

**MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**SPECIAL BOARD MEETING**

**Wednesday, July 30, 1997**

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on July 24, 1997, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting/work session of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, July 30, 1997, at 4:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Kirk Bailey, Vice President

**CALL TO ORDER:** Board President Pat Hocken called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** There were no audience members who wished to address the Board.

**FALL TELEVISION ADVERTISEMENT CAMPAIGN:** Andy Vobora, Service Planning and Marketing Manager, presented LTD's television campaign. The target for this campaign was the informed public or those who were aware of transportation issues and TransPlan as well as the general public. The purpose of the campaign was to inform the public about what LTD was doing, what the future plans were, and how the viewers could get involved. The overall message of the ads was that LTD was a steward of the quality of life in the area, that LTD was planning for the future, and that the general public as a person in the community could make a difference by taking advantage of LTD services. There was a mix of commercials that addressed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), commuter solutions programs, the use of Park & Ride lots, the use of the sports shuttle program, and how the general public could be involved. The techniques used to produce the ads were very unique and would catch people's attention. The ads were designed to resemble a public service announcement rather than an LTD promotional advertisement.

After viewing the ads, Mr. Vobora explained that the different clips would not be shown all at once, but would be spread out over a long period of time. The first purchase of television airtime would be during the fall, and would showcase the ads for fall service, football service, and BRT. A number of the advertisements, due to the nature of the way they were designed, could be changed to accommodate various events or functions.

Ms. Hocken thought the concept was interesting because the message was written rather than presented orally; however, she was concerned that viewers would not have the patience to sit through and read the ad while hearing the background voiceovers. Mr. Kleger stated that he had seen similar type of advertisements, and when he took the time to read the message, he believed that it had been a very powerful one.

Mr. Vobora explained that in addition to the television campaign, there would be written and radio material. He felt that LTD would be very visible during that time. Ms. Murphy noted the telephone numbers that were shown at the end of the ads and asked if that was a new technique. Mr. Vobora replied that one of the goals of the campaign was to get viewers to think about the issues facing our community and to get them to take action by calling LTD with their comments and questions. Staff would respond to comments and questions and take names and addresses for direct mailing announcements and further information.

Mr. Saydack was concerned that viewers would not know who was running the ads and thought that the LTD logo and slogan should be more visible. Mr. Vobora replied that he would discuss that issue with the advertising agency. Ms. Hocken wondered why the administrative telephone number was being shown rather than the customer service telephone number. Mr. Vobora responded that the customer service number was used in ads that were customer service oriented, such as the football service ads, but that administrative staff would be responding to the other ads, such as BRT and Park & Ride, so it made sense to use the administrative telephone number.

Ms. Hocken asked if Mr. Vobora expected any Board action regarding the advertisements shown, to which Mr. Vobora replied that no action was needed. He thanked the Board for their comments and suggestions.

**EXECUTIVE (NON-PUBLIC) SESSION:** Mr. Saydack moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed and concerning written legal advice under ORS 40.225, ORS 192.502(8), and ORS 192.660(1), and pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(3), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which then carried by unanimous vote, 6:0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. The Executive Session began at 5:05 p.m.

Motion

Vote

District Counsel Greg Skillman was present for the discussion of current litigation, written legal advice, and negotiation of real property transactions. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano was present for the discussion of real property transactions.

**RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:** The Board returned to regular session at 5:40 p.m.

**TRANSPLAN UPDATE: TRANSIT POLICIES AND SYSTEM DESCRIPTION:** Mr. Viggiano provided an update to the TransPlan process. The Board was given an opportunity earlier to provide input on the Decision Package that was intended to guide the development of the draft Plan. Based on that Decision Package, a staff team representing the various agencies was working on the draft Plan. LTD staff had been participating in the development of transit policies and transit system descriptions to be included in the draft TransPlan.

