18, 1996, at 7:30 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 7:40 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Hocken opened the meeting for audience participation. There was no one present who wished to address the Board.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Hocken introduced the September Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Gary Levy, an LTD employee since September 1985. As of March 1996, he had earned awards for good attendance and ten years of correct schedule operation. Mr. Levy had served on many committees, been a union officer and an accessible service instructor, and worked on various photographic projects for the District. The bus rider who nominated Mr. Levy said that Mr. Levy really went the extra mile to help her husband when he had some trouble with his legs when crossing the street. Mr. Levy helped get her husband on the bus and, after the couple refused ambulance assistance, called his dispatcher, who met the bus at the couple's stop and guided the bus to their door. A couple of hours later, Mr. Levy rode his bicycle to their house to be sure that her husband was okay. The customer wanted to be sure that Mr. Levy received the Employee of the Month award because of his outstanding efforts.

When asked what made Mr. Levy a good employee, Transit Operations Manager Patricia Hansen said, "Gary really cares about people, and it shows in the service he provides. He is especially considerate of the needs of our customers with disabilities. An

avid bike rider, Gary is an inspiration to all of us at LTD in his use of alternative transportation modes. His supervisors describe Gary as always being cooperative, positive, and pleasant to work with. He also has a unique sense of humor that keeps his co-workers on their toes, and his customers happy to see him behind the wheel."

Ms. Hocken presented Mr. Levy with a letter, certificate, and monetary award, and thanked him for his service to the District. Mr. Levy thanked the Board. He used a quote from the movie White Squall, in which young men on a boat who were coming of age and learning to work as a team had a slogan, "where we go one, we go all." He said that slogan made him think about LTD; the people at LTD were a lot like those young men, and as they learned and developed and went forward together into the future, where one went, what one did, greatly affected all. He said that this was why it was so important for each person to extend compassion, help, and understanding to others, be it front-line, maintenance, supervisory, administrative, or managerial employees, or Board members. Everyone, he said, should seize opportunities to do good in the world. Mr. Levy said that, while he appreciated the award and recognition, the things he was being lauded for were actions that were selflessly performed by LTD employees every day, and he was very proud to be there.

Ms. Hocken noted that the October Employee of the Month, bus operator Paul Burgett, was unable to attend that evening's meeting, so would be introduced to the Board in October.

MOTION
VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kieger moved approval of the Consent Calendar for September 18, 1996. Mr. Bennett seconded, and the Consent Calendar was approved by unanimous vote. Included in the Consent Calendar were the minutes of the July 17, 1996, regular Board meeting and a Resolution Setting Time and Day for Regular Monthly Board Meeting, which changed the regular meeting time to 7:00 p.m. Ms. Hocken noted that in October, the Board would begin meeting at 7:00 p.m. and would finish its meetings earlier in the evening.

STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN (STIP) PRIORITY LIST:

Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano explained that the STIP was a state four-year plan that was updated every two years, which was to include every state- and federally-funded transportation project. Because the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will not release funds unless the project being applied for appeared in the plan, it is very important for LTD to make sure its projects are included. Additionally, it is during the STIP process that some money is allocated for some transportation projects, and LTD was competing for some of those funds. The plan under review would be implemented by October 1997, and would go through several draft steps. The State asked that local metropolitan areas indicate their priority for transportation projects. The Transportation Planning Committee, a staff committee, reviewed the projects and developed priority lists for road, transit, and transportation demand management (TDM) projects, and presented those to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) in July. The MPC endorsed those and sent them on to the State. Mr. Viggiano explained that Mr. Bennett had attended that meeting and supported the action, but felt a little uncomfortable that the recommendations had not been discussed by the Board, so staff were bringing this to the Board in what might

be called backward order. In the future, he said, staff would bring it to the Board first. Mr. Viggiano stated that there was still time to ask for changes in the priorities, if the Board had concerns about that list.

