

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, February 19, 1997

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 13, 1997, 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, February 19, 1996, at 7:00 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
Mary Murphy, Secretary
Roger Saydack
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: (One vacancy, Subdistrict 1)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: (1) Appointment to Board Compensation Committee: Ms. Hocken noted that Thom Montgomery had been on the Board Compensation Committee before his term on the Board expired. She asked Mary Murphy to replace him on that committee and work with continuing committee members Rob Bennett and Roger Saydack. (2) Board Community Outreach Committee: Ms. Hocken said she had been thinking about LTD's community outreach regarding bus rapid transit (BRT), after hearing comments from U.S. Senator Ron Wyden that day. She suggested that the Board Community Outreach Committee (Mary Murphy, Kirk Bailey, and Rob Bennett) meet during the next few weeks and recommend a course of action at the next Board meeting.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Hocken introduced the March Employee of the Month, Human Resources Secretary Holly Tomlin, who was hired on July 5, 1995. She was nominated for this award by a member of the community and three co-workers. The community member described Ms. Tomlin as a "very rare person," explaining that she had been seeking work after her marriage ended, and Ms. Tomlin had listened to her cry and never made her feel "less of a person." Ms. Tomlin also located the name of a career counselor at LCC for the caller, and the caller wanted to thank Ms. Tomlin for her efforts. The co-workers nominated Ms. Tomlin not only for the professional, friendly, dedicated, and competent manner in which she performed her job, but also for her leadership and hard work on a successful United Way campaign. The campaign reached its contribution goal,

thanks in large part to new and fun activities that Ms. Tomlin instituted. The co-workers were very impressed with Ms. Tomlin's dedication and efforts to make this a successful and fun campaign for everyone.

When asked what made Ms. Tomlin a good employee, Human Resources Manager Ed Rutledge said, "Holly is a perfect match for her responsibilities. She handles the varied details of her work with aplomb, meets very tight production time lines and yet always makes the time to help out those who visit the HR offices with personal attention and a smile. Holly is known throughout LTD as being a pleasant, outgoing, and upbeat person. She is a joy to have as a co-worker on the Human Resources team."

Ms. Hocken presented Ms. Tomlin with a certificate of achievement and a monetary award on behalf of the District. Ms. Tomlin thanked the Board, saying that it was a privilege and an honor not only as an employee, but also as an LTD family member. She stated that she had had a miscarriage the previous month, and she did not know how strongly she felt about LTD until then. She said that flowers were sent to her from people she didn't even know knew her, and that it was a privilege to work for such a great company.

PRESENTATION TO PAUL REED: Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora introduced Paul Reed, who had been employed by Sacred Heart Hospital since 1973. He had been a dedicated member of their team, volunteering in the Lane County Fair booth and for the Eugene Celebration, the Children's Miracle Network, and the Crow Rural Fire Department, among other activities. He also had been instrumental in establishing LTD's group pass program with Sacred Heart employees in 1990. Not only did he establish the program, but he set an example on his commute to work by parking at the Willamette Christian Center Park & Ride and riding the bus from there. Mr. Vobora stated that Mr. Reed had just retired from service at Sacred Heart Hospital, and that LTD staff would miss him greatly. He presented Mr. Reed with a wooden bus with an inscription honoring him for his commitment to alternative transportation.

Mr. Reed thanked everyone, saying that it had been gratifying to support LTD because it was one of the premier transportation systems in this part of the country, doing a grand job of gaining acceptance and extending service to people.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Hocken stated that there were four different opportunities for the public to address the Board that evening, and explained what they were. She said that the Board had found over the last several months that the number of people coming to speak to the Board had increased dramatically. Therefore, the Board was going to try a new policy, a three-minute time limit for each speaker, to see if that would enable the Board to hear from more people and still finish its agenda in a reasonable length of time.

(1) Suzanne Cole of Eugene spoke first. She said that a few things had been bothering her that she wanted to share with the Board members. She said she felt it was very important that the Board get some public input on the initial stages of the decisions they were making, and this applied specifically to the siting of a Park & Ride lot on the Coles' property. She said there was no public input until the District got into the EA.

process, and she felt the Board should have had some public input when making this initial decision. She asked if the Board knew if anyone was going to use a lot there, and where those people would come from. Second, she said the Board should have the courtesy to notify property owners that they were considering that property, so they did not hear it from a tenant or a reporter, which happened to them. She said a tenant came to the Coles and said they had heard that LTD was going to condemn the property and they would have to move, which did not make for good relationships. Third, she said that the Board needed to be sure that it was getting correct information. She said she had been very upset by all of the plans that had been produced. Every single one of the plans of their property showed the intersection of Conger as aligning with the west property line, which was not true. The intersection of Conger, she said, intersected with Tax Lot 200 almost in the middle, so as the intersection stood, there were 47 feet between the crosswalk and the eastern property line. She said that LTD's plan showed a bus stop there, and even if the crosswalk were to be squeezed to the west, she questioned whether there was enough room. She stated that there were several other problems with the property. She added that LTD was under a federal mandate to reduce the number of automobile trips, and it seemed to her that it was contrary to that to promote parking lots that people had to drive to in order to catch a bus.

(2) Gabriel Cole of Boston, Massachusetts, said he wanted to focus on some responses to the last meeting and the issues addressed there. He thanked several of the Board members who took the time to ask some probing and prescient questions, but said that there were still significant concerns about how the process had occurred. He thought those questions should have been addressed up front. He said he thought there were a lot of miscommunications at the last meeting. At one point, he said, Micki Kaplan made a statement that staff were absolutely convinced that this was the right site and that any objections could be refuted. He said he was an engineer and he did not see how that statement could be made without engineering data in hand. He said there were very detailed criteria that went into the process and there was no opportunity for public comment as to how the target for the Park & Ride got moved from between Bertelsen and Beltline to between Garfield and Bertelsen. He said that in the 1986 TransPlan, LTD was saying that it should be between Bertelsen and Beltline, and in the 1994 review of Park & Ride, it was in that area. He said that somehow between 1994 and this process, it got moved into town, and no one had given them an answer as to how that happened. He said that this was the core of their concern, because they felt like they had been hoodwinked through a lot of the process. He said they had not been getting the information that they wanted; had not been getting information in a timely and thorough fashion. He said that there was an obligation on the part of the LTD staff to provide them with everything that was mandated by the Oregon records law, which meant not just what they wanted to give, but e-mails, voice mail records, correspondence, drafts of reports from consultants, correspondence with consultants. He said it was interesting to get a copy of the Parametrix proposal, because a couple of the things that the decision was predicated on as far as Parametrix was concerned were, and he read from the report: "Based on our current understanding of the proposed Park & Ride, this project is not likely to be controversial, and its adverse impacts are not likely to be significant." Mr. Cole said that this was what the Board voted on and approved at the last meeting. He said that he thought that anything that took away or impacted six businesses was significant and went well beyond that.

