

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 21, 1997

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 15, 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, May 21, 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
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.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: There was no one in the audience who wished to speak to the Board.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Hocken introduced Bus Operator Mary York, the June 1997 Employee of the Month. Ms. York was hired on January 6, 1997, and had been nominated by a customer for excellence in service and job accomplishments and excellence in providing accessible bus service to customers with disabilities. The customer had reported that Ms. York was very pleasant and friendly in greeting all passengers, as well as helpful and patient in communicating with a man with severe speech impediments. Additionally, after learning of a detour in the route, she handled the situation calmly and reassured the customers and helped them make their connections on time.

When asked what made Ms. York a good employee, Transit Operations Manager Patricia Hansen said, "Mary has stood out from the first day she started training with us only four months ago, and she may very well hold the record for being the newest operator to receive an Employee of the Month award. It is certainly an auspicious start for what I'm sure will be a very successful career for Mary at LTD. Her pleasant and positive attitude contributes to her ability to get along so well with her customers, peers, and supervisors. We are all very glad to have Mary on our LTD team!"

Ms. Hocken presented Ms. York with her certificate and monetary award. Ms. York thanked the Board very much, saying that she was very happy to be at LTD and wished that she had done so a long time ago. She said it had been a very pleasant experience, and she looked forward to being at work and meeting the people on her bus, because it felt like a family and was a very pleasant place to be.

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 21, 1997, is approved as presented." Mr. Saydack seconded, and the Consent Calendar was approved by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and no one opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the April 16, 1997, regular Board meeting, minutes of the April 30, 1997, special Board meeting/work session, and the FY 97-98 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goals.

TRANSPORTATION AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATION: Transit Planner Lisa Gardner explained that the Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) program was administered jointly by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The program's mission was to enhance Oregon's livability and foster integrated, compact land use and alternative transportation modes, such as bicycles and transit usage. LTD had been involved in this program in the past, but had received the funding through the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). Projects that had used TGM grant funds included the Urban Rail Feasibility Study and research to support the TransPlan Update. LTD currently had a contract for a TGM grant in the amount of \$12,000 to conduct an analysis of alternative transit strategies. The proposed application was the first year that staff were not recommending a joint project with LCOG.

Ms. Gardner explained that LTD had submitted a pre-application notice to ODOT and DLCD to indicate LTD's intention to submit a grant application for \$75,000 for a BRT project to study bus stop locations and spacing, corridor alignment, and the integration of mixed-use development areas and transit. This project would fit well with the BRT demonstration project by allowing LTD to proceed with the project for another year in the event that the District did not receive the federal funding for the demonstration project.

Mr. Saydack asked who would conduct the study and how staff determined that the application should be for \$75,000. Ms. Gardner replied that staff believed that it would be conducted by a consultant. Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano explained that this amount was a "guesstimate" based on what had been spent during the last year. He said that it would cost about \$75,000 if LTD continued the same level of planning and design effort for the next two years.

Mr. Saydack asked what kind of product LTD would expect to receive. Mr. Viggiano said the product would include plans for what the corridor alignment actually would be, plans for integrating bus stops with nodal development, etc. Ms. Gardner said that ODOT and DLCD also would expect some kind of final product, whether that be a report or actual plans, and that would be part of the contract for receiving the funds.

Mr. Bailey asked if receiving the grant would lock LTD into completing the project or lock LTD into any decisions regarding system organization or routing. Ms. Gardner replied that LTD would have to proceed with the study, but it would be useful even if there were no BRT project. There would be no further commitment beyond the study. LTD would share the findings with LCOG but would manage the grant itself. Mr. Viggiano added that LTD could refuse the grant if it wished to.

Mr. Bennett asked when LTD would hear about the federal demonstration grant. Ms. Loobey explained that demonstration funds would be part of the reauthorization of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). October 1 would be the date by which Congress should have written and authorized the next generation of ISTEA, so the District would hope to know by then whether or not the demonstration project had been funded.

Public Hearing on Transportation and Growth Management Program Grant Application: Ms. Hocken opened the public hearing on the District's proposed grant application for TGM funding. There was no testimony, and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION **Board Discussion and Decision:** 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 Transportation and Growth Management Grant Program in the amount of \$75,000 for a Bus Rapid Transit Pilot Corridor Study." Mr. Kleger seconded, and VOTE the resolution passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

SECOND READING AND ADOPTION--SIXTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO 35. AN ORDINANCE SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES: Ms. Loobey stated that the Board had held a public hearing on the proposed change in RideSource fares and accomplished the first reading of the amended ordinance at the April 16, 1997, Board meeting.

