

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, December 14, 1998

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 10, 1998, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Monday, December 14, 1998, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Kirk Bailey, President, presiding
Rob Bennett, Vice President
Patricia Hocken
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Dean Kortge
Virginia Lauritsen
Hillary Wylie, Secretary
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: None

II. CALL TO ORDER

Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m.

III. INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Bailey welcomed local-area legislators to the meeting. Legislators in attendance included District 43 State Representative Jim Welsh; District 40 State Representative Floyd Prozanski; District 41 State Representative-elect Vicki Walker; and District 44 State Representative-elect Al King.

Mr. Bailey stated that the Board wanted to discuss 1999 legislative issues with the legislators, such as bus rapid transit and some of the funding issues

related to transit that might be discussed during the 1999 legislative session. In addition, the Board wanted to hear from the legislators about any issues or topics that they were working on and that they believed LTD should be working on.

Bus Rapid Transit: Mr. Bennett stated that he appreciated the opportunity to speak on the bus rapid transit (BRT) issue. He said that more than two years ago, the Board of Directors decided that while there were a number of things that LTD was doing well, and while it appeared that LTD was keeping up with population increases, and when viewed independently LTD received good marks, LTD was not reaching a level that would allow the District to play a larger role in terms of the overall balance of transportation in the community. The reason LTD was not reaching that level was that under the existing format of LTD's operating procedure, it could not compete effectively with other modes of transportation, such as the automobile. What evolved was the concept of bus rapid transit.

Mr. Bennett stated that the concept was not a new one. There had been many discussions of a rapid transit system. In this community, a light-rail feasibility study was conducted that determined that light rail would be too expensive for a community of this size.

Bus rapid transit most extensively had been used outside of the United States, but recently, it was a new concept that was being considered by a number of communities. The concept had received strong support from the federal government. Several government officials had visited LTD and the community, and LTD staff had been involved in various nationwide work sessions where the concept and its future were discussed.

LTD was aggressively pursuing the BRT concept. LTD had lobbied heavily at all levels, but particularly at the federal level in terms of funding and had received a significant amount of money for research, engineering, and analysis, as well as for some implementation. The funding was contingent upon gaining sufficient support from the community and particularly from elected local and state officials.

The concept was particularly appealing to LTD because it would be one-tenth of the cost of a light-rail system. It was a new concept because it envisioned a different kind of vehicle, a pre-paid fare system, low-floor buses, more speed, and fewer stops.

For example, five years from now, when people are trying to get home from work on Franklin Boulevard, the BRT vehicle will go right by cars stopped in heavy traffic. If LTD could not compete for business in that way, it would have a difficult time getting people to choose transit over driving their own vehicles. LTD did not expect to get everyone out of their cars, but vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) were increasing at about 10 percent per year, and LTD was carrying only 2

percent of the trips. From a business point of view, LTD needed to be in a better competitive position.

In five or ten years, with the concept of compact urban growth, mixed-use development, increased density, and increased land value within the urban growth boundary, etc., LTD would not be able to achieve a rapid transit system because right-of-way would be difficult to obtain. Exclusive right-of-way was a key element of BRT.

Mr. Bennett then provided an overview of the BRT activities to date. It was an extensive process. LTD was interested in obtaining the support of the local state legislators, and the Board was anxious to answer questions and hear suggestions from the legislators.

Mr. Bailey added that each of the legislators had been given a packet of information about LTD. In that packet was background information about the kinds of services LTD offered, ridership statistics, and budget information. A BRT brochure was included that could provide additional information.

Representative-elect Walker asked how BRT was different than regular LTD service. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano responded that when LTD asked people why they did not use the bus, one of the main reasons was inconvenience and slow travel time. BRT would address both of those issues.

BRT would provide fast and frequent service along major corridors complemented by small bus service that operated within the neighborhoods. When discussing BRT within the community, people generally liked the neighborhood service concept. The neighborhood service not only would provide a connection to the faster service along major corridors, but also would make connections within the neighborhood to stores and schools, etc.

The reason the major corridor service was faster was that much like a rail system, people would have pre-paid their fares and not have to wait for boarding. Station stops would be spaced farther apart, and exclusive bus lanes and signal priority features at traffic lights would be used. All these features combined would increase the speed by which the buses could travel.