(3) Al Couper of Eugene said he would provide a brief status report in keeping with their intention to probe for and question the rationale for the assertion that the Cole property was a red hot site for a Park & Ride. He said that at the Board's last meeting, he laid out a number of issues and concepts that were based on his experience as a land use planner plus the information he had been provided up to that point. He noted the response from Mr. Viggiano in that evening's Board materials, which he said he found to be helpful in a number of ways. First, he said, Mr. Viggiano made a number of statements without telling the Board where the facts were to back those up, and he said he would use those as a checklist to look for information. He said that Mr. Viggiano also mentioned some data Mr. Couper did not know about; for example, a 1995 ridership survey that talked about safety issues. Mr. Couper said he had developed a good working relationship with Micki Kaplan and one of the things they had agreed on recently was that he was to list, with as much specificity as he could, specific information that he thought they needed, although sometimes it was difficult to be specific if he did not know something existed, but he could talk about categories of information. He said he would do that very soon, and then it would be Ms. Kaplan's responsibility to do that, and he had every confidence that she would do that. Then, he said, with his help and likely with some other professionals in transit planning, he would analyze that data and their goal was to get all that information back before the Board before they made a decision.

(4) Mike Farthing of Eugene said that he represented the Coles, and that this was their only opportunity to address the Board directly since there were no public hearings. He submitted a package of information addressing the Fred Meyer Park & Ride that was later on the Board's agenda, which included some of his prior letters. He said they were objecting to the District's acquisition and designation of that as a Park & Ride facility also. Mr. Farthing said he wanted to report to the Board what he was doing on behalf of the Coles and give them his view of where this was going. He said he wanted staff to provide the Board with certain correspondence, if they had not done so already. Included were his January 23 memo to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC); Al Johnson's January 31 response to that; Al Johnson's letter to Jan Childs, City Planning Director, asking three questions; Mr. Farthing's letter to Jan Childs responding to those; and Mr. Farthing's letter to Vicki Elmer, the new city manager, after Jan Childs told MPC that she would respond to those questions, which Mr. Farthing did not believe she had any authority to do. He urged the Board to read that correspondence. He said that he shared Mr. Couper's belief that the Board and staff had not addressed the basic questions of whether there was a need for a Park & Ride along West 11th and, if so, where it should be located. He said they had looked through everything they had received and were not convinced; they were more convinced that LTD had not established that need. He said that was the number one question the District had to address in the environmental assessment. Mr. Farthing said that, as a preview of what they would be doing in the next couple of weeks or month, would be to participate fully in the environmental assessment process; they would contact Jeff Heilman and provide him with written information; they would contact Nick Hockens at the Federal Transit Administration in Seattle; they would encourage Lane County, Springfield, LCOG, and ODOT to submit information into that process. Second, he said, any action taken by LTD toward the Cole property and furthering the Park & Ride, they would appeal to LUBA and/or circuit court. He said they had to do that because they did not know and no one could say what would be the final land use decision, so they had to protect themselves.

Third, he said, they were very much aware that LTD was part of the United Front that went to Washington, D.C., and was soliciting ISTEAs and other funds, and that the fed dollars required LTD to satisfy regional planning requirements, so they intended to work closely with both Senators and track that program. Finally, he said, as they researched the issue more and more, it was apparent that the Cole acquisition was part of a larger program, which the Board had mentioned previously, called BRT. He said LTD had the Cole property, the Fred Meyer property, the signal prioritization report, and the meeting with Senator Wyden's staff in December. He said that the Coles would join LTD in its community outreach because they would be out telling the community about BRT; they did not think LTD had authority to do that until it was adopted as part of TransPlan.

FY 1997-98 SERVICE RECOMMENDATIONS: Mr. Vobora stated that, as part of the annual route review each year, the staff and Board reviewed what the Service Advisory Committee was recommending for service for the following fiscal year. He explained that the public hearing that evening was not part of the required public hearing, which would be held in March. However, staff had found that at this meeting each year it was very helpful to hear comments from the public before taking the final recommendations to the Board in March.

Mr. Vobora first discussed service decision criteria, listed on page 7 of the agenda packet for that evening. He asked the Board members to consider this list and any questions they might have, and discuss those later, to see what criteria would meet the Board's needs as well as staff's needs.

Mr. Vobora then discussed a question from last year: "If you add 'X' amount of service, what will that buy for the District?" He used a chart to compare the years from 1988-89 to 1997-98 in terms of schedule hours, customer trips, and the percent of change of each category. During the last three years, the schedule hours had been increased 7.5 percent, and the resulting ridership increase was just over 14 percent. Mr. Vobora stated that the District was adding more productive service and better meeting the customers' needs.

Mr. Vobora also discussed unproductive service, or routes currently below the urban standards. Some of that service was not being recommended for cutting because it was still new; some was being recommended to be cut; and some trips were recommended to be cut from some routes. Mr. Vobora discussed these recommendations in more detail.

In discussing a category called "service fixes," Mr. Vobora talked about the addition of peak-hour timepoints on routes that had trouble staying on time, mainly in the afternoon. Staff were recommending an amount that would allow peak-hour timepoints to be added to 17 additional trips. A contingency would be set aside to remedy problems that arose during the year, as well as a contingency for trippers to meet new demands during the year.

Mr. Bennett asked about peak timepoints. Mr. Vobora said that afternoon peak hours were between 2:00 and 6:00 p.m. During those hours, the buses had more difficulty getting downtown on time for people to make their transfers. Those routes might be made into a 70-minute route instead of a 60-minute route, so they would have time to make their

connections and maintain a schedule that people can have confidence in. There were added costs because running time on the buses would be increased by ten minutes. Mr. Vobora discussed some specific examples of service fixes, as explained in the agenda materials.

Mr. Vobora then discussed proposed service additions. He explained that most attention during this year's annual route review was focused on the West 18th Avenue area. He discussed how small buses could be used in the neighborhoods and the question of how then to serve high-use corridors with larger buses. He explained that staff were proposing to use small buses for feeder loop service or on less productive routes. Feeder loop service on the #34/35 routes would allow people to stay within the neighborhood to go to retail areas on West 11th, Churchill High School, etc. The downside would be that people who left the neighborhood to go downtown, to the University of Oregon (UO), or to Sacred Heart Hospital would have to transfer from the feeder loop service to corridor service. The more critical connection would be going home, if there was only one bus per hour going into the neighborhoods. Mr. Vobora explained that bus rapid transit (BRT) would be reliant on feeder loops, which were used in major cities, feeding the major bus corridors or rail lines.

Mr. Vobora also discussed other service additions, as outlined in the agenda packet. In discussing industrial service, he mentioned that HMT had built a parking lot with a bus turnaround, because there were no through streets in the area, and provided only 150 parking spaces for 500 employees. Staff were proposing to add an express route from the River Road Transit Station to HMT and Hyundai. He said that the service could meet the shift changes and dovetail with the regular service, with some service geared around connecting with express trips.

Mr. Vobora then discussed requested service additions that staff were not recommending for FY 97-98. He also explained that staff did not know if Lane Community College would be voting on a group pass during the spring, or what the results of the Cottage Grove election would be.

