

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, February 17, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 11, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, February 17, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Hillary Wylie, Board Secretary

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. Ms. Lauritsen was not yet present.

**WORK SESSION**

**INTRODUCTORY MEETING WITH BOARD'S LEGAL COUNSEL:** Mr. Bailey welcomed John Arnold and Roger Saydack, representing the local law firm of Arnold Gallagher Saydack Percell and Roberts, P.C., which was the newly appointed legal counsel to the LTD Board of Directors. Mr. Saydack said that the firm was pleased to have been selected as legal counsel to the Board. The firm believed in the mission of LTD. Mr. Saydack stated that his firm had a good combination of resources that he thought would be attractive to LTD. The firm combined an extensive business practice with a lot of experience in municipal law. Mr. Saydack thought that combination would be very beneficial to the District during the weeks and months ahead as it embarked upon one of the largest public/private partnership developments the community had ever experienced.

Mr. Saydack stated that his firm had met with staff to discuss the protocols for providing service, the expectations that staff would have of legal counsel, and the type of work the firm initially would be encountering. The firm also wanted to meet with the Board to hear what the Board's expectations of counsel would be. Mr. Saydack stated that it also was important for the Board to hear counsel's philosophy of representing a municipal body.

Mr. Arnold stated that he appreciated the opportunity to represent the District. The District had a number of exciting projects coming up that would present some interesting

legal issues both for the District and the community. It was exciting to be on the cutting edge of progress, and the firm looked forward to working with LTD on issues as they came up.

Mr. Arnold said that the philosophy of the firm was that service was key, and the key to providing good service was to understand the mission of its clients, how they worked, and what they expected of counsel. In terms of representing a public agency, there were some similarities to representing a business enterprise, because in many ways LTD was a business. The difference was that LTD was doing the public's business and that mission was first.

Counsel would endeavor to provide concise and clear advice and to help the District meet its mission so that the public's business could be done in an orderly way.

Ms. Lauritsen arrived at 5:45 p.m.

Mr. Saydack added that the firm was very mindful that the Board set policy and counsel's job was to assist the Board with implementing its policy and not to interfere with the setting of policy.

Mr. Kleger stated that he always had some resistance to spending money on lawyer's bills, even though he knew how unavoidable it was in this day and age. He believed that a critical role of counsel was to ensure that its clients were kept well informed. Mr. Saydack stated that counsel would review each Board agenda packet and would be proactive in notifying the Board members of possible issues. Also, the firm would be in frequent contact with staff to be aware of potential issues. In addition, the partners were very involved in the community in many different ways, so they also would pay attention to things they saw or heard concerning LTD.

Ms. Hocken stated that because of the large capital projects the District was involved in, most likely there would be issues around land use and property acquisition. She asked if counsel planned to work on these issues or if outside help would be brought in. Mr. Saydack stated that counsel had thought about that in the abstract because no specific situations had come up. The role of general counsel was to know its limitations and to obtain outside help when needed.

Mr. Saydack added that his firm had been in contact with the general counsel for Tri-Met in Portland to learn more about some of the issues that came up for Tri-Met as it planned and implemented the MAX light-rail system.

Mr. Bennett stated that Mr. Saydack's firm represented his company, and because of that, he had remained out of the decision-making process. He had a lot of confidence in the firm, and in particular, Mr. Arnold's experience with municipal government. He expressed a high regard for both Mr. Saydack and Mr. Arnold, and was pleased to welcome them to LTD.

Mr. Bailey stated that it was important for the firm and LTD to have clear communication and a commitment to a proactive approach to legal counseling. The Board used that approach in its public policymaking, and Mr. Bailey hoped that it could be fostered in dealing with legal issues as well.

Mr. Arnold stated that the firm worked closely with its clients to ensure that issues were addressed proactively rather than reactively. A collaborative relationship was what the firm was looking forward to with LTD. LTD had some big issues on the horizon, and it would be important to remain ahead of those issues.

Mr. Bailey asked if counsel had expectations of LTD. Mr. Saydack requested that the Board never hesitate to ask for help when needed and to not hesitate to let counsel know if they were not meeting the expectations of the Board. He asked that the Board give some consideration to how it would present issues to counsel; i.e., funneling issues through staff or a more direct approach. For instance, matters relating to individual situations as Board members might be brought to counsel on an individual, direct contact basis.

Mr. Bailey stated that it was his understanding that the Board typically channeled issues through the general manager, and meetings were arranged between the Board and counsel according to circumstances.

Mr. Kortge thought it was inappropriate for a Board member to have direct contact with the firm. Mr. Kleger added that he could only think of one instance where it would be appropriate for a Board member to have direct contact with counsel, and that was a if there was a possibility of conflict of interest.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that even though the firm would act as legal counsel to the Board, the client was Lane Transit District.

Mr. Bailey again welcomed the law firm and thanked Mr. Saydack and Mr. Arnold for attending the meeting.

**Glenwood Design Alternative for BRT Pilot Corridor:** Mr. Bennett stated that the Glenwood segment was the second segment of the bus rapid transit (BRT) pilot corridor design process. This segment presented some particularly difficult issues. A good job had been done so far in addressing those issues and the public process. The Glenwood segment design was now ready for Board deliberation and a decision.

Mr. Bennett explained that the Glenwood segment had two significant problems in terms of LTD achieving its objectives. Franklin Boulevard, the main corridor through the segment, had a very narrow right-of-way. Also, there was a very unusual mix of businesses along the corridor. Many were industrial, with large equipment that would be impeded by a center lane right-of-way, which became a major obstacle in terms of the various options of where the BRT route could go.

Mr. Bennett thought that the alternatives prepared by staff were good ones, and while there was not a solution to all the problems, considerable progress had been made.

Project Engineer Graham Carey presented the three design alternatives. Alternative A1/A2 was a one-lane guideway in the median of Franklin Boulevard, with bus passing opportunities at stations. Alternative A1 would implement the median guideway right away, while alternative A2 would phase the guideway in over time, allowing turn access across the center bus lane in the short term.

Alternative B was a two-lane bus guideway on 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There were two options at each end of the segment for connection points with Franklin Boulevard.

Alternative C was a two-lane bus guideway on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There were two options at each end of the segment for connection points with Franklin Boulevard.

Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano stated that there had been an extensive public process with this segment of the corridor. He reviewed for the Board the steps that staff had taken, including one-on-one meetings with everyone along the corridor, direct mailing of informational pieces, and the open houses and design workshops. In addition, a small working group was formed that included residents and business owners and a third workshop was held that was well attended.

