

AMENDED MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 9, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, September 15, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Virginia Lauritsen
(Board vacancy – Subdistrict 5)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

WORK SESSION:

DISCUSSION WITH FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) REGION X ADMINISTRATOR HELEN KNOLL: Ms. Wylie introduced Ms. Knoll, who had been visiting LTD throughout the afternoon. Ms. Knoll stated that she was interested to hear about LTD's plans for the future and about TransPlan. She said that by visiting LTD, she was able to get a better understanding of the topography and demographics of the area, which helped her to understand some of the challenges, opportunities, constraints, and issues that LTD faced. The FTA was very excited about the proposed bus rapid transit (BRT) project at LTD. BRT was a national initiative of much importance to the FTA because it was a suitable alternative to light rail for many communities. It was more affordable and flexible than light rail, but had the same attributes of serving the public with rapid transit. LTD had the opportunity to provide a model for other communities. There already was a vision in the Eugene/Springfield communities about what the BRT system and buses might look like, which the FTA believed would increase ridership tremendously. She thanked the Board for having her at its meeting.

Mr. Kortge asked if Ms. Knoll visited LTD very often. Ms. Knoll stated that she had not previously visited LTD, but it was her intent to visit more often. Ms. Wylie added that FTA Region X included Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was interested to hear what Seattle Metro was doing to more effectively compete with the automobile. Ms. Knoll said that in 1996, the voters had approved a \$3.9 billion package of transit projects, including about 81 miles of commuter rail using existing heavy-duty rail lines and building nearly 26 miles of light rail service that would operate from the University district in the north to the SEATAC airport in the south. The project included acquiring right-of-way and building tunnels and would take approximately 10 years to complete.

Mr. Kleger asked how transit agencies were dealing with the 'we do not need it yet' mentality. Ms. Knoll stated that other cities the same size as Eugene/Springfield were facing the same problem, but in places like Seattle, where congestion was so visibly heavy, people now realized that it was a problem that should have been addressed well ahead of time. Even if people were not concerned about future congestion problems, there were other reasons to do something like BRT and light rail. A project with a fixed visible presence in a neighborhood, like BRT, with its fixed guideways and stations, offered land-use planning and economic development opportunities that a normal bus system could not accomplish.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie thanked Ms. Knoll for her visit to LTD and invited her to visit again.

WORK SESSION - CONTINUE TRANSPLAN DISCUSSION: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano reminded the Board members that a public hearing on the draft TransPlan was scheduled for September 29, 1999, at the Lane County Fairgrounds. Mr. Viggiano introduced Tom Schwetz and Lee Shoemaker from the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) and Jan Childs from the City of Eugene, who were present to answer questions the Board raised at the August Board meeting as well as any new questions or concerns the Board might have about TransPlan or the public hearing.

Ms. Childs began the discussion by talking about the nodal development strategies that were contained in the draft TransPlan. She stated that she agreed with Ms. Knoll's earlier statement that a system like BRT brought with it opportunities to look at a more intensive development of the land use surrounding the key stations.

The nodal development in TransPlan was particularly relevant for the BRT corridors, but staff believed it also was an important concept in other areas of the region. Ms. Childs stated, for the record, that she preferred the term 'mixed-use centers' rather than 'nodal development' as it was presented. Three documents pertaining to specific nodal development plans were distributed to the Board members. Ms. Childs then reviewed the handouts. One of the handouts was the definition of nodal development as proposed in the draft TransPlan, which defined three different types of nodal development: Neighborhood Centers, Commercial Centers, and Employment Centers. The other two handouts were draft plans for the two pilot nodal development projects located in the Chambers Street area and in the Royal Avenue area that the City of Eugene Planning and Development department had prepared last year. Ms. Childs reviewed the processes and challenges of the two plans.

