

MINUTES OF THE DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, January 21, 1998

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on January 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, January 21, 1998, 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
Hillary Wylie
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Roger Saydack

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Pat Hocken called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Hocken stated that Dean Kortge would sit with the Board as a guest. Mr. Kortge had been appointed to the Board by the Governor, but his Senate confirmation hearing would not be held until January 28, 1998.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Hocken introduced Bus Operator Esther Schaller as the February 1998 Employee of the Month. Ms. Schaller was hired on November 15, 1988, and had achieved seven years of safe driving and eight years of correct schedule operation (CSO). In the past, Ms. Schaller had served on committees for the annual employee awards banquet and the annual employee picnic, and currently she served as a member of the Take Care Committee. Ms. Schaller was nominated by a customer, who noted that Ms. Schaller was not only a kind person to all of the passengers, but also to her fellow employees. The customer stated that Ms. Schaller brought her positive attitude to her job, and even went out of her way to help some of the elderly passengers on her days off.

When asked what made Ms. Schaller a good employee, Field Supervisor Marylee Bohrer stated that Ms. Schaller was an asset to the District for many reasons. Some of those reasons were that she had a wonderful rapport with all customers; she was very pleasant to be around; she had excellent attendance, safety, and CSO records; and her role as chair of the 1997 Picnic Committee resulted in an excellent employee picnic.

Ms. Hocken presented Ms. Schaller with a letter of congratulations, a certificate, and a monetary award. Ms. Schaller stated that she was very honored to have been selected as Employee of the Month. She complimented Ms. Loobey for her leadership and stated that she thought the employees of LTD were of great worth. She thanked the Board for the award.

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

MOTION
VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for January 21, 1998, is approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, and the Consent Calendar was approved by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the Minutes of the December 10, 1997, Special Meeting/Work Session, the Minutes of the December 17, 1997, regular Board meeting, and the minutes of the January 7, 1998, special Board meeting.

FEDERAL SECTION 5307 GRANT APPLICATION: Transit Planner Lisa Gardner was present to discuss this item with the Board. She stated that the Section 5307 funds previously had been referred to as Section 9 formula funds, and represented the capital and operating federal funds. LTD would apply for the capital portion of the funds.

Ms. Gardner discussed the grant-funding schedule for the funds. The District's fiscal year began in July, and in October or November, LTD typically would receive a Federal Register notice, which stated the available funding allocated to LTD. At that point, the funding essentially was available, and LTD typically would apply for it through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) immediately in December. However, that caused complications because LTD's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) was not developed until March, and in December, staff did not yet have the exact figures for projects that would be in the next fiscal year's budget. Staff were proposing to submit this year's grant application in March following the CIP development. In order to make that transition, two applications would be submitted.

The application presented before the Board was a request for \$845,000, which included \$697,000 in 1998 Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, and \$148,000 in Section 5307 funds carried over from the 1997 allocation. The STP funds were allocated by the state and were part of the State Transportation

Improvement Program (STIP). The application also included funding for preliminary engineering and design for the Springfield Station Alternatives Analysis, passenger boarding improvements, the Transportation Demand Management program, and miscellaneous transit-related capital items. It also included \$269,000 in STP funds for construction of the Thurston Station. In March, an application would be submitted to request funding for FY 1998-99 capital projects.

In regard to the Thurston Station funding, Ms. Gardner explained that in June 1997, the Board had approved the Thurston Station construction budget, which included a list of the funding sources. Because 1998 STP funds had been included, LTD could not apply for those funds until now, but had received permission to pre-spend the funds in advance without prejudice to the project.

Mr. Bennett stated that the grant application history had been good, and he asked if staff anticipated any problems with this application. Ms. Gardner stated that staff anticipated no problems at this time. These funds were allocated on a formula basis and were not discretionary. The exact amount of funding was known in both cases. This year was somewhat different because the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) had not yet been reauthorized. It was known how much LTD would receive, and a percentage of that amount currently was available. It was anticipated that all the funds would be available when the March application was submitted. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn added that LTD rarely applied for funding that had not previously been allocated to the District.

Public Hearing: Ms. Hocken asked for public testimony on the proposed Grant application. There was none, and she closed the public hearing.

MOTION

VOTE

Board Discussion: There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed 1998 Section 5307 federal grant application for \$845,000 in federal funds and authorizes the General Manager to submit this application to the Federal Transit Administration for approval." Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

FEDERAL SECTION 5309 FEDERAL GRANT APPLICATION: Ms. Gardner stated that at the November Board meeting, the Board approved the 1998 Section 5309 grant application for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) preliminary engineering and design. She explained that Section 5309 funds were discretionary funds, formerly referred to as Section 3 funds. They were appropriated by Congress, and LTD received notification of the available amount. This year, LTD was fortunate to receive two appropriations – one of approximately \$1 million for BRT, and another \$1 million appropriated for bus purchase. This application was for the bus purchase portion of the funds.