Mr. Viggiano discussed the priority projects and a letter from the State to the MPC, indicating what projects Region 2 would recommend for funding. He first discussed the road projects, and said that LTD staff had participated in the development of those priorities. When doing so, staff considered whether they were projects which might significantly help LTD, such as improvements to meet full urban standards, such as sidewalks, which would provide better access to the transit system, or projects that would help address congestion. Mr. Viggiano explained one complication, which was that there were two West Eugene Parkway projects, phases 2 and 3. City staff had believed that phase 1 would be under contract before the new plan took effect. However, phase 1 of the West Eugene Parkway had been delayed. In order for that project to proceed, it needed to be included in the next STIP and be funded again. It was given a high priority and was one of the projects that would be funded within the next STIP. Additionally, the State indicated that it would have the funds to fund through item number three on the list. Those projects were a Pioneer Parkway overlay; Beltline Highway (completion of four lanes from Barger to West 11th); and safety improvements at the I-5 and Beltline interchange. As Mr. Bennett had mentioned at MPC, there was not enough money to build most of the new projects, much less maintain existing roads.

Mr. Bennett said that the South 42nd Street project was very important to Springfield, because of the building of new schools in that area. He thought there would be some continued effort to try to fund that project. As a point of interest, he discussed the sound wall issue, which apparently was not going to be funded under the current funding mechanism, and it did not sound as if there was another way to fund it. Ms. Hocken said she had been impressed with Mr. Bennett's argument in favor of it, that it should be done because there would be a lot of houses near roads in order to maintain compact urban growth, and those houses needed to be made livable. Mr. Bennett said that his other reason was that there was a certain level of traffic 25 years ago when the road was built, and then the traffic doubled. The homeowners were willing to raise part of the funds, so he was disappointed that the project did not receive more support.

Mr. Viggiano said that item number four, the South 42nd Street project, was a good example of the type of project that was of benefit to LTD, because it would add sidewalks for people to walk on. LTD was supportive of that item.

Table 2 showed TDM projects. The priority list was developed by an inter-jurisdictional staff team and presented to TPC and then MPC. It was an effort by more than just LTD staff, although LTD would have lead responsibility for most of the projects. The only item being recommended for funding by Region 2 was the TDM Coordinator position for the four-year period.

Table 3 listed the transit projects. Only one of the projects mentioned bus rapid transit (BRT), but all had BRT components and were intended to support a future BRT system. The first priority was the West 11th Park and Ride. It was funded in the current

STIP for \$435,000. LTD was requesting additional money for the West 11th Park and Ride facility, for a total of \$1.1 million. Mr. Viggiano explained that the District would like to relocate the Springfield Station to be on the BRT corridor. He said it defeated the purpose of express service if it took an extra five minutes to jog up to and around the station. A Park and Ride on Coburg Road also was important for a future BRT corridor, and could function as a Park and Ride before development of that BRT corridor. The West Springfield Park and Ride would be on the initial BRT line, and there had been a lot of requests for a closer-in Park and Ride for Springfield. The BRT pilot project was included on the STIP priority list, but staff did not expect it to be funded in this way.

Mr. Viggiano explained that the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds were highway funds that went to the State. Some of the funds were allocated on a formula basis, and the State kept some STP funds to allocate as part of the STIP process. The region had indicated that all of those flexible funds would go for transit and TDM projects. The "inflexible" funds, such as the state gas tax, would go to road projects. Most of the region's flexible funds would be split between Salem and LTD, as the two largest transit districts within one region. Each would receive approximately \$1 million for transit projects, with some funds possibly going to Corvallis. The State had said that it could fund the \$665,000 request for the West 11th Park and Ride. LTD was in the position to try to influence how the additional \$200,000 to \$300,000 would be spent, and would want to keep that money in the area. Staff would propose that a total of \$300,000 be allocated for TDM. The bulk of that would be what the region already indicated it would fund, which was the TDM Coordinator. About another \$76,000 would allow the funding of items two through six, and possibly part of item seven. LTD would still have approximately \$200,000 that could be used to begin work on the Springfield Station relocation, which was the second priority. That would fund site selection environmental assessment, and then additional funds would be needed to actually build the project.