Mr. Bennett mentioned the possibility of a reduction in school bus service as a result of Ballot Measure 47. Mr. Vobora said that staff had been in contact with School District 19 (Springfield) so the school district would know LTD's lead time and need to participate in the discussions. School District 4J (Eugene) was applying for a waiver for providing high school bus service, because its current three-year waiver was ending. Mr. Vobora said that LTD probably could serve middle schools fairly well with current service, but was not situated to serve elementary children. That would involve a lot of service, route deviations, and safety issues, and staff would recommend not serving elementary schools.

Mr. Bennett commented about long-range operating projections. He thought that, given a certain level of productivity and continued growth in the community and continued increases in operating costs, even based on what currently was thought to be reasonable productivity, the District could get to the place where it would not have the resources to implement some of its initiatives. He said he worried about continuing to add significant costs each year, even though LTD was trying very hard to operate as efficiently as possible

given the criteria it set for itself, and wondered if the District could keep adding significant costs and still leave room for major initiatives.

Mr. Vobora commented that one thing the District had to keep in mind was the 2015 BRT plan, which did call for continually adding to the base system to feed the BRT system. The cities would continue to grow, and how the District served them might change, whether that be feeder loops or other options.

Mr. Bennett said that Mr. Viggiano had indicated that a more efficient operating system might help with operating costs, and might replace some of the existing system and not end up as a net cost. He added that he may be worrying about something too far out. Mr. Vobora said that if the District instituted BRT, there would be some savings along the corridors that already were served by many different routes, but there still would be the need to feed into the corridors from the neighborhoods.

Public Testimony: Ms. Hocken said that this was not the official public hearing, but the District did want to hear what people had to say. She again asked those testifying to limit their comments to three minutes.

(1) David Cohen of Eugene read something that he wrote earlier in the year about keeping riders waiting needlessly. It used the example of waiting eight minutes beyond the posted time of arrival at his corner for the 6:01 #28, which he said was not unusual. He said that for the Willamette Street corridor, LTD could improve service on routes #24 and #25 and might get greater ridership. He said that elapsed time currently scheduled between Station C downtown and Willamette Plaza was six minutes; it used to be five. He said he rode that bus frequently, and it should be eight or nine minutes except for very late at night. He said that the bus was often late, and could not make that commitment. He said that instead of the bus being at Willamette Plaza at six minutes after its departure time, at five minutes after it was only at 18th and Willamette. He said he brought these concerns to LTD's attention two years ago, and all that happened was an increase of one minute. He said it should go to eight or nine minutes, especially during peak hours, which were approximately from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and then again during evening rush hour for that route. On the route #28, peak hour service was introduced, but only during the mid- to late afternoon. He thought peak mid-day travel, the lunch rush, also should be increased. He said that bus often was late by several minutes on its outbound run. He asked staff to please look at the #24, #25, and #28 for these reasons.

(2) Tim Higgins of Eugene said he was one of the owners at the Texaco Station operating at the corner of 18th and Willamette. He had a concern about the stop at that location. He said he had watched the kids get on at that stop day after day, and that, without a doubt, 98 or 99 percent of the ridership at that stop originated at South Eugene High School, with a small portion originating from Safeway, Hiron, and Starbucks. He thought those patrons would be much better served if that bus could make a loop, or another bus going out 18th could go past the high school and pick the students up and continue out 18th. He said the kids were walking in the rain and crossing two busy streets, so he didn't know why that stop wasn't moved. He also made a comment about Mrs. Cole, whom he had not met before. He said that being a business owner and a property owner in

Eugene, he thought that LTD would create a lot of animosity between the business owners and land owners in Eugene with the situation with Mrs. Cole. He thought they were all at the point where they were asking who would be next. He thought the Board should be concerned with this.

(3) Christopher Phillips of Eugene said he lived on City View, on one of the routes proposed for changes. He said he rode the bus essentially every weekday to the University and back. He said he realized what the planning department was thinking and was trying to do with the route, but he did not think it would work. He strongly opposed the proposed changes. He said that those hill areas were affluent neighborhoods and the people who lived in those hill areas had cars, even the kids who were old enough to have drivers' licenses probably all had cars. He said it was hard to get them to take the bus to work instead of driving; it took somewhat longer to go on the bus, even when the service was as convenient as it was. It only ran once an hour, but people with some flexibility could plan their work schedules so they did not really have to wait for the bus. Service went directly from those areas to downtown, Sacred Heart, and the UO. He said that making the service a little more inconvenient would induce a significant number of those people to give up on the bus and switch to cars. On the other hand, he said, LTD would not persuade people who lived in those areas to go shopping by bus. The loop bus would run once an hour, and people did not know exactly how long shopping trips would last. That meant an average of a half-hour wait to get back. Also, they had to carry items back home from shopping. People with cars would not do that. He said that this proposed change would mean losing a significant number of the people who took the bus to commute to work and back without gaining any other riders. He said it looked good, but it did not take into account the nature of the people who lived in the neighborhood and how they were likely to behave. He asked the Board to please not change the service.

(4) Bob Higgins of Eugene handed out a page to the Board, which he said had to do with a solution to a real problem on West 18th. He said that one of the main purposes of LTD was to transport students from the UO out to the Westmoreland district. He had considered how to do this by changing 18th and cutting down on areas, because there wasn't enough room for traffic anyway. He thought that buses were a barrier to traffic, and the traffic was a barrier to buses, which had a difficult time turning on 18th. He had driven around 16th and 17th to campus, to a UO parking lot on 17th and Alder. He thought that would be a perfect place for a bus to make a circle to go back out west. He said that 17th was not too wide, but there was a lot of parking, which he understood was public property and could be incorporated into the street. He said this could make a street much wider than 18th, all the way to Jefferson Street. With the exception of the downtown area from about Pearl to Willamette, it would have to be widened. If it were, for the purpose of transporting buses and students, the bus could turn left on Jefferson to 18th, where there was a wide lot that would be easy to cut through to make a nice turn off Jefferson onto 18th, with short access to West 18th. He said he was going to submit his idea to the City traffic department, and he thought it could solve some of LTD's problems.

(5) Paul Swagner introduced himself as the business manager at Marist High School. He said he was there to ask the Board's support in his working with Will Mueller to improve the service to Marist for its students. Specifically, he was asking for a focused route to

provide service at about 3:20 in the afternoon that would provide focused service for the parents collecting and distributing some of the kids. He had three issues he had been discussing with Mr. Mueller. He described the layout of Marist at the end of Kingsley Road, which ran from the fire station on Goodpasture back to the school, generally east from Goodpasture Island Road, which was about a six-minute walk to the school from the road. He said in the past there had been focused service in the morning, and he had learned that collecting students from all around the county and taking them to school did not work so well in the morning, but after 3:00, there were about 25 students waiting to take the bus to Valley River Center and downtown. He said he would like to focus on that for the next couple of years to build ridership and awareness of the bus routes. He said he had tried to get subsidized tickets, but until ridership improved, he did not think that would work. The three things he had been working on were the collection of students, now focusing on the afternoon; the addition of a full lane, in order to have three lanes - a drop-off lane, a bus lane, and a fire lane, because it had always been a problem that buses got blocked by cars at rush hour; and the timing, focusing on getting buses there earlier before school started and later after school, after the traffic had cleared.