MOTION Mr. Saydack moved, seconded by Mr. Kleger, that Sixth Amended Ordinance No. 35 VOTE be read by title only. The motion carried unanimously, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken read the ordinance by title: "Sixth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services." Additional copies of the ordinance were available to the audience.

MOTION Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved VOTE that the Board of Directors adopts Sixth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services, effective 30 days after adoption." Mr. Bennett 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.

FISCAL YEAR 1996-97 BUDGET TRANSFER: Ms. Hellekson stated that in the last two or three months staff had brought to the Board a number of agenda items related to

BRT and community outreach. In most of those instances there had been a request for Board approval of the additional activities in support of BRT and community outreach, and staff received that approval from the Board.

She stated that this item would approve the formal transfers of funding that would fund certain of these items in the current fiscal year that were not included in the original adopted budget. Those items were production of BRT display materials for a community support campaign (\$20,000); additional BRT engineering expenses related to the identification and configuration of a pilot corridor (\$10,000); and additional temporary professional services support for public relations and a community campaign (\$11,000), for a total of \$41,000. She stated that funds were available in contingency for these expenses.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the Resolution transferring \$41,000 from the General Fund Operating Contingency account to the General Fund Materials and Services accounts as follows: \$20,000 to Planning and Development Contractual Services, \$10,000 to Planning and Development engineering Services, and \$11,000 to Public Affairs Contractual Services. Ms. Murphy seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken wanted to make it clear that even though the Resolution listed the detail of what the funds would be used for, the Board was only appropriating at the level of Materials and Services.

VOTE

There was no further discussion, and the Resolution passed on a vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

CITY OF EUGENE URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM: Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn explained that some people viewed the elimination of the urban renewal districts as one way to retain \$1.6 million in tax money. He stated that LTD had been directly and indirectly the beneficiary of downtown urban renewal projects, with such projects as the current Eugene Station, the new Eugene Station, surface parking lots, and the new parking structure. He said that LTD should be aware of the possible loss of the urban renewal districts because the concept of urban renewal was to redevelop downtown and bring back vitality to the urban core, and LTD was best able to serve riders to and from the downtown area. The District was most likely able to get people to ride the bus and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) if they were going downtown to work. The Council planned to discuss this issue on June 23, and LTD had been asked by the Eugene Chamber of Commerce to weigh in with support of the continuation of urban renewal. There was no staff recommendation.

Mr. Bennett said that he hoped that the LTD Board would support the continuation of both urban renewal districts. He thought the issues had been laid out very well and carefully by Mr. Pangborn in the agenda materials and his comments. Mr. Bennett stated that a segment of the community had always attacked urban renewal with the argument that it took property tax money to some degree and allocated it at the front end for a segment of the community in a particular way, so those funds did not go through the general fund allocation process with the same level of scrutiny as other funds. However, Mr. Bennett said, his argument and the argument of others was that the downtown area was probably

the most important commercial area in the community, not because every business should be there or because it did the most business, or there weren't other important areas. It was because, as many people in the community believed, unless there was a successful, viable, improving downtown, there would not be a successful community. While downtown had achieved some increasing level of improvement and success, particularly during the last four or five years, for a number of years, he said, the majority of the community did not go downtown on a regular basis, and he thought that some prioritization of downtown was going to be necessary for a long time, and to abandon the effort was short-sighted.

Mr. Bennett stated, in declaring a "potential conflict," that, as everyone knew, he was a private business owner downtown and a founding member of Downtown Eugene, Incorporated (DEI), had been on the City Council, and was active in the Chamber of Commerce, but he did want to make a case for the continuation of urban renewal. He was hopeful that LTD, in its own best interest, as well as the interests of the community, would support the continuation of the urban renewal concept.

Mr. Bailey declared a potential conflict of interest because one of the two districts involved the University of Oregon (UO), where he was employed, in partnership with the City of Eugene. As a private citizen, he said, he wanted to speak to the issues of transportation systems and the effects of land use decisions on those systems. He said that elimination of an urban renewal district or any other structure that served to create greater density for land use development, which promotes alternative modes of transportation, would make it harder for LTD to achieve its mission and for the community to plan for the kind of community it wanted to have. He said he thought that would be the wrong direction to go, and he concurred with Mr. Bennett's assessment.