Mr. Viggiano stated that staff were asking the Board to endorse the priority list as approved by the MPC and provide some direction to staff in regard to the direction to the State for allocations.

Ms. Hocken asked for a brief explanation of TDM items numbers two through seven. Commuter Resources Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams explained that Item #2 was an up-front investment to create static displays for all area high schools. Not many programs were directed toward the high school audience, and these displays would help the message reach a large market. The materials would change two to three times a year, with the involvement of a student advisory group. Activities would include competitions among schools to lower the number of single-occupant vehicles. Other items on the list included a video that would be developed as a curriculum aid for teachers, and might be useable in middle schools, as well. The clean air project would involve a public awareness campaign, including a series of signs alerting people to be aware of the quality of the air. It could be done in cooperation with the City or the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), if the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) no longer existed. The carpool matching software was a program installed this year. Staff wanted to link that software with Salem and include Corvallis, to help people traveling among those three cities. The plan to provide train depot and airport information centers had been scaled down to the

metropolitan area, and would focus on the local area. Staff wanted to include intermodal information wherever possible--bus schedules at the airport; car pooling information for employees; bikes on buses and trains; etc. The goal was to coordinate that information up and down the Willamette Valley. The public kiosk was a sizable project that would provide information on a touch screen similar to those at the Oregon Employment Office. People could access bus schedule information that would print out. This would be an expensive system, but similar systems had proven to be well used.

Mr. Saydack observed that the more familiar he became with these issues (through the TransPlan Symposium, etc.), the more convinced he was that educational projects were critical. The only way to change the pattern was to change people's attitudes about the value and importance of transit for the environment, the quality of life, etc., and educational programs were the way to do that.

Ms. Hocken said she would like to support the information at the train depots, etc. She had found good information on Tri-Met at the Portland train station.

MOTION Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: Resolved, the LTD Board endorses the
VOTE STIP priority lists for road, TDM, and transit projects, as presented. Mr. Kleger seconded,
and the resolution was passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Viggiano if it was staff's intention to obtain some additional funding from the State, or to comment on the draft. Mr. Viggiano replied that the intention was to try to direct the State on how to spend the funding that they tentatively had promised. Staff's recommendation would be to spend about \$300,000 on TDM projects and the rest on the transit projects, which would fund West 11th and a portion of the Springfield Station relocation. If the Board concurred or had any concerns about that recommendation, it would be good to get those comments to the State as soon as possible. Once the draft plan was developed, it would be more difficult to make any changes. The Board's direction to Mr. Viggiano was to proceed as planned.

POLICY ON SOLICITATION: Human Resources Manager Ed Rutledge explained that LTD already had a Policy on Solicitation, but staff were concerned that it may be inadequate. During the past year, a couple of groups had called to ask to come onto the property and make presentations to staff, and it would be helpful to have a written policy to outline current practices. Mr. Rutledge had worked with counsel to update the 1983 policy.

Mr. Bailey asked if voter registration would qualify as a political activity. Mr. Rutledge thought that it would. Mr. Bailey asked if it was staff's intent not to have voter registration efforts on the site. Mr. Rutledge stated that he was uncomfortable about how that would appear with public agencies' governing bodies, even though it may be technically correct. He was concerned about the possibility of any group with a particular agenda wanting to have a voter registration campaign on the property. Mr. Bailey asked about voter registration at the UO Station. Mr. Rutledge replied that this was different because the Station was a public area, and there was not a captive audience. Mr. Viggiano added that the UO Station would not be covered under the policy, but the new downtown station, on LTD-owned property, would be, as outlined in the paragraph on Application.

Mr. Rutledge noted that a section had been added to outline the process for dispute resolution.

Mr. Saydack noted that the policy stated what permitted solicitation by groups involved, and asked how it gave guidance regarding charitable activities. Mr. Rutledge replied that Counsel had recommended the text included in the Objective paragraph, which was more attentive to groups that more or less supported the District's overall mission. If the group truly was not political, then the question was whether it addressed the issues that were close to the District's mission. It still allowed the District the right to say yes or no, based on that criterion.

