

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, March 19, 1997

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 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, March 19, 1997, 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  
Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: (One vacancy, Subdistrict 1)  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken.

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:**

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Hocken introduced the April 1997 Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Bob Younger. Mr. Younger was hired in July 1997 and had recently received awards for eight years of safe driving, eight years of correct schedule operation, and exceptional attendance in 1996. He had participated as a member of the employee Eugene Station Committee and the Radio Acquisition Team, and had received many Employee of the Month nominations. One customer nominated him because he was a very safe driver. Another customer said that Mr. Younger had gone out of his way to make the customer's daughter, who had moved here from another state, feel comfortable and safe, and always had a smile and a joke for her. A third customer described some of Mr. Younger's safe-driving techniques, saying that Mr. Younger exemplified what it meant to be a good public transit driver, and said, "This man made riding LTD comfortable and enjoyable. If more drivers took this care in operating their bus I wouldn't even think about buying a car."

When asked what made Mr. Younger a good employee, Transit Operations Manager Patricia Hansen said that she had personal accolades for him after working with him for two consecutive years on the bus operator Rodeo. She said, "designing, setting up, and taking down the various stations for the bus driving competition is really hard work. Those

who labored elbow-to-elbow with Bob and his two wonderful sons, who also volunteered to help, really appreciated the dedication and teamwork that he brought to this special event, and couldn't have done it without him. Bob also demonstrates this same level of commitment to his job as a bus operator. The supervisors who work with him on a daily basis note that he takes pride in his work and is willing to go the extra mile when needed. He has a great relationship with his customers, and represents the District well. He is a genuinely nice guy with a super sense of humor--a terrific combination that makes working with Bob a real pleasure."

Ms. Hocken presented Mr. Younger with his certificate and monetary award. He thanked the Board and said he hoped he could live up to those expectations.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Ms. Hocken asked for public comment on topics other than the two public hearings scheduled for that evening.

(1) Renee Freeman of Eugene said that she would be giving the District a petition for route #50. Her cover letter asked that LTD add explicit criteria that considered the demographics of service areas, including composition of families, economic hardships, and private vehicle ownership, as well as the safety and distance of pedestrian access to the nearest bus stop, to its Service Design Criteria. She said there were new homes and duplexes in the area defined in the petition as being bounded on the north by Hatton Street, on the south by North Patton Street, the west by Bennett Lane, and on the east by a north-south line approximately 500 feet east of North Park Street, within a half mile to three-fourths of a mile to Kelly School and the store. She said there were people with handicaps who were not able to walk that far, and the walkways were narrow. She had gathered sixty signatures. She read the petition, which defined the area within which the signers lived and stated that they were petitioning for improved public bus service to that region. They requested a stop along the west side of North Park in the immediate vicinity of Bennett Lane and Virgil, which would be much closer than the current closest stop at Kelly Middle School. She described the type of housing in the area, which included 22 units at St. Vincent dePaul's Mac McDonald project, 34 units in Lane County's Walnut Park complex, and 67 privately-owned units. She said that the area included preschool and school-aged children, many single heads of households, and households dependent upon public transportation. The petition also mentioned the nature and condition of the streets that made pedestrian access to the two closest bus stops unsafe for pedestrians, especially during inclement weather and in the dark. Thirty-nine people had signed the petition.

Mr. Vobora said he would review the petition and provide a brief response later in the meeting.

(2) Alysia Crabtree of Eugene stated that she was the mother of four children, and that she had Multiple Sclerosis and was one of those handicapped people who were not able to walk those distances. She said that the handicapped bus was not always available when she needed to go somewhere, and the doctor had told her she should not walk alone. She said it would be more convenient for her if buses came closer, and that she would appreciate it if the District looked into this request closely.

There were no additional speakers, and Ms. Hocken closed the public testimony period of the meeting.

**MOTION**        **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Bennett moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for March 19, 1997, is approved as presented." The motion was seconded and approved by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kieger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the February 18, 1997, special Board meeting and the February 19, 1997, regular Board meeting; a resolution authorizing Bank of America Transactions, and a Resolution authorizing Wells Fargo Bank Transactions.

**VOTE**

**ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW SERVICE PACKAGE PROPOSAL:** Mr. Vobora described the portions of the service proposal that had changed since the February Board meeting. He explained that the Board was not locked into this service proposal during the budget process. If something happened during the budget process to cause the Board to want to revisit the service decision, that could be done. He explained that the proposal included an annual cost of \$301,600; three full-time and five part-time operators, and 10,578 annual service hours. A 3.6 percent service increase was estimated to result in approximately 194,000 rides, or a 3.5 percent ridership increase over the current year, plus a percentage from the rest of the system as it became more productive.