(6) Carlis Nixon, who said she lived a couple of blocks off 18th and Wilson in Eugene, said she had a number of very specific requests. She said she lived in a no-car household, and had a number of friends living in similar households. She used the bus or a bicycle, and said she was a City of Eugene employee and loved the group pass. She said LTD needed a Saturday morning bus other than the 8:10/9:10 option. She said she and at least three other employees who worked downtown all had a choice of getting to work 40 minutes early or 20 minutes late, and said it was currently costing her \$6.00 each Saturday having breakfast at the French Horn during those 40 minutes. She said that people do work on Saturdays and there was a need for this service. Similarly, she said, if LTD could extend the half-hour service from downtown just one more half-hour, so that there was a 7:00 p.m. bus, it would eliminate a long, cold wait downtown for those leaving work who might miss the 6:30 p.m. bus. She thought that some of this could come from the #36 route. She said that some of those buses were empty during the daytime, and she did not think that current use patterns were high because they came right after the #34 and #35. Ms. Nixon also requested bus service to the train station. She said she took the train a lot and usually had to lug her suitcases quite a few blocks. The Market bus often did not work, and there was not a good connection to the train station. Also, for evening outings, she said that a bus going straight across 18th rather than downtown for a transfer would be simple for riders. She had a friend who could not be there to testify who said that she frequently went to concerts and did not own a car, and there wasn't service late enough for people out in the evenings to get home.

(7) Kathleen Brandt said she lived at 29th and City View in Eugene and was in agreement with Chris Phillips that the new plan made some sense but yet would discourage a lot of people who were already uncertain about riding. She said she was one of the few people who did ride regularly. She said she rode the bus the three days a week that she worked, and that she had purchased her house after finding out that there was a direct route. She said it was very important for her to get to Sacred Heart without having to transfer, and she could not imagine the transfer and probably would come up with another

creative alternative to get to work without transferring. She said she could not imagine taking the bus to Fred Meyer to shop.

(8) Curt Yider said he lived on West 28th Avenue on City View Loop. He said he agreed with Ms. Brandt and Dr. Phillips. He said that he was one of the commuters and the proposed routes would not be as convenient for him. He said he appreciated that there may be extended evening services, since he usually could not leave at 5:00. He said that his experience on the 7:00 a.m. bus was that it was fairly full; about a third of the people got off with him downtown, and it appeared that everyone else got off at Sacred Heart and the University. Similarly, in the evening, the bus was very full going back up the hill. He said he did not know what happened mid-day, but for the basic commuters, the existing system seemed to work very well and he wanted to encourage that.

(9) Sandy Shaw said she lived on 18th in Eugene and had noticed that if LTD could extend the Mac Court bus, that might take some of the pressure off the commuters. She said the #34/35 was heavily used at 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m., and sometimes it was frustrating to not be able to take the Mac Court bus until 10:00. She said she knew it was designed for students, but she thought it might take some of the pressure off 18th by running it earlier. She suggested running a one-time commuter loop with direct service on the #34/35, and running feeder routes the rest of the day.

End of Public Testimony: There was no further testimony from members of the audience on this topic, so Ms. Hocken thanked those who testified and closed the public testimony period.

Staff Response: Mr. Vobora said that there were many options that staff could consider for the #34/35 issue, and staff were prepared to do that. They had talked about identifying those peak commute trips that would run through the neighborhood and to downtown and the UO area. He thought that could be done, with feeder loops starting later in the morning. It would cost some more service, because in the afternoon, when LTD would want the feeder loops running, there might have to be some tripper buses to meet the peak commute trips going home from the University to downtown and back up into those neighborhoods. He said staff could bring this option back to the Board next month with a cost associated.

In response to the 18th Avenue corridor and the comment about 18th and Willamette, Mr. Vobora said it probably was true that students were the ones boarding at 18th and Willamette. However, he said, as others had testified, those buses coming from the UO and downtown often were carrying a lot of people because it was a major pulse connection downtown for people transferring off the system. He thought that there were other people using that stop. He said he liked the idea of further cross-town service on West 18th that possibly would serve the needs of those students better, and cross-town evening service on 18th might be an option that could be considered, as well.

In regard to the widening of 18th, Mr. Vobora said that LTD had participated in neighborhood meetings with the City. It had been made very clear that while it was a project in TransPlan, there was no project. It was not programmed and there was no

identified funding source. The City made it clear that it would be a very long time before anything would happen on West 18th Avenue. He said that the idea of going to an alternative street was interesting; there were some hurdles in addition to street width, such as street crossings that would have to be improved, etc.; however, those were things that could be looked into in the future.

Ms. Hocken said that someone had contacted her about the feeder loops; her main concern was the fact that there would no longer be any kind of service on Hawkins. Mr. Vobora said that the current routing came off 28th and down City View, down the hill, and cut over on 21st to the west, to Trillium Street and down Hawkins. It went behind the Willamette Christian Center property and exited at the new traffic signal at 18th and Hawkins. The reason that service initially was cut was the timing issue, to be able to provide bus service within a one-hour time frame in order to have consistent service. Second, in order to head east on West 18th, the bus had to make a left off 18th onto City View. That was not a protected turn and caused the buses to sit there for a long time and could be a scheduling issue. Ms. Hocken asked about going down Oak Patch. Mr. Vobora said it also was a problem coming off Oak Patch. There were some other routing options that could be considered.

Mr. Vobora talked about outbound timepoints. He said that he had mentioned this in January, and that Mr. Cohen had illustrated the problem beautifully. He said that staff had not paid a lot of attention to outbound timepoints in the past because as long as the bus made it back downtown for transfers, that had been their focus. As Mr. Cohen illustrated, it was an issue for people if the District published a schedule and the bus was always late. Even though the bus would make it around the route and back downtown in time, anyone riding just on the outbound portion would want confidence in the schedule. He said that staff wanted to look at the outbound timepoints in the system much more carefully and work to ensure that the buses were able to meet the outbound timepoints as well as the transfers downtown.

FISCAL YEAR 1997-98 PRICING PLAN: Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano explained that approval of the pricing plan was a multi-month process. Staff brought to the Board a preliminary recommendation in February. A formal public hearing would be held in March on a final recommendation from staff. Then the Board would be asked to hold two readings of the amended fare ordinance, in April and May, with adoption of the amended ordinance in May.

Mr. Viggiano first discussed the FY 96-97 changes, which were listed in the agenda packet. He explained that the District alternated increases in the cash fare with increases in tokens and passes. Currently, the adult cash fare was \$.80, and the adult reduced fare was \$.40. The plan showed the adult cash fare increasing to \$.90 in FY 97-98; however, because \$.90 may be a difficult fare to pay, requiring a number of coins, staff were considering recommending an increase to \$1.00. Mr. Viggiano stated that many riders already used dollar bills rather than \$.80 in change.