Mr. Kleger said that he had concerns over the years with the process of tax increment financing, but he was pleased with what he had seen in downtown the last few years. Downtown had more people working in it than ever in its history, and he thought that was due to the urban renewal program. Also, the street system was such that LTD could not run its system without going downtown, and if people were not working there, LTD would be in a poor position to sell its service. He said he did not think that cutting off a successful promotional effort was a good idea. He did not have an objection to business development in other parts of town, but did not want to see Eugene end up with an empty hole in the middle of the city, like a donut. He thought the needs for the expenditures were going to remain. He stated that results do not happen overnight; the downtown area did not show a substantial turnaround for quite a few years, and probably the same thing was happening at the UO. He thought that stopping now would throw away what had been invested already. He supported the Board expressing its support for continuation of the program.

Mr. Bennett suggested that Ms. Hocken, Ms. Loobey, or Mr. Pangborn might take the opportunity to meet with Vicky Elmer, the new Eugene City Manager, and express the Board's position and the reasons for it. Ms. Hocken said she thought a formal letter should be sent to the Council, and then maybe the Board could follow up with personal calls to the Councilors.

Ms. Murphy said she supported the concept, but she lived in Springfield, so this was not her city's issue at that time.

Mr. Saydack said he thought the statement in the agenda materials did a good job of explaining the importance of urban renewal to the mission of LTD. He thought that the goals that LTD was trying to accomplish would be an important point to make. He said he wanted to go on record as supporting the urban renewal programs.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved that the Board express its support for the continuation of the urban renewal districts and request the Board President to send a letter of support to the Eugene City Council. Mr. Saydack seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken added that she and staff would try to follow up with Mr. Bennett's suggestion to meet with Ms. Elmer.

Ms. Loobey said that it was interesting how many cities across the country were trying to deal with the flight of jobs out of the central city. It was very difficult for transit to serve that "donut" that Mr. Kleger was talking about very effectively and efficiently. To see where the value of urban renewal made a difference, she said, they should look at Portland in 1950 and today, and Portland's commitment to urban renewal and alternate modes. She said she did not think Eugene/Springfield had that mass yet, where it could cut off urban renewal. She said that some of the critics talked about the difference, which was not very much, only about 6 cents or so, but people forget that investments are made on the fringe of the city that are not made in the downtown core, and most of that development comes through the state gasoline tax, such as improvements along Highway 99 or West 11th and other major corridors. Those same kinds of funds were not available in the urban renewal district because they typically were not state highways. She said that there was a balance of the investment; it just comes from different pots, and often critics did not look at the total picture. She said that the continuation of urban renewal was vital to LTD's interests, and she appreciated the Board's support.

VOTE The vote on Mr. Kleger's motion to support continuation of Eugene's urban renewal districts carried on a vote of 5 to 0, with Mr. Bailey abstaining and Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor.

PROCEDURES FOR RECEIVING PUBLIC TESTIMONY: Ms. Hocken said that the draft procedures found on page 55 of the agenda packet would institutionalize the procedures the Board had been following for the last several months, and would formalize the process.

MOTION Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the Resolution adopting procedures for receiving public testimony. Mr. Saydack seconded the motion.

Mr. Kleger observed that when he first came on the LTD Board, the Board went several months without hearing any comments. He said he would rather have comments and public input than none, and he thought it was nice that the Board was in a situation where it needed to formalize its procedures.

Mr. Bennett wondered whether using the statement "a large number" in item 5 and the number "20 people" in item 7 would be confusing and limit the flexibility of the presiding officer. Ms. Hocken said she did not see those two items as being directly related, and did not think they were mutually exclusive. She thought that both #5 and #7 could be used at the same meeting, but most of the time #5 would not apply. Both would be at the option of the presiding officer, so she did not think it would be too cumbersome.

Mr. Bailey said he agreed with Mr. Kleger's comments about public testimony in the past. He said that when he came on the LTD Board, one of his goals was for LTD to have a more active role and visibility. He thought it was invigorating that the Board had public testimony, and he also thought it was important to have a policy. He asked if item 9, restricting the use of flags and banners, had been reviewed with Counsel and whether Counsel had an opinion on its constitutional rights. Ms. Sullivan said she had taken that section from the City of Eugene's policy, and District Counsel had removed the phrase "for safety and comfort reasons" that was used by the City. Mr. Kleger said he was glad to see this item listed in the procedures, because he had been in situations when the use of banners and sticks in a small room the size of the Board Room was dangerous. He saw it simply as a public safety issue. Mr. Saydack asked Ms. Sullivan to ask Counsel about putting that phrase back in. He thought that the District could have restrictions on time, place, and manner of speech as long as they were related to certain purposes, such as safety, and a room the size of the Board Room could necessitate some restrictions for safety reasons.