Mr. Viggiano reviewed the schedule for TransPlan adoption, which included a release of the Draft Plan in September 1997. Public review would occur during the fall of 1997; public hearings and Planning Commission review would take place during the winter of 1997-98; and in the spring and summer of 1998, the governing bodies of the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, and LTD would review and adopt the Plan.

The policies were one of the few sections in the TransPlan that were to be adopted. They needed to be general statements, and the implementation actions that supported the policies were examples and were not binding. The draft policies and implementation actions relating to public transportation were listed in the meeting agenda packet starting on page four. Mr. Viggiano reviewed each of those policy and action statements.

The second policy was broken down into two statements -- one addressed BRT, and the other addressed an enhanced transit system. A decision had been made following the Decision Package review to provide both options in the draft Plan. The LTD Board and the Eugene City Council had directed staff to prepare a transit strategy based on a BRT system, while the Springfield City Council and the Lane County Board of Commissioners favored the enhanced transit system. As part of the review of the draft Plan, one of those two options would be selected.

Mr. Bennett asked for clarification on Policy Statement number three. Mr. Viggiano explained that no matter what type of transit system was in place, traffic priority options for buses would be pursued. Mr. Bennett then asked if the language about an enhanced bus system could be dropped from the draft Plan. Mr. Viggiano explained that there was no choice but to include options for both BRT and an enhanced system, because that had been the direction from the jurisdictions that reviewed and approved the decision package. Mr. Bennett opposed the inclusion of the enhanced

bus system. Mr. Viggiano further explained that he would discuss the two options at greater length later in his presentation.

Mr. Saydack stated that when he thought about policy statements, they described why we did what we did. He felt that TransPlan should very clearly endorse those policies or reasons that LTD existed, to the extent that staff could leave the implementation built into the TransPlan document in order to later demonstrate that all jurisdictions had approved that implementation. Mr. Saydack further stated that the policy statements, as written, diffused the purposes of LTD. Mobility was certainly one purpose, but also the need to reduce traffic congestion and proactively promote land use policies that discouraged parking lots, as well as other purposes of transit, should be included. He thought it was very important to have those purposes clearly stated in the draft Plan, and those were the kinds of policies that he wanted to see endorsed.

Mr. Viggiano stated that there were TransPlan goals, and to date, they were still called "tentative goals," that addressed some of the issues the Board members had brought up, such as creating a better balance of transportation to address transportation congestion. Those were overriding goals to the TransPlan, and the policies fit within that goal frame. The assumption was that if the policy statements were adopted, then the goals were accepted as well.

Mr. Viggiano thought that what Mr. Saydack said addressed the goal level rather than the policy level. Mr. Saydack asked if there was a transit goal at the goal level. Mr. Viggiano replied that there were a number of goals that addressed transit, and he would provide a copy of the goal statements to the Board.

Ms. Murphy asked about bullet number two under policy statement number three, regarding exclusive bus lanes or high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. She was concerned that if the two options were listed together, and if BRT were operating, then sometime later, the jurisdictions could require that BRT lanes be shared with HOV. The other concern she had was the lack of unity among the various jurisdictions. Lane Transit District did not serve one jurisdiction over another. She also opposed the inclusion of the enhanced transit system language.

Ms. Hocken stated that to some degree LTD would have to accommodate the other jurisdictions, as all four jurisdictions needed to adopt TransPlan. If one jurisdiction did not adopt, then staff would have to keep working on the draft Plan until it was adopted. The final Plan would not have both the BRT and enhanced transit system alternatives. That was why the Board was holding joint meetings with the other jurisdictions. Ms. Murphy wondered if there was another way to reach consensus or to gain buy-in, such as a different name for the BRT system, etc.

Mr. Saydack agreed that it might be premature to be bickering over exclusive right-of-way. He suggested that if exclusive right-of-way needed to be stated in TransPlan in order to give LTD the authority it needed to create it, and if, currently, it was a point of resistance among the other jurisdictions, then maybe it would be better

not to have TransPlan address that whole concept until such time as LTD was in a position to demonstrate the need for it, more than LTD could now.