In discussing the proposal to change the fare for football shuttle service, Mr. Vobora explained that the UO sports shuttle program was the only program offered as a special

service with a premium fare. The District had seen an increase in costs, so wanted to restructure this program and have the UO share in the costs. Staff currently were negotiating with the UO on this issue. Staff had found that speeding up boarding was most effective and productive post-game, so they were recommending a different payment plan. Everyone would pay \$.75 each way, but would pay for a round trip pre-game. After the game, everyone would just get on the bus. Staff were negotiating a price per hour with the UO as a joint partnership.

Mr. Kleger wondered how staff would ensure that post-game riders would have paid. Mr. Vobora said they had considered that, but did not think a significant number of people would take a one-way trip and try to ride without paying.

Mr. Bennett mentioned the lines after the games. Mr. Vobora stated that the District had been caught by surprise this season, and had increased the number of buses from 32 to 44. Staff were talking to the UO to see if there were ways to delay people or slow down the demand, or maybe a private carrier would have to be added to provide some service.

Mr. Bennett asked how staff decided on the \$.75 shuttle fare recommendation. Mr. Vobora said that it had been \$1.00. One idea was that if the UO service was provided in the same way as other special service, the UO said it would charge a high premium fare both ways and get people used to it. By charging the same fare for children and adults, LTD probably would come out okay, and then the UO eventually would take over the pricing of the fare and pay LTD a set amount. He said that LTD wanted to start recovering a bigger share of the cost. He added that one option for reducing the wait would be to use a split staging area. It would cause some logistical problems in overseeing the boarding, but it probably could be done if LTD could allocate more buses and operators; however, providing 40 operators on weekends was difficult. Mr. Vobora added that staff wanted to be sensitive to LTD's partnership with the UO, and maybe balance the cost sharing and who controls the fares, etc. He said that this kind of change, which was still being discussed with the UO, also would apply to basketball service.

Public Testimony: Ms. Hocken asked for public testimony on the fare recommendation for FY 97-98. There was none, and she closed the public testimony period.

Board Discussion: Ms. Murphy asked about the use of paper dollars. Mr. Viggiano replied that the fareboxes currently were set up to accommodate dollar bills and coins, so people could pay either way.

Mr. Kleger said that about 30 percent of the riders paying the cash fare already used dollar bills. On the other hand, he said, a larger increase now would mean that some people would have to decide to make fewer trips. He said he did not expect a significant ridership drop, but the people relying on LTD for lifeline service would be restricted in their mobility with either increase. He said he was leaning more toward \$.90, even though it was a nuisance.

Mr. Bennett said he would support the increase to \$1.00, and that maybe the District could address the lifeline issue in some other way. In order to continue service to the

community and position LTD to compete harder, the District was going to have to have the revenue, he said. He did not think the District would lose 100,000 annual riders. As a percent, the increase to \$1.00 was more difficult, but in looking at the costs and what the District wanted to do with additional service, he thought the District needed to struggle through with this one.

Mr. Bailey said he was leaning the same direction as Mr. Bennett, and that he was interested in the public hearing next month.

Ms. Hocken said she was leaning toward \$1.00 also. She suggested that the District may want to delay increasing the token prices next year.

Mr. Saydack said he had no strong feelings about this. He thought that \$1.00 represented a tremendous bargain, and the service was heavily subsidized. He said he realized the increase may be a hardship on some people, and suggested that there might be another way to deal with that. He added that the inflationary group pass increase might mean continuing to lose money at the same rate. Ms. Hocken said that the Board may have to look at the whole group pass program and the way the contracts were written, which was a fairly complicated issue.

Mr. Kleger said it would be nice to have comparative fare information with other systems available the following month.

Ms. Loobey said that when employers increased salaries by inflationary costs or added employees, that changed the revenue; for the private sector, that raised over time and an annual adjustment was included. She suggested reviewing the formula for how group pass rates were set.

Ms. Murphy said she wanted input from the public and the riders. She thought that making the leap from \$.80 to \$1.00 made sense, especially if tokens were available for hardship situations. She thought it was important to get user fees to support the service as often as possible, not just for the District, but also for the community the Board members represented.

ITEMS FOR ACTION:

MOTION
VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Bailey moved approval of the Consent Calendar for February 19, 1997. Mr. Bennett seconded, and the motion carried unanimously, 6 to 0 (Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor; none opposed). Items on the Consent Calendar were the minutes of the January 15, 1997, special Board meeting/work session; minutes of the January 15, 1997, regular Board meeting; and the nomination of Russ Brink to a second three-year term on the LTD Budget Committee, beginning immediately and ending January 1, 2000.

OREGON TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE BANK LOAN APPLICATION:

Mr. Viggiano explained that this was a loan application for funding for a priority system to allow buses to influence signals as the buses approached them, in order to have more

green time. It would be a lower-level priority than emergency vehicles, and would not involve signal preemption. It would be designed to extend the green time as a bus approached an intersection, or to call for an early green light, and would be done within certain parameters. There currently was a bill in front of the legislature to allow signal prioritization for buses. He said that it currently worked well in many communities, including Bremerton, Washington. The loan would be provided through a new federal program, which was looking for ten pilot states in which to develop the loan program. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had encouraged LTD to apply. If Oregon were approved for a pilot program, it would establish an ongoing funding source. As the money is paid back, it would be available for other projects and the fund would grow. Mr. Viggiano said that one of the reasons staff were recommending this action was to help establish that fund, and perhaps be able to use it for future capital projects.

Mr. Viggiano said that Mr. Farthing had mentioned in an earlier comment that signal prioritization was not consistent with TransPlan. Mr. Viggiano read to the Board one of the policies in TransPlan (A.M.2), which said, in part, "Implement traffic management techniques and other actions where appropriate to give priority to transit vehicles and carpools to improve operating conditions and travel times." One of the implementation strategies was "installing electronic devices for preemption of traffic signals." Therefore, he said, it was pretty clear in TransPlan.

Mr. Bennett asked what the chances were for receiving this loan. Ms. Loobey said she thought they were good; LTD was encouraged by ODOT to apply. She said there currently were no transit projects that were moving forward, and the director of ODOT was very interested in setting the precedent for the state of Oregon, and in setting the precedent for a down-state project rather than in the Tri-County area.

Ms. Hocken said that the Board Finance Committee had discussed this proposal.

Opening of Public Hearing: Ms. Hocken opened the public hearing on the OTIB loan application.

Mike Farthing of Eugene said that he represented the Coles and was there to object to the authorization of the loan by the Board. He said he believed it would initiate a program that would have an effect on land use; signal prioritization was part of BRT 2015, which had not been adopted as official transportation policy by either LTD or its partners in the transportation plan, Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County. He said that ORS 195.020 required special districts to take action with respect to programs affecting land use in accordance with statewide goals. He said that if the Board authorized this, he believed they had to consider goals. If they considered goals, they had to consider Goal 12 and the new Goal 12 rule in OAR 660(12). He said he saw no evidence that that rule had been addressed. In his opinion, he said, this was a land use decision that required notice and a public hearing consistent with ORS 197.763 that was applicable to all land use decisions, but he thought first the District needed support in TransPlan that was consistent with Goal 12, which included the newly-adopted rule that was not in effect in 1986. He said that all new actions affecting land use, just like the Cole acquisition and the McKay acquisition, had to consider that goal; those were land use decisions in his opinion. He said that the reason

they (he and the Coles) were there was that they wanted LTD to follow land use rules. He said he represented the person who owned the Speedway property who wanted to put commercial designations on the corners of 11th and 18th on Willow Creek Road, and he had to go through a plan amendment process to do that. Mr. Farthing said that LTD had to go through a plan amendment process if it wanted to change the rules, in his opinion. He urged the Board to not take this action, to initiate some kind of plan amendment or some kind of land use decision process that addressed the new Goal 12 rules and invited public comment pursuant to ORS 197.763.