Mr. Saydack said he thought it was good to have this procedure formalized, and he also thought it was important to have item #11 listed as part of the process, so that the Board and staff would have the expectation that they would respond to testimony in order to keep the District's record straight and accurate.

Ms. Murphy said she liked to see these procedures formalized and articulated because, as individuals, the Board members had no power, but they made decisions collectively. She said that as people called her, she encouraged them to come to meetings and share with the Board as a whole, so that their complaints or comments became part of the public record.

Mr. Saydack suggested adopting the Resolution as it was written, and have staff ask District Counsel about item 9. He said the Board could revise the procedures the following month if necessary. Mr. Bailey said he would be comfortable with that course of action.

VOTE

There was no further discussion, and the Resolution adopting procedures for receiving public testimony was approved by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and no one opposed.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Board Member Reports: Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC): Mr. Bennett said that the grant preapplication program Ms. Gardner had talked about had passed MPC with clear sailing. He said also that there were opportunities to schedule meetings with the

elected boards and councils, and that he thought the District should try to do that at every opportunity. At MPC, Commissioner Steve Cornacchia had commented that he had a brief discussion with Mr. Bailey and suggested that he would like to have written materials to review and that the two boards should meet. Mr. Bennett had asked staff for some basic background material to be prepared, and said he had promised Commissioner Cornacchia that he would call to answer any questions. Mr. Bennett thought it would be helpful if Commissioner Cornacchia could get the significant technical information first and then have a discussion about it, and then a meeting of the boards as a whole.

Ms. Loobey said that staff were preparing the technical information and had been in contact with Lane County Administrator Bill Van Vactor to follow through with the suggestion for a joint meeting. She said she appreciated Commissioner Cornacchia's willingness to meet.

Ms. Murphy added that Commissioner Ellie Dumdi had contacted her regarding LTD TV on Channel 11 and they also discussed a meeting of the two boards. Commissioner Dumdi thought a meeting might have to wait until after Lane County's budget discussions.

Walkabout: Ms. Murphy said she had been on jury duty during May, and two Springfield residents had approached her regarding Eugene being the main corridor or hub of activity, and were concerned about taking 1.5 hours to go from the Thurston area through the Springfield and Eugene Stations, to Valley River Center. They said they wanted to use that mode of transportation to get to their job site, but felt that 90 minutes was unreasonable. She asked them to call the Customer Service Center (CSC) and see if there were different routes. Mr. Bailey said he had met with Lane County Commissioners Cornacchia, Weeldreyer, and Dumdi, and they had raised the issue of wanting more information on bus rapid transit (BRT). Mr. Saydack said that as he had been talking about the general concept of BRT he had found interest, openness, concern about the cost and impact in the community, and a desire for more information and what the community in general thinks about BRT. He said that people who were willing to look ahead to solve problems were receptive to the idea, but cautious because of the cost and impact. There was a need for more public dialog about the process.

Statewide Livability Forum: Ms. Hocken explained that the Governor had established this forum, which included 12 advisors to manage a forum of about 60 people from around the state, and the group had held its first meeting. Susan Brody, Chris Andersen, and Dave Frohnmayer were on the board of advisors, and Ms. Hocken was in the group of 60. The idea was to get people from the Willamette Valley to discuss future transportation, land use, and other core issues. Ms. Hocken said she was the only person out of 60 with a direct transit connection, but most were supportive of transit and other alternate modes. She said she thought the forum would be able to get some things accomplished during the next couple of years.

April Financial Statement: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that the payroll tax revenues would exceed budget for the year by a slight amount. She had begun plans for an in-house compliance program that was part of the budget presentations and funded for the next fiscal year. She said there was a large collection problem last quarter with the

self-employment tax, and to a lesser extent with the payroll tax. The State was behind in processing state income tax returns. The self-employment tax had exceeded budget because a significant amount of the tax returns that had been received were from 1995. State in-lieu-of taxes had been a little under budget, and fares would be on budget. Expenses also were expected to come in on budget. Ms. Hellekson said that the banking services transition had gone extremely well. Staff expected to terminate the District's relationship with Wells Fargo on the morning of May 29, after making sure that all checks cleared. The first payroll had gone through Bank of America two weeks previously and all had gone well.

BRT Corridor Site Inspection Tour: The Board members discussed what they had thought and seen on the BRT corridor site tour. Ms. Murphy asked for a clarification of the jog down 13th and 18th Avenues in Eugene and whether that was being considered as a package. Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that staff had wanted to show what alternatives were in that area. The corridor had been considered to be Main Street out to West 11th. The issue of whether to operate on 11th or 13th or both in that couplet was still open. The options were that LTD could travel with flow, westbound on 11th and eastbound on 13, or to operate in both directions on 13th; others may surface as well. There also was the option of using either 11th or 18th west of Chambers. Two different markets would be served by these two routes, and eventually it might be wise to have the BRT line branch and serve both. He said that this was a good time to discuss the options, since LTD was still in the planning process.