Mr. Viggiano reminded the Board that the implementation actions were not binding. The policy was binding. The policy for BRT did not state exclusive right-of-way. Exclusive right-of-way could be included within the BRT policy, and in that case, the four jurisdictions would need to adopt it now. At this point, exclusive right-of-way was mentioned in the draft Plan as an implementation action and not a binding decision.

Mr. Saydack asked about the legality of the TransPlan. Mr. Viggiano replied that it was a refinement plan to the Metro Plan, and, therefore, it was legally binding. Mr. Saydack asked at what point LTD needed to turn to the TransPlan to validate what it wanted to do. For instance, the enhanced transit system language in the TransPlan could be in support of exclusive right-of-way. Mr. Viggiano agreed. Mr. Saydack asked how comprehensive the implementation actions were, and Mr. Viggiano replied that they were meant to be examples. Mr. Saydack stated that if LTD didn't have political support for exclusive right-of-way now, then taking it out of the draft Plan wouldn't preclude LTD from introducing it again in the future.

Mr. Kleger suggested that the two options under policy statement number two be combined to encourage a higher share of modal split to transit. Mr. Viggiano mentioned that during the review of the draft Plan, there would be opportunities to make language changes. Mr. Bennett asked if the Board could insist on certain language. In other words, could the Board take a position not to endorse the draft Plan without the BRT-specific language. Mr. Viggiano replied that the Board could take action in support of the BRT option in policy statement number two, but he did not think the Board could ignore the direction that was received from the Decision Package, because this was a regional plan and not an LTD plan.

Ms. Hocken did not think that LTD would benefit by refusing to support one of the two options. Rather, she thought that the Board should be attending planning meetings and holding joint meetings and continuing to reach out to the key members of the community. Ms. Murphy stated that in her conversations about BRT with community leaders, she believed that there was a clear lack of understanding. She thought that it might be helpful to bring in members of the community who understood and supported the concept to meet with the decision-makers. She further stated her support of the BRT language in the policy statement. What was good for Eugene was good for Springfield and Lane County as well. She wanted to be able to bear out that argument one-on-one with elected officials as well as other key leaders in the community. In meeting with the business and community leaders, Ms. Murphy saw nothing but support. She met with some people who did have concerns, but she believed even they could not look at BRT without feeling that this would be something good for our community. She said she truly felt that it was a lack of education and understanding that had caused the two jurisdictions not to support the BRT concept.

Mr. Bennett asked what would happen if the BRT system language were included with the implementation policies having to do with exclusive lanes, and then add a caveat that stated that research on the long-range plan would continue and that it be stated that implementation of the right-of-way program, for instance, would not occur without specific approval of each jurisdiction.

Mr. Saydack stated that, politically, the language about providing exclusive right-of-way was unacceptable at this point to the decision-makers. He agreed with Mr. Bennett's direction to modify the language to say, "consider exclusive rights-of-way and other transit priority techniques along BRT corridors to make BRT travel competitive with private automobiles." In other words, explain what it was LTD wanted to do and why LTD wanted to do it. His concern was that if the BRT language was rejected at this time, that rejection would be brought up in the future. He wanted to see the BRT language kept in the Plan, and the parts of it that were not acceptable at this time be rewritten to indicate that they would be worked on. He suggested that the implementation action be kept in, but reworded. He felt that Springfield and Lane County were just not willing to approve the language until they knew more about it. He thought the word "consider" should be used as well as "to encourage people to use this instead of their cars."

Ms. Hocken thought that what Mr. Saydack, Mr. Bennett, and Ms. Murphy had said was what she would expect the final language of TransPlan to be. She thought there was some willingness in the Springfield Council to work with LTD, but since the decision had been made to present the two alternatives, she was not sure if it made sense for the LTD Board to try to find the middle ground. She thought the BRT alternative should be in the Plan as strongly as it could be for now, and the time to come up with alternatives would be next spring when the TransPlan was being reviewed for adoption.