Mr. Vobora said that Cottage Grove had passed its ballot measure and staff had met to begin discussing how to provide that service. Staff also would meet with the Cottage Grove city staff and community members. The service probably would involve five or six weekday trips and approximately 3,000 hours of service. The demonstration project would pay the fully-allocated cost for the service, less fares--approximately \$152,000.

Mr. Vobora said that the Lane Community College group pass program was still uncertain. Ms. Hocken was scheduled to meet with LCC President Moskus on April 1.

Mr. Vobora stated that the District had received a lot of input on the service proposal by telephone and in writing, and copies had been given to the Board members. He discussed the recommended changes to the service proposal, as described in the agenda materials.

The recommended 1.3 percent reduction in service and the recommended service fixes had not changed from the February proposal. The service additions recommended in February had changed just under .3 percent, to add commuter service back to the #34/35 routes, at a cost of approximately \$20,000. The loops where the commuter service was being added back produced a number of trips, mostly during the commuter hours.

Ms. Murphy commented that after reading the information from the public, she saw the #16 mentioned twice. Mr. Vobora explained that those who lived along Mill Street would have to go downtown Springfield to transfer.

Mr. Vobora said that customers in many areas would like to have new service. However, the staff recommendation did not recommend going into any new areas. Rather, it concentrated on meeting the demand along heavily-used corridors.

**Public Hearing on Service Recommendations:** Ms. Hocken opened the public hearing and stated that two people, Ms. Freeman and Ms. Crabtree, already had spoken on this topic.

(1) Chris Phillips of Eugene spoke about the City View #35, and said that he had spoken to the Board in February, also. He thanked the Board and planning staff for reconsideration of the proposed changes to the #34 and #35 routes. He stated that he rode the #35 every weekday during rush hour, and would find it to be a significant irritation to have to transfer. He said he tried to get work done on the bus, which made up for some of the extra time it took to ride the bus. To transfer would be quite disruptive, he said. He had noticed an increase in the number of commuters riding when he rode, and he thought it would have been a bad mistake to cut the commuter service.

**Closure of Public Hearing:** No one else wished to address the Board, and Ms. Hocken closed the public hearing.

**Board Discussion and Decision:** Mr. Vobora commented about the petition that had been presented to LTD earlier. He explained that Transit Planner Paul Zvonkovic had done field work in that neighborhood, and there was a potential for ridership. However, providing service there now would be a trade-off with service the park and the swimming pool. Also, some of the streets in the area were problematic for LTD; there were narrow streets and one dangerous turn. Mr. Vobora stated that there were a number of new developments in the River Road area that might be candidates for feeder loop service that could tie into the River Road Transit Station in the future.

MOTION Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the 1997 Annual Route Review service package as presented. Mr. Kleger seconded. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unanimously, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE

**FISCAL YEAR 1997-98 PRICING PLAN:** Transit Planner Lisa Gardner stated that in February staff presented a proposed pricing plan. Staff were asking for preliminary approval at the March meeting and would bring a revised fare ordinance to the Board for the first reading in April. She explained that the proposal had been amended to reflect the direction from the Board at the last meeting. Staff were recommending an increase to a cash fare of \$1.00 and a round-trip football shuttle cash fare of \$2.00, rather than decreasing to \$1.50, due to negotiations with the University of Oregon.

Staff provided a fare survey similar to one done the previous year, which showed that the average adult cash fare was \$.84 for the current year and \$.79 the previous year. Staff had spoken with other transit systems about how they determined their fares and found that

very few prepared an annual pricing plan or had annual fare increases. Some also had different ways of generating revenue, such as dedicated taxes.

Mr. Bennett said he was interested to note that Portland's cash fare was \$1.35, Ms. Gardner said that was the fare in the downtown area, and the next zone was \$1.75. Mr. Bennett commented that the Portland fare was higher than any other in the survey. Mr. Pangborn said he thought that the fare in any major urban area ranged from \$1.00 to \$1.50; in New York it was \$2.00. Mr. Bennett also noted that Medford had a \$1.00 cash fare and a \$38 adult monthly pass, which was higher than Portland's. He wondered about the rationale for that. Mr. Vobora replied that Medford recently had a property tax funding cut, and service was cut dramatically, so was trying to raise revenues in some way.