Mr. Viggiano mentioned that the guided bus concept was a new concept for the United States. He handed out additional information and asked for the Board's reaction. Guided buses were used in five places in the world and were very successful.

Graham Carey of JRH Transportation Engineering said that guided buses were an exciting concept that would work well with BRT and reinforce LTD's position as an innovative organization. He listed the advantages as being less expensive, environmentally friendly (allowing the District to put back some of the green strip), noise reduction, and costing only about \$1,000 per bus to retrofit. The guided system used curbs and guide wheels connected to steering, so it did not take the force of rails and was cheaper to construct. He suggested that LTD could learn from other systems using guided buses.

Mr. Saydack asked if the main point was to keep cars out of exclusive bus ways. Mr. Carey replied that the main reason to use guided buses was the need for less right-of-way. It would use an 8.5-foot-wide corridor rather than the typical 12-foot-wide lane. It was difficult for anyone else to use this lane, so would be self-enforcing. An extra, small wheel would extend only an extra two inches, so the bus could be driven anywhere else in traffic, as well.

Ms. Murphy asked about a maximum speed and standard brakes. Mr. Carey replied that the system in Leeds travels up to 62 miles per hour and can enter the special lanes at 40 miles per hour. The system depends on bus brakes.

Mr. Bennett said that on the tour staff had pointed out the area where the most difficult challenges might be, involving old trees and development close to the street, along east 11th Avenue in Eugene and some other areas in central Springfield past 10th Street. He asked for a sense of the alternatives. Mr. Viggiano replied that that section of east 11th was so built up that it would be difficult to find any place for bus lanes. There were very few westbound alternatives to allow BRT to serve destinations such as Sacred Heart Hospital and the University of Oregon (UO). The District might have to purchase buildings in order to acquire a lane in those areas. Mr. Bennett proposed looking at a grade-change approach, realizing that it would be considerably more expensive, and said that he would appreciate trying to understand the ramifications of a grade change, in order to understand what conversations could be like when trying to move forward with a difficult situation. He asked about cost estimates, and Mr. Carey said that for light rail, using at-grade as a benchmark, the costs would increase six times for an above-ground grade change, and twelve times to go below ground. This would depend on the property that would need to be purchased, and the trade-offs between going above ground or underground. Mr. Viggiano added that ten years ago Seattle took the underground approach for its downtown buses.

Mr. Bennett stated that LTD could incur significant savings by the rubber tire approach. To the extent that these savings are significant, as well as the savings that LTD might have by using a guided system, he wondered if the District might better make the case that there might be certain areas that could be considered at the front end. Mr. Viggiano said that staff could bring back options and cost estimates for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Saydack said that one of the things the site inspection tour brought out for him was the number of areas where it was hard to imagine ever getting an exclusive right-of-way, unless congestion became so severe that people were willing to pay a large expense to correct that (such as removing trees, going above ground, etc.). He said that Seattle and Portland already had those problems. He said there were a couple of ways to look at BRT. One was as a solution to a problem that did not yet exist, as a preventative measure. Another was as a cure for a problem that already existed, and maybe people would need to experience the problem before they would be willing to do what it would take to correct the problem, such as needing a form of transit to get to places where there was a lack of parking. Under those circumstances, maybe some of the concerns about exclusive rights-of-way would not be as great. To him, he said what the tour underscored was the need to make a case for the difference that BRT could make, both in the short term and the long term, and see if there was support in the community for the kinds of changes that would have to occur in order for it to happen.

Mr. Kleger said that the south side of South "A" had a lot of industrial driveways and trucks making right turns. He did not want to create a conflict with industrial traffic. He commented that feeder service could move through the same corridor as BRT and stop every two blocks, particularly along east 11th Avenue, while the BRT buses would stop only every half-mile or so.

Mr. Saydack said that there were enough problems with that corridor that he wondered if that was the corridor the District wanted for a pilot project. He wondered if

there were too many problems to allow LTD to demonstrate the impact BRT could make. He asked about Coburg Road or River Road, and whether those would have a more immediate and dramatic effect. He said he did not know the answer, but thought LTD should keep this question in mind.

Ms. Murphy agreed with Mr. Saydack. She commented on Pioneer Parkway east and west, and thought that the Gateway area should be revisited as an option because of its growth, rather than an industrial area through Springfield. She suggested linking Gateway with Coburg Road or the Beltline Highway, or by going north to Gateway from Main Street. She said that land on both sides of the Depot was still available.