Ms. Hocken asked why nodal development of certain areas was being recommended in TransPlan and not required. Ms. Childs responded that the jurisdictions were being asked to adopt a new zone designation of nodal development for the recommended areas. Once

approved as part of TransPlan, the Cities and County would need to adopt the change to the Metro Plan. Once that was accomplished, each jurisdiction would have the right to zone nodal development areas within its jurisdiction without the approval of the other two jurisdictions. At this point, the nodal development designation proposal was considered a legislative action.

Mr. Kleger asked if there would be a substantive difference between the expectations of this zoning designation and its impact and the existing zoning provisions currently in place. Ms. Childs replied that in the more centrally-located areas, there would be little need for zone changes, but development and design standards and incentives would be reviewed very carefully for new developments. The Royal Avenue nodal development would be a good local example of how it could work.

Mr. Kleger also asked how the newly developed Barger/Beltline area compared with nodal development goals. Ms. Childs stated that the Barger/Beltline area was somewhat larger in scale commercially than what would normally be expected for a neighborhood-focused center. The Barger area was one that had been woefully underserved, and the commercial development had addressed that need. The Barger area development would be beneficial to the Royal Avenue nodal development project in that it would allow the developers to design a smaller-scale commercial center.

Mr. Kleger stated that the Board had received a number of letters from the public about the proposed Valley River Bridge, and he asked Mr. Schwetz if staff knew what the neighborhood impacts would be and to whom if the Bridge were built. Mr. Schwetz said that staff only had made an estimate of where the bridge might cross, but impact studies had not yet occurred. Ms. Childs added that LCOG was collecting the public testimony, and copies of any letters received by LTD should be forwarded to Mr. Viggiano, who would ensure that they were forwarded to LCOG.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was political support for a Valley River bridge. Mr. Schwetz replied that support was sharply divided. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) supported the project as a regional benefit, but the letters that had been received indicated that local support was low. Mr. Bennett stated that he had served on the North Ferry Street Bridge Committee. That committee, which had broad-based representation, supported a Valley River bridge. He wondered if that issue had been resolved. He said that he was a toll-bridge advocate, and there had been fairly strong agreement as to how that would help with the cost. Ms. Childs responded that the Ferry Street Corridor Citizen Advisory Committee that Mr. Bennett participated on had looked at alternatives to placing a second bridge adjacent to the Ferry Street Bridge. The committee strongly supported a new bridge, as did the City Council at the time, but at the Planning Commission public hearing on TransPlan, no one spoke in support of a new crossing or even the concept of a new crossing. The Planning Commissions agreed that an additional river crossing needed to remain in TransPlan as a project, but not necessarily one for the near future. The Ferry Street Bridge improvements needed to be completed and in operation for some time prior to again researching the need for an additional river crossing.

There was no further TransPlan discussion, and Ms. Wylie closed the Work Session.

REGULAR MEETING – 6:35 p.m.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Wylie introduced bus operator Don Matney, who had been selected as the Employee of the Month for October 1999. Mr. Matney had received awards for eleven years of safe driving and eleven years of correct schedule operation, and previously was selected as Employee of the Month in July 1992 and April 1998. He was nominated for this award by a co-worker because he embodied attributes that were highly prized by the District, such as his caring and concern beyond the call of duty to his customers and colleagues; his natural leadership capabilities that motivated others; his command of the big picture and his willingness to explore new concepts with attention to the greatest benefit to all employees; his work ethic, integrity, and follow-through; and his willingness to step up and be counted upon by his fellow employees. Mr. Matney's supervisor added that Mr. Matney thrived on being involved in District and employee functions in addition to his bus driving duties, impressing staff with how much he volunteered to help coordinate and represent LTD in many special events.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Matney with a certificate of recognition and a monetary reward. Mr. Matney said that he enjoyed working at LTD and working with people. He thanked the Board for the honor.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Tom Lester of Eugene stated his objection to the downtown Springfield BRT alignment. He thought that the focus on the Main Street thoroughfare was going to reinforce the existing development patterns of downtown Springfield and would not leave downtown Springfield anywhere. He thought it was a bad idea to the degree that it had nothing to do with the organization of downtown Springfield. The alignment pandered to real estate speculation interests for the area south of South A Street, and he did not believe it was a good motivation for developing a plan.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Lester if he had a suggestion for a different alignment. Mr. Lester said he thought there needed to be a more serious urban design study of downtown Springfield to understand the organization of the downtown area. Mr. Bennett then asked if Mr. Lester agreed that BRT ought to connect to the downtown Springfield Station, wherever Springfield decided that should be. Mr. Lester stated that he did agree with that. He said he thought that the decision of where to locate the station was following the BRT alignment decisions rather than vice versa. He thought the BRT alignment should be more sensitive to a good decision about where the station ought to be located and to the entire organization of the downtown area for a bigger and more complex downtown area.