There was no support for alternative A1/A2, and there were objections to alternative C because it operated through the middle of a neighborhood. Alternative B generally was supported by residents and business owners in Glenwood.

Mr. Viggiano then reviewed the Glenwood Alternatives Evaluation of the various options that was included in the agenda packet. He explained that a new section was added to the spreadsheet that evaluated business and neighborhood impacts. He noted that traffic impacts did not change much among the three options. Currently there were 25,000 vehicles per day traveling on Franklin Boulevard, and by the year 2015, 38,000 vehicles per day were projected.

The projected travel speed along 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue was 25 miles per hour, but staff determined that this speed still would be faster than traveling on Franklin. Running time on 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue was guaranteed with a two-lane guideway.

Mr. Viggiano noted that staff were committed to holding a fourth workshop to report the findings to the community.

The BRT Steering Committee considered this issue at its meeting on February 10, 1999, and voted unanimously to recommend Alternative B to the Board as the preferred alignment for the BRT corridor through Glenwood. Staff would continue to work on the issues of the east- and west-end alignments as well as gaining approval for the design of 14<sup>th</sup> Street from the County and/or the City of Springfield.

## **REGULAR MEETING**

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** (1) Tom Lester of Eugene spoke to the Board about the federal BRT Demonstration Program. He urged the LTD Board to withdraw its request for participation in the federal BRT Demonstration Program. Instead, he believed the Board could prove public support for the BRT project by asking local citizens to "pony up" the money for the project rather than relying on handouts from Washington, D.C. There had been a lot of talk that this project only would go through if there was public support. How could you measure public support if you did not put it before a vote of the local citizens?

The second issue Mr. Lester addressed was the Glenwood segment of the BRT pilot corridor. He urged the Board to not approve the 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue alignment for the Glenwood segment of the BRT. That alignment would set serious negative development forces in motion that would prevent 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue from evolving into a viable urban street. Instead he asked the Board to order LTD staff and the design team to fully develop plans for a split BRT alignment between 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenues, with the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue leg routed between LTD's Maintenance and Administration buildings. He asked the Board to instruct staff and the design team to not skimp on right-of-way acquisition. Both streets would need to have a vehicular travel lane, a parking lane, a couple of 4-foot bicycle lanes, and adequate sidewalks for an urban street, for an overall minimum width of 61 feet.

In addition, he urged the Board to order staff and the design team to develop a set of plans for routing the BRT line over the Willamette River on a new bridge to be located between the Springfield bridge and the Union Pacific Railroad bridge. He noted that this idea actually was suggested by one of the participants in the downtown Springfield segment of the project. He urged the Board to set a deadline for the completion of these plans, and to not let staff miss that deadline.

Lastly, Mr. Lester thought that urban design considerations should be incorporated into the planning process both for the BRT and the downtown Springfield Station. He believed that LTD needed to put in the time and the money to ensure that LTD's efforts contributed to rather than detracted from the quality of urban development now and into the future.

(2) Mr. Fred Simmons of Springfield stated that he had comments that he would make during the public hearing process of the meeting; however, he did ask if he could get more information about the process for public notification about pricing changes, route review changes, and the BRT project. He realized that these were federally driven, but wanted to get copies of the regulations related to those specific processes.

(3) Mr. Douglas Moorhead, Project Manager at Gainsborough, a manufactured home community in Eugene, spoke to the Board about adding bus service on Irving Road west of Arrowhead. He stated that he had contacted LTD requesting this bus service last year, and was told he was too late for that process. There was a resident who had a signed petition for service that would be turned in. There was a lot of housing going up in that area, and he suggested that LTD add a bus on Irving that would turn around at the Eagles golf course. The manager at the golf course was very much in favor of having the bus travel there, and the bus could serve an existing bus stop on Irving. There were many people who were over 55 in the area who were interested in the bus service.

There were no others in the audience who wished to address the Board at this time.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Mr. Bailey introduced bus operator Peggy Gordon, who had been selected as the March 1999 Employee of the Month. Ms. Gordon was hired on January 12, 1998. A co-worker and six customers nominated her both for excellence in service and job accomplishments and for excellence in providing accessible bus service to customers with disabilities. Her nominators said that in addition to being a careful driver, Ms. Gordon was special: always cheerful, with a big smile to share

with everyone; always helpful and considerate; and a person who consistently went out of her way to make her riders happy and comfortable.

Her supervisor said that Ms. Gordon brought a wonderful quality to LTD. She had the ability to connect with her customers, and they felt special when riding with her. In addition, it was pointed out that Ms. Gordon held the record for the most Employee of the Month nominations received by any employee during the first year of employment. Her supervisor also stated that Ms. Gordon's understanding and appreciation of the true meaning of public service would win her many more accolades throughout her career at LTD.

Mr. Bailey presented Ms. Gordon with a plaque, a letter of congratulations, and a monetary reward. Ms. Gordon thanked the Board for the honor.

**ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW – Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Service Plan:** Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated that this was a preliminary public hearing, but not the official public hearing for this issue. The official public hearing would be held in March with adoption by the Board.

Mr. Vobora stated that this year's plan included minor changes to the system. Staff had not planned to make major changes to service this year because a Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) was in progress that would result in major changes in September 2000. He noted that the FY 1999-2000 proposal was the smallest increase in service since 1985. Typically, the Annual Route Review (ARR) resulted in service increases of about 3 percent. This year, staff were requesting a 1.19 percent increase in service.

Mr. Vobora reviewed the eight service adjustments that were being requested, including adding peak timepoints to route 13, weekend service to route 32, Saturday service to routes 11 and 15, and a Creswell circulator service for route 98.

Mr. Bennett asked if the predicted productivity represented the standard. Mr. Vobora responded that the system average was 30 rides per hour, and the minimum standard set by the Board was 20 rides per hour. Creswell was the only route that dropped below the minimum standard; however, the rural service standard was lower than the urban service standard.

Mr. Bennett asked what the reason was for the changes. Mr. Vobora responded that the route 13 request was driven by congestion, ridership, and bus operator comments. Route 32 changes were being requested because it mainly was industrial service and it was being redesigned to better meet the nature of work shifts in the area. The requested changes to route 26c was to accommodate school children who rode south on Willamette Street. The addition of Saturday service on route 11 was based on ridership statistics. There also were contingency categories that staff were requesting in order to accommodate possible growth areas during the next year.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff had made a firm decision about implementing the contingency recommendations. Mr. Vobora replied that contingencies were based on anticipated growth, but would not be implemented unless that growth was realized.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff were concerned about the contingency plans in conjunction with the CSR review. Mr. Vobora stated that the contingency recommendations were not for service to new areas, but rather were additions to existing service, such as the request for contingency service to accommodate anticipated LCC ridership growth.