Mr. Bennett stated that in choosing the corridor currently being studied, a technical committee had considered current ridership levels that could be enhanced by a more competitive system, as well as how to have an impact Springfield and Eugene at the same time, with one route. He said he had tried to listen to that carefully in making the decision to go forward with studying this particular corridor. He said he did not think that any one corridor would be easy, and asked if others had the potential to have the impact as the first route that LTD could have in the community with the proposed route. He said that his view was that, because of the reasons he mentioned and the relationship with downtown Eugene and Springfield, the UO, and Sacred Heart, the Board approved going forward with the study. He thought the Board should consider carefully whether it wanted to switch at that point. He said he would rather not do that; he would rather study this route and at a point where all the information was available for review, the Board make a decision as to how to proceed.

Mr. Bailey said he agreed with Mr. Bennett, and made a few observations about the site tour. He said he saw it in a more positive light and that it confirmed and eliminated some of the challenges he thought were there. He said he was not expecting the introduction of the guided bus concept and wanted more information about how that worked, and how the District would work on some of those challenging places. He said that instead of seeing more problems, he saw more opportunities as a result of the tour than he had expected.

Mr. Saydack said that what was needed to proceed with the assessment were more details and a realistic technical study. He wanted to know what exactly LTD could do in the corridor in terms of guided buses and exclusive lanes, the impact on travel time, etc. Then, he said, the Board could make a more realistic assessment and the community could, also.

Ms. Hocken said she shared a lot of Mr. Bailey's reactions. She said she was not surprised that West 11th was a mess, and she did not know how that fit in with what was done in other places. She asked how fast MAX (light rail) moved through downtown Portland. Mr. Viggiano replied that it moved slowly, since it was in stop and go traffic on city streets, and stopped every couple of blocks in the downtown area. However, there were rails in the lane to deter automobiles that LTD would not have with a rubber-tired systems. MAX did have limited stops and moved quickly in outer areas.

Ms. Hocken said she was not saying that LTD should abandon the efforts toward exclusive right-of-way. She needed to see technical information to see how difficult that would be on a block-by-block basis. She said she did not think the District should switch, for all the reasons Mr. Bennett had mentioned; she thought the Board picked the corridor it did because the Coburg Road river crossing was a major impediment. She added that some day LTD may have to deal with that, and possibly build its own bridge or somehow gain access to a bridge that was just for LTD.

Mr. Saydack said that the reasons for selecting West 11th were very strong reasons, and that the support of Sacred Heart and the UO for this concept was very important. Mr. Viggiano said that staff had held some discussions with UO staff and planners, in a fairly conceptual manner, especially regarding the frontage along Franklin. He said that they were supportive of the concept but that a lot more discussion needed to happen.

Ms. Hocken asked about timing and the issue of the TransPlan Update and the demonstration grant funding. She asked how much more technical data LTD needed in order to make the case to the governing bodies, and if it had time to do so. Mr. Viggiano said that with the engineering work that had been completed so far, there were different concepts and techniques that LTD could communicate to others; a communications package was being developed. Better drawings and designs were being developed to help with discussions with the community. He thought that LTD had enough information for people to understand the concept and its impacts, advantages, and disadvantages. That information should be available in late June, when the draft TransPlan was to be released.

Mr. Bennett said that he thought the design, characteristics, amenities, and types of vehicles to be used were very important, and the bus types currently being used would not succeed to the same degree. He said he would not buy any more of those kinds of buses. He said that LTD had to present, along with its plan, its vision for what it could do with a different kind of ride, environment, etc. He said he did not know that the vehicle design was being considered as much as it should, and he hoped that did not get left behind.

Ms. Murphy said she had not heard miles per hour discussed for the corridor, and wondered if light rail had a speed limit. She thought that emergency vehicles could go ten miles per hour faster than posted, and wondered if LTD would adhere to the posted speed limits or apply to go faster. Mr. Viggiano said that this had not been discussed. Staff had assumed that the buses would go the posted speed, which would be faster than buses were able to travel currently. He said that whether there could be a speed limit just for the exclusive bus lanes was an interesting question. Ms. Murphy thought it might be possible to apply for exemptions if LTD could describe safety systems that were in place.

Mr. Viggiano agreed with Mr. Bennett that the image of the bus was important. Some of that image would come across in the informational materials being developed, the corridor, stations, and buses.