Mr. Bennett commented about looking at operating performance and the fare system as part of a comparative basis. He said he would be interested in sometime having additional information. Mr. Pangborn clarified that Mr. Bennett thought it would be interesting to talk with Santa Cruz, for instance, because the monthly pass there was not discounted. Mr. Viggiano said he thought it depended on the fare philosophy among systems. He said that LTD's had been to encourage the use of tokens and passes, which encouraged greater use of the system. He explained that Richard Orem, the "guru" of transit fares, would encourage an even greater difference between cash and tokens. Mr. Viggiano explained that people who use cash are less fare sensitive, and others who are more fare sensitive gravitate toward tokens and passes. LTD had been moving in the direction of a greater differential between cash and prepaid fares to increase ridership and revenues.

Mr. Saydack asked about group pass revenues. Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that the students and faculty at the University of Oregon, with the largest group pass contract, accounted for 12 to 15 percent of the total fares. While looking at the financial statements, Ms. Hocken commented that year-to-date group pass fares amounted to \$400,000, and all other fares were at \$1.8 million, so it was about 20 percent or so. Ms. Hellekson commented that the timing could be off, because some groups were billed monthly and some quarterly.

Mr. Saydack asked what percentage of ridership came from the group pass program, as opposed to cash fares, etc. Mr. Pangborn said that the group pass accounted for about 20 percent of total fares and 25 percent of ridership, according to the latest information from the origin and destination study, which was three to four years old. He said that staff could look at that again if the Board wished.

Mr. Bennett said he thought Mr. Viggiano made a good point regarding the differences in the pricing policy and how he saw it working in LTD's favor. He thought LTD should be charging what the market would bear, and should test what the market would bear and know that. He said he had heard that a third of the people who rode LTD also had a car, and that the District should not assume that everyone was poor. He said it was better to create a progressive system that tried to account for people who could not afford to ride, but not assume that everyone was broke. He asked why the District considered fare increases on an alternating basis, and whether that was consistent with what was happening with service. Mr. Pangborn said that the short answer was that staff interpreted

the intent of the Board along those lines and recommended increasing the cash fare to \$1.00 instead of to \$.90, which staff considered to be fairly aggressive. Other transit districts were surprised that LTD raised fares or some fare instrument annually. He said that staff did not know what the market would bear, but staff had heard the Board say to be sure they were fairly assertive in the fare policy. What they did not know was what the market would bear.

**Public Hearing on FY 97-98 Pricing Plan:** Ms. Hocken opened the public hearing on the Fiscal Year 1997-98 Pricing Plan and fare recommendations. No one wished to speak, so Ms. Hocken closed the public hearing.

**Board Discussion and Decision:** Mr. Kleger called staff's attention to page 62 of the agenda packet, on which "FY 95-96" was used twice instead of "FY 97-98."

Mr. Saydack asked if customers would pay \$2.00 for the UO football fare on the first bus, whether they took the return trip or not. Mr. Vobora said that they would, both children and adults. Mr. Kleger asked how the bus operators would know who had paid for the return trip. Mr. Vobora said that they would not; the idea was to load the buses quickly after the games rather than handing out and collecting tickets. He did not think the District would lose much revenue this way.

Ms. Murphy said she was interested in the parking fees in Portland and Santa Cruz. She said she thought Mr. Bennett made a good point in looking at this annually because LTD's monthly pass was at the low end of those in the survey. She said she was curious to see if Medford sold many monthly passes, and thought that maybe escalating the price was a deterrent to sales.

Ms. Hocken thought LTD always would want to have some sort of discount, because there was a lot of overhead with handling cash. She then asked if the Board members were happy with the direction staff were going, in order to have the ordinance written for next month's meeting. The Board members agreed that they were.

**AMENITIES ON NEW BUSES:** Mr. Pangborn called the Board's attention to the description of proposed amenities for new buses that was included in the agenda packet. He explained that these amenities were proposed for the six 30-foot buses and three 40-foot buses that were currently on order and would be delivered in August. Staff had listened to the Board request to make the buses as attractive as possible, so some new amenities had been included in the Capital Improvements Program. Some of these involved fairly significant costs, so staff were bringing a recommendation to the Board for discussion. Mr. Pangborn discussed the items on the list, which included individual reading lights; AM/FM radio; air conditioning; more colorful interior, including upholstery and interior design; two TV screens; individual headphone jacks for radio/TV and broadcast equipment; and luggage racks. He also discussed the purchase and maintenance costs for these items.