Ms. Wylie agreed with Mr. Saydack, that the issue be written in a way that it would not be rejected by the other jurisdictions.

Mr. Viggiano reiterated that staff currently were writing the draft Plan, and that these policies were staff's suggestions to go into the draft Plan. When the draft Plan was released, it would be under review for nine months. The draft Plan would include the two alternatives, and the jurisdictions would not need to choose one at this time. However, during the review process, one of the two options, or maybe a third option, would be chosen. The other jurisdictions would go through a process where, after a public review and comment period, their planning commissions would first look at the draft Plan and make a recommendation to their elected officials, who would then take action on it.

Ms. Hocken asked if there would be active involvement by the staff to come up with alternate language in places where the draft was not getting agreement. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff would follow the process very carefully and most likely would attend all the work sessions of the planning commissions and the public hearings,

etc. Staff would brief the Board on how the review was going. There would be options for staff to revise the language as they observed how the process was going and what issues were being opposed. Mr. Viggiano thought that the time to propose revised language would be during the planning commissions' review, which would occur during the winter of 1998. Staff advised the Board to support the language that it wanted and to make sure that the policy language itself, not the implementation actions, was something that the Board could support and to ensure that those policy statements really described what LTD wanted to do with BRT. One change he suggested, based on the comments made by Mr. Saydack, was the addition to the policy about why LTD wanted to implement a BRT system, which was to be more competitive with the automobile and to encourage greater use of transit, etc.

Ms. Loobey stated that if the Board wanted to make a difference in how the transportation infrastructure was developed and how those resources were apportioned for this community, then they would have to seriously look at the BRT option and make the distinction that BRT would provide these types of benefits, at this kind of cost, with this kind of outcome. She thought that the distinction was not being made between doing business as LTD was now doing business and the way that business could be if LTD were operating differently.

Mr. Bennett stated that he also thought something should be stated in the enhanced transit system policy that would clarify and add issues, such as to state that it would allow LTD to provide a viable service in a number of areas, but that it would not get the community to the next level.

Mr. Viggiano stated that later in his presentation there would be more description about the two systems that also would be part of the TransPlan. He thought that once he reached that point, the Board might have more comments about how the two systems were described.

He then proceeded with his presentation of policy numbers four, five, and six that addressed facilities, the Park & Ride system, and the use of transit and other alternative transportation modes to address specific traffic congestion and parking problems, such as at special events and at employer-related developments. Policy number seven addressed coordinating transit planning with land use planning efforts, and policy number eight promoted transit service within the community.

Mr. Viggiano discussed the two different transit systems, BRT and enhanced. Staff had suggested describing the enhanced system as a continuation of the development of the current system. This would include continued improvement to the service frequency, development of new routes to serve new development, addition and improvement of facilities, and the continued improvement of the overall operation of the District.

BRT was described as a significantly new and different approach to transit. It would emulate the positive characteristics of a rail system, but at a fraction of the cost.

Mr. Viggiano suggested that a good place to include different language might be in the description of BRT that would be included in the draft Plan. The key issues under the description of BRT were the need to select one transit system for TransPlan; the implementation of exclusive bus lanes and signal priority, particularly the timing of the implementation and the role of the cities, county, and ODOT in decisions; the continued discussions with the cities and county; and the funding availability, as TransPlan was a financially-constrained plan. Mr. Viggiano explained that a financially-constrained plan meant that the participants had to actually show that there was a realistic expectation of funding for the projects within the plan.

Ms. Hocken thought that the Springfield City Council was willing to compromise on the BRT issue, and that the Board and staff needed to define where those areas were that they would be willing to compromise on.

Mr. Saydack stated that LTD needed to persuade people that BRT was the right thing to do. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) would be looking for community support. The discussions with the Springfield City Council would be important, but they could not be premature. He was concerned that the TransPlan adoption process might freeze the issue of gaining the support of the FTA.