This grant application requested \$996,774 to purchase approximately five 40-foot, low-floor buses. These funds would be matched at 20 percent by LTD, for a total budget of \$1,245,968.

Public Hearing: Ms. Hocken asked for public testimony on the proposed grant application. There was none, and she closed the public hearing.

Board Discussion: Mr. Kleger asked if staff anticipated that these five buses would be identical to the 13 buses that currently were ordered. Purchasing Administrator Jeanette Bailor stated that they were identical, and the additional five buses would be received in December, three months after the 13 that currently were pending.

MOTION
VOTE

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board approves the proposed 1998 Section 5309 federal grant application for \$996,774 in federal funds and authorizes the General Manager to submit this application to the Federal Transit Administration for approval." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

MOTION
VOTE

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Mr. Bailey made the following motion: "I move that the Board meet in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1) and 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." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

The Executive Session began at 7:20 p.m. District Counsel Greg Skillman, Bob Fraser, Martha Walters, and Robert Lowry were present for this discussion with the Board. The Board returned to regular session at 8:55 p.m.

FIRST READING, LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT ORDINANCE 36, 1998 REVISION, "REGULATIONS GOVERNING CONDUCT ON DISTRICT PROPERTY": Ms. Hocken announced that the Board had received replacement pages 33, 34, 35, and 36 to the Board packet that contained some revisions to the Ordinance. Mr. Pangborn reviewed the revisions that were made to address the Board's concerns and comments that were made at the regular meeting in December. Mr. Pangborn stated that section 1.15 on regulations had been revised to address the Board's concern about people's rights. The words *intentionally or recklessly* were added to address disorderly conduct and harassment and to narrow the intent of the function of the Ordinance. In addition, the Ordinance was revised to be consistent with state law, and in fact, referenced state law where appropriate.

Subsection 7, which addressed threatening or offensive Language, was moved to be included under regulations section 1.15. The words *intentionally or recklessly* also were added to this section, and a reference to *obscenities* was added

after District counsel found relevant case law supporting this regulation. Ms. Loobey noted that this section applied to District vehicles and stations, but wondered if this applied to bus stops and shelters as well. District Counsel Greg Skillman replied that by definition, District Station included the LTD Maintenance and Administrative Facility, the Eugene Transit Station, any other District transit station, any bus passenger shelter, the Customer Service Center, any District-operated parking lot or Park & Ride lot, and covered areas of any bus stop.

Mr. Pangborn stated that staff and counsel had revised subsection 8, which addressed Food and Beverages. The provision clarified that passengers may consume non-alcoholic beverages only from LTD-approved containers with snap-on or screw-on lids. Ms. Wylie stated that she appreciated that clarification.

Under subsection 11(c), which addressed the District's Right of Closure, and subsection 11(e), which addressed the exclusion of non-District vehicles, clarifying language had been added.

Mr. Kortge asked what the penalty was for violation of the Ordinance. Mr. Pangborn replied that it had to do with the severity of the event, and LTD had staff who would enforce the Ordinance, in addition to the Mall Guides and the police. Generally, people who were caught violating the Ordinance would be given the opportunity to change the behavior or incident. If the violator chose not to correct the situation, he or she would be subject to possible exclusion, arrest, and/or fines. Ultimately, the tool would be to deny access to buses or facilities. People who were denied access would be trespassing if they came back onto the property.

Ms. Murphy asked if there was a requirement to post that information. Mr. Skillman replied that there was not a legal requirement to post that information, but that it was a good idea to do so. District counsel Bob Fraser added that he had talked with Transit Projects Administrator Rick Bailor about the type of signage and where signage would be placed. Mr. Pangborn stated that as a matter of enforcement, LTD always had started with the least intrusive form of enforcement, which usually was education, then escalated that enforcement appropriate to the response. Because there was consistency among those who enforced the Ordinance, there were always opportunities to recognize repeat offenders who had been forewarned.

Under subsection 23(c), regarding Solicitation, the regulation regarding the collection of money was removed from the Ordinance. On the loading platforms and in the CSC area of the Station, where safety and operational issues were present, that type of behavior could be regulated; however, in the areas of the station where safety and operations were not an issue, the collecting of money could not be regulated, as it was a constitutionally protected right.