There were no others who wished to speak at this time.

CONSENT CALENDAR: The Consent Calendar for September 15, 1999, included the minutes of the canceled July 21, 1999, regular Board meeting; the minutes of the August 18, 1999, regular Board meeting; and the adoption of a resolution appointing Board President Hillary Wylie as successor trustee for the LTD/ATU Pension Trust and the LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan. Mr. Hocken moved approval of the Consent Calendar for September 15, 1999, as presented. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kleger, Kortge, Wylie, Bennett, and Hocken voting in favor, and none opposed.

**MOTION
VOTE**

DOWNTOWN SPRINGFIELD SEGMENT ALIGNMENT FOR BRT PILOT CORRIDOR:

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were seeking Board approval of the BRT Steering Committee's selection of the downtown Springfield BRT alignment as proposed in the agenda packet. The process for the BRT alignment in downtown Springfield began in February, and the downtown station location had been a key factor in the preferred alignment proposal. The downtown Springfield alignment included a three-block area east of the Willamette River to either of the proposed downtown station locations.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the two sites that were being considered for a new downtown Springfield Station were the U.S. Bank site at Main and South A, and the block immediately south of South A and 4th Streets.

The indications from the City of Springfield were that they liked the approach as outlined in Alternative A3. In addition, there were some recent developments with regard to BRT that Mr. Viggiano outlined for the Board members. Each Board member had received a copy of the agenda item summary for the TransPlan Review and Update from the Springfield City Council meeting agenda packet. The packet previously had been distributed.

The Springfield City Council would discuss several issues, including the BRT policy statement that was contained in the TransPlan document. There was a Springfield City staff recommendation to change the BRT policy statement back to its original wording, which was to "materially reduce traffic congestion." The current policy statement was "to increase the transit market share." No action would be taken at the Council meeting, and staff would prepare a response to Springfield explaining why that policy language had been changed.

Ms. Wylie stated that she was not sure that people understood what increasing transit market share meant. Mr. Bennett stated that whenever he talked about BRT, he used the term 'market share' because it helped him in his discussions with private business groups. The objective of BRT was not only to increase ridership among the current riders, but also to go to the next level, or to the people who currently were not using the bus. Whatever terms were used should recognize what the objectives of BRT were – increasing ridership in a specific, new approach.

In addition, Mr. Bennett added that he was fine with including a statement about materially reducing traffic congestion, but only if it was stated that traffic congestion would be materially reduced over what it would otherwise be. Most people did believe that there would be an increase in traffic congestion, and LCOG projections showed an increase as well.

Ms. Wylie added that she met with some disagreement when she stated that increasing ridership would serve to reduce congestion.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the alignment issues in the memorandum were more critical issues for discussion at this time. He stated that "market share" was intended to mean "modal split," and Mr. Viggiano thought some clarification on the issue would be prudent. Making the distinction about reducing traffic congestion over what it would otherwise be was important, but there were other problems with the term "materially reduce traffic congestion,"

such as its difficulty to measure and how influenced it would be by other factors. It also could invite litigation because it would be very difficult to interpret.