Mr. Saydack asked how many groups the District said yes to. Mr. Rutledge replied that only one, United Way, had been authorized to hold a campaign on District property.

Mr. Montgomery said it seemed that it would be easier to say no to all solicitation, and people could contribute to United Way on their own. Mr. Rutledge replied that LTD had a long tradition of being very supportive of the United Way campaign, and that Counsel was not comfortable with naming one specific group to be allowed on the property.

Ms. Hocken said she shared Mr. Saydack's concern that the criteria were open to different interpretations. Mr. Saydack suggested seeing how the policy worked.

Mr. Bailey asked if it was a fairly standard policy. Mr. Rutledge replied that in his experience with school districts, it was fairly standard.

Ms. Hocken asked about bulletin boards. Mr. Rutledge said that there were a number of different bulletin boards, for required postings (EEOC, etc.); in the employee lounges; one reserved for employee postings; and space reserved for the union, for instance.

MOTION Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: Resolved that the Board of Directors
VOTE hereby adopts the revised Policy on Solicitation as presented to the Board on
September 18, 1996. Mr. Kleger seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

WEST 11TH PARK & RIDE SITE SELECTION: Micki Kaplan, a transit planner in the Planning & Development department, presented this item. She said that LTD had hired Branch Engineering to conduct research into possible sites along West 11th. She introduced Jim Branch to the Board, and stated that LTD had a long history of working with him. Ms. Kaplan stated that a full copy of the site research report had been given to the Board members with their agenda packets, and a condensed version was included in the packet itself.

Ms. Kaplan said that staff would like Board approval to move to the environmental assessment phase of this project. The study area was along West 11th, between Garfield Street and Bertelsen Road. She used a map showing 15 possible sites reviewed for possible Park and Ride sites, and discussed the factors and criteria to evaluate. Those

included: existing use, which was important in terms of expense of development; bus access; pedestrian access; cost of land; visibility, which was important in order to attract riders to the site; and joint use opportunities, such as day care facilities. Ms. Kaplan said that when the 15 factors were applied to different sites, Sites A, C, D, and N were the top four. Site N screened high on the matrix because it was vacant, but it was not on West 11th, and there currently was no bus service to that site. Site D fell out because someone had begun building a restaurant on that site. Sites A and C remained for the Board's consideration.

Site C was across from Oakpatch Road and had good frontage on West 11th and a traffic signal. There also was good access from Conger, where there also was a signal. Bliss Restaurant currently was on the western part of the site.

Site A had access on 10th Avenue. Waremart was to the east, and would provide excellent trip linkage, meaning that riders could make one stop for their cars and groceries. There was no signal, so that would add approximately \$100,000 to the development cost, which would be dependent upon City approval. Site A involved the Jubilee night club and Jiggles Tavern buildings.

Site E was a vacant half-acre near the current Fred Meyer bus shelter. Staff thought that site might be worthy of development regardless of where a West 11th Park and Ride might be located. If Sites A and C fell through, Site E could be a back-up site for development.

Ms. Kaplan discussed demand estimates compiled by Mr. Branch. She showed service population estimates derived using transportation analysis zone data, similar to census tracts. There did not appear to be any magic trip-generation numbers for the success of Park and Ride facilities. However, staff believed the River Road Park and Ride station to be a good corollary. It was the only major Park and Ride in the community, and it had express bus service and other features that make a successful Park and Ride. Staff reviewed the population figures in the catchment area for that station. The current population in the River Road Transit Station catchment area was 16,000, with a potential population of 25,000 in 2015. Westerly sites on West 11th, around the Bertelsen area, had a potential catchment area significantly less than the easterly sites. Staff believed that a Park and Ride closer to town had a better opportunity to be a successful Park and Ride than the westerly sites. At 58th and Main in East Springfield, the catchment area population currently was 22,000, with 33,000 expected by 2015.