Mr. Vobora explained that increased service frequency and expansion of service on the weekend were the two more frequently requested service issues.

Mr. Vobora reviewed the evaluation of service implemented in the fall of 1997. Mr. Bennett asked why the Willow Creek express service still was being operated when its productivity level was so much lower than the standard. Mr. Vobora responded that staff continued to work with Hyundai, a major employer in the area, which just recently had reached its full employment level. Hyundai had agreed to work with LTD once it reached full employment to encourage its employees to use the bus. In addition, that area was developing rapidly, with several large industries planned.

Ms. Hocken asked at what point staff would pull the route 38/39 service if it did not reach expectations. Mr. Vobora replied that at this time, staff planned to leave the service in operation and address it during the CSR process. Staff believed that pulling service for one year during the CSR process would leave large gaps in service coverage. Ms. Hocken responded that she was not sure where those gaps would be. The particular route did not appear to accomplish much. Mr. Vobora stated that staff were planning to do additional marketing in that area. Ms. Hocken asked staff to take another look at eliminating those routes.

Mr. Bennett asked about the Comprehensive Service Redesign process and if the Board would be involved early in that process in terms of establishing the criteria. Mr. Vobora replied that the Board would review and take action on the guidelines later in the meeting. At the March meeting, the Board would decide how it wanted to allocate resources in terms of coverage, equity, or productivity.

**Public Testimony on Annual Route Review:** (1) Fred Simmons of Springfield stated that he appreciated the work the planners did to attempt to balance the needs. He had a suggestion regarding the bridge of regular service to the BRT service. Expanding route 32 was a valid idea because there were 1,000 people working in the serviced area with a large amount of growth expected. He suggested that staff consider a transitional BRT-type of route that would operate from 1<sup>st</sup> and Bertelsen along the West 11<sup>th</sup> Corridor that would correlate with routes 38/39 and 32. This would increase the velocity of travel from the west side, which could impact the people at Hyundai and others in the Willow Creek area.

Mr. Simmons thought that a transitional route that traveled the West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor to the Eugene Station and followed the 11x routing out to Thurston Station could be implemented quickly, and travel time could be reduced by 20 minutes if it used the express bus stops. He also believed that this suggestion would begin to build the desire in the community for BRT and would begin to develop the patterns around BRT that would give some good ideas as to what was needed to make the BRT system most effective.

He believed that this service could trim out 20 minutes from this high-velocity corridor, continue to serve the Sacred Heart/UO area, and show the potential success of the future BRT service.

(2) Douglas Moorhead of Eugene asked which route currently served the Irving area. Mr. Vobora responded that route 52 served that area. Mr. Vobora added that Irving was a growth area that would be considered carefully during the CSR process. Mr. Moorhead asked if staff would consider adding the service he requested previously during this year's ARR process. He knew of 5 people in the housing development who did not drive. There was a lot of traffic to the golf course, and the golf course management was willing to allow LTD to use its parking lot as a turn-around.

(3) Jack Kodera of Eugene stated that he used routes 41 and 42 and found them to be very convenient. However, he had a friend who lived in Southeast Eugene near 43<sup>rd</sup> and Donald. His friend would appreciate having regular route 24 service after 6:00 p.m.

(4) Chris Phillips of Eugene commented that for the first time in several years, he thought the bus service during the recent snow was very good. He had concerns about routes 35 and 39. He had argued against the route 39 proposal several years ago because he believed it was not likely to attract many riders. Most people who lived in the City View area were not likely to use the bus to go shopping because it was not very convenient, and they all had cars. If LTD wanted to attract the area's residents to use the bus to commute to and from work, then the service needed to be more convenient. Transfers interfered with working or reading while on the bus, and people would choose to drive rather than wait in the rain for 10 minutes for that transfer. One of the advantages to riding the bus was that he could work on the bus, and it was not wasted time.

Route 39 had produced very few riders and he knew staff were considering deleting it entirely. However, deleting the route would leave him with service only during commute trips. He said that being on a bus route with direct service to the university that operated conveniently throughout the day had been a very important factor when he purchased his home.

No one else wished to address the Board, and Mr. Bailey closed the public testimony portion of this agenda item.

**Board Discussion:** Mr. Kleger relayed a message from another rider about the gap between the route 11x service and the transition to the next regular route 11 trip. The first trip of route 11 following the last route 6x trip always was full. The rider had asked Mr. Kleger to request staff to consider an extra bus during those transitional periods.

Mr. Vobora stated that during the March meeting, staff would provide an analysis to the Board of the service requests and comments that had been received during the ARR process. Mr. Bailey thanked those who testified and stated that another public hearing would be held during the March meeting.

**FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000 PRICING PLAN REVISION PROPOSAL:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that each year in February staff reviewed the current fare pricing plan with the Board and proposed fare changes. The prices for various fare



instruments that the District used were set in LTD Ordinance No. 35; therefore, changes in the pricing plan required a change to the ordinance, which required formal readings at two separate meetings prior to adoption. A preliminary public hearing would be held at this meeting, a formal public hearing would be held during the March meeting, and the two readings of the ordinance would be held at the April and May regular Board meetings.

Ms. Hellekson stated that there were two separate policies regarding fares. One addressed the fixed-route fares, and the other addressed the demand-response fares. Staff would present the fixed-route fare recommendations at this meeting, then in March, would present the demand-response fare recommendations. Ultimately, both policies would be combined into the proposed revision to Ordinance No. 35.

Staff were proposing to increase the price of all pass instruments (except the day pass) in accordance with LTD fare policy; possible elimination of the day pass, which would be phased out at the end of the calendar year 1999; and possible discontinuation of the evening fare reduction (after a review of the Origin and Destination study results). No changes to the price of tokens and cash fares were being proposed at this time.

Ms. Hellekson stated that, typically, the Board had considered cash fares and pass fares in alternating years. This year, staff were considering a proposal to eliminate the evening fare reduction, which would raise evening fares to the current \$1.00 standard daytime fare. Staff would review the results of the Origin and Destination study, which surveyed bus riders, before making a final recommendation on the evening fare.