Mr. Bennett asked about radio music and earphones. Mr. Pangborn said that individual headphone jacks would cost about \$125 per jack and would be included on the forward-facing seats only. Customers would be able to change channels. The dilemma

was that radio and television signals would fade in and out as a bus traveled, and rebroadcasts required a fee if rebroadcast to paying customers. This would amount to about \$190 per year per bus. Staff were exploring whether LTD could obtain an agreement with a local radio station for exclusive broadcast rights. Staff wanted to offer radio at least for select programs, such as sports shuttles. With low-floor buses, there would be headroom clearance for a 13" television, but staff had not yet worked out the problem of how to get a constant signal. He explained that commuter buses on the east coast played videos of earlier broadcasts, but labor costs for LTD to do that for one inbound and one outbound trip each day might be too high for any advantage offered to the customers. He said staff would consider this option for the purchase of low-floor buses.

Mr. Pangborn explained that air conditioning would involve a big expense. The Northwest probably was the only area of the country without air conditioned buses, because of the temperate weather. C-TRAN in Vancouver, Washington, was the only property with air conditioning, because its commuters traveling 35 to 40 minutes into Portland were not willing to ride without air conditioning. C-TRAN then found that after air conditioning those buses, it had to air condition the rest of the fleet. Salem had some air conditioned buses, also. LTD received this request each summer, from both customers and operators, and Mr. Pangborn thought that if LTD purchased some air conditioned buses, there would be a big demand to have the rest of the fleet air conditioned. Staff believed that if given a choice, customers with air conditioned cars would not use the bus in 90-degree weather, but there were costs associated with offering that amenity.

Ms. Murphy asked whether increased fuel expense and additional weight were considerations. Mr. Pangborn said that Fleet Services Manager Ron Berkshire thought the increased fuel consumption would be from 2 to 3 percent, and that the new systems were relatively lightweight. The air conditioning probably would run only during three months of the year.

Mr. Bailey asked if the recommendation to not include the radio and television items was based on legal counsel. Mr. Pangborn said this had not been discussed with counsel. He had requested the federal regulations and had not yet received those. He said that staff were not prepared to recommend the paraphernalia for rebroadcasting without knowing more.

Mr. Bailey asked if this could be part of the agenda during ISTEA reauthorization. Mr. Pangborn said he was not sure, since the permits went to the recording artist copyright organization to protect the copyrights of original artists. He added that the buses could be retrofitted with the equipment if the Board wanted to do this in the future.

Mr. Bennett wondered if the existing buses circulated outside air. Mr. Pangborn said that they had roof vents and windows. The newer buses did not have sliding windows; they had slit windows at the top of the windows. The windows and vents did help, especially when the bus was moving.

Mr. Bennett commented that the air conditioner would add the dimension of bringing in outside air whether cooling it a little or a lot. He thought it was a combination of things

that gave LTD the best chance of increasing its competitive edge, but he was not sure what that combination was.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff were asking the Board if they were on the right track. Mr. Bennett said he had pushed real hard for these kinds of amenities. He was not sure he was right, and would be interested in hearing from the other Board members.

Mr. Bailey said the Board had talked about this, and he wanted to jump on the more-convenient and filled-with-amenities bandwagon. He thought it would attract more choice customers; although there was some risk in trying to figure out which amenities would do the trick, the District would not really know until it tried something. He said he was fully behind the idea.

Mr. Kleger said he had thought about this a lot. The wheelchair bays were in the front of the buses, where lights were not turned on after dark, so he was not able to read on the bus after dark. He thought that air conditioning was not worth the money if it just served those with no alternative transportation, but should help in marketing to other markets. He thought that it was the time to do this. He agreed with staff that going ahead with the TV arrangements before knowing for sure the legal environment was not a good move, and he thought it would not be that difficult to retrofit the buses later. He said he liked what staff were recommending for a start.

Mr. Phillips spoke from the audience, saying that in trying to get work done on the bus, he would be upset to have a radio or television program broadcast if he could not turn it off; that would be too distracting. He said that a lot of people he rode with did work of various kinds on the bus, and he thought they would find it distracting, as well.

Mr. Saydack asked if staff had decided which routes to use the air conditioned buses on. Mr. Pangborn said that because the smaller buses would do the feeder loops, in some cases those bus assignments would be dictated by capacity. The three 40-foot buses could be assigned everywhere. They also would have automated passenger counting (APC) equipment, to count ridership in a sampling process, so they would move through the fleet. In some ways, everyone would have a chance to drive or ride them. Mr. Saydack suggested using them for the September football games.