Although there was no magic transit number, there was a transit shape, a parabola, found in transit research. It essentially showed a catchment area that fanned out from the Park and Ride facility toward the central business district. There did not appear to be a certain distance for this area. Ms. Kaplan said that the River Road station estimates only included people living within the urban growth boundaries.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff knew what was happening currently in the River Road catchment area. Ms. Kaplan replied that staff had passenger counts from two years before. The lot was 40 percent full at that time, with a primary destination of the University of

Oregon/Sacred Heart Hospital area. She did not think that riders had been surveyed about where they were coming from. Staff would like to conduct further research to determine why people used the River Road Transit Station Park and Ride facilities, what they found attractive about it, where they were coming from, and where they were going. They would then apply that kind of information to future Park and Ride locations. Ms. Kaplan stated that this was a new area for LTD, and staff's research was really just beginning.

Mr. Bailey asked about other research at other transit districts, and if there was further information about how far the parabola extended. Mr. Branch said that the available information provided the shape, but he thought other information was community-specific. The consultants had tried to identify the transportation analysis zones that fit with the parabola, and that resulted in the estimates that were being shown to the Board. He said that riders would be coming from farther out, such as from the Veneta area or beyond, who were not included in this estimate. Ms. Kaplan added that she did not think Portland was comparable, because of the much larger size of that metropolitan area.

Mr. Saydack said he was struck by the different in value between parcels A and C (\$600,000) and N (\$200,000), with N being a block away. Ms. Kaplan said that the visibility and frontage on West 11th were important criteria, and the success of BRT depended on having the stations along the direct route and visible to potential riders.

Mr. Bennett said he did not think people would walk a block to reach BRT from the Park and Ride. He added that Portland had improved its competitive position and increased demand a lot when it finally got service that was attractive. It would be different in a larger metropolitan area, but the District would be investing a lot in what it was doing in this area, in trying to increase its competitive position. He said that the reality was that land would not get less expensive. He thought LTD could err on the optimistic side and buy land now, and get out of it down the road if it did not turn out the way the District expected. Ms. Kaplan agreed that there probably would be no loss of investment in the land, and added that land was going fast in the West 11th area. She stated that the Board was seeing the assessed value, because that was the only information available to the consultant.

Mr. Bennett asked why LTD had to pay the assessed value. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn stated that the District paid the appraised value. Essentially, it was a condemnation process. There was a tax advantage to the property owner for public agencies taking property, which meant that the District would have to use at least the appraised or market value.

Mr. Bennett asked if there would still be a tavern on the property in phase 1. Ms. Kaplan explained that during phase 1 the District probably would remove the Jubilee building for access and visibility, and seek joint development for the Jiggles building, with a day care or some other type of use.

Mr. Bennett asked about Site E. The site was adjacent to Fred Meyer and about one-half block from West 11th, and buses currently traveled adjacent to that site.

Mr. Bennett asked if the District needed surrounding uses that were consistent with trying to broaden its market in the future. Ms. Kaplan replied that linking trips was very important. This could include shopping and commercial retail, to provide as many incentives as possible for people to use the system.

Ms. Loobey commented that for the 58th and Main Park and Ride, Pete Pifer and the property owner went to the Springfield City Hall to say that there should be good access between LTD and other commercial development. Mr. Pifer had been a good supporter of LTD's development on River Road, and was happy about the location at 58th and Main.

Ms. Hocken said that one issue was whether LTD would participate in commercial development, such as for child care.

Ms. Kaplan said she thought it was a wise investment to conduct an environmental assessment (EA) on two sites. Mr. Bennett asked why a site might drop out following an EA. Ms. Kaplan replied that the EA could uncover issues that would preclude LTD from developing the site.

Mr. Bennett asked about the cost of the environmental assessments. Ms. Kaplan stated that the estimate for an EA on one site was \$54,000, and \$70,000 to \$80,000 for two sites. The savings were in a number of activities that would be the same for both sites, such as letters for comment, etc.