Mr. Viggiano responded that BRT was a conceptual issue at this point. LTD was attempting to obtain conceptual approval with the understanding that eventually, once the engineering data was available, more specific decisions could be made. FTA staff had estimated, after touring the pilot corridor, that the pilot corridor probably would require \$500,000 of preliminary engineering.

Mr. Saydack thought that the case should be made for the result of BRT in order to gain approval from the other jurisdictions.

Ms. Hocken asked what kinds of projects would be listed in TransPlan. Mr. Viggiano replied that primarily those would be road projects. Examples of LTD projects included identifying where transit stations would be located, with a description of what a minor and major transit station was. For the BRT system, LTD would describe the corridors, and if BRT were selected, then the BRT map would be incorporated into the TransPlan. Ms. Hocken then asked if the BRT map would be conceptual if it were in TransPlan. Mr. Viggiano replied that it identified the corridor, not the specific streets that it would operate on.

Ms. Hocken then asked how the vision of nodal development was to be included in the Plan. Mr. Viggiano replied that the map would show the three types of nodes -- employment nodes, residential nodes, and commercial nodes. The map with those three designations would be adopted as part of the Plan.

Ms. Hocken then asked if staff needed action or further direction from the Board. Mr. Viggiano stated that there appeared to be agreement on the one change that added wording to Policy number two, which described the reason for BRT. Mr. Kleger stated



that he thought the Board was in agreement that they strongly favored the BRT option remaining in the TransPlan. Mr. Saydack said that he wondered if there were a way to capture the issue that Ms. Loobey had raised about distinguishing between business as usual and new and expanding techniques. Mr. Viggiano thought that those distinctions could be made in the descriptions of the two systems.

Ms. Hocken asked what the status was of the descriptions in the Plan itself. Mr. Viggiano stated that they were not binding, but they had to conform to the policies. Mr. Bennett stated his concern about the timing of a BRT system. When looking at or driving on any of the major corridors around the Eugene and Springfield area, one could see that already there were congestion problems. He thought that the justification for a BRT system should be included and wondered how that could be done. Mr. Viggiano stated that the justifications and reasoning for BRT could be placed in the description of the service portion of the draft TransPlan document.

Ms. Loobey stated that if the language and the approach on the transit piece was the norm for the rest of the document, the Plan lacked vision, excitement, and drama. She believed that was part of the problem. There were none of those elements about this Plan. She further stated that in order for this community to get a sense of what it now had, and even though it may be too late in many instances, there still was a way to reclaim the prize. And that needed to be stated in TransPlan. If the language in the transit piece was reflective of the way staff viewed TransPlan and LTD's role in the communities' future, then staff did not see that LTD had a role at all. There was nothing in the language that stated that LTD could make BRT happen.

Mr. Saydack thought it was important to state the results or what the community would look like with and/or without the elements of TransPlan. After reading the draft transit piece, it almost seemed to him that transit was an amenity rather than an essential service. The language needed to reinforce that transit was an essential service.

Mr. Viggiano responded that the document had an introduction section that set the stage for what was included in the Plan. He was very open to suggested changes in the language.

Ms. Hocken inquired about the time line for changing the language. Mr. Viggiano replied that changes would be made by mid-August. Mr. Saydack suggested that the advertising agency look at the draft Plan.

**DRAFT PARK & RIDE PLAN:** Mr. Viggiano reminded the Board that he had presented an outline of the Park & Ride plan in March 1997. Mr. Viggiano reviewed the elements of the draft plan, which included current facilities, planned facilities, criteria for site selection, and plans for Park & Ride development. In discussing the development of end-of-the-line lots, Mr. Kleger stated his concern that calling it an end-of-the-line Park & Ride lot might lock LTD into a certain location that might not be favorable:

Following this review, Mr. Bennett moved that the Board adopt the resolution approving the Park & Ride plan as presented on July 30, 1997. Mr. Saydack seconded the motion.

Mr. Saydack stated that he thought the plan formalized the process and asked Mr. Viggiano if he could point out the areas in the plan that might be new information. Mr. Viggiano replied that the plan formalized the approach that already had been taken, and there was no new information. The plan reflected a process that had been developed during the past year with the West 11<sup>th</sup> corridor Park & Ride selection.