Staff were recommending an increase in the adult monthly pass price from \$26.00 to \$28.00 and the adult three-month pass from \$60.00 to \$65.00. Youth monthly pass prices were proposed to increase from \$19.50 to \$21.00, with the three-month youth pass increasing from \$45.00 to \$49.00. Child, Senior, and Reduced pass prices were proposed to increase from \$13.00 to \$14.00 for the monthly pass and from \$30.00 to \$33.00 for the three-month pass. Staff also proposed an increase from \$29.95 to \$33.00 for the summer youth Freedom Pass, effective in May of 2000.

The elimination of the day pass was being proposed because it mostly was being used by social service agency clients, it was expensive to produce, and it was not selling well. Staff would consider halting sales of the day pass with the implementation of the September service changes, but would plan to honor day passes through the end of 1999.

These recommendations would simplify the fare structure and reduce costs. Ms. Hellekson explained that the token was infinitely reusable, and the day pass was used once, then thrown away.

Mr. Bennett asked how many Freedom Passes were sold. Mr. Vobora replied that 2,800 Freedom Passes were sold last year.

Mr. Kortge asked who besides the social service agencies would be affected by the elimination of the day pass. Mr. Vobora responded that mostly it would affect low-income families and those who rode the bus more than twice daily. Ms. Hellekson added that the day pass sales made up less than one-half of one percent of the total fare revenue.

Ms. Hocken asked how the low-income program related to the day passes. Mr. Vobora stated that the low-income program was for private, non-profit agencies. LTD donated a very small number of tokens and day passes to the Catholic Community Services on a monthly basis. Other private, non-profit agencies could apply for and purchase up to \$115 worth of fare instruments per month at one-half the price. It was a very limited number of instruments that were sold under this program.

Mr. Kortge asked who bought day passes. Mr. Vobora responded that often it was repeat customers who bought several day passes at one time. Those people would need to make a transition to the cash fare, tokens, or the monthly pass.

Ms. Lauritsen asked about the increase to the group pass fare that was included in the pricing proposal summary and why the percentage increase was higher to the group than to the individual. Ms. Hellekson replied that there was a different policy that addressed group pass pricing. Group pass rates were adjusted according to the average increase in operating expenses over the three most recent fiscal years. LTD recovered the actual increase in operating costs. Group pass prices were adjusted on an annual basis. In three years, the group pass participants would experience a larger increase than the single pass holders would on a per-year average.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was interested in a comprehensive review of pricing policies. He was concerned about making a decision to increase the adult pass price just because it was the year to do so, and he did not know what the basis of the actual pricing was. He did not think it was reasonable pricing policy. He thought there was a serious responsibility of the Board to take a fiscal responsibility in terms of time to consider what might occur if the fare system was a higher percentage of the budget. He thought that the decisions that the Board was making and the policy that the Board operated under needed to be reviewed. He was hopeful that the Board could discuss the policy criteria along with the Comprehensive Service Redesign.

Ms. Hellekson stated that staff shared Mr. Bennett's concerns. The proposal was meant to keep LTD moving in the right direction while staff and the Board took the time to research the balance between projected ridership, community goals, serving those with low income, and appropriate farebox recovery.

**Public Testimony on Pricing Plan Revision Proposal:** (1) Mr. Shawn Westcott of Eugene stated that his wife and he rode exclusively with LTD. They had used many transit systems throughout the United States, and they trusted LTD the most. They had no problem with the evening price increase.

He thought that while it may be fiscally sound for LTD to eliminate the day pass, it was not socially responsible. The people who used the day pass were homeless children and social service organizations. It was more difficult to get a bus token from the social service agency, and often the transfer expired before it could be used. The day pass gave a low-income person the freedom to move around and do more than one errand in a day.

(2) Fred Simmons of Springfield concurred with what Mr. Westcott said. Some of the passengers used their day passes many times throughout the day until the pass became

nearly worn out. He saw many well-used day passes on a daily basis in his capacity as a bus operator.

Mr. Simmons thought that in accordance with state law, the three-month price for the reduced fare pass should be \$32.50, or one-half the regular adult fare, rather than \$33.00.

In addition, Mr. Simmons suggested a universal bus pass. He believed it was time for LTD to begin researching a universal bus pass that included a photo and was not transferable. People could purchase their transportation for the year, and that system could transition into the BRT process in the future. It was cheaper to produce the universal pass, and it encouraged long-term ridership.

There were no others who wished to address the Board.

**Board Discussion:** Mr. Kleger stated that when he had made the transition from exclusive car use to dominant bus use, he used the day pass. It was approximately 2.5 years later that he decided he was making enough trips to warrant his purchasing a monthly pass. He thought that while it might not be a major fare instrument in terms of utilization, the day pass was a good sales tool to encourage people to try the bus.

Mr. Kortge asked staff to re-evaluate the elimination of the day pass. Unless it was a real burden, he thought it should not be eliminated.

Ms. Lauritsen concurred with Mr. Bennett's comments about a more in-depth Board review of policy. She stated that she would like to see some of the research that staff used to make pricing proposals.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Board would receive some comparative data at the March meeting prior to making a decision on the pricing plan.

Mr. Bailey endorsed Mr. Bennett's comments about holding a pricing policy discussion. It was his assumption, based on discussions from the Board retreat in October, that the Board would continue to discuss the service and pricing standards and policies. He thought the Board would get to that process very soon, and the CSR guidelines were later on the agenda, which would set the stage for beginning these discussions.

#### **ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

**MOTION**

**Consent Calendar:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for February 17, 1999, is approved as presented." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken asked if it was appropriate for a Board member to vote on the Consent Calendar if he or she was not present at the previous meeting. Ms. Loobey replied that it was not appropriate. Mr. Bailey called for the vote on the motion to approve the Consent Calendar, which passed by unanimous vote, 4-0, with Mr. Kleger, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Kortge voting in favor; none opposed.

**VOTE**

Ms. Lauritsen and Ms. Hocken abstained from voting because neither had been present at the January Board meeting.

The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the January 20, 1999, regular Board meeting.

**Request for Participation in the Federal Transit Administration Bus Rapid Transit Demonstration Program:** Transit Planner Lisa Gardner was present to discuss this item with the Board. In January 1999, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) published a Request for Participation in its Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Demonstration Program.

Ms. Gardner stated that the FTA had been extremely supportive of LTD's bus rapid transit project and had recognized LTD for having, in large part, developed the concept of BRT as a new program in the 1990s. LTD had uniquely packaged a set of innovative strategies, and the FTA recognized LTD for this extremely innovative program.