Mr. Saydack asked, regarding the cities with guided bus systems, how large a factor that system was within the transit system and how large the cities were, compared with Eugene/Springfield. Mr. Carey said that the largest, Adelaide, the capital of the Southwest

Territory, had a guided bus system 7.5 miles long that was used to link a big suburb to the central area. The other cities were slightly bigger than the Eugene/Springfield area. Leeds had a small guided bus system in terms of the network, with a couple of sections of one mile and .5 mile in phase 1, but would be expanding those because the system was working well. Mr. Viggiano added that LTD's corridor would be ten miles long, from 58th and Main in Springfield to West 11th and Seneca.

Mr. Kleger said he thought LTD definitely should keep going on the corridor. Ms. Hocken said she thought the tour was a good reality check. Mr. Bailey said there were no surprises; about one mile was difficult and the rest was doable. Mr. Kleger said he had been surprised at how little, possibly one or two miles, would be technically difficult.

Eugene Station Relocation: Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora said that Ms. Loobey had asked him to put together a chronology of discussions and events regarding the temporary move of the Eugene Station, to keep the Board informed. Since the materials in the agenda packet had been written, he had checked with the property owner, "GMH" Hanavan, about the changes that had been made the previous week. Some of her concerns had been corrected and she raised some others, which staff were working on. Eventually, he said, LTD would vacate that section altogether and be solely on the south side of 10th Avenue.

Mr. Bennett said that he had read the correspondence from the Emerald Credit Union and found it difficult to understand. He asked if staff had observed the issues that had been mentioned, such as parking and trash. Mr. Vobora said that they did not; it was in anticipation of that happening. Since LTD began operating in that area, there had not been any graffiti or garbage. The biggest issue was people asking to use the restrooms in that building, because there were none at that end of the mall. Staff would be discussing that issue with the City of Eugene. Ms. Murphy asked about access to restrooms in the former Sears building. Mr. Vobora explained that there was access for employees only. Another business leased most of the first floor and did not want to encourage access through their business. Also, LTD's site requires a certain level of security.

Mr. Bennett asked about restrooms at the new Eugene Station. Mr. Vobora said that there would be public restrooms, which was a good addition for LTD's customers. They would be fairly high maintenance, but were designed to allow maintenance and security. People off the street would be able to walk into the CSC to use the restrooms, just as they would if they walked into LCC, City Hall, etc. Staff expected that the restrooms would remain open during the Station operating hours, which currently were from 6:00 a.m. to 11:30 p.m.

Legislative Update: Ms. Loobey said that the most exciting news was that the flexible funding bill was expected to be reported out of House Revenue to the House floor. It was thought that there were enough votes to get it off the House floor to Senate Transportation with a subsequent referral to Senate Revenue. A transportation day at the legislature was being planned for May 28. It was expected that a lot of people interested in transportation would be there. The Governor and House and Senate leadership had been invited to address the crowd. Ms. Loobey said that most of the credit went to Tri-Met and

Roger Martin, Executive Director of the Oregon Transit Association, who were doing impressive work.

Mr. Bennett said he had received the *Labor Press* and read that there was an ongoing investment to have SB 150, to allow buses to have priority getting back into traffic (the "yield" bill). He thought that would be important in the short run and maybe in the long run. Credit was given to ATU and Portland. ATU was taking the lead, and indicated that the bill was moving along successfully. Ms. Loobey added that it had been moving along on the Senate side. The union had taken the lead on the yield bill, which had been approved on the Senate side. She said that this bill would be very useful to LTD for safety reasons. An amendment would require LTD to make expenditures of approximately \$300 to \$400 per bus to retrofit the buses for lighted yield signs. The signal prioritization bill had been through several work session in Senate Transportation. It was sponsored by ODOT.

West 11th Park & Ride Update: Transit Planner Micki Kaplan stated that at the April meeting the Board had approved criteria for considering potential sites. Staff hoped to have a list of potential sites ready for discussion at the June meeting. Staff had been in contact with the U.S. Army about a possible site at 13th and Chambers. Staff also were continuing to work on a long-range Park & Ride plan.

Fred Meyer Park & Ride: Mr. Viggiano said that there was nothing to add to the agenda item summary in the materials for that evening. He hoped that the appraisal and appraisal review would be completed for discussion at the June meeting.

Meeting with Springfield City Council: Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn discussed a draft packet that was handed out to the Board. The packet was developed to provide informational materials for the joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council on May 27. Ms. Hocken and Mayor Bill Morrisette would chair the meeting together. The Springfield City Council had requested this meeting as part of its policy to hold periodic meetings with public agencies with which it has important business.

The Board members provided feedback on the materials. Final materials were to be taken to the Springfield City Manager's office the following day for delivery to the Council.