Mr. Bennett asked if this would be a Level 1 assessment. Mr. Branch replied that it was kind of like that. Once the EA was completed and approved by the federal government, the funding would be locked in. Mr. Viggiano added that this was not a contamination assessment. Instead, it looked at the flood plain, wild life, archeological resources, etc. It would take approximately three to four months, and then a period for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) approval after that.

Mr. Saydack asked if doing both environmental assessments at the same time would save time if one site were to drop out, but would not affect the ability to purchase either. Ms. Kaplan said that was correct; LTD would gain some efficiency if one of the sites should prove to be undevelopable, and would not have to start over with a second site.

Mr. Bennett said he was not interested in doing that, and needed additional conversation with staff.

Mr. Montgomery said he would not be able to make a decision that evening. This situation seemed similar to the Eugene Station site selection process. He thought some of the criteria seemed to be the same but ranked lower or unequally. He also thought that using Les Schwab as a shopping destination for people on the bus was ridiculous. He said he would need to see if he agreed that those sites were better than some that did not make the list.

Ms. Kaplan asked if a work session on all the sites would be helpful. Mr. Montgomery said it would be helpful to him. Ms. Murphy said she would like to drive to the sites and look

at them. Mr. Kleger said he was familiar with that part of town and would support Ms. Kaplan's position; however, he was willing to attend a work session if other members wanted to. He added that one impact of a delay could be that someone would buy and begin to develop one of the sites.

Ms. Hocken said she was concerned about using the assessed versus the appraised value, since some of those buildings were money makers.

Mr. Saydack said he also was interested in having more time before making a decision. He was concerned about the hundreds of thousands of dollars difference in the sites, and unsure about the parallel assessments. He also was interested in driving to the sites. Mr. Montgomery said he did not need to tour the sites, but would like to attend a work session. The Board members agreed that a tour of sites N, E, L, C, and A should be held in early October, and a work session should be held at 5:00 p.m. on October 16.

The Board also asked for additional information, including where people came from to use the River Road Transit Station Park and Ride facility; what the potential demand for the site would be; the appropriate size for the site; and the population in the parabola. Ms. Kaplan said that staff wanted to take new counts after school started.

Mr. Bennett wanted to know the potential demand for the site. He did not want to need three or four different sites to meet that demand. The site also would need room for buffering, planting, etc., and could occur in phases. Mr. Bennett stated that there would be even more activity in that area of town in the future. Under some set of criteria, LTD needed to say how many parking spaces would be needed a certain time into the future, not how many spaces will fit on a certain site. Ms. Kaplan said she thought that the Park and Ride facility should be built for at least the year 2015. Mr. Bennett also wanted to know what alternatives there were for development on parts of the site, and if the River Road Transit Station, at 150 parking spaces, was the right size.

Mr. Saydack thought that Mr. Bennett made good points, and said that he would like to get a better handle on the relative development costs of the various sites. He said that the Board needed better, solid, figures for parallel environmental assessments, and stated that he would rather not be asked to spend money that way.

Ms. Hocken wanted more information about the relationship between the location of the BRT corridor and the potential Park and Ride sites, and wanted to know if staff did not know that yet.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:

Board Reports: MPC - Mr. Bennett and Ms. Hocken said they had no further report, in addition to the earlier discussion on STIP priorities.

TransPlan Symposium - Mr. Kleger said that on balance, the latest Symposium worked better than he had expected, and showed where there was clear agreement and the absence of consensus. He said there was a pretty strong endorsement of the idea that

to reduce fares, service needed to be in place. There was endorsement of the concept of BRT, with a preference for incremental development. There was general agreement that if there were increases in parking charges, they should be community-wide, not just in downtown, so everyone recognized the cost of operating a car.

Mr. Bailey added that he was surprised at the level of support for LTD's preferences. In the early voting and throughout the day, there was support for an increase in the gas tax, but people were not sure whether it should be at the state or local level. The incremental approach to BRT seemed a little slower than the Board had hoped.