This demonstration program attempted to further BRT not only as a concept, but as a project that could be implemented nationwide. It was designed to encourage transit agencies, local and state governments, and metropolitan planning organizations engaged in coordinating infrastructure improvements to consider the benefits of BRT. The desired outcome of this demonstration program was to improve mobility and accessibility, advance economic growth and trade, and enhance environmental quality.

Ms. Gardner emphasized that this program was not a capital funding program, but rather an administrative and technology support program. Those selected to participate in the program would receive administrative support from the FTA in terms of possible funding for an administrative position; regulatory benefits, such as waivers of requirements that FTA had control over, such as a waiver for the Buy America requirement for bus purchases; and as much technological assistance as the FTA could provide, directly from the FTA or through consultants who could assist the districts in researching vehicle design, fuel technologies, signal priority technologies, etc.

The funding for this program, \$2 million per year for a total of \$12 million, would come from the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21), which was the new legislation for transportation funding. Because it was not a capital-funding program, it would not assist in the implementation of BRT, the purchase of buses, etc. LTD would continue to seek capital funds as it had in the past, through appropriated Congressional funds and through urbanized area formula funds.

Participants in this program would be in the best possible position to receive the Congressional earmarked funds in the future. It was critically important that LTD be a part of this demonstration program. Staff had developed a proposal that met the requirements of the program, and Ms. Gardner provided an overview of the proposal. She said that this was the most comprehensive document prepared to date regarding LTD's BRT proposal, and it would be an excellent reference piece for Board members.

**Public Hearing on FTA BRT Demonstration Program:** (1) Tom Lester of Eugene stated that he believed this was a way for LTD to get a foot in the door to a federal handout for the BRT project. He thought that we needed to show local support by going to the local taxpayers and selling BRT to those taxpayers.

(2) Douglas Moorhead of Eugene asked how much LTD was asking for. Ms. Gardner stated that LTD was not asking for money, but to be a participant in a consortium that the FTA would oversee to ensure that resources were dedicated nationally to research particular technologies that LTD already was researching. It was not a capital project that would provide funds to LTD for the purchase of buses, right-of-way, etc. However, if selected, LTD would be in a position to receive administrative funds to pay for an administrative staff person to oversee the project implementation and some specific dedicated technical expertise.

(3) Fred Simmons of Springfield stated that he thought it was an excellent program; however, the optimism about the speed with which this project could be done was effervescent. He thought the issue was that TransPlan, as currently adopted, did not have BRT in it, and the update that included BRT most likely would not be adopted until late in the year. The only document that Mr. Simmons saw in the plan that had been negotiated was the prioritized signal project, which had a great deal of merit in moving forward.

Mr. Simmons believed there were many problems to solve, and he thought staff would have successes and challenges in the future. He thought LTD should be careful because it was not operating in an environment that was interjurisdictional. It would be difficult to move as quickly as the timeline called for.

Mr. Simmons also thought that with the issue of the BRT stops being placed in one-half-mile increments, LTD would not be able to "peel off" local service to the degree projected in the proposal. One of the reasons he was at this meeting was to discuss the issue of the 300-series buses. The operator compartments in the 300-series buses were flawed in many ways, and Mr. Simmons wanted to ensure that before any equipment was purchased for the BRT project, there would be an ergonomic study to delineate and successfully design a compartment that would meet 95 percent of the operators' needs.

His mechanisms included complaining to the FTA and the LTD Board. He also talked with Jimmy LaScalla from the Transit Union, who would be making comments to this process. The Union would provide input prior to funding for capital equipment for the buses that would be used in this project.

Mr. Simmons said that he thought BRT was a wonderful idea, and he was very pleased with the way staff responded to the Glenwood people, and he hoped the same thing would happen during the Springfield segments of the project.

He asked the Board to remember his pitch, which was to follow the old Booth-Kelly Hall Road out to 58th Street; and to cooperate with Weyerhaeuser. The city already owned 28th to 48th Streets, and he thought LTD could establish a system not too unlike what was observed in Brazil, in that what happened out of that system was a community built around it, and he thought it was a wonderful process. He assured the Board that there would be some "peeking" at the issues and there would be objections to certain things.

(4) Shawn Westcott of Eugene asked if there would be a process for acquiring the new technology. He had designed a bus-stop technology and wanted to get in on the process. Mr. Viggiano explained that LTD had a competitive bid purchasing process. He asked Mr. Westcott to please make sure that staff were aware of his product.

There being no further testimony, Mr. Bailey closed the public hearing.

**Board Discussion:** Ms. Hocken assured Mr. Simmons that the Board was very aware that the BRT schedule was ambitious and that there would be many successes and challenges along the way.

Mr. Bennett stated that he supported the effort to be part of the demonstration project. It would be nice to address funding issues locally and allow local citizens to indicate their support or lack of support. The problem was that the automobile was many years ahead of transit in terms of support, and many federal programs had gone into and continued to go into the highway system and state and regional transportation systems. He did not see how LTD could get into a competitive position for alternative transportation unless it took advantage of all resources that might be available. Federal money was LTD's money too, and he believed that LTD was entitled on the basis of that. Since this demonstration project was being offered, and since bus rapid transit was getting a strong hearing throughout the country, and since LTD had taken the initiative ahead of many communities, then LTD should compete for the funding that was available.

Mr. Bennett said that he also believed that BRT would never succeed unless it had strong local support. It may appear that local support was not being shown necessarily by all the local taxes; however, there was a local share, and a substantial amount of research and development was being done using local funds, so in a sense, the local taxpayer was involved.

LTD was in a position to act now to be competitive, and some might argue that the project was moving along too rapidly, but without the effort now to put alternative modes in a competitive position, such as with exclusive rights-of-way, the transit system in place now would never reach the next level. Mr. Bennett thought LTD should have the chance to do that, and he believed that transit ought to be able to compete with the automobile for funds, maybe not at the same level, but at a much stronger level than before.

Mr. Bennett said that the routing could be debated by many, but his sense was that it had to be close to the center of the city, and while it may not be Main Street in Springfield, it had to be close enough to take advantage of the utilization that might occur at the city center. He felt the same way about Eugene. He hoped that point of view received serious consideration in Springfield. The major point was that now was the time to establish the right-of-way.