Mr. Viggiano further explained that modeling showed that by the year 2015, LTD should be able to provide faster service along the corridors than traveling by car.

Mr. Kleger added that the Board knew that if LTD continued its current style of operation, it would not be able to make any impact upon the people-moving patterns in the community. The community would not be able to afford to pave enough area to meet the increased driving demands of this community.

Something would need to be done, and the Board believed that BRT was the best alternative.

Representative Welsh asked about the dedicated lanes for transit. Ms. Loobey replied that exclusive lanes were a principal feature of BRT in order to achieve the speed. The design would mimic what was being done with light rail, except that LTD would continue to operate at street level with rubber-tired vehicles, avoiding the capital investment of a light-rail system. However, by using a guideway, an exclusive lane would take up much less space than a travel lane and would allow a bus to move independently of regular traffic.

Mr. Bailey added that the exclusive lane was the heart and soul of the concept. He likened the BRT concept to a metro or subway system on rubber tires in terms of the architecture of the routing system. In some areas, an exclusive bus lane could be accommodated within the existing right-of-way; however, in other areas, it might mean acquiring land or taking an existing lane. Also, there could be existing right-of-way that was insufficient and would need to be widened somewhat.

Currently, preliminary design work was underway to determine what that preferred alternative would look like in terms of the actual design of the pilot route. Without that preliminary design work, travel time requirements would not be known.

Representative Welsh asked what other cities in the United States had a BRT system or were considering one. Mr. Bailey responded that he believed that there were no other cities within the United States that were actively operating a BRT system. LTD was first or early with the project, which explained the high level of interest in the project from the federal government. There were several larger U.S. cities that were investigating the concept. Eugene/Springfield was the only community of its size considering the BRT concept. He believed that was one of the reasons that the federal government was interested, because small- to medium- sized communities could not afford light rail but would develop congestion problems in the near future.

Representative Welsh asked if Seattle had something similar. Ms. Loobey responded that Seattle had high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and other methods, such as changing direction of travel lanes on the freeways to match the commute direction. Mr. Bailey added that there were several international communities that had BRT programs; most notably, Curitiba, Brazil, where the entire bus system was a bus rapid transit type of system. About 70 percent of the population in Curitiba used transit on a regular basis.

Representative-elect Walker stated that she had just returned from Washington, D.C., and had found the Metro system to be very convenient. It was easy and painless. She believed that the current LTD bus system was

somewhat antiquated and very difficult to use because delays were long and bus service was further reduced during the evening and weekend hours. In addition, delays were further caused by having to go to the transfer station to catch another bus. She believed that ridership could be increased if LTD addressed the issues that had been discussed, such as speed.

Representative Prozanski asked if BRT would be a two-way system. Mr. Viggiano responded that, ideally, BRT would operate on a guideway in each direction; however, for the foreseeable future, BRT could operate, at least in sections, with only a single lane, much like a train with a single track with a signaling system. If a bus approached from the opposite direction, one of the buses would have to wait, and priority would be given to the peak-direction bus. In the sections that had been designed to date, there were some one-lane sections. Staff were attempting to fit in two-lane guideways where ever possible, without having a significant impact on property acquisition or traffic congestion.

Representative Prozanski asked what, with that in mind, was the goal for 2015 as it related to existing bus service and BRT. Mr. Viggiano responded that the goal for the year 2015, with the BRT system entirely in place, was primarily to have a system with small buses in the neighborhoods and the BRT system in operation on the major corridors. Some regular bus service still could exist to serve areas that would not easily be served by the BRT system.

Representative Welsh asked how much communication had been accomplished with the business community. Mr. Bailey stated that it had been quite extensive. During the last several years, each of the Board members had been involved in one-on-one meetings with local business leaders in both Eugene and Springfield to talk about where LTD was and what the vision was for the future of LTD, including the BRT project. Also, during the past several months, through an extensive outreach process, each of the businesses within specific segments, on or close to the proposed route, had been met with and also had been invited to design workshops. LTD was attempting to get the local business community to be active participants in the process. So far, that segment included the UO and Franklin Boulevard area from West 11th Avenue to Walnut Street. Currently, the Board and staff were in the same process for the Glenwood area, and next would approach the downtown Springfield area.