Ms. Hocken said that she thought nine buses was a good experiment to see if these items were necessary and popular and what the maintenance costs would be. She stated that she liked the staff recommendation.

#### MOTION

Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Board of Directors approves the inclusion of individual reading lights, AM/FM radios, air conditioning, and more colorful interiors on the six 30-foot buses and three 40-foot buses currently on order." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken commented that she agreed with Mr. Phillips of the audience, that LTD probably did not want to make everyone on the bus listen to the radio unless it was a pre- or post-game show, so riders probably would need individual access.



## VOTE

There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unanimously, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Ms. Hellekson stated that approval of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) that evening meant that it would become part of the staff recommendation to the Budget Committee in April, but it could be changed. Also, approving the CIP did not mean that the money would be spent; the District would need grant approval first, and the timing of expenditures was sometimes difficult to anticipate.

Ms. Hellekson reviewed the history of the Capital Fund. She explained that grants had a three-year life and sometimes were allowed to carry forward for a year. The money was drawn down by the District as it was spent. She stated that the current year budget had anticipated that LTD would spend almost \$12 million, but it would be closer to \$7 million. The unspent balance is carried forward and included in the following year's CIP as part of that proposal. The District had been deliberately building a cash balance carry-forward in anticipation of fleet replacement and expansion and a decrease in future federal funding.

Ms. Hellekson said that the proposal had changed since the agenda packet was distributed. She explained the handout and went through each category, explaining the major changes.

Ms. Hellekson informed the Board that Oregon had been designated as a pilot program for an Oregon Transportation Infrastructure Bank (OTIB) and had \$10 million in the program. LTD's application ranked third in the state. If the legislation passed in the state legislature and LTD received letters of agreement with its partner agencies, the District's application for a signal prioritization project could be funded. She stated that staff would not sign a loan agreement with the State without letting the Board know first.

Ms. Hellekson explained that staff were recommending a fairly large unallocated contingency total because of the Eugene Station construction. She explained how the District would pay for the CIP in FY 97-98, stating that the funding authorizations virtually had all been identified, and that a \$22,000 unfunded balance would not be a problem. The grand total was \$11,700,000. Staff anticipated \$9,500,000 in grant funding and \$280,000 in local match. The Special Transportation Program (STP) would provide \$1,600,000 if the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) is reauthorized. Staff recommended that the Board approve \$11,689,560 for the FY 97-98 CIP.

Ms. Hocken asked if somewhere between \$1 million and \$2 million for local match was included in the total. Ms. Hellekson said that the total included the local match, some of which would be at 20 percent and some at 11 percent. Those funds already had been deposited and were available.

Ms. Murphy asked about the administrative fleet. Mr. Pangborn explained that those were vehicles used for District business, bus operator shuttles, etc., and that after being driven approximately 100,000 miles the vehicles were traded out.

Mr. Bailey asked if STP funds required approval of the Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI). Mr. Pangborn said that they did not; they were federal pass-through funds. Ms. Hellekson added that LTD's transportation plan had to be included in the state transportation plan, so that was done based on certain assumptions before funding was known.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the proposed Capital Improvements Program for fiscal years 1997-98 through 2001-02 is approved as presented." Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Mr. Saydack asked about the motion including a five-year program. Ms. Hellekson replied that the Board would approve all five years of the plan, but most of the known portion was in the first year. The CIP was subject to availability of grant funding and keeping the projects on time.

Mr. Saydack asked how this fit with the Budget Committee process. Ms. Hellekson replied that the Board was not adopting the CIP budget. Approval of the CIP that evening gave staff approval to put the plan in the budget recommendation for the following year.

Ms. Hocken clarified that funding approval was basically for the next fiscal year, not five years. Mr. Kleger added that the Board received a five-year plan each year. Ms. Hellekson stated that the Board would review the 20-year Long-Range Financial Plan at the next meeting, and that the bus rapid transit (BRT) project made it much easier to make 20-year projections for capital needs.

Mr. Bennett stated that he supported the resolution with Mr. Saydack's clarification about approving one year only. He commented on the high-quality presentation, saying he had read the materials and they were clear and not too detailed, so a lay person could follow them.