If a person who believed in compact urban growth or in finding a way to hang onto the urban services boundary, and as a result of that belief, was willing to accept the fact that prices of existing property would increase, then LTD had to start now. LTD had an aggressive calendar, and Mr. Bennett did not apologize for that. He believed that the information had to get to people, and staff and the Board had to work harder on the project in order to have a reasonable chance of moving forward.

Ms. Lauritsen supported Mr. Bennett's statement. In regard to the consortium idea of being involved with other districts that were considering a BRT project, she thought it would be synergistic and would far outweigh any negative aspects.

Mr. Bailey added that one thing he had noticed happening both at the state and federal level was a coalescing around an agenda that described urban livability. Generally that conversation concerned cities the size of Portland or Seattle, but LTD was at the forefront for mid-sized and smaller communities, which were the bulk of communities around the country. He believed it was incumbent on LTD to continue leadership or attempt to be a leader in this area. So far, LTD had been lucky and had bright people who were keeping it at the forefront. It would be a betrayal to the community if LTD did not attempt to maintain that effort now. Just because LTD supported the demonstration project did not mean that all the questions and concerns had been addressed and all the decisions had been made. However, he agreed with Mr. Bennett that LTD needed to begin now in order to have a good answer in the years to come.

In regard to the public support aspect of the BRT project, Mr. Bailey stated that LTD had worked very hard to get the BRT project involved in the TransPlan conversation. To use another mechanism to demonstrate public support at this time would circumvent the community conversation that occurred during the TransPlan process.

Mr. Kleger added that the entire planning process for the pilot corridor currently was, in truth, an extremely detailed feasibility study. He thought it would be good to be involved with partner agencies around the country, particularly when the time came to make some hard decisions. On the technical side, this project was one that coordinated the investigative efforts of many transit entities at many different levels of government. He thought it would be good to have access to that pool of knowledge.

**MOTION** There being no further comments from the Board members, Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the submittal of a Request for Proposal for the Federal Transit Administration Bus Rapid Transit Demonstration Program. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Lauritsen voting in favor, and none opposed.

**VOTE**

Mr. Bailey thanked those who were present to testify on this and other topics.

**COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN:** Mr. Bailey stated that the Board had discussed the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) at the Board's weekend work session in October 1998, and how important it would be, particularly in regard to issues related to the level of service and farebox recovery. At the retreat, service consultant Jarrett Walker had led the Board in a very interesting discussion.

Mr. Vobora presented the timeline for the CSR. The Origin and Destination survey had been conducted. Following the approval of the CSR Design Guidelines, the outreach process would begin in April for sectors 1 through 4, which were the Bethel/Danebo area, River Road area, Ferry Street Bridge area, and the Springfield/Gateway area. The remaining sectors would follow throughout the summer. Staff currently were working out the details of that outreach process. Other issues also would be studied, including the airport service, the downtown shuttle service, etc. In November, staff would present the findings to the Board prior to making budgetary recommendations.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was concerned about the public outreach process occurring prior to the Board's review and discussion about service and pricing policies. He was interested in an in-depth discussion about the goals, criteria, and productivity versus the social service contract and how it related to prices, as well as what role fares played in the total budget.

Ms. Hocken thought that community outreach could occur at the same time as the Board discussions Mr. Bennett described. She was not sure how much time would be spent on matching frequency of service to the density, which was the core of how LTD allocated its resources. She shared Mr. Bennett's concern that the CSR process not get too far along before the Board had that general discussion. There was nothing on the schedule that concerned her if the Board could begin those discussions in March.

Mr. Bennett thought that if staff began the public outreach in the Bethel/Danebo area before the Board had that discussion, those issues of productivity and pricing would come up, and staff would not have the direction from the Board.

Mr. Vobora agreed that staff would want to have good clear direction from the Board before the public outreach process began. The Board discussion was scheduled to begin during the work session in March.

Mr. Bailey thought the Board actually could begin the conversation at this meeting with the Design Guidelines.

Mr. Kleger stated that each time he had been involved in a local comment session about LTD service, the only comment he heard about fares was about a "fareless square," with no two persons agreeing about what that meant. Another comment he heard repeatedly was from people who wanted the bus on their street. The third thing he heard was about things that people thought LTD did not do, but in fact were things that LTD was doing. He believed that it was necessary to gather information from the community both for political and service purposes. However, without an overriding philosophy from the Board, the information would not be very helpful.

Mr. Kleger added that the design guidelines were acceptable; however, he did not see anything addressing fare structure coordinated with the service redesign, and he thought it should be addressed in the design guidelines.

Mr. Vobora stated that the design guidelines were revised from the previous CSR, and addressed the issues that would assist LTD in streamlining service and making it as productive as possible.

Ms. Hocken asked how the guidelines fit in with the whole BRT system. Mr. Vobora responded that these guidelines were geared toward the current system, with the last guideline addressing future convertibility to the BRT system. The fixed-route system would operate throughout the community during the next 20 years while BRT was being built. These guidelines would allow LTD to create a system that was more effective and efficient and would accommodate the future BRT system.



Mr. Bennett stated that he wanted to discuss changing the Board's policy criteria. If the policy criteria were to materially change, then the attitude in which staff approached the public, even under the guidelines, would significantly change. He wanted the opportunity to review the criteria and standards. That was why he thought the Board policy discussion should occur first in order to drive the guidelines. He was concerned that if the Board set the criteria, for instance, 90 percent of the service would meet productivity and 10 percent would go to coverage, then the guideline that addressed matching frequency of service to level of density might need to be changed.

Mr. Vobora responded that Mr. Bennett's example would not change the overall statement, but would alter the detail, which was how the Board would decide to allocate the resources. Staff would bring a specific recommendation to the Board for change to the productivity standards in March and would provide analysis on it.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that the overriding philosophy, as Mr. Kleger had referred to, would drive the process. She supported staff providing more background and analysis.

Mr. Kortge thought that the guidelines were quite technical, and he did not feel qualified to vote on whether or not, for example, the bus stops should be spaced two or three blocks apart.

Mr. Vobora stated that stop spacing referred to the overall guideline or goal of reducing total travel time. The overall guideline statement needed the Board's support.

Ms. Lauritsen asked how it would affect the process if the Board deferred a vote on guidelines for one month until after the Board policy discussion. Mr. Vobora responded that it would not adversely affect the timeline for the process.

Mr. Bailey asked if there was any objection to deferring the vote to the March meeting. There was none.

Mr. Bennett stated that he would support the motion based on the conversation and by relying on the overall guideline statements, which he believed were within the goal.