Ms. Wylie asked if prostitution was covered under Ordinance 36. Mr. Skillman replied that not all Oregon Statutes were mentioned, but under Section 1.30, Jurisdiction, all laws of the State of Oregon and all local laws applied and were

enforceable. The police were authorized under Ordinance 36 to enforce all applicable laws. Mr. Pangborn added that one of the purposes of having the Community Policing station in the facility as well as having field supervisors who would monitor the platform was to have a good level of supervision at the station.

Mr. Pangborn stated that under Section 1.20, Exclusions, subsection 3, language was added that enabled the General Manager or designee the right to terminate an exclusion or grant a variance if the excluded person showed that he or she was wrongly or unfairly excluded. It was included to allow an escalation of an appeal. That process already was in existence, as people were able to appeal their exclusions to Mr. Bailor as the General Manager's designee. Following an appeal, if it was determined that the exclusion would stand in effect, the Contested Case hearing process could be requested. Under section 1.25, Violations, subsection 1 was rewritten for clarity.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Pangborn stated that staff were asking the Board to conduct its first reading of Ordinance 36 as amended. There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey moved that Ordinance 36, 1998 Revision, be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. Ms. Hocken then read Ordinance 36, 1998 Revision, by title: "*Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, 1998 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property.*"

FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES:

Mr. Viggiano stated that this was a set of standards and procedures that would help LTD plan, design, build, and maintain its facilities. Facilities, in this context, covered a broad range, included everything from the small passenger shelters at bus stops to the larger facilities, such as the Eugene Station. The document mostly reflected ongoing practices, but also there were standards that addressed areas where there had been some inconsistency in application, such as the timing and extent of cost estimates for facility projects. Staff believed that the use of these standards would improve the quality and consistency of staff work on new facility development. Mr. Viggiano then provided an overview of the document.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "The Board of Directors hereby approves the Facilities Development Standards and Procedures as presented." Ms. Murphy seconded the motion.

Mr. Bailey asked if the Facilities Development Standards and Procedures document was discretionary, since the Board was not adopting these guidelines in Ordinance form or something more formal. Ms. Loobey replied that once approved, this document would become administrative policy.

Mr. Kortge asked about the standard under section VI, Cost Estimating, where the provision was made requiring the architect to redesign the project, at no additional cost to LTD, should the lowest responsive construction bid exceed the cost estimate by more than 10 percent. He wondered if that were standard

procedure and if it would preclude architects from bidding on a project. Mr. Viggiano replied that it had been used in almost all architectural contracts in the past. For example, on the Thurston Station project, all changes that were made as a result of the cost overrun were borne by the architect. Ms. Bailor added that this redesign had occurred on other projects. She stated that was a standard clause in most architect and engineer contracts. Mr. Viggiano added that it only occurred if the lowest bid was more than 10 percent over the cost estimate.

VOTE

There being no further questions, Ms. Hocken repeated the motion that was before the Board and called for a vote. The resolution to approve the Facilities Development Standards and Procedures as presented carried by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

SPRINGFIELD STATION WORK PLAN: Mr. Viggiano stated that this work plan had been presented to the Board in November 1997 as an information item. At that time, the Board was concerned about the amount of work that actually would be completed by consultants and how much work would be performed by staff. Staff had considered this issue carefully, and it had been determined that much more of the work could be completed by staff than was originally anticipated. This was due in part by the addition of engineering staff at LTD, which would allow much of the engineering work to be performed by staff. There still would be a need for some contracted work, such as the appraisal estimates and environmental site assessments, etc. The intent was to have staff manage the entire study and seek outside help only as necessary.

Another concern that the Board had expressed in November was that the study results reflect recommendations from staff, not a consultant. Mr. Viggiano thought that would be achieved with the work plan as presented.

Mr. Viggiano stated that staff presented the work plan to the Springfield City Council in September. The Council appointed Norm Dahlquist to serve on the Springfield Station Steering Committee. The Council also had several comments about the proposed study, which were included in a letter that was copied on page 52 of the agenda packet. Those comments included a concern about the investment that had been made in the current facility, and its close proximity to City Hall. The Council asked that the issue of moving the station be addressed first. Staff committed to the Council that the existing station would always be carried forward as an alternative. If at any point during the study it became obvious that the current station was the best alternative and there was no reason to look further, staff would concentrate its efforts on making improvements to the current site. The Council agreed with that approach. Another concern the Council had was about the cost and duration of the study, \$170,000 during 18 months. Staff were hopeful that it would cost a lot less than that, but to some extent, it was difficult to predict. A portion of the money was set aside for the various environmental studies, but it was unknown at this time just what environmental studies, if any, would be necessary.