Ms. Hocken said that she thought the definition of Park & Ride facilities was somewhat scattered. She thought all types of facilities should be defined in the beginning of the document. In addition, she thought that as a project step, the demand estimate for use of the lot should be included. Mr. Viggiano agreed that was an important factor in siting a Park & Ride lot, and that it should be more clearly stated in the Park & Ride Plan. Ms. Hocken also pointed out selection criteria number four, regarding market area served, and wondered if it could be reworded because there were many different functions for locating a site. She thought that the catchment area should be appropriate to the function of the lot, such as smaller lots within neighborhoods and larger lots along the corridors, etc. Mr. Viggiano thought that was a good point and said that staff would make the appropriate change to state that the potential lot served the needed market.

Mr. Saydack discussed the first step of development, specifically the staff assessment of the need for a Park & Ride location and the development of a plan and schedule, which was done prior to staff presentation to the Board. That first step needed to be included in the Park & Ride Plan.

Mr. Kleger suggested moving the public participation aspect higher on the list, as public outreach was performed throughout the process. Mr. Viggiano agreed, and thought it could be included as part of the project plan development. Mr. Kleger stated that making that change would address his concern.

Ms. Murphy liked the plan, in that it gave the Board a clear and concise plan and a vision of the steps that staff would follow in developing a Park & Ride location. She concurred with Mr. Kleger's recommendation to list the public process piece further up in the process. She asked if the public process included publishing an official notice in the papers about a specific parcel or piece of property. Mr. Viggiano replied that it was not published other than in legal advertising required for a public hearing, although there was a formalized public participation process included in the environmental assessment process, which occurred later in the plan. Mr. Saydack stated that during the initial or assessment process, staff identified a generalized location where a Park & Ride would be desirable, and at that point, no public process had begun.

Ms. Hocken stated that the Board could include public comment during their regular meetings at the point in the agenda where the Board was discussing the particular topic. Mr. Saydack asked how LTD advertised for public comment during the

annual route review process. Mr. Vobora replied that there were a variety of means, such as *BusTalk*, on-board posters, newspaper advertising, open houses at public places, neighborhood meetings, etc.

**Motion**

There being no further comment from the Board, Mr. Bennett moved that the Board adopt the Park & Ride plan as amended by Board discussion. Mr. Saydack seconded the motion. The motion carried by unanimous vote, 6:0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**Vote**

**WEST 11<sup>TH</sup> PARK & RIDE SITE SELECTION:** Mr. Viggiano stated that in February 1997, the Board had directed staff to investigate alternative sites to the Cole property for a Park & Ride lot on the West 11<sup>th</sup> corridor. At that time, staff delayed the environmental assessment on the Cole site, pending resolution of the site selection process. Staff currently were evaluating sites based on criteria, which was step six in the Park & Ride Plan site selection process. A very important factor of the staff analysis was the impact of the Fred Meyer Park & Ride on the site selection process. The Fred Meyer site had an impact on the total number of spaces needed. The original goal was for 100 spaces along the West 11<sup>th</sup> corridor. The Fred Meyer site would accommodate 40 to 50 vehicles, which meant that staff were now looking for a site that would accommodate 50 to 60 vehicles to meet that ten-year projection. Also, the Fred Meyer site had an important impact on the location. The primary benefit of having different Park & Ride locations was that they appealed to different markets, and if there were more than one Park & Ride along a corridor, the people who lived along the corridor would have the convenience of choosing the Park & Ride closest to their homes. The third impact that the Fred Meyer site had was to provide immediate Park & Ride capacity along the corridor, which gave staff some flexibility to spend more time seeking other desirable sites.