Ms. Hocken asked if, other than the stop spacing, any information had been changed since the discussion with Mr. Walker. Mr. Vobora replied that Mr. Walker had reviewed the guidelines, and no substantial changes were made, but the information was repackaged following Mr. Walker's review.

Mr. Bailey proposed to defer the decision to next month. Mr. Vobora asked the Board members to think about how they would like to be involved in the process; i.e., by direct contact, by regular staff updates, or by forming a Board committee.

Ms. Hocken stated that she had some policy-level concerns about some of the technical information contained in the guidelines, and while she did not particularly need an answer at this meeting, she did want these issues addressed at some point in future discussions. Under the first guideline, there was a statement about minimizing loops to reduce travel time, and Ms. Hocken asked how that statement related to the BRT neighborhood feeder concept. Under the second guideline that addressed minimizing the

inconvenience of transfers, one of the issues with the timed-meet system was how to coordinate the timed meet with the bus bunching that often occurred at the station. For instance, when a large number of buses were scheduled to leave the station at the same time, and several traveled down the same street, such as 8<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup>, she wondered if there was a better way to spread that service out. In addition, she asked about the three-transfer issue and if that meant a person was taking four buses to get somewhere. Mr. Vobora thought that the occurrence of a person using three transfers for one trip was rare, but it could happen, particularly with feeder service. Staff would provide more detail to the Board in March, and Ms. Hocken's questions would be answered.

Mr. Bailey stated that the Board would defer a decision on the guidelines to the March meeting.

**SCHEDULING AND OPERATIONS SOFTWARE PURCHASE:** Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson stated that this proposal had been presented to the Board Finance Committee in January. He would provide an overview of the total package and the costs involved, and Mr. Vobora would provide specifics about the scheduling portion of the software and the benefits to the District. Currently, there were some, but not all, of the needed funds available for this proposal. The software package had been included in the Capital Improvements Plan, with a portion of the package slated for purchase in 1999.

Staff were proposing to purchase the scheduling and run cut portion of the software during the current fiscal year, which would require an additional \$105,000 to be transferred from Contingency to the General Fund.

Mr. Vobora described to the Board the process that the Service Planning and Marketing department went through to prepare the fall bid service package. It was a labor-intensive process that took a great deal of staff time. This software would be much more efficient and effective and would free up a great deal of staff time.

Mr. Kortge asked how long the software had been available on the market. Mr. Johnson responded that it had been available for approximately four years. Mr. Kortge asked why the District had not previously purchased the software. Mr. Vobora replied that staff had always thought that the current DOS-based software that was in use could easily be converted to the Windows environment, but had discovered that it would be a costly and time-consuming endeavor and the end product would not have the capabilities of the software currently available on the market.

**MOTION**

Mr. Bennett moved that the Board adopt the resolution approving the purchase of new scheduling and operations software, including the transfer of \$105,000 from contingency. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Bailey asked if Mr. Johnson had prior experience with the software. Mr. Johnson responded that he had used the software while at Pierce Transit. There were four vendors, two of whom were proven and ahead of the others. Those two vendors had visited LTD to demonstrate the software.

**VOTE**

There being no further Board discussion, Mr. Bailey called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Lauritsen voting in favor; none opposed.

**APPROVAL OF GLENWOOD DESIGN ALTERNATIVE FOR BRT PILOT CORRIDOR:** Mr. Viggiano stated that this was the action item that was associated with the earlier discussion. Mr. Viggiano had nothing further to present, but he addressed some of Mr. Lester's questions. In regard to the issue of maintaining through traffic on 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue, he said that currently, only 3 blocks of 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue were a public street. The design called for two BRT lanes, some landscaping, and a travel lane or two. Local access for the residents would be maintained, but it would not be designed as a thoroughfare. The final design of the street would be worked out with the County and with the City of Springfield.

The suggestion of putting one-half of the BRT line on 14<sup>th</sup> and the other half on 15<sup>th</sup> Street was different in that the impacts to the neighborhood would be duplicated. The residents of the neighborhood strongly opposed the BRT line on 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Hocken added that one of the big issues was fire truck access, so those design standards would need to be met to ensure emergency vehicle access. Mr. Viggiano said that staff had met with the fire and police chiefs in Springfield and shown them the design. They both thought it would work for them. Staff also met with the emergency services technician in Springfield, who agreed that the design could work. He said that emergency vehicles typically would travel on Franklin and turn into the nearest cross street of the emergency call. Thus, they would not use 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue unless the emergency was on that street.

Mr. Bailey asked what the Steering Committee recommendation was. Ms. Hocken responded that after extensive conversation, the Steering Committee had voted unanimously for option B, with the realization that there were still issues at both ends of the segment. The Steering Committee had agreed to support one option and have staff work out the segment end details.

Mr. Kleger asked about the consideration of the bridge into Springfield. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff had received preliminary cost estimates of building a new bridge. Without the approaches, the preliminary cost was estimated at \$3.7 million.

**MOTION**

Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "The LTD Board hereby selects Alternative B (14<sup>th</sup> Avenue) as the preferred BRT alignment for the Glenwood segment of the bus rapid transit pilot corridor, and directs staff to continue work on remaining alignment details." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett stated that he would support a bridge right now. It was his belief that LTD had to be competitive from the beginning, and unless the money could not be raised, why not include it in the plan. Mr. Kleger agreed, but thought it should be a lower priority. If LTD did not begin reserving corridor space now, there would not be any way BRT could succeed.

Mr. Bennett added that the spreadsheet could not show that having an alternate, competitive system would increase the level of service and reduce the level of congestion.

An alternative system may not impact traffic, but it could move twice as many people through the corridor in a convenient and competitive way.

**VOTE**

There being no further Board discussion, Mr. Bailey called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Lauritsen voting in favor, and none opposed.

**SMOKING AT THE EUGENE STATION:** Mr. Johnson stated that the staff and the Board began discussing this issue in December. Currently, Bays A and C were designated smoking areas. Staff were requesting a policy change to make the Eugene Station a no-smoking facility. The issues were the cost of maintenance and cleanup, customer complaints, and operator complaints. Customers who smoked were not necessarily using the designated smoking area, but rather were smoking on their way to the designated area, or stepping away from other bays to smoke. People who smoked would need to go to the perimeter of the station along the sidewalks to smoke.