Mr. Viggiano said that there were members of the Council who were supportive of looking at alternative sites. Ms. Murphy added that it was an educational fact that many of the issues brought up at the LTD Board meetings were not reflected in Council discussions. Such things as the cost of the upgrade to B Street, the cost of which was borne by the City of Springfield, were areas of misunderstanding. One of the misunderstandings, for instance, was the thought that the upgrade that was made to B Street was made strictly to accommodate the buses, when, in fact, the buses only used a small portion of the entire street that was upgraded. She thought that the Board and the Council should get together to resolve those types of issues and bring about an understanding. She felt that the Steering Committee, which would be made up of people who represented many interests, would be a good forum to clarify many of those issues as well.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the Steering Committee would contain three LTD Board members, as well as one position each for the Springfield City Council, the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Commission, and the Springfield Planning Commission. There were two at-large positions, which the Board would appoint. Staff hoped that the Steering Committee to be prepared to meet in February. Staff also asked to work with one Board member, such as the Board President to ratify the at-large positions, rather than waiting until the February Board meeting to gain full Board approval.

MOTION
VOTE

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Board approves the Springfield Station Work Plan and directs staff to use the work plan as the basis for proceeding with the project." Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

STEERING COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS: Ms. Hocken appointed Ms. Murphy, Ms. Wylie, and Mr. Kleger to the Springfield Station Steering Committee. She asked Ms. Murphy to act as Committee Chair. She stated that she would work with staff regarding the at-large positions, and would ratify those positions herself. She asked Ms. Murphy and Ms. Wylie to make recommendations for those two positions.

Ms. Hocken then appointed Mr. Bailey, Mr. Bennett, and Ms. Murphy to the BRT Steering Committee. Mr. Bailey or Mr. Bennett would chair that committee, and Ms. Hocken asked them to make that decision. Ms. Hocken also stated that if Ms. Murphy found being on both committees to be too overwhelming, she would take Ms. Murphy's place on the BRT committee. She asked about the time line for the at-large positions. Mr. Viggiano replied that there was more time with that committee, and it could be handled as an action item at a regular Board meeting.

Ms. Hocken stated that her term as President of the Board would be finished in June. She thought it made sense to wait until then to fill other committee assignments, as the new Board President could make those assignments.

REPORT ON GENERAL MANAGER'S EVALUATION: The Board had conducted Ms. Loobey's evaluation in executive session on January 7, 1998. Ms. Hocken stated that it had been a positive evaluation, and she asked the other Board members to comment as well. Ms. Loobey distributed to the Board members a two-year work plan for the General Manager. Mr. Bailey thanked Ms. Loobey and her staff for a good job.

As referenced in the agenda packet, the Board felt that overall the general manager was doing an exemplary job of managing District resources in accordance with Board policy and legal requirements. Strengths cited by the Board included hiring talented employees and motivating them to deliver outstanding service, being flexible and willing to take the District in new directions and to adopt new strategies, and developing strong relationships with the business community and other local agencies. Phyllis was commended for achieving a new multi-year union contract before the expiration of the old contract and for successfully representing the District at the state legislature. She also was complimented on her sense of humor.

COTTAGE GROVE SERVICE: Ms. Loobey reported that ridership on the #98 Cottage Grove route was high. An origin and destination survey was conducted in November, which showed that there was a high number of riders from Cottage Grove and Creswell who had a car available for the trip and had chosen to take the bus, which was a good indicator for reduced VMTs. There also were many riders who were riding the bus to from Eugene to Creswell and Cottage Grove. There would be some decision points for the Cities of Cottage Grove and Creswell about what their next steps would be with the conclusion of the demonstration project, and what they would need to do to continue the service.

EUGENE STATION: Ms. Loobey reported that the construction of the station was going well, and was on time and within budget. She directed the Board's attention to page 101 of the agenda packet and the dates of the station opening events. She reminded the Board members that tours would be conducted at noon on the first Tuesday in February and March. Training had begun with the operators, who were now driving buses through the station.

SENECA PARK & RIDE: The new tax lot had been recorded with Lane County, and it was expected that the property purchase would move swiftly since an agreement had already been negotiated with the current property owner.

CORRESPONDENCE: There were a number of letters received, and staff responses were available.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Ms. Loobey stated that the monthly staff reports were self-explanatory, and asked if the Board had any questions. There were none. Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora provided a correction to his staff report regarding holiday service results. His report about the last departure on Christmas Eve actually should have referred to the last departure

on New Year's Eve. He said that 637 people rode the last departure on New Year's Eve, at 12:40 a.m. on January 1, following the First Night event, on the twelve routes that were offered. Some of the buses experienced overloads and extra buses were sent out.

ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW: PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW SERVICE PACKAGE: Mr. Vobora presented an overview of the annual route review process. Each fall, new service was added and adjustments were normally made in the winter to that service package. This year, the service adjustments would be made in the spring to coincide with the opening of the Eugene Station. There also was a summer service adjustment, which typically occurred following the end of the school year. Within that process was the annual route review (ARR) process. Right after the fall service was implemented, staff began to analyze the service package for the next fall. That process began in November and culminated with the implementation of service in September.

Mr. Vobora stated that in November, requests for service changes and new service from customers, bus operators, and the public were compiled by the Service Advisory Committee, which was made up of bus operators, planning and marketing staff, and customer service staff. The Committee reviewed and researched possible service changes for implementation the following September.

Service change options were narrowed and analyzed in December through February. In January, a preliminary review of the ARR service package was conducted with the LTD Board. In February, detailed service changes were presented to the LTD Board and the first public hearing took place. In March, a second public hearing was conducted and the Board adopted the service package. From March through August, the Service P and Marketing staff completed the work necessary for service implementation in September.

There were several major categories that staff reviewed. The first was service additions and requests from the community. Currently, staff were keeping service additions to a minimum, as it was expected that a Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) would take place in two years. There was so much growth in the area, and the system had become so complex, that there was a need for a CSR.

Staff were considering a limited number of service additions for September 1998. In Junction City, there was a reverse commute taking place due to the number of jobs available there. LTD was not meeting those shift times very well, so staff were considering new service that would travel on Highway 99 to Junction City. Additional LCC trippers also were being considered. Mr. Vobora explained that tripper service was an unscheduled and unanticipated service contingency. New service south of Main Street in Springfield on Jasper Road from 32nd to 42nd Streets would be proposed. There were new schools and growing neighborhoods in the area. Chad Drive was another area where there was significant growth and no service, so staff were considering adding service there. In addition, staff were considering extending the afternoon peak service from 6:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Service reductions included deleting airport service, the 61s Oakway (evening) route, the #63 VRC Delta, and the unproductive segments of some of the rural routes.

Service adjustments, which addressed pressure in the system, included additional service on the #11 Thurston route so that it would run six times per hour instead of the current four times per hour. Another adjustment staff were considering was the afternoon pulse change at the Eugene Station from :00 and :30 after the hour to :10 and :40 after the hour. In the morning hours, the pulse worked well, as people would arrive a few minutes before their scheduled work start time; however, in the afternoon, with the bus just leaving on the hour and half-hour, people were unable to catch the bus after work without waiting an extra 20 minutes.

Mr. Vobora asked if the Board members wanted to hold the public hearing at the February Board meeting. He stated that staff could hold open public meetings where the materials could be presented and public input taken, then present the information to the Board. Mr. Kleger stated that he liked the fact that the public was given an opportunity to comment to the Board on the proposed plan before the Board adopted it. Staff often responded to that input by making adjustments to the proposed service plan.

Ms. Murphy concurred with Mr. Kleger. She asked how the public was notified of the public hearing. Mr. Vobora replied that LTD prepared press releases and paid advertising, and flyers were handed out on the routes that would be affected by the service plan. In addition, articles were written in BusTalk, and placards were placed on every bus. Mr. Bailey stated that he liked the approach as it had been done in the past.

Mr. Vobora then asked if the Board members felt that staff presented the right amount of detail, or if there was other information that could be provided.

Mr. Bailey stated that he was concerned about the urban growth boundaries, and if new service, such as to the Chad Drive area, might be in conflict with LTD policies, such as the group pass policy. Mr. Pangborn stated that Chad Drive was well within the urban growth boundary. Ms. Loobey added that issue had come up before when the State of Oregon announced that it would build a new Adult and Family Services (AFS) office outside of the downtown area in Eugene. There was a state policy that stated that social services would locate in downtown areas. Despite repeated phone calls from Board members and staff and a letter from Ms. Hocken, the office was still being built in the Chad Drive area where LTD did not provide service. AFS often served low-income clients who relied on the bus service.

Ms. Wylie asked for further information about the service deletion on Green Acres. Mr. Vobora replied that one route would be deleted, but there was a lot of other service through that area.

Ms. Wylie asked what the process was for people who wanted to request service additions and adjustments. Mr. Vobora replied that typically neighborhood residents could get a petition together or make individual requests either in writing or by telephone. Ms. Hocken added that each year, the Board received a list of those requests that had not been accommodated.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken adjourned the meeting at 9:55 p.m.


Board Secretary