Ms. Hocken stated that the Board had not tampered with the phrase in the policy statement, "if local governments demonstrated support." She believed that the policy statement as written did not preclude the City of Springfield from considering the "materially reduce traffic congestion" factor when making a decision to support BRT. However, she agreed that as stated, the policy better addressed a measurable outcome and was more focused on what LTD was attempting to accomplish with the transit market.

Mr. Viggiano noted that there were six conditions included in the memorandum that Springfield City staff proposed as guidelines for the Council to follow in order to continue to support the BRT pilot project as well as future projects in the Springfield planning area. Staff currently were reviewing the guidelines and would spend more time discussing the guidelines with Springfield staff.

Mr. Kortge thought LTD and the City of Springfield already were in agreement with proposed guideline number six, providing for financial support for participation. He thought the guideline statement was very broad, but more importantly, he thought there already was agreement in this area, and LTD already was funding a traffic engineer for the City of Springfield. Mr. Viggiano stated that the current agreement was for a one-year period. He thought that this was one of the guidelines that needed further review, and one that staff would report back to the Board about.

There were two recommendations in the memorandum with regard to the BRT alignment. One was that the Council support the downtown Springfield alignment as proposed by the BRT Steering Committee. However, the recommendation did not include seeking priority treatment on Main Street. LTD had recommended that Springfield staff make the Council aware that LTD intended to aggressively pursue priority alternatives on Main Street.

The other recommendation was that the Environmental Assessment (EA) of the Glenwood alignment include a Franklin Boulevard curbside lane option. In addition, City staff recommended that a decision about the Glenwood alignment should be delayed until after the City conducted a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) study, which should be expanded to include an analysis of how BRT would fit into the transportation and land use mix. LTD previously stated its position that a Franklin Boulevard option would not be considered for the BRT alignment.

Ms. Hocken said that it was possible to conduct a supplemental EA that included several different options, and she thought it would be good to get the TGM results prior to making a decision, but she was concerned about the timing. Mr. Viggiano said that Springfield staff projected TGM completion of June 30, 2000, which could delay the BRT project if LTD waited for those results.

Ms. Hocken stated that Springfield Councilors Tammy Fitch and Scott Meisner were in agreement at the BRT Steering Committee meeting that nothing would be done to change the Glenwood Refinement Plan for at least five years. She asked how the TGM project

would fit into that commitment that both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield had made to the residents of Glenwood. Mr. Viggiano said that he assumed that the TGM projected development for the period of at least five years into the future.

Mr. Bennett asked if Springfield staff were aware of the right-of-way difficulties on Franklin Boulevard. Mr. Viggiano stated that they were, and also they were aware of the Glenwood Business Association's position.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff had a notion of what the travel time penalty would be for operating in mixed traffic on Main Street. Mr. Viggiano said that what had been analyzed was the peak direction flow, which was eastbound. Westbound travel time would be researched and projected as well. Mr. Kleger asked if agreeing to include Franklin Boulevard in the EA, at the request of the Springfield City Council, would compromise LTD's prior commitments to the Glenwood Business Association and residents. Mr. Viggiano responded that including Franklin Boulevard would neither commit the Board members nor the City Council. It would simply mean that it was being evaluated.

Ms. Hocken thought that since Springfield was taking such an incremental approach to a Franklin option, it was nearly the equivalent of the no-build alternative, which was where LTD currently was in regard to Franklin Boulevard, so she did not believe it was different than one of the alternatives that already would be included in the EA, and she did not think LTD could formally include it at this time. Mr. Viggiano stated that the Board did not need to take action at this time, but staff could review and present a more detailed analysis of that alternative.

Ms. Wylie said that since LTD was in a period of prolonged negotiations with the other jurisdictions, she thought it was important for the Board to be as open as possible to researching other alternatives when possible. She also wanted to be supportive of the work and processes that previously had been done. She looked forward to a report from staff about what the options were.