Mr. Viggiano directed the Board to view a map of the alternative sites that were originally considered, other sites within the original study area, and other sites within an extended study area. He noted that the original study area was between Garfield and Bertelsen. That study area had been expanded to the east in order to appeal to a different market than the Fred Meyer site market.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the Army site stood out above the others that were being considered, so staff would compare the Army site to the Cole site for Board consideration. The Army site was located at the southeast corner of 13<sup>th</sup> and Chambers; the land was owned by the U.S. Government; the local U.S. Army Reserve staff supported the development of a Park & Ride; the site would accommodate 50 to 60 parking stalls; and there would be the possibility of a long-term, no-cost lease. Mr. Viggiano distributed a site plan of the Army site to the Board. He noted that the Board already had seen the site plan for the Cole site.

Ms. Hocken stated her concern about getting approval from the federal government. Mr. Viggiano replied that a three-step process would be used, which included local approval that already was given. Regional approval would then be needed. Transit Planner Micki Kaplan already had spoken with the regional office staff who indicated that, typically, the regional staff tries to accommodate the local requests and community needs. The third step would be approval at the federal headquarter level, and Mr. Viggiano stated that there was no indication about how long that would take, but he thought that if the local staff endorsed the concept, the headquarters staff would be more inclined to look favorably upon it.

Mr. Kleger asked about the access south on Chambers Street. Mr. Viggiano replied that because 13<sup>th</sup> was a one-way street, people would need to exit the lot on 13<sup>th</sup> and travel to Polk Street to loop back around. However, an option would be pursued to include a driveway on the south side of the Army building for access to and from Chambers Street.

Mr. Saydack asked about how the population numbers differed per site. Mr. Viggiano replied that few people would drive out of their way to access a Park & Ride. The Fred Meyer site targeted the far southwest area of Eugene. The Cole site was similar and would duplicate a lot of what the Fred Meyer site accomplished, but it would draw a few more from further east to include the Oak Patch to 18<sup>th</sup> area. The Army site would draw a much broader market, including the unique market not served by the Fred Meyer site.

Ms. Hocken asked why the other new potential sites were not being considered. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff had looked at sites at several different intersections. The Army site currently was vacant and on the south side. The biggest concern was the cost of other sites, as corner lots were more expensive and the cost per space was very high.

Mr. Kleger asked how far ahead the two sites, Fred Meyer and Army, would put LTD. Mr. Viggiano replied that those two sites would accommodate customers for at least 10 years, and that staff would begin looking farther to the west for future development. Mr. Saydack stated that he saw good reason to further study the Army site, and asked if there was reason to continue considering the Cole site. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff recommended concentrating efforts on the development of the Army site.

Mr. Viggiano explained that the primary advantages of the Army site were that it was a low-cost site; it was on a major arterial to residential areas to the south; it had good spacing from the Fred Meyer Park & Ride; and it provided good service to the University of Oregon (UO) area and downtown Eugene. The disadvantage was that it was not located on the major bus service routing from the UO and downtown. In comparison, the advantages of the Cole site were that buses in both directions conveniently served it and it had extra capacity for future growth. The disadvantages

included duplicating coverage of the Fred Meyer Park & Ride site and that it would be developed at a much higher cost.

Ms. Hocken asked what staff would do if the Army site did not work out. Mr. Viggiano stated that the completion of the Fred Meyer sight allowed staff more time to consider alternatives, and that if the Army site did not work out, staff would go back to looking at the other potential sites that were shown on the map.

Mr. Saydack asked when staff would begin looking further west on the West 11<sup>th</sup> corridor. Mr. Viggiano replied that if the Park & Rides were filling up and development in the area increased, staff would then begin searching for more locations. Ms. Hocken mentioned that if staff waited for further development in the area, the costs for a site would increase and fewer choices might be available.

Mr. Saydack asked where the process was, if staff needed further review of the process, and if the Board needed to take action. Mr. Viggiano replied that the Board could direct staff to go ahead with the environmental assessments on both the Cole and Army sites or to just concentrate on the Army site, which might not need an environmental assessment. In addition, the Board could direct staff to put this project on hold now that the Fred Meyer site would be operational, or to look for more site options.