**VOTE** There was no further discussion, and the resolution to approve the CIP as presented carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

**DRAFT LTD STRATEGIC BUSINESS PLAN:** Mr. Pangborn stated that the Board had received copies of the draft strategic plan the previous month. He reviewed the process for development of the plan, stating that the Board had developed the basic plan at its strategic planning work session in November and had given direction for a few issues that remained, which staff had continued to work on and included in the draft plan. Staff wanted to discuss those changes with the Board before releasing the draft plan to the community.

Marketing Representative Dan Tutt stated that the Board had generated a follow-up list, which the staff had worked on. The largest amount of work on the plan itself was on language and making it consistent throughout. He explained the changes to the plan, and said that the next step would be for staff to generate a public copy to be available in April for public review and comment.

Mr. Pangborn discussed the follow-up issues from the Board's November work session. He listed the issues and dates when further work was done: Transportation Demand Management (TDM) - December 18, 1996, work session; revisions to strategic plan - March 19, 1997, work session; clarify role of the TransPlan - December 18, 1996, and January 15, 1997; broad-based community education - February 19, 1997; fare questions - February and March, 1997, with further discussion to be scheduled during the year; consider changes to Group Pass Program - Ms. Hocken would be talking with LCC President Jerry Moskus, and then more Board discussion would be scheduled; Annual Route Review - February and March, 1997; Service Policy - January 1997; Long-Range Financial Plan - scheduled for April 1997; Capital Improvements Program - March 1997; moving into the future folder/BRT and strategic plan - April 1997. He stated that there were some continuing Board questions, so some issues would be revisited, but the first year of the plan basically had been accomplished.

MOTION  
VOTE

Mr. Bailey moved that the LTD Draft Strategic Plan be released for review and comment by the public. Mr. Bennett/Saydack seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. Mr. Kleger thanked staff for all their work.

**EUGENE STATION BUDGET:** Mr. Viggiano explained that the Board Eugene Station Committee had met and was recommending an increase in the project budget by \$50,000, based on an increase in expenditures for artwork and on the results of \$163,000 worth of deductive change orders for the Phase 2 contract, which did not quite meet the goal of \$175,000 in deductions. The committee members believed that the changes being recommended still maintained the functionality, durability, and attractiveness of the project.

Mr. Viggiano explained that one part of the artwork proposal had been approved: the glass over the archways at the bus entrances. The first recommendation for additional art work was for pavement treatment in the plaza area at 10th and Olive, and the second priority was for similar pavement treatment on the plaza on east side of that bus drive. The Art Selection Committee's third-highest priority was to use colored prisms rather than glass block in the clock tower. Mr. Viggiano explained the proposals, and said that these were the first three priorities of the Art Selection Committee, of which Mr. Saydack was a member, and were being recommended by the Board Eugene Station Committee. These three items amounted to approximately \$48,000. A fourth priority, the addition of art atop the clock tower, was not recommended by the Eugene Station Committee. This item had an estimated cost of \$40,000.

Mr. Saydack said he thought the glasswork in the arches worked very nicely with the pavement.

Mr. Kleger said, for the record, that the station committee made a priority preference when it had to make cuts. As much as possible, it made cuts that could be later replaced, with a short-term, temporary effect chosen over a long-term, permanent effect. He said that the committee did not want to skimp on the long-term capital investment.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors increases the budget for the Eugene Station project by \$50,000 for the addition of art project funding as recommended by the Board Eugene Station Committee." Mr. Saydack seconded, and the resolution passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Park and Ride Draft Plan:** Mr. Viggiano explained how the Park & Ride process had evolved and what staff had learned as they went through the process. He said that they had started with what might be described as a typical approach to Park & Ride facilities, which every community did; basically, that was to estimate the need and try to find a location to meet that need. Preference changed from on-site bus circulation to a better idea for the West 11th site, and maybe for other sites throughout the corridor, which was an option where the bus would not have to pull on-site, thus saving a minimum of two to three minutes (pulling onto the River Road Transit Station took seven to nine minutes).

Mr. Viggiano stated that the biggest shift was to look at keeping buses on the arterial, similar to the bus stops at the smaller, leased Park & Ride spaces in the system. Other important considerations were the need to be located on the main corridor, preferably on the in-bound side of the street, and to be located by a traffic signal for pedestrian crossings. These considerations led to another conclusion: because the buses would not be pulling onto the site, the District could opt to build more, smaller Park & Ride facilities. This meant a lower investment and more choices for riders if LTD offered two small instead of one large Park & Ride, and also offered the opportunity for more incremental investment.