Ms. Hocken asked about the Springfield alignment, and if the Springfield Station were located on the south side of South A Street, whether LTD would be required to add a stoplight in order to travel north across South A to get back to westbound travel on Main Street. Mr. Viggiano said that a stoplight would be required at 4th and South A as well as one at 4th and Main. The US Bank site would require one additional stoplight, at 4th & Main.

Ms. Hocken then said that at the BRT Steering Committee meeting, the committee discussed the use of the three blocks on Main Street in mixed traffic. She did not hear a strong objection from the Springfield Council representative to pursuing a way to remove the parking and still satisfy the commercial property owners along that stretch. She asked that the Springfield Station EA include an alternative of parking removal for those three blocks. Mr. Viggiano said that staff could add that.

Mr. Bennett said that at the Steering Committee meeting, he had voted against the recommendation of Alternative A3 as the downtown Springfield segment alignment for BRT. His reason for voting against the alternative was the lack of right-of-way in the westbound direction, and he could not in good conscience vote for something that did not include the fundamentals that he believed were critical to the success of BRT over time. He was

convinced that right-of-way was crucial to the effective success of the project. He said that he understood that some concessions had to be made in the short run in order to achieve what was needed in the longer term, but as Ms. Hocken had pointed out, there was an honest opportunity to make a case at the local business level where two blocks of that stretch now had on-site parking. He was willing to mitigate parking on the third block in order to obtain the entire three blocks of right-of-way. At this level, he stated he would vote for the motion, because his position would be recorded.

Ms. Hocken said that Mr. Bennett had made a very good point during the Steering Committee meeting. He had said that even though it was only a three-block stretch of road, those three blocks would set the tone for the other BRT segments in Springfield, which was another reason not to accept mixed traffic, even if it was for only three blocks. Ms. Hocken stated that she voted for the motion, but she thought Mr. Bennett's was a very valid point of view. She also agreed with Mr. Bennett about mitigating parking for those businesses.

Mr. Kleger agreed with Mr. Bennett that exclusive right-of-way was critical to the success of the project, but was more willing to accept the foot-in-the-door approach. However, he was not willing to take a shared right-of-way situation without a clear declaration by the District that the goal was the exclusive right-of-way.

Ms. Loobey suggested that the motion be amended to reflect the conversation. Mr. Bennett said that he thought the Steering Committee had intended the recommendation as read in the motion. He thought the Board's conversation could be on record in the meeting minutes, but that the vote should go forward based on the current language.

Ms. Hocken said that she was comfortable with Mr. Bennett's approach as long as the Board was committed to including the removal of parking as an alternative in the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff could take that direction with or without a formal motion. Ms. Wylie asked if mitigated parking also could be included in the language of the EA. Mr. Viggiano said that the EA would require that parking mitigation be considered.

Mr. Kortge said that he had difficulty envisioning BRT as a swift operation through the Glenwood area and across the bridge, then suddenly coming to a stop in traffic on South A. He also asked when the decision would be made for the remainder of the Springfield portion. Mr. Viggiano replied that the current funding covered only Phase I from downtown Eugene to downtown Springfield. Phase 2 would cover the area west of downtown Eugene, and Phase 3 would be east of downtown Springfield. Preliminary design work on Phase 2 would begin in the fall of 1999, and currently there was no schedule to begin Phase 3 because additional discussions were required with the Springfield City Council about the appropriate timing for that. The City Council had expressed a desire to see BRT in operation before they were interested in looking at further options.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors selects Downtown Springfield Alternative A3 as the preferred BRT alignment for the Downtown Springfield segment of the bus rapid transit pilot corridor with the understanding that the removal and mitigation of parking along Main Street will be considered as one of the alternatives in the environmental assessment."