Mr. Bennett stated that within the first segment, the UO/Franklin area, there already was a median located on Franklin Boulevard, which made it somewhat easier to place exclusive guideways within the public right-of-way. There was not much controversy, and the University was very supportive of the concept.

However, the Glenwood area was primarily industrial. The right-of-way in Glenwood was very narrow, and there were a number of industrial uses along Franklin Boulevard. There was more skepticism in the Glenwood area, and it

was possible that LTD would make more compromises to find reasonable ways to travel through the Glenwood area.

In downtown Springfield, LTD also was considering a relocation of the current downtown station. The strategy there would be to try to coordinate the BRT system with the station location. It appeared that downtown Springfield business people were willing to carefully consider the entire approach to transit services.

Mr. Bennett thought that there would be some segments that would be easier to design, engineer, and obtain support for, while other segments would be more difficult. When Mr. Bennett spoke with business people, he asked them to take a hard look at how BRT would affect them personally and to consider BRT from a community point of view and how they wanted to see transportation in the future. The Glenwood area currently had 18,000 automobiles per day passing through on Franklin Boulevard, and it was projected to go to 38,000 cars per day by the year 2015. Franklin Boulevard in front of the University was expected to reach gridlock.

Most of the business people with whom Mr. Bennett had met were willing to give careful consideration to the project.

LTD Budget: Ms. Hocken provided an overview of the LTD budget. She discussed the various funding sources, including the cigarette tax, which was earmarked for special transportation and was shrinking due to a lower demand for cigarettes. At the same time, the demand for special transportation services, such as RideSource, was increasing because the population was aging and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) had certain requirements for providing services to people who had various disabilities. For instance, LTD was required to provide equivalent service to people with disabilities, which meant during the same hours that regular bus service was in operation and the ability for people to get to the same places that the bus traveled. Therefore, costs were increasing while the revenue was decreasing, resulting in LTD providing more of a subsidy from its general fund.

Ms. Hocken then described the special transportation services that LTD provided. The fixed-route service was 100 percent accessible, and training programs were in place for people with disabilities and the elderly to learn how to access the bus and use the system. In addition, a paratransit system was in place, RideSource, which provided demand-response bus service to people who were unable to access the fixed-route system. RideSource was a very expensive system to operate.

The cigarette tax generated \$370,000, which equaled 37 percent of the cost of operating the paratransit service, and none of that money was used for the fixed-route accessible features. In addition, LTD received very little in capital

funding for special transportation, so if one of the paratransit vans was put out of service, there was little support to replace it. In Fiscal Year 1997-98, LTD contributed \$650,000 from its general fund just to the paratransit service. That contribution was expected to be more than \$700,000 during the Fiscal Year 1998-99. The good news was that LTD had other operating money that could be used to subsidize the service; however, other communities that did not have those resources could not provide those services.

During the last session of the legislature, the Governor's budget included a new source of funding for elderly and disabled transportation, which unfortunately did not get through the legislature. There had been intense lobbying by seniors and other transit groups, which gave the budget bill some momentum, but not enough. Ms. Hocken believed that the senior lobby would be strong again during the next session, and even though there was no proposal in the Governor's budget, she believed a proposal would be brought forward.

The last proposal would have resulted in LTD receiving approximately \$1.5 million, which was determined to be about what it cost to provide incremental service to elderly and disabled individuals. Ms. Hocken was hopeful that it would come up again in the 1999 legislature.

Representative-elect King asked Ms. Hocken to characterize what typically was received from federal sources for special transportation. Ms. Hocken responded that federal funding primarily was used for capital expenses. Very little federal money was used for operating expenses. LTD received approximately \$2.8 million in federal formula funds, and provided the local match of 20 percent for those funds.

She mentioned that in addition to requesting state assistance for operating special transportation services, LTD also was interested in pursuing state assistance with local match requirements.