LTD TV Research Results: Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron said that staff were pleased with the results of the research. The LTD TV program had been in place only three months when the research was conducted. Of 12 percent in the community who had heard of the program, 5 percent had seen it and of those with an opinion, two out of three thought the program was a good thing to do.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Bergeron to review who LTD was trying to reach and what was the purpose. Mr. Bergeron said that when the program was established, there were several objectives. The audience that the District was trying to reach were those who were politically aware and involved in the community, who were paying attention currently to what the Eugene City Council and the Lane County Commissioners were doing. Staff also wanted to use the program as a tool to educate the community regarding the kinds of projects and issues that LTD was working on in a way that a two- minute sound bite on a

news program, a 30-second commercial, or hand-outs at public forums could not do. Staff were trying to fill a niche to educate the community more effectively, and to respond to concerns from County Commissioners and City Councilors that they had made a tremendous investment to be able to educate the community about their issues, and LTD was not participating in those efforts. Mr. Bennett said, however, that the City and Council did not expect LTD to be a partner in things that it did not see as being effective. He said he thought the market LTD should be trying to reach were the people who did not ride the bus as much as LTD would like them to, or people LTD would like to introduce to the system by talking through the important business points. The question in his mind, he said, was whether those people were watching these programs. He was concerned that LTD essentially may not be reaching the market it wanted to reach.

Mr. Bergeron replied that LTD was doing a variety of things, and this was just one aspect of the overall marketing campaign for the past year. Staff also wanted to develop footage that could be used in other forums, as Ms. Murphy had suggested earlier. The LTD TV program currently was not funded for the following year, but staff would be reevaluating that decision based on positive research results and comments from partner agencies. He stated that these kinds of programs were becoming increasingly important in the marketing mix for transit systems.

Ms. Murphy said that a lot of people did not subscribe to cable, so she suggested running some of the footage in waiting areas at the fairgrounds, the UO, the bus terminal, and events, rather than just using Channel 11.

Mr. Bailey wanted to confirm the letter from Commissioner Dumdi. He said that she and Commissioner Weeldreyer made it very clear that they wanted LTD to continue its Metro TV programming. They related some anecdotal evidence of their constituents who rely on the coverage of commission meetings. He added that it thought the research was important in order to know what the community was watching and not watching. He thought it was still an open issue.

Mr. Saydack thought that the survey needed to tell LTD who was watching, in order to know if LTD was reaching people who were not riding the bus. He said he could not make any judgment about this without that information, or evidence that LTD could reach new people. Mr. Bergeron explained that this was part of a larger media survey to which LTD had been able to add a few questions. Staff had thought it was healthy for both bus riders and non-riders to learn about the Eugene Station, BRT, and other projects, so had not differentiated between riders and non-riders in the survey, but probably should have.

Ms. Murphy stated that Commissioner Dumdi had contacted her about this issue, also. She then asked about production costs. Mr. Bergeron said that using the investment the City and County had made on the studio made the LTD TV program fairly low cost. Staff had considered using some of the same footage with some new material. During FY 96-97, the cost was \$2,000 per show, as a small part of the community outreach program. It was created as a news program with more in-depth coverage of the issues that arise during the year, as well as endorsements from LTD's group pass partners. Those segments might be packaged as a special piece to use in the Commuter Solutions program marketing and

sales program. Also, Grace Crunican, the Oregon Department of Transportation director, wanted a package she could take around the state to show that transportation in the state was more than Tri-Met and the Portland area, so the show's usefulness was larger than just producing monthly segments. He added that staff would return to the Board for approval before proceeding if staff determined that they wished to continue the Metro TV funding.

West 11th Park & Ride: (1) Responses to Selected Public Comments and (2) LUBA Final Decision: Ms. Loobey noted that staff had handed out an additional agenda item summary and wanted to make it part of the record for the meeting. The first attachment to the summary contained staff responses to certain inaccurate testimony regarding the West 11th Park & Ride project. Also attached was a copy of the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA) final order dismissing George and Suzanne Cole's petition appealing a decision authorizing LTD staff to conduct an environmental assessment of the Coles' property.

MOTION **EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Mr. Bailey moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations. Mr. Kleger seconded, and the Board
VOTE unanimously moved into executive session at 9:53 p.m. Human Resources Manager Ed Ruttledge was present for this discussion with the Board.

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION AND ADJOURNMENT: The Board unanimously returned to regular session at 10:05 p.m. and immediately adjourned the meeting.


Board Secretary

C:\WPDATA\BDMN0521.DOC