MOTION

VOTE

Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kleger, Kortge, Wylie, Bennett, and Hocken voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken added that she had attended the Eugene City Council meeting on September 13, 1999, for the presentation of BRT, and one of the things that Mayor Torrey asked was, if the only thing LTD could build was the downtown to downtown segment, or Phase 1, would LTD do it?

DISCUSSION OF REVISED DISTRICT BOUNDARIES: Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora reminded the Board that in May, some small revisions were made to the District's service boundaries. According to Board direction, staff had formulated a more comprehensive review of the boundary issue. The current boundary (distributed to each Board member for reference) included a 2.5-mile boundary revision for the eastern portion of the service area along Highways 58 and 126 that currently was based on census tract boundaries.

Mr. Vobora said that creating a boundary at one mile or at 2.5 miles established a service area defined solely by the mileage method and provided the District with a more consistent service area.

Mr. Kleger asked if LTD currently was not providing service to the businesses that would be dropped from the boundary. Mr. Vobora said that was correct, and based on caller input from taxpayers who were farther than 2.5 miles from bus service, staff believed the revision would treat them equally with other taxpayers throughout the service area.

Ms. Wylie stated that she appreciated consistency wherever it could be applied. She asked if there was a strategy or timetable to achieve consistency across the entire boundary. Mr. Vobora replied that none of the changes restricted the Board from changing the boundary in the future; for example, if LTD were to reintroduce service along the northern side of the Willamette River in the Jasper/Fall Creek area, the boundary could be revised using the 2.5-mile strategy.

MOTION

Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors directs staff to prepare a revised LTD Ordinance No. 24 that reflects the following revisions to the LTD service area boundary map:

1. Establish the service area boundaries at the 2.5-mile limit along the eastern portion of the service area, using the Willamette River as the boundary in the area west of Lowell and north of the Willamette River to Jasper.
2. Maintain the boundary following the McKenzie River in north Springfield and north Eugene.
3. Make changes to the boundary north of Coburg and in southwest Eugene using the 2.5-mile limit.
4. Maintain existing boundary lines where establishing the 2.5-mile boundary would exceed the current District boundary."

Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken stated that she did not want to get into a situation where LTD had to change the boundary frequently. She was concerned with revision 4 in the resolution, because maintaining those existing boundary lines would not be treating all taxpayers and potential taxpayers equally. She preferred to include a few more taxpayers so that LTD could not be criticized for unequal treatment of people in different areas.

Mr. Bennett said that it was his understanding that where there was a disparity, it was because of a significant disparity in the level of service or no service, or no reasonable access to service. The explanation, as he understood it, was that LTD could be consistent, which was an objective worth pursuing over time, but it would cause a significant reaction with very little additional revenue. He was concerned about losing the revenue, but he believed staff were in strong support of the revision.

Ms. Hocken stated she was concerned about the lack of consistency in the south Eugene area, where service was within the 2.5-mile limit, but the boundary did not reflect that. Mr. Vobora replied that since there was not a natural boundary, the urban growth boundary had been used.

Ms. Wylie asked why staff were not including a revision in south Eugene at this time, since the 2.5-mile limit was being applied elsewhere. Mr. Vobora stated that staff could revise that area, but were concerned that the number of concerns that LTD would receive from those taxpayers would outweigh the amount of revenue that would be realized.

Mr. Bennett asked about the service to south Eugene. Mr. Vobora stated that there were 16 payroll taxpayers who currently were outside the boundary but within the 2.5-mile limit, but there was no information about the number of self-employed in that same area. There were two bus routes that operated four buses per hour to the edge of the boundary.

Ms. Hocken asked if revision 4 of the resolution could be deleted from the resolution. Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that revision 4 was designed to ensure that LTD did not accidentally cross into another county. Mr. Vobora suggested amending revision 4, because even though the boundary would never go near a county line to the south, it could approach the county line to the north.