Special Transportation: Mr. Kleger discussed the special transportation services in Lane County, which were divided into two pieces: in-District and out-of-District. In-District services were administered by the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) under contract with LTD. LCOG, in turn, contracted the service out to Special Mobility Services as the operating entity. When the cigarette tax was first instituted, the local match was provided by a sinking fund that was created when LTD was unable to expend the first year's operating fund. That sinking fund was almost gone, and LTD would be required to provide that local match from its operating fund. In addition, the State of Oregon Department of Transportation administered any federal funding for special transportation. The contract operation at LCOG had done remarkably well considering an extremely small staff.

Out-of-District special transportation was one of the best examples of shoestring operations that Mr. Kleger had ever seen. However, it did not work everywhere in the county. For instance, there was no special transportation service in the McKenzie valley. There was extremely marginal service in Veneta, Elmira, and Junction City, which strictly was shopper service. In the Florence area, there was a taxi subsidy program that was so marginal that it only was used for extreme need situations. However, there was an effective paratransit service in the south Lane County area. In Oakridge, there was a van that operated within the city limits.

Mr. Kleger further stated that for every person in Lane County whose needs were met by special transportation accommodations, there were another six to eight people whose needs were not being met. He added that 80 percent of the special transportation users were senior citizens. Most of the providers in the rural areas used volunteers and volunteer vehicles to provide the service.

The situation was not good in the rural areas, and Mr. Kleger said that it would not get better without some significant improvements in funding.

LTD was a world-class operation in service to people with special transportation needs; however, much of the funding was being taken away from the fixed-route service, which was much more efficient. The cost per trip on the fixed-route service was approximately \$2.50, while it was \$12 to \$14 for paratransit service.

Eligibility for paratransit services periodically was reviewed in an attempt to ensure that those who could use the fixed-route service were using it. In addition, Mr. Kleger mentioned that the fixed-route service provided much more independence. People who used the paratransit service had to make their travel plans at least 24 hours in advance. Within the District, people used RideSource for any purpose that they could use any other form of transportation for.

The fact that people who needed special transportation services often could not use a regular vehicle, such as a sedan, decreased the ability to use volunteers and volunteer vehicles.

Mr. Kleger stated that any help the legislators could give in improving the special transportation facilities in Oregon would be appreciated.

Mr. Bailey added that the packets that had been given to the legislators contained more information about the RideSource program and the Bus Buddies program, which involved individuals who volunteered as "bus buddies" to assist the elderly and people with disabilities to access the fixed-route bus system.

Mr. Bailey asked the legislators what the likelihood was of a transportation funding package during the 1999 legislative session. Representative Prozanski

stated that he thought it would be important for the LTD Board members to begin lobbying as soon as possible. Representative Welsh added that transportation would be a big part of the legislative agenda, and he had noticed that the Association of Oregon Industries had played into the process. He believed that there would be a number of people within his caucus who would want to make sure there was a segment for senior and disabled transportation during the session, and he had the notion that it would be a strong subject.

Mr. Kleger noted that any enhancements to the fixed-route service also would benefit special transportation. Ms. Hocken added that BRT buses would be easier to board for the elderly and disabled. Mr. Kleger said that pre-paid fares also would enhance services to people with special needs.

Representative-elect King asked what the state funding portion was last year. Ms. Hocken replied that the state contributed \$370,000 last year, and it was not expected to increase. LTD expected to contribute in excess of \$700,000 next year. Mr. Kleger noted that based on projections, there would be a miniscule increase in funding for the out-of-district services. Federal law mandated that the paratransit services within the LTD service district match the fixed-route service.

Representative-elect King noted that the state's contribution to special transportation within the LTD service district was less than 2 percent of LTD's total budget.

Willamette Valley Train: Mr. Bailey noted that this issue was one that most likely would be on the legislative agenda. The Governor already had included the train in his budget proposal. He urged the legislators to fund, at some level, the Willamette Valley train.

Representative-elect Walker stated that she had requested to serve on the transportation committee. She was very interested in pursuing mass transit and rail issues. Representative Prozanski added that he used the train service daily to Salem and used his bicycle while in Salem. He stated that he believed that \$14 million, as proposed in the budget, was below the threshold of where the state should be.

Mr. Bennett asked what the legislators thought would happen with a transportation budget during the next session. Representative Welsh stated that he thought it would be similar in priority to last session. He believed there was strong support, but that other priorities superceded the transportation issue.