Ms. Hocken added that just before the station opened, the Board Downtown Station Committee had recommended that the station be smoke free. There was some hesitation about implementing the recommendation because it was thought that there would be negative feedback both from the employees and customers. However, the feedback that LTD was getting was against the smoking allowance. Ms. Hocken supported the idea.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that since this issue had come up, she had spent time observing other public areas, and she was astounded that she had not seen maintenance people around other public areas where it looked like it was taking one-third of their time to empty a few ashtrays. On the other hand, she had seen this issue flip-flop several times. It started out that people were lighting their cigarettes as they were exiting the bus, and LTD asked them not to do it, and apparently they quit because she did not hear that issue brought up again. Then, the problem, which was stated somewhat vaguely in the agenda item summary, was a group of people that LTD did not want in its bus station, and if the ashtrays were moved out of the station, those particular people would move with them. She did not think that the resolution was appropriate because it made reference to the congregation of people in the designated smoking areas. And now, the problem seemed to be mostly about people complaining about their health and welfare.

If the problem was that there were underage people smoking at the station, then there was a social concern. If that was the group that LTD wanted moved out to the sidewalk, Ms. Lauritsen did not think LTD could do that to a public interest group. However, if the reason was public health and safety, then it would be viable. She thought the reason given in the agenda item summary could give a bad impression of LTD.

Mr. Kleger stated that a rather large number of people who were smoking in the designated areas were not using the ashtrays, but rather putting cigarette butts on the ground, which created the extra workload for the maintenance crew who had to sweep those butts away on a regular basis. This also was taking place on the sidewalks at the entrance to the station. It was less of a problem than when the station operated along 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Conduct rules would not apply outside of the station area. Many of the people who were abusing the designated area were not even using transit. There was overwhelming support

for making the station smoke free among those with whom Mr. Kleger had spoken. Also, he had seen the same people cautioned about abusing the area more than once.

Mr. Bennett stated that the issue had become so sensitive, it was difficult to manage any other way. He had been in the building management business for many years, and the degree of sensitivity had grown to the point that people who used to be able to just step outside the doorway to smoke outdoors now had to move completely away from the doorway. He had come to the conclusion that people who smoked would be subject to regulations, and LTD needed to impose regulations as well. He did not see any other way.

Mr. Bailey agreed with the concerns raised by Ms. Lauritsen, that if LTD was doing this for the purposes of public health, he could be supportive, but if it was because LTD did not happen to like the people who were smoking, then he would not support it. He thought it was very important for the record that the Board be very clear about what this policy was about. This policy was about public health, and it encouraged people to think about the impact on the people around them and the message it sent to young people about whether LTD encouraged them to smoke or not. He wanted it made very clear that LTD was concerned about public safety and health.

Mr. Kleger stated that when the Board first considered the design of the station, it was thought that this would be more than LTD would want to take on. After the canopies were constructed, it was noticed that smoke rose to the eaves level, but did not rise up through the roofing vents. It was at that point that the Board Committee began discussing the designated smoking area.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she thought there would be very serious problems if the second paragraph that addressed a congregation of people in the smoking area remained in the resolution. The resolution should be re-worded to state that LTD was concerned about public health and safety and not that LTD would like to exclude some people from the bus station.

Mr. Bailey stated that the resolution that the Board would vote on was included within the proposed motion. The remainder of the agenda item summary was the public record that supported the resolution. The resolution had to be viewed not only in the context of what was written in the summary, but also in the context of the Board's discussion of the topic at this particular meeting.

Mr. Bennett asked if the background could be amended to address the concerns of the Board members. Ms. Loobey responded that the resolution could be amended to include a statement about the interest of public health and safety; however, the agenda item summary already was published material and had been distributed. The minutes would reflect the disdain of the Board members.

Ms. Hocken added that the Ordinance clearly addressed behaviors that LTD was attempting to regulate and not the way people looked or what their attitudes were.

## MOTION

Mr. Bailey called for a motion on the issue. Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that for the maintenance of public health, the entire Eugene Station shall become a non-smoking area as of March 14, 1999." Mr. Kortge

**VOTE**

seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Lauritsen voting in favor; and none opposed.

The Board members unanimously requested that the minutes reflect the fact that the second paragraph in the background material for this topic that addressed congregations of people in the designated smoking areas was irrelevant to their decision and, in fact, the Board members did not agree with the statements in that particular paragraph (page 41 of the agenda packet for the February 17, 1999, regular meeting of the Board of Directors).

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING**

Due to the late hour, Mr. Bailey pointed out several remaining items, without further Board discussion.

**MPC:** Ms. Hocken stated that the MPC had a presentation from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) representative Dick Upton regarding how the State designated funds for the proposed Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for 2002 and 2003. One of the issues for LTD was that the MPC had forwarded the list of local priorities for projects that could be funded in the TIP. There was a confusion about the priorities of the LTD projects, and as a result, the Coburg Park & Ride was selected to receive funds and not the Springfield Station, which actually was a higher priority for LTD. ODOT staff would investigate the problem and respond to LTD and the MPC.

Ms. Hocken also reported that representation on the MPC had changed.

**NORTH-END SCOPING GROUP:** The Mayor of Eugene was forming this group to discuss the north downtown Eugene area. Mr. Kortge would represent LTD on that group.

**JOINT MEETING WITH EUGENE AND SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCILS:** Mr. Bailey reminded the Board that a joint meeting with the Springfield City Council was scheduled for Monday, May 17, 1999, at Springfield City Hall from 6 to 7 p.m.

In addition, a joint meeting with the Eugene City Council was scheduled for April 12, 1999, at LTD, from 5:30 to 7:15 p.m.

**BRT UPDATE:** Mr. Bailey reminded the Board that a meeting with the Lane County Board of Commissioners to discuss the BRT project was scheduled for February 24, 1999, at 10:00 a.m., in the Commissioners' chambers. Ms. Hocken would attend to represent LTD, and she asked the other Board members to attend as well if they could. Mr. Kleger stated that he would attend.

**1999 EMPLOYEE AWARDS BANQUET:** Mr. Bailey asked the Board members to take note of the date, time, and place for the 1999 awards banquet. It would be held on Sunday, March 14, 1999, beginning at 5:30 p.m., at the Springfield DoubleTree Inn.

**MONTHLY STAFF REPORT:** Mr. Bailey pointed out that for the second month in a row, there were fewer accidents than usual. Mr. Bailey extended his congratulations to the LTD bus operators. Ms. Lauritsen asked what constituted an accident. Mr. Johnson replied

that accidents included anything from passengers tripping while boarding, to bumping a mirror, to the more serious accidents.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 9:30 p.m.

  
Board Secretary