Mr. Bennett thought it was important that the amended resolution mention the geographical area, since service in that area was consistent. Ms. Hocken asked if Mr. Bennett meant to leave revision 4 alone, but add a revision 5 that addressed the south Eugene area. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn suggested that revision 4 be amended to read, "Maintain existing boundary lines where establishing the 2.5-mile boundary would exceed the current District boundary, consistent with state law" because the state law did not allow LTD to go outside the county boundary, which would solve the problem to the north, but would maintain the south Eugene problem. LTD must be consistent with state law.

Ms. Loobey added that the language in revision 4 could not remain as stated because it was contrary to what was being stated in the other provisions.

Ms. Wylie asked if it was urgent that the Board adopt the resolution at this meeting. Mr. Vobora responded that if the change were made, the Ordinance readings would occur in

October and November, and the Ordinance then would become effective January 1, 2000, to coincide with the publication of tax materials and the tax year. Ms. Wylie asked if the Board could delay the resolution for one month to give staff an opportunity to amend the language of the resolution. Ms. Hocken said that the resolution was what gave staff the direction to change the Ordinance with the intent of the Board's discussion. Ms. Loobey said that an Ordinance could be drafted without the resolution. Ms. Hocken wanted staff to be clear about the Board's direction in drafting the Ordinance revisions. Mr. Vobora stated that the Ordinance did not address the specifics of the boundary, but referenced the map, and he thought that staff could proceed with direction from the Board discussion.

Ms. Hocken thought that if the 2.5-mile rule were applied in one area, it should be applied in all areas for consistency, and Mr. Kortge agreed with that. Mr. Bennett stated that he did not agree with that statement, because of the lack of service or low-level of service in some areas where the 2.5-mile limit should not be applied.

Mr. Kleger said that he did not want to collect the tax from people who were a significant distance from service, but, on the other hand, there were cases where even though the taxpayer was within the 2.5-mile boundary from service, the roads to get there were often a lot longer than 2.5 miles.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken withdrew her amendment, and the original motion had been made and seconded. A vote was taken, and the original resolution passed by unanimous vote, with Kleger, Kortge, Wylie, Bennett, and Hocken voting in favor, and none against.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:

- a) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken stated that MPC met in September, and there were two transportation items. The first issue was about the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) request for input for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that would cover the period of 2002-2005. It gave MPC an opportunity to again discuss some of the funding lost during the last STIP. A decision was made by ODOT at the regional level to not provide the Surface Transportation Funds (STF) for flexible spending money for transit last year. MPC would send a letter to ODOT providing input for the STIP 2002-2005 request, which will include a comment regarding the STF funding.

The other issue on transportation was a request as a region to suggest road projects for the new gas tax money that might or might not be collected depending on how the referral to the voters went. The Lane County Commissioners went on record opposing the gas tax measure that the legislature passed. It did not affect LTD, but was an issue between the cities and the county.

- b) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken reported that the next meeting would be held in November 1999.
- c) BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input: No report was provided at this time.

- d) Springfield Station Steering Committee. Ms. Wylie reported that the EA was reviewed for the two finalist sites. There were no adverse conditions on the South A site report, but there was a possible oil tank buried on the US Bank site. The Committee was encouraged about going ahead.
- e) Executive Search Committee. Mr. Kortge reported that the Committee had hired The Oldani Group as the executive search firm. On November 1 or November 15, the entire Board would be invited to review the list of applicants for the position. The Committee was looking forward to holding final interviews around January 20. Ms. Wylie added that she wanted to invite Mr. Oldani to the November Board work session to provide an update to the entire Board. Mr. Kortge said that one decision the Board would want to make was whether or not the Board would hold a site interview for final applicants, where LTD representatives would travel to the current worksite of the applicant for the site interview.
- f) North End Scoping Group. Mr. Kortge said that the City Council had passed the recommendations of the Group. The direct impact on LTD was the issue of the downtown shuttle, which Mr. Vobora was working on. The other big issues were the location of the federal courthouse and what to do with the train station.
- g) Eugene City Council Work Session on Downtown Segment Alignment for BRT Pilot Corridor. Ms. Hocken added that the Eugene City Council remained very supportive of the BRT project, but saw its roll as advisor to the LTD Board about difficult questions that it wanted LTD to be sure to consider. The Council spent a lot of time asking questions and seeking staff response to those questions.