Mr. Bailey thanked Mr. Farthing for his comments and asked Mr. Farthing if it was his position that Goal 12 preempted the local TransPlan documents. Mr. Farthing said that it required LTD, when enacting new transit facilities or programs, to address Goal 12, in his opinion, just like this acquisition of a Park & Ride site. Mr. Bailey said that all Mr. Farthing was saying was that LTD had to be in compliance with state law as it was expressed in that goal. He was asking Mr. Farthing if it was his position that that rule preempted the local TransPlan document. Mr. Farthing said it did not preempt it; it supplemented it. It meant that LTD had to consider TransPlan and, in considering TransPlan, he did not believe that TransPlan was consistent with the Goal 12 rules, and that was why the community was going through the two-year update. He said that BRT was an integral part of that update, but it had not been adopted.

Mr. Bennett stated to Mr. Farthing that LTD was receiving different legal advice, as he knew. Mr. Bennett stated that even signal prioritization, which could be used in a variety of different circumstances to help the transit system get along, certainly would help the BRT situation, but it would help even if there were no BRT. He asked Mr. Farthing if he thought it was an integral part of BRT. Mr. Farthing said it was that; it was part of the transit system, and because that aspect of it had not been initiated previously it had to be coordinated with the other units of government. For example, he said, LTD's preemption or prioritization of signals would affect city of Eugene traffic patterns; there had to be some coordination, so that kicked in another jurisdiction. And then Lane County had coordinating authority throughout the metro area, pursuant to ORS 195.

Mr. Viggiano mentioned that for LTD to put in signal prioritization, it needed the City's approval, or the local jurisdiction in charge of that signal, whether it be ODOT or Lane County or the City of Eugene or Springfield. He said this was not something the District could do on its own. Also, he said, signal priority was something that LTD was looking at before BRT, as evidenced by the fact that it was in a document written in 1986.

Ms. Hocken asked if this question had been posed to Al Johnson, to see whether he believed it was a land use decision or whether the current TransPlan covered it. Mr. Viggiano said it had not been posed with regard to signal priority. This was the first that staff had heard of this concern, so had not asked Mr. Johnson specifically.

Ms. Hocken asked about the time line for this application. She commented that by approving the loan application the Board was not actually signing to take the money, so it was not the same as committing to spend money when there was any kind of cloud over whether the District had the ability to do so. Ms. Loobey said that waiting until next month

probably would not violate the process. She said that she had previously reported to the Board on ODOT's bill in the legislature that would establish the bank. The process LTD was going through was like walking down a sidewalk with ODOT. ODOT needed to be able to go to the federal government and say they had projects that they wanted to fund and needed to have it in their budget so they could appropriate the money. Until the legislature approved that bill, ODOT could not appropriate the money. The only question was whether LTD wanted to move forward at that time so ODOT could demonstrate that there was a need and an interest so that Oregon did not miss out on being one of the pilot states.

Mr. Bennett said that unless he heard something else from his colleagues on the Board, he would be inclined to go forward because he was supporting this particular program. At a layman's level, he said, it did not look as if there was a good reason not to go forward in terms of the Board's recommendation. If the Board learned something differently, they could withdraw or take different action, but if the District was on solid ground, it could keep the ball rolling.

Mr. Saydack said he was not there to speak to the legal questions, but he did not see a problem with approving the application and then withdrawing it if the Board received advice to do so.

Mr. Bailey said he concurred with Mr. Bennett's analysis. He said he did not have any insight into the legal aspects of the situation, although Mr. Farthing's comments were well taken. He said it seemed to him that the TransPlan statement read by Mr. Viggiano was pretty convincing on this topic. As one Board member, he said, by following up on this, he thought the Board was essentially saying that it found that this sort of action was a furtherance of its efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), as mandated by state goal, so that would be to him the purpose of this action. He thought the Board should go forward.

Ms. Murphy said that the Opticom system was initiated in Springfield as the first in the nation. She thought that when there was an asset in the community that met the needs of the emergency vehicles, allowing them the preemption of signals, and also could be used by another community player such as transit, to expedite or keep the flow of traffic and moving a lot of people in a shorter period of time, she thought the District should take advantage of that. So far, she said, she had not heard any opposition in the emergency/medical/fire community that would find it a conflict of property or prioritization, so she would strongly recommend moving forward.

Closure of Public Hearing: Ms. Hocken closed the public hearing, since only one person had wished to address the Board on this subject.

Board Discussion and Decision: Mr. Kleger said that it stretched his credulity to think of a signal prioritization system as a land use measure. He said it was a traffic flow enhancer, but was not a land use measure because it applied in far too many situations. He thought that the politics of the situation were such that the Board did need to be on record regarding this application, if the State were to get the advantage statewide. Also, the District had needed for some time to get itself into the center of transportation planning in the state, and this was one more way to do so. He said he was strongly in favor of the

proposed loan application. He noted that nothing would happen until the laws were changed to authorize the infrastructure loan program and until the signal prioritization was authorized by state law or until the federal government authorized the money, so there was a lot of opportunity to withdraw the application if the need arose.

MOTION Mr. Bailey moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the funding application for the Oregon Transportation Infrastructure Bank for the amount of \$781,000 for signal prioritization."

VOTE Mr. Kleger seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0 (Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor; none opposed).

FRED MEYER PARK & RIDE: Ms. Hocken asked for this item to be next on the agenda because the owners of the Fred Meyer site were present to provide some information to the Board. Transit Planner Micki Kaplan introduced Linda Korth and Doug McKay, owners of the Fred Meyer site. She said that McKay Land Development Company had provided LTD with information that allowed the District to save some money on the Level I environmental site assessment (ESA), so she thanked them for their assistance. She stated that the Board had been discussing the Fred Meyer site since November, and staff had provided information about the site during the last several months, with reasons that the site would work effectively for the District. At the January Board meeting, the Board directed staff to proceed with the Level I ESA, which was the paper search to review the current use of the property (it was currently vacant), as well as a paper search for past uses, to try to determine if there was any evidence of environmental contamination. In the executive summary on page 76 of the packet, the consultant stated that the current and prior uses of the property did not include any evidence of contamination, and did not recommend proceeding with a Level II ESA, which would be on-site drilling or examination of the water table. That was consistent with the information provided by Ms. Korth, which was a Level I ESA from four years ago.