Ms. Murphy asked if sites had been identified at 13<sup>th</sup> and Jefferson or 13<sup>th</sup> and Tyler streets. Mr. Viggiano replied that the fairgrounds owned most of that property and the homes located in that area could have historical significance. In addition, he said that sites had been investigated in that area, but were deemed to close to the city center and/or too difficult to serve for the return trip.

Mr. Bennett thought that the Army site was a unique opportunity, and though the process could take a long time, it was very inviting. He favored pursuing solely the Army site at this time. Mr. Saydack agreed with Mr. Bennett that the Army site was a unique opportunity. He thought that maybe LTD could obtain congressional support to further the approval process, and that staff could keep looking at other possibilities in that area. He also felt that there was no reason to continue consideration of the Cole site, and he thought that staff should begin looking farther west on the West 11<sup>th</sup> corridor before property became too expensive in that area.

Ms. Hocken asked if the FTA would require that a second site be identified if the Board dropped the Cole site from consideration and an environmental assessment was needed for the Army site. Mr. Viggiano replied that was not necessary, as the FTA would agree to one site if there was not much controversy surrounding that particular site and if there were no major environmental issues.

Ms. Hocken stated her interest in investigating sites farther west as well as looking into a contra-flow lane on West 11<sup>th</sup> between Garfield and Chambers, then looking for a site in that area.

**Motion**

Mr. Saydack asked if any Board action was needed at this time. Mr. Viggiano asked for formal Board direction to staff. Mr. Saydack moved that the Board direct staff to focus further investigation on what was identified as the Army Reserve site as the next corridor Park & Ride for the West 11<sup>th</sup> corridor, and under these circumstances dropping the Cole site from further consideration at this time. Mr. Kleger seconded. There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken called for a vote of the Board. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor.

**Vote**

**DEBRIEF ON JOINT MEETING WITH SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL:**

**Vote**

Mr. Pangborn, Assistant General Manager, was present to discuss the Springfield City Council meeting with the Board. He asked the Board to link the Springfield City Council meeting discussion with the next item on the agenda, which was the September 9, 1997, joint meeting with the Lane County Board of Commissioners.

In preparation for the joint meeting with the County Commissioners, Mr. Pangborn asked the Board to discuss how the joint meeting with the Springfield City Council went, and if there was anything that was learned at that meeting that could be applied to the meeting with the Commissioners. Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron had prepared suggested responses to the issues that had been raised at the Springfield City Council meeting. His suggested responses were included in the meeting agenda packet.

Ms. Hocken thought that more time should have been spent to allow the Springfield City Council members to present their thoughts. Mr. Kleger thought that the joint meetings should be held more often than once each year. Mr. Saydack thought that the Council's comments and attitudes were very representative of the community-wide concept.

**JOINT MEETING WITH LANE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS:** The Board was scheduled to hold a joint meeting with the Lane County Commissioners on September 9, 1997, and the draft packet for that meeting was discussed. Mr. Pangborn stated that the format for the meeting would be very similar to the format used for the joint meeting with the Springfield City Council, but with a more rural focus. Items on the agenda included current LTD service in urban and rural Lane County; future LTD service; and the next step in planning for Lane County transit improvements. Mr. Saydack asked how the information would be presented. Mr. Pangborn replied that the Board members would make the presentations. The BRT video would be shown, and staff would mail a copy of the video to each Board member prior to the meeting.

Mr. Pangborn stated that a joint meeting with the Eugene City Council would be held on Monday, October 13, which was the evening of the Board work session for October. The evening would begin with dinner at 5:30 p.m., and the meeting to follow at 6:00 p.m. It was possible that a tour of the Eugene Station would be held prior to the dinner. Ms. Hocken would meet with Mr. Pangborn to discuss the agenda. Mr. Kleger would meet with Mr. Viggiano in early September to get an update on the Thurston Station.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

\\ADMINVOL3\DATA\COMMON\MINUTES\1997\07\BDMn7-30.doc