Mr. Bennett asked if incremental meant one line at a time. Mr. Kieger replied that those present thought that was probably okay, but they were not ready for complete separate rights of way. The idea of priority signals, etc., was well-received. Mr. Bailey thought that the materials did not adequately describe the concept of exclusive rights-of-way. He thought that people thought it would be an entire line, but the District had not presented it that way.

Mr. Saydack said it struck him that there would be a selling job to do on BRT. The Symposium was attended by a sophisticated group of people who had been studying the issues, and there was general support, but it was not overwhelming. People had lots of questions, but were interested in the time savings. The group was made up of thirty or forty people, with six or eight around each table, with the assignment to reduce trips in a certain period of time. Mr. Saydack used the example of the education regarding recycling during the last twenty years, and thought that the attitudinal issue was there for everyone. He said that all tables individually were able to reach consensus, but reaching the entire room was more difficult.

Mr. Bennett repeated his position that BRT would not work without exclusive rights-of-way. No one said it would be an easy sell, and he was listening carefully for someone who could make the case strongly that queue-jumpers and pull-outs would make the difference for the attitudes in the community. He did not want to wait until the local area had Portland's problems until it made some kind of move. He said it may be politically difficult, but when LTD started backing away from a plan that included exclusive rights-of-way, the District would lose. He did not want to be selling a plan that did not save time and made it more convenient for the cars to get around the buses. Unless the District made a dramatic change in its competitive position, it would not succeed.

Mr. Saydack said that a decision needed to be made very soon on whether BRT would include exclusive rights-of-way or not, and go with it.

Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI) Base System Working Group: Ms. Hocken explained that the Governor was pursuing the transportation initiative formerly known as the Governor's Transportation Initiative (GTI). The Governor had appointed five regional committees that took testimony in those five regions the previous spring, regarding what the needs were for transportation infrastructure and what the funding gaps were. The committee issued a report, and then it was decided that another group needed to determine a base system. Ms. Hocken had been appointed to represent transit on that committee.

The other members represented the League of Oregon Cities, the Association of Oregon Counties, and the Oregon Transportation Commission (the Board that supervised the Oregon Department of Transportation), as well as a public interest person with a lot of state government experience. The charge for the committee, on the road side, was to decide which roads the State should be responsible for at some level of preservation and maintenance, from the 90,000 miles of roads in the state. One issue was what was meant by the level of preservation, what level of preservation was necessary for their maintenance, and whether that could be different in different parts of the state. The transit charge was less clear, and the group did not expect to get as much out of this process for transit because there was less information and discussion regarding transit in the past than on roads and highways. The Governor, when pressed, admitted a larger role for transit than only for people with no other options, but Ms. Hocken thought it would be difficult to keep that concept on the table. The working group's work had to be completed in September so the finance committee could finish in October for the Governor's financing package.

Ms. Hocken thought that the most that would come out of this process for transit, in terms of a financing package, would be something dealing with special transportation needs. Her goal was to have the committee understand and accept transit's broad role, but she realized that funding probably would not be attached. She thought her role was to get as much recognition from the committee regarding the importance of all aspects of transit and to get as much consensus from people around the state as to what the state should assume. None of the staff initially associated with the committee had transit expertise, so the Oregon Transit Association (OTA) had created an ad hoc staff committee to put together information for the working group.

Mr. Bailey asked about Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) participation. Ms. Hocken said that ODOT was providing staff, and one OTC member was on the committee. The head of ODOT, Grace Crunican, was not involved. Ms. Loobey added that the key senior staff was Chris Andersen from the City of Eugene. The OTA transit technical group, representing LTD, Tri-Met, Salem, Corvallis, and small elderly and handicapped service, was meeting to define a base system for transit. This base system was comprised of three elements: (1) transit doing its core piece of business, for the too young, too old, and too poor; (2) an added component that provides for growth in the population; and (3) a component that provides for reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), congestion, and pollution, increased economic development, land use transportation planning, mobility, economic development, etc.--all the things that transit was told it was supposed to be doing as part of the solution, but had not been recognized or funded.