Mr. Viggiano said that a suggested strategy that would work well with the BRT concept was to (1) have a Park & Ride at the end of the line with a bus turnaround and transfers from feeder buses; (2) consider more, smaller Park & Ride facilities (with 50 to 75 spaces) along the corridor (although this may not be the approach on every corridor if it made sense to build larger Park & Ride facilities on some corridors); (3) have easy access and good geographical coverage; (4) be located on the corridor; (5) not have the bus deviate onto the site; and (6) locate near signalized intersections. He requested Board feedback at some point before the staff continued working on this draft plan.

Mr. Viggiano stated that in the short term, the Fred Meyer site could be the current end-of-the-line location at the corridor's west end. Ten-year demand projections were for 100 to 120 total spaces within the West 11th corridor. The Fred Meyer site would provide 45 spaces, so 60 to 70 more spaces would be needed along the corridor. In the long term, the end of the line likely would be at 11th and Bertelsen, especially after addition of the circumferential route, which would connect the spokes of four corridors. In addition to having a Park & Ride facility at this location, this would be the station anticipated in TransPlan, with transfers between buses and possibly connections from feeder buses. Twenty-year demand was estimated at 200 to 225 total spaces, which would mean three or four Park & Ride facilities along the West 11th portion of the corridor.

Mr. Viggiano discussed the typical Park & Ride selection process used by LTD to select the Thurston site and used so far in selecting the Fred Meyer site. That process included estimating the demand, establishing criteria, investigating potential sites and ranking them against the criteria, selecting the top sites for a Level I environmental site assessment (ESA), performing an environmental assessment (EA) for federally-funded sites, selecting a site, and providing a public participation process.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the River Road Transit Station had one user for every 270 people in the area served. This Park & Ride was expected to grow over time because the population in the market area would grow and because use of Park & Ride facilities was becoming more and more attractive, with parking prices increasing and parking becoming more scarce. Within ten years, staff estimated that there would be one space used for every 200 people in the area, and within 20 years, one use for every 135 people.

Mr. Viggiano next discussed the establishment of criteria. Rather than use many detailed criteria as had been done in the past, staff would concentrate on the important criteria in order to find six or eight that had the most influence on siting and take those to the Board for review and approval prior to site investigation. Other steps would include identifying the boundaries for the site; field investigation; asking for proposals from property owners to help identify properly-zoned sites and alternative sites for the EA; collecting various information (assessment, zoning, size, etc.); touring the sites if necessary; site plans for the most feasible sites, including using an engineer to determine access issues, etc., but with most of the work being done by staff; evaluating the sites against the criteria using a simple rating system; and public participation, including proposals from owners, public hearings, and neighborhood meetings. Mr. Viggiano said that the real value of the Branch Engineering report was in identifying the appropriate sites, not in the detailed ranking of the sites.

Mr. Bennett asked if this would allow the best opportunity for comparison during the EA. Mr. Viggiano said that it would; staff wanted to truly compare viable and attractive alternatives and investigate them thoroughly.

Mr. Viggiano next used a map to discuss one option for the West 11th Park & Ride facility. He explained that staff had not done an extensive evaluation of alternative sites, but were considering one site at 13th and Chambers, at the southeast corner of the intersection. The property was owned by the City and currently housed the Army, Navy, and Marines, who evidently were planning to move to a new location. Staff did not originally look this far east, but were considering it as an alternative because they were considering having the inbound BRT line travel on 13th Avenue. Chambers Street was a major arterial from the south and would provide good access for the southern neighborhoods. Staff had only a preliminary discussion with City staff; there was no commitment by either party. The City had considered building a youth work center, low-income housing, or some similar type of facility on that property, all of which would work with a Park & Ride site.

Mr. Bennett stated that this might be one consideration for more research, based on a substantially different approach of providing more locations with fewer spaces at each location.

Ms. Hocken stated that 13th and Chambers would not be the outbound corridor for BRT. Mr. Viggiano said that this was a concern regarding this site; the current corridor alignment would cause a two-block walk for outbound riders. However, the #77 route from the University to downtown Eugene could be an option, since it traveled to 13th and Chambers. Another option would be for BRT to work in both directions on 13th Avenue; it would be easier to do this on 13th than on 11th. He said that improvements at the Fairgrounds, etc., may allow two travel lanes eastbound and two bus lanes, without having to purchase too much right-of-way.

Ms. Hocken said that if 13th were not used for the corridor, the District might have to put the Park & Ride further west on 11th Avenue. Mr. Viggiano agreed; it might have to be west of Garfield.