JULY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson stated that this was a very busy time for LTD. The federal auditors visited LTD during the second week of September and the District's independent auditors the following week. Staff had been very busy preparing materials for the auditors, and the July Financial report was a preliminary one. The August and September Financial reports would be presented during the October Board meeting.

Ms. Hellekson said that the Capital Fund appeared high because some grant funding had been received, but often LTD pre-spent grant funds in one year and received the funds in the next year, which was the case here. This meant that the additional revenue was reimbursement for expenses that occurred during the last year.

There was a possibility that staff would present a request for a budget transfer to amend the current-year budget for the radio project if it was completed. In addition, the budget did not anticipate the Cottage Grove election, and if successful, LTD would need to make some adjustments in the budget to accommodate the service.

At the request of Mr. Kortge, Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson provided a brief update of the radio project.

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS REPORT: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch noted that the Board had received the Final State Legislative Report by handout. The report

included a summary of every bill that LTD staff reviewed during the recent legislative session.

1999 FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) TRIENNIAL REVIEW: Ms. Loobey reported that the summary report was not yet completed, but would be provided at the October Board meeting. However, the auditors complimented LTD on its record keeping and there were very few instances of correction. The Triennial Review was a very important event for any agency using FTA funds. The Review helped to maintain the relationship and credibility with FTA Region X and the national office as well as keeping LTD out of trouble by ensuring that LTD complied with regulations. Ms. Loobey said that it was very gratifying to hear from the national level that LTD was one of the best in the nation. Ms. Wylie congratulated the staff on the good work and said it was reassuring to the Board to receive good audit reports.

BOARD STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION – OCTOBER 29 – 30, 1999: Ms. Wylie stated that there were several options for the Board to select, one of which was the location. Ms. Wylie polled the Board, and it was decided that an in-town location would be preferred. The Saturday session would end by 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Pangborn provided an overview of the topics that were planned for the work session. An outside facilitator would facilitate the session.

Mr. Bennett stated that it was his desire to allow time for a free-flowing, philosophical Board discussion about service development. In addition, Mr. Bennett said that he also preferred that some social time be spent together, such as a dinner on Friday evening of the work session.

Ms. Wylie added that in a very short time, the Board would be hiring a new general manager. The Board was accustomed to Ms. Loobey's knowledge, guidance, and abilities. How the new general manager viewed the Board and the agency was up to the Board. One of her objectives for the work session was that the Board and staff clearly know the goals of LTD that could be presented to the new general manager.


Ms. Hocken suggested that the Board wait until the new general manager had been on board for six months or so before making changes to the way the Board conducted its business. Ms. Wylie stated that she had a direct request from a Board member for the Board to discuss how it conducted business, particularly how agendas were determined.

Mr. Kleger thought it was a very ambitious agenda. Ms. Hocken thought that the proposed agenda items number 1 and 6 were the most important. Mr. Bennett asked if there was another time to schedule a review of the strategic plan.

It was determined that the proposed agenda item number 1, regarding service development, be held on Friday morning for ½ day, with some discussion of item number 2, farebox policy, mixed in. On Friday afternoon, the Board would discuss item number 3, the LTD Strategic Plan. On Saturday morning, item number 6, LTD's Preparedness for the Future, would be discussed. At lunch on Saturday, the Board would discuss how it conducted its business. As a wrap-up on Saturday afternoon, the work session would

conclude with a discussion of the general manager transition. The work session would end at 2:00 p.m. A dinner would be held on Friday evening. Ms. Wylie would work with staff both on a location and on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion regarding any of the other informational items in the Board packet, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.



Board Secretary