Ms. Loobey said that at the regional meetings during the GTI discussions, intercity transportation, public transportation, and transit within the communities were high on the priority list, and these were not confined to elderly and handicapped service. There were issues such as how to make the connections to the commuter train project from Corvallis. Ms. Loobey stated that what had come out from the Governor's agenda had woefully ignored transit, and did not recognize that a lot of elderly and handicapped persons used the fixed-route systems.

Eugene Station Update: Facilities Manager Charlie Simmons stated that the environmental clean-up of the contamination on the east side of the site had been completed, and the rest of the site had been stripped to a three-foot elevation below grade. An additional source of contamination had been discovered on the west side of the site, but the District was fortunate because the vehicle hoist sump was contained. The soil underneath had been tested and found to be clean.

Mr. Simmons said that since the whole site had been excavated, the District's consultant was comfortable with the level of risk from contamination. The DEQ had sent a report on its findings, and District Counsel sent a letter summarizing what the DEQ had said. In essence, there was a low level of risk, with no evidence of an on-site source. Staff hoped to close on the site the following Monday. Then Eugene Sand and Gravel would begin the major excavation.

Mr. Saydack reported that the Art Selection Committee had selected two finalists for art, but rejected one after the final proposal. Therefore, art selection had been opened up for bids again. The art that was selected was fused glass, by the person who did the glass in the Hult Center ticket booths. Mr. Saydack said that the glass would be quite colorful and would cost about \$20,000. The other proposal, which would be taking the bulk of the money, did not have the support of the committee that they felt was necessary. The committee wanted the artwork to benefit downtown Eugene and be something that people could get excited about. He thought that they would know by the end of October if there was such a proposal in the community.

Fleet Status Report: Ms. Loobey told the Board that the District had received favorable bids from Gillig for 29-foot buses. The District was having problems with enough buses to provide service. Hyundai was coming on faster than expected, and there was not sufficient parking for the management staff who had been hired and the construction employees. Since the managers would help set the tone, it was important for them to be on the buses. All of the 700-series buses had been pulled out of the reserve fleet and were being used in active service. There currently was no spares ratio.

Ms. Loobey stated that staff were contemplating a couple of actions. First, they were looking at schemes for acquiring additional buses, possibly five to six used buses. Second, they were researching the possibility of leasing additional buses. Third, the House and Senate Conference Committee had met on the appropriations bill. Staff did not know if they could ask the FTA to allow the District to build more buses with the current order because the money would be coming.

Mr. Bennett stated that if there was a particular bus on the market that could strengthen LTD's demand, the District should have the courage of its convictions and obtain those buses. Ms. Loobey commented that going to different buses would require starting at the beginning of a specification and bidding process that would take 18 months. Mr. Bennett suggested leasing something in the short term until those buses could be bought.

Mr. Saydack suggested eliminating unproductive routes, but Ms. Hocken stated that the District had already completed the annual route review and the schedules had been published.

Mr. Vobora stated that the District would be running 82 buses at the peak the following week. The area where capacity was stretched the most was in the area of special services. He thought LTD could squeak by the next year with the six buses that were on order.

Ms. Hocken asked about the cost of purchasing used buses. Ms. Loobey said they could be bought for salvage value, approximately \$2,000 to \$3,000. She said that staff were talking about stopgap measures to get through the problem areas.

Bikes on Buses: Mr. Bennett asked what staff were doing about the safety concerns with the Bikes on Buses program. Mr. Vobora replied that the District was providing additional education, including posters on the buses, brochures, and newsletter articles telling people to be sure to tell the driver when they were going to retrieve a bike from the rack. There also would be stickers by the rear door to tell riders to disembark through the front door and tell the bus operator.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Bailey moved that the meeting be adjourned. After seconding, the motion carried by unanimous vote. The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:55 p.m.


Board Secretary

C:\WPDATA\BDMN918R.DOC