Ms. Kaplan said that since the District would use local funds if the Board decided to purchase this property, the next step would have been a full appraisal. However, the District had conducted an estimated appraisal, which the Board had discussed in executive session several months before, so staff were recommending that a full appraisal was not needed unless there were legal proceedings on condemnation. Therefore, the next step would be for the Board to declare its intent to acquire the property. A resolution had been prepared by attorney Greg Skillman. Declaring the intent to acquire would allow the District to start the process to begin discussions and negotiations with McKay Land Development Company. Staff were asking that the Board proceed with adopting the resolution so that this process could begin. Ms. Kaplan said that Ms. Korth or Mr. McKay might want to address the Board that evening.

Mr. Bennett asked how long it would take to know whether there was some agreement as to the price, were the Board to move in that direction. Ms. Kaplan said she would not know that until the negotiation process began, but that process could start right away. She said that the Board could discuss whether staff should proceed with hiring someone to negotiate on the District's behalf or have staff negotiate directly.

Mr. Bennett said he would like to hear from the owners. He said that Ms. Korth had called him because she knew him and wanted to know whether the District was serious or just shooting from the hip. He said he could not speak for the entire Board, but he thought they were reasonably serious. She had indicated to him that the approach of LTD was absolutely not her first choice, but that she was willing to listen to the extent that it was part of the District's overall plan.

Ms. Korth said she did call Mr. Bennett, and also talked with Ms. Kaplan and Ms. Loobey individually and shared what the owners' plans were for that piece of property. She explained that it was about a half-acre, located adjacent to Seneca Center, north of the property. She said it was a fairly small site, in her opinion, for a Park & Ride, probably 50 cars or less. She said that her concern was encroachment onto their property if it were used for a Park & Ride; that was one of the problems the owners saw that they would face in the future. Beyond that, she said, she wanted the Board to understand that the owners had an agreement with Blockbuster Video, by lease, that they would not develop this parcel until Blockbuster had been in its location for one year. That year had passed, and there was a demand for commercially developing this property. Presently, she said, they had architectural plans drawn up for a 4,500 square foot office building; there was a lease out for signature, after verbal agreement on all points. Currently there was a site review application that neighbors had until February 27 to respond to, and it was the owners' intention from that point on to begin the process of obtaining the building permit and developing the property. She said that they were very interested in LTD's plans because those certainly would disrupt their plans.

For the general public's information, Ms. Korth said that once LTD acquired this property it would go off the tax rolls. She said she believed that approximately 75 percent of the land in Lane County was off the tax rolls, which contributed to higher property taxes.

Doug McKay said he thought the property would hold fewer cars than Ms. Korth indicated. He said it was 70 feet wide and 200 feet deep, so with an access from the street there could be two rows of about 20 cars, except that under the new TRIP regulations, trees also had to be added. He thought there would be less than 40 cars. He did not see where that size of lot fit in either the major or minor transit plan areas. He said that his concern was that if there was going to be a Park & Ride, it should be big enough to make it worthwhile. He thought that Park & Rides should be spread out a little; he did not think that one at the Fred Meyer site and at the Cole site were both necessary. Based on some of the information he saw on the priorities, he said, his site did not have the visibility or some of the other things that should make it a top priority. One of his concerns was that he had one telephone call and then LTD essentially indicated that it was going to go ahead without the McKays' knowledge that it would be on the agenda. However, Ms. Korth said LTD staff had been in contact with her throughout the process.

Ms. Korth said that one of the things that the City of Eugene was trying to do with commercial properties was to create denser development. She said it was hard for her to understand why LTD wanted to take commercial property out of the picture for a Park & Ride. She did not know why LTD was not going north of West 11th to gain that kind of property cheaper. Mr. Bennett responded that LTD could not compete with property in that

location. In trying to create a balanced transportation system, the way it was currently trying to compete, with big buses stopping in traffic and trying to get back into traffic, LTD would never compete. He said the Board needed to consider her comments carefully, but also needed the access and visibility and locational advantages in order to compete over the long run if, in fact, the community really wanted to have a balanced transportation system. He said that it was a tough sell, but that was the reason, and added that this was not fun.

Ms. Korh said that maybe she had not been in the loop of what LTD was trying to accomplish, but it fell against her grain to have LTD take prime commercial property like the Coles' property on West 11th and turn it into an asphalt parking lot.

Ms. Hocken said it was her understanding that a traffic engineer had evaluated the McKay property in terms of number of spaces. Ms. Kaplan said that the number of spaces would be fewer than 50, somewhere in the 40s, but not fewer than 40.

Mr. Kleger said he was concerned that there would be beginning-of-the-day commuting going in both directions in this corridor relatively soon, and they knew that Park & Ride facilities on the side of the street out of the direction of commute would not be used as well as those on the side of the street in the direction of the commute, barring some special service enhancements. In this particular instance, he said, the Board had already received some indications of distress from Fred Meyer because people were using their parking lot for Park & Ride functions, so it was known that a demand already existed. He said that there was a major bus stop in that location, so there would not be any significant need for an extra marketing effort. He said it seemed to him that by itself it would be a bad buy, but it was not by itself. He said it might allow the District more flexibility in what it did with other Park & Ride plans, but it might not. He thought it was a better move than not doing so, and it seemed to be a "fish or cut bait" situation right away. If the Board did not take action, the site would be developed relatively quickly and move into a price range that the District could not afford.

District Counsel Greg Skillman asked to clarify one point. He said that the resolution before the Board was a step in the process of acquiring the property that would authorize the Board or its agents to begin negotiations with the property owner. Passing the resolution did not mean that the District was committed to acquiring the property. If the negotiations did not pan out and if the Board decided not to proceed with condemnation, or for whatever reason, it could back off from the intent to acquire the property. The resolution just allowed the Board to proceed with negotiations with the owner and gave the Board the necessary first step before initiating condemnation action, if the District intended to do that.

Ms. Hocken said she agreed with Mr. Kleger on some level: even though the Board would not be irretrievably committed to acquiring the property by passing the resolution, to be fair to the property owners and the people considering leasing the property, the Board did need to make a decision that it was not going to back away from, if at all possible. Negotiations could change the whole dynamic, but the District needed to get into that process right away if it planned to do so.

Mr. Bennett asked if a site on the other side of the street made this site any more attractive, by handling the back and forth traffic that had been discussed, or whether staff viewed this site as a stand-alone site. Ms. Kaplan said that staff's opinion was that the site stood alone. It achieved the District's goal of trying to expand Park & Rides along the major corridors, and the Board and staff had discussed a series of several sites along the major corridors, rather than necessarily one large site. She said that staff opinion also was that it built diversity into the Park & Ride program. As a stand-alone, it was too small to be pursued as the main West 11th Park & Ride, but it was pursued and seen as attractive for all the reasons Mr. Kleger had already mentioned. She said it was cost effective because it was vacant. Once it was developed, there were costs for the McKays and it might put it out of LTD's price range to acquire. The cost per space was significantly cost effective for the District. It was already being used by Fred Meyer, and Ms. Kaplan thought there were opportunities to share in the parking during times when the Park & Ride might be underutilized; for instance, on weekends and in the evening when the commuters were not using it. That was a time when Blockbuster would be very active, so she thought there were some opportunities for joint use.