Representative Welsh stated that the rail problems were caused by the infrastructure in Portland, and the time it took to pass through the Portland area by train. Trains were required to travel 15 miles per hour through Portland, where they were switched on and off the main line. Oregon was so far behind in

rail technology that it was unable to bring in a commercial rail shipper. Moving goods and products by rail needed to be improved in order to secure more funding.

Partnership: Mr. Bailey asked how the Board could work together with the legislators with regard to transportation services. Representative-elect Walker stated that one issue of concern to her was the outlying communities not having access to rail or bus service. She thought that in order to generate rural support for the Willamette Valley rail issue, bus service needed to be enhanced in order to get people from those areas to the train.

Mr. Kleger stated that he was raised in a rural area of Oregon, and he noted that transportation services actually had declined in that area. There once was regular bus service that was fully self-supporting that transported people to train services; however, today, there was STF-supported service that was inconsistent and that did not provide the same level of service. He thought it was important to identify what was being done in the public policy side that was making these things not fit together when clearly there was a demand.

Representative Prozanski suggested that the LTD Board outreach to other transit boards across the state regarding the transportation package. He thought it was important, on a statewide basis, that transportation providers join together to lobby. He also thought it was important to demonstrate the statewide need where rural and urban services met. He noted that representatives who were in the position of chairing the Ways and Means Committee typically were able to secure funding for special projects within their own district. He hoped that at least one representative and one senator from the Lane County area would be appointed to a transportation committee. He thought it was a just a matter of time before the corridor between Salem and Portland became one long series of communities, much like the Seattle to Olympia, Washington, corridor. Now was the time to get the infrastructure in place. He reiterated that the connections between the rural services and urban services should be emphasized, because he believed that improvements on either side would benefit the other.

Representative-elect Walker noted that Senator Susan Castillo had been appointed to the Senate Transportation Committee.

Ms. Loobey stated that it was her understanding that currently there was no way to subsidize passenger service on private carriers as a way to connect people in rural areas to the urban areas. She thought the legislators should consider a subsidy for private providers. She was aware that RAZ Transportation, for instance, had attempted to provide service from Seaside to Astoria that was not profitable. She thought the domestic providers should be subsidized so as not to leave communities stranded with no public transportation alternatives.

Ms. Loobey added that the Oregon Transit Association, which was the lobbyist for providers in the state, had worked with transportation providers prior to the statewide transportation conference in Seaside regarding special transportation needs. She noted that there was concern that the Tri-Met and Tri-County solution would be applied to the rest of the state. She noted, as an example, the "Elders in Action" in the Tri-County area, which had developed a \$25 million proposal for transportation for the frail elderly that included very expensive door-through-door service. That type of service, while it might work in the Tri-County area, most likely would not be feasible for the rest of the state.

Representative Welsh stated that he was pleased to hear about the BRT proposal. He encouraged the Board to talk with other representatives and senators.

Representative-elect King asked the Board to comment on the Cottage Grove transportation circumstances. He noted that it was a close election in Cottage Grove, and he wondered if there was a funding structure that took into account the needs of the satellite communities.

Mr. Bennett responded that LTD primarily was funded through a tax on local payroll. And while not everyone favored the payroll tax, they generally understood that in order to keep the roads efficient to benefit their own companies, public transit services were needed. He stated that the people in the Cottage Grove area needed to make the case for transit services.

Representative-elect King stated that he realized the payroll tax was less than perfect but was the best option available. He thought that the use pattern in a market like Cottage Grove was different primarily because people rode the bus to commute to and from work, so the same arguments that applied within the urban area did not apply to Cottage Grove, such as easing the gridlock on the city streets. He was not sure if legislators had addressed those considerations on a statewide basis.

Ms. Loobey added that there were many issues to address. For instance, for most of the people who used the bus to commute to work in the urban area, the payroll tax already was being paid on their wages. In addition, the people who worked at UO or Sacred Heart, for instance, already had a subsidized bus pass through the Group Pass Program. She believed that a community needed to mature to a certain level in order to more fully support issues like public transportation. For instance, it was not true, in her opinion, that Cottage Grove was an economic entity within itself. There were many people who earned a living in the urban area who then supported their cities, schools, business, etc., within their rural community. The economy was two-way. Bus service to Cottage Grove had been considered several times during the past 20 years. During this last consideration, the City Council and staff in Creswell had made the decision to institute the service regardless of the election results in Cottage Grove.