Mr. Viggiano also discussed a suggested schedule for the West 11th Park & Ride site selection process. He said that criteria would be established in April, to reflect the criteria that the District had been using. Potential sites could be identified in May, with further investigation occurring in May and June, site ranking in June, a Level I ESA and appraisal estimate in July, and EA work completed and site selection in December. He explained that this would slow down the process, but selecting the Fred Meyer site had bought time. He commented that the Cole site originally had been the only site to meet the criteria of those studied. Staff hoped that this process would determine what other sites might be appropriate as alternatives in the EA process.

Mr. Saydack stated that action taken so far with the Cole site was to identify one of the sites for the EA. Mr. Viggiano said that was correct, and the EA held a broad direction to find an alternative site or sites. Mr. Saydack asked if the 13th and Chambers site was a new site that could be evaluated in the EA. Mr. Viggiano said that it was too early to say, but the City was comfortable with him mentioning it to the Board that evening.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff wanted Board direction on this evolving concept that staff and the Board had developed together as they had gone through the initial site selection process. If the Board agreed, staff would develop a Park & Ride plan based on that strategy.

Mr. Kleger said that he liked it a lot, and thought it addressed a lot of the Board's concerns.

Ms. Hocken asked if staff were proposing to come back to the Board in April with six to eight criteria. Mr. Viggiano said that they were. They might want to refine and change the criteria in the future, but probably would use pretty much the same criteria for future projects.

Mr. Bennett said that the criteria and process made sense to him, too. He agreed that they had been using the criteria Mr. Viggiano had enumerated, to some degree, but it could be confusing to someone who looked at the original Branch report. However, he said, that report did not address some of the most important criteria. He said this was an opportunity

to clear up some of that and that the opportunity to use the EA to establish some alternative sites in addition to the one that currently met the criteria. He added that taking a hard look at more sites and locations along the way for an express bus lent itself to that approach.

Mr. Saydack agreed. He thought that what staff were suggesting in a sense formalized a lot of the issues the Board had looked at in the last six to eight months as it had gone through the analysis, which to him was a natural part of the process. He said the Board had always looked at the site on West 11th, other than the end-of-the-line site, as a decision that was in process, and the Board was at a preliminary point in the process. He said that he liked this proposal a lot, and was interested in the 13th and Chambers site.

Ms. Murphy said that after the work session on BRT and the site tour, she believed that the District was refining and learning as it went along. She thought that a corridor tour would help her visualize things better, and said she appreciated the approach being suggested.

Mr. Viggiano added that staff were investigating other sites, so he did not want it to seem that the 13th and Chambers site would be the only one under consideration.

Mr. Kleger said he thought it was important to mention that staff were feeling the way with what worked in a community of this size. He said that much of what was going on in larger communities did not always translate to communities of Eugene/Springfield's size. He said the District had to deal with both the future and what it had to deal with currently. He said he thought this looked like a better approach than the original one.

Mr. Saydack asked if staff needed the Board to take action. Mr. Viggiano said they did not; the approval of the proposed direction was clear from the Board's comments.

**Fred Meyer Park & Ride: Executive Session:** There was no staff presentation.

MOTION Mr. Saydack moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions, and pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(f), to consider records that are exempt by law from public inspection. Mr. Kleger seconded, and the VOTE motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. The Executive Session began at 9:40 p.m.

**Return to Open Session:** The Board unanimously returned to regular session at 10:00 p.m. upon a motion by Mr. Bailey and seconding by Mr. Saydack.

**Board Member's Community Involvement:** Mr. Kleger stated that he had been asked to participate in a series of public forums for people with disabilities on the Talgo Train by the Washington State Department of Transportation. The first meeting was scheduled for April 15 in Eugene. He also planned to meet with a group from Germany under the auspices of Mobility International regarding how accessible service began in Eugene years ago.

**Eugene Station Update:** Mr. Saydack asked for a construction update. Facility Services Manager Charlie Simmons said that construction was on schedule and things were going very well; overall, it was very positive, and the contractor had a very positive attitude. Mr. Simmons stated that staff would begin conducting tours on the first Tuesday of each month at noon. Board members were welcome to attend then or at a separate time. Since it was a restricted, hard hat area, those wishing to tour the site were asked to call and reserve a space on the tour. Mr. Saydack suggested showing the construction on the LTD TV show. Ms. Murphy asked if someone was annotating the progress with a video camera. Mr. Simmons replied that the construction manager was taking both videos and photographs, daily and weekly.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

C:\WPDATA\BDM0319.DOC