Ms. Hocken said that one of the reasons it was a good site even though it appeared to be on the wrong side of West 11th was that there was a bus that stopped there as it was heading into town, so it was heading the right direction even though it was a half-block off West 11th. It had the inbound sense that riders normally would get on the other side of 11th. Ms. Kaplan added that LTD already served the site; there was a shelter there, as well. She said that was a very popular stop and she could not imagine the District pulling out of it in the future. She said there had been some discussions as a potential terminus for the BRT pilot corridor; she did not know where that discussion was at that moment. However, as a stand-alone site, staff thought it was an attractive site.

Mr. Saydack said that he was listening with a lot of interest to the discussion and the comments of the owners. He thought this required the District to revisit the priorities for that particular location, which was being done in the discussion that evening. He said that he thought such decisions needed to be very carefully made, and the District needed to be sure this was what it needed for the goals that the Board was committed to achieve, and he did not think it could be done casually. He said he had not been aware previously of the owners' concerns, and that bothered him, because he did not recall the priority of this site during previous discussions. He said it seemed to be something that was attractive, something that had a purpose for LTD, but he did not know if he gave it the level of priority he would want it to have to make this decision. He thought that what was lacking for him was the ability to call up the other possible locations in that area that would not be controversial and would serve the same purpose, and he wondered if there was all that much difference.

Ms. Kaplan said that there were other sites that were vacant on the north side of West 11th, particularly next to Advanced Audio; however, there was no shelter or stop, and the inbound bus did not currently come in and serve the site. She thought that the Fred Meyer site was unique in that it already had those amenities and services. She offered to look at the site map the Board used on its tour if the Board wished to. Mr. Viggiano said that Fred Meyer was the only site where the bus pulled off West 11th along that whole stretch. He

explained that the small strip next to the shelter was almost a perfect location because the shelter and service were there, and people who parked their cars would walk a few steps to the sidewalk and get on the bus. The only problem was that it was not large enough to accommodate the estimated demand of 100 Park & Ride stalls during the next ten years, and that was why it was not the primary site. The thought had been that as demand grew, it would make sense to develop that site for Park & Ride use in the corridor. The issue then came to a head because the McKay's were planning to develop the site. Mr. Viggiano said that if the District developed this and other sites along West 11th, there would be an overabundance of capacity in the short term. Ideally, LTD would wait 10 to 15 years before developing the Fred Meyer site, but that was not to be the case because of development plans by the owners.

Mr. McKay asked the Board to please make a decision. He said he preferred that the Board not take the site, but if they were going to take the property eventually, he preferred that they make that decision right away. Ms. Korth added that the bill kept running up as they proceeded with their development plans.

Ms. Murphy said that if people were already using the Fred Meyer parking lot as a Park & Ride lot, she thought that might wear thin and wondered if LTD would have to move that bus stop if there were no Park & Ride there. Mr. Viggiano commented that this Park & Ride was listed on one of the District's maps, and said that Fred Meyer was comfortable with limited use of its lot as long as that use did not interfere with Fred Meyer's operations. However, Fred Meyer had expressed a concern and at some point might say LTD could no longer use it for a Park & Ride area and try to enforce it.

MOTION

In order to put a motion on the table, Mr. Bennett moved that the Board approve the Resolution Declaring the Public Necessity to Acquire Certain Real Property on Seneca Road Near West 11th for the Construction of a Park and Ride Facility. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett said he would vote for the motion because he either believed in what he was doing on the Board or he had better get off. He said that he was convinced that the community would not be able to grow in the sort of political environment that was present, with continuous tugs and pulls on the urban services boundary and the other infrastructure issues, systems development charges, etc. LTD would have to work in that kind of environment, and had to have some kind of transportation system that recognized that a number of people would not have to use their cars every day and allowed others to do so.

VOTE

Mr. Bailey called for the question. The motion to adopt the resolution then carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0 (Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack in favor; none opposed). Ms. Hocken said that the Board had made that decision, so the McKays knew where they were at that point. Mr. McKay said he would make an offer to purchase the site back if it did not work out for LTD.

Ms. Hocken commented that LTD would like it to be easy for people using the Park & Ride to go into Blockbuster and rent a video on their way home, so maybe Blockbuster and LTD could cooperate on a sidewalk there.

WEST 11TH PARK & RIDE: Ms. Hocken moved this information item to that point on the agenda because Mr. Skillman was present for the executive session.

Ms. Kaplan provided a status report on the project to date, including the correspondence to MPC by LTD and Mr. Farthing and staff responses to issues that had been raised by Mr. Couper and Mr. Kleger. Mr. Kleger thanked staff for the rapid response to his questions.

MOTION **EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h):** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to consult with counsel regarding the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed. Ms. Murphy seconded, and the motion passed 5 to 0 (Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor, with Mr. Bailey temporarily out of the room). The Board moved into Executive Session at 9:50 p.m. Mr. Skillman was present for this discussion.

VOTE

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION: The Board unanimously returned to regular session at 10:20 p.m., upon a motion by Mr. Kleger.

Ms. Hocken commented about the possibility of considering sites originally considered and adding other sites to consider for evaluation of a second site in the Environmental Assessment (EA). Mr. Kleger said he had a strong preference for something on the south side because of the operational advantage and the customers' time advantage.

Mr. Skillman asked if the Board desired to consider more than one alternate in the EA. The Board members affirmed that they did. Ms. Hocken said it probably was appropriate for staff to go back to the Board after further investigation; there may be two or three viable alternatives that they might want to ask the Board about. She said she was not sure how the scoping process would work. Ms. Kaplan said that the staff recommended that the District wait on the scoping session for the EA because they wanted to look at alternatives before the public made its comments so that the public would have an opportunity to comment on what the District was considering.

ELECTION OF A BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Saydack said that since the previous Board Secretary came from the great city of Springfield, he nominated Ms. Murphy to fill the term of Board Secretary vacated by Mr. Montgomery. There were no other nominations, and Ms. Hocken closed the nominations. Mr. Saydack moved that the Board elect Ms. Murphy as its secretary. Mr. Bailey seconded, and the motion carried unanimously, 6 to 0 (Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor; none opposed).

MOTION
VOTE

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN: Mr. Bennett asked if this was something the Board should take more time with and whether it could wait. Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that staff planned to discuss the Long-Range Financial Plan with the Board in March, and could discuss the CIP at that time, as well. She commented that 81 percent of the capital projects for FY 97-98 already had been approved in one form or another.

SALARY CAP INITIATIVE: Ms. Hocken commented that at its work session the previous evening, the Board had met in Executive Session related to the Appeals Court decision regarding the initiative to cut the General Manager's salary. At that time, the Board took no formal action, but counsel requested that the Board do so. She called the Board's attention to page 144 of the agenda packet, which had been handed out that evening.

MOTION Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors directs legal counsel to file a Petition for Review of the Court of Appeals decision in Lane Transit District v. Lane County v. Citizens for Responsible Public Transit, Case No. CA A894559." Mr. Saydack seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0 (Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor; none opposed).

VOTE

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:30 p.m.


Board Secretary

C:\WPDATA\BDM0219R.DOC