Ms. Loobey added that LTD was continuing discussions with Cottage Grove. One issue that had yet to be settled was a definition of the metropolitan area, and if areas outside the metropolitan area should be considered differently and how to accomplish that.

Representative-elect King stated that he sensed that the business community in Cottage Grove that fought the payroll tax issue knew that they would have to contribute some, but not all, of the revenue for the service.

Mr. Bennett stated that he had considered a way to transition into the Cottage Grove area by making more of a contribution now, knowing that it would be valuable in the future. However, he did not think LTD could do that because it would end up treating the various rural communities differently. Representative-elect King stated that any subsidy would need to come from the state, and this was an example of an issue that occurred throughout the state.

Mr. Kleger added that a subsidy to private operators for inter-city operations could apply to the Cottage Grove connection. He believed that a private operator marginally could get by running a commuter service between Cottage Grove and the metropolitan area; however, it probably would not make enough money to justify it. It was a good investment for the state to make and a lot cheaper than building another lane of freeway.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion with the legislators, Mr. Bailey adjourned this portion of the special meeting at 7:03 p.m.

WORK SESSION: Following a short break, the Board reconvened for the work session portion of this meeting.

FRANKLIN BOULEVARD / UO SEGMENT BRT REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano stated that this was an action item scheduled for the regular Board meeting on December 16, 1998. However, the Board would begin discussions of the segment alignment at this work session, then continue discussions and select the preferred design alternative for the Franklin/UO segment of the BRT pilot corridor on December 16.

Mr. Viggiano provided a brief background of the process of selecting the preferred design alternative. He stated that the BRT Steering Committee had reviewed the same information that the Board was reviewing at this session. He directed the Board's attention to the Franklin/UO Alternatives Evaluation Chart on page 23 of the agenda packet, which showed the projected impacts of each design alternative. The Steering Committee had selected a preferred design for the Franklin/UO segment and would request Board action at the regular meeting.

1000
1000

1000
1000
1000

Following the selection of the preferred design alternative, a technical review would take place, so Mr. Viggiano assured the Board that this would not be the final decision for the Franklin/UO segment. It would be combined with the Glenwood, downtown Springfield, and downtown Eugene segments as Phase I, which would then be forwarded for further study and review and approval by the partner agencies.

Mr. Viggiano then reviewed the four design alternatives: A-1, A-2, B, and C. Alternative A-1 featured a single-lane guideway throughout the entire segment with passing opportunities at stations. Alternative A-2 featured a combination of single- and double-lane guideways. Alternatives B and C operated two-way guideways throughout the entire segment and would result in the taking of one or two existing lanes from Franklin Boulevard.

Ms. Wylie asked why ridership was expected to be higher in alternatives B and C than in A-1 and A-2. Mr. Viggiano replied that automobile travel times would be significantly impacted with alternatives B and C, which both took existing travel lanes from Franklin Boulevard.

The Steering Committee recommended Alternative A-2 as the preferred alternative because it achieved the best mix of benefits. It provided much of the transit benefit needed for BRT, but it did not create some of the problems in terms of car travel times, congestion, and air quality that were shown in alternatives B and C.

Ms. Wylie noted that there were more trees to be removed under alternative A-2. Mr. Viggiano stated that an arborist had taken a look at the trees, and they were found to be fairly healthy, but were not necessarily the best trees for a traffic median. The arborist suggested a tree that would form more of a canopy and be bigger. Mr. Kleger asked if there was a possibility of moving some of the trees. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff had not asked that specific question, and if it could be done, it most likely would be an expensive process. Mr. Kleger stated that he recalled when those trees were planted, and if he remembered correctly, there was not a lot of room for root expansion. He thought they were planted in the early 1970s. He suggested that staff have the arborist check into the root situation.

Adjournment: There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey thanked Mr. Viggiano for his presentation, and he reminded the Board that the discussion would be continued at the regular Board meeting on December 16. He then adjourned the meeting at 7:52 p.m.


BOARD SECRETARY

