AMENDED MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, October 27, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 21, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special Board of Directors meeting on Wednesday, October 27, 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
Virginia Lauritsen
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: (Vacancy, subdistrict 5)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:38 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

WORK SESSION

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Wylie reminded the Board members of the work session scheduled for Friday and Saturday, October 29 and 30. She stated that it was the time once each year that Board members came together to discuss issues in more depth. She was sorry that Ms. Lauritsen would be unable to attend. Agendas for the session were distributed at the meeting.

TRANSPLAN: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano was present to discuss the draft TransPlan process to date. He stated that it would be inappropriate for the Board to begin deliberations about TransPlan as the public review period was not yet complete. He asked the Board, at this time, to provide direction to staff about additional information or research that might be needed.

Staff were planning a November 17, 1999, work session to discuss the approval process for TransPlan. The expectation was that all four of the adopting agencies would discuss a possible change in the process to include a more extensive review period based on the comments that had been received to date. At its meeting on December 9, the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) would discuss the process and a plan to bring the four jurisdictions together. It was likely that Board discussion of the content of the draft TransPlan would not occur before January 2000.

One of the issues that had been mentioned at the public hearings was the concept of a free fare system. Staff had begun researching the issue in preparation for anticipated questions from the Board. Potential issues involved in the free fare concept included revenue loss, operational savings, and various options for free fare, such as just for youth, certain time of day, etc. Mr. Viggiano stated that some of the other issues that had been raised during the public hearings were alternate fuels and neighborhood service.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff could research the impact on ridership for other transit agencies that had tried or currently were using the fareless system, particularly from the part of the community that previously had not used the bus, or the choice riders. Mr. Kleger said it would be interesting to know what ridership increases resulted from the same people taking more trips or from new choice riders using the service.

Ms. Wylie asked what the ridership difference was between a reduced fare and a fareless system.

Mr. Kortge added that staff already were researching a downtown shuttle, and he was interested to know what the difference in ridership would be to have a fareless segment, such as a downtown shuttle, as opposed to the entire system being fareless.

Ms. Wylie stated that it was suggested to her that the local businesses subsidize shuttles, such as the downtown shuttle, so that there would be no fare imposed. Another question that had been asked of her was if bus rapid transit (BRT) would have a separate fare system from the current bus system. She asked staff to look into options for subsidizing the fare.

Mr. Kleger stated that one of the things LTD had done throughout the years was to substantially discount pre-paid fares as an incentive to using the system. He was interested in knowing what the likely effect would be on choice riders of giving up the pre-paid fare incentive, such as, for example, if employer-paid passes were discontinued. He was concerned that the employer would lose the incentive to use the bus. He also was concerned about the impact to the overall mission of the District.

Ms. Lauritsen said it would be detrimental to lose the group pass participants, such as Sacred Heart Hospital and the University of Oregon.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff had an idea of where the revenue replacement would come from. He was concerned about cutting service to realize the operational savings. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff could research that issue. Ms. Wylie added that the downtown shuttle system in Orlando, Florida, was paid for by a parking lot tax.

Mr. Kortge asked if the free fare concept was just a feel-good concept or if it was truly meaningful operationally. Mr. Viggiano stated that other transit systems had tried all types of fareless options, and staff could gather information based on those experiences. Mr. Bennett added that the shuttle approach that operated in a very dense area where the key to getting people to ride was the ability to quickly get them on and off the system made sense to him.

Ms. Lauritsen asked how long it would take staff to provide answers to the Board. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff would have some of the information at the December Board meeting and more comprehensive information in January, when the Board began its deliberations on the draft TransPlan.

Mr. Kleger stated that he was aware that other agencies that had tried to have a [illegible]

Mr. Bolden was a veteran operator who gave great customer service every day, showing the same care and professionalism that he demonstrated during the fire.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Bolden with a letter of congratulations, a certificate of appreciation, and a monetary award.

Mr. Bolden stated that he was very happy to receive this award. He said that even though he had come to be congratulated, he also wanted to congratulate the Board and staff for their good work for LTD. He said that Ms. Loobey had been a mentor to him. In addition to being a bus operator, he was a working minister of a church. He had watched the dedication and hard work that Ms. Loobey had and continued to have. He tried to capitalize on some of the things Ms. Loobey did to be very successful in her endeavors. He was glad for the opportunity to speak to that in light of Ms. Loobey's pending retirement. He was grateful to have known Ms. Loobey, and he appreciated the way she had shown care for all employees, but especially the bus operators. He said that in her position, Ms. Loobey was not too high to regularly visit the operators' lounge for a cup of coffee and some conversation. He again thanked the Board for the award and stated that he really liked his job.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: a) Mr. Don Nordin of Cottage Grove stated that he wanted to take the opportunity to express his appreciation and that of the Friends of LTD organization in Cottage Grove for the assistance provided by LTD, and particularly Mr. Vobora; Mr. Pangborn; Transit Planner Micki Kaplan; Commuter Solutions Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams; and Customer Service Supervisor Angie Sifuentez.

Now that the election had been successful, LTD was a member of the Cottage Grove community and now was in a position to build an infrastructure in Cottage Grove. To that end, Mr. Nordin suggested that LTD consider a bus station in Cottage Grove.

He noted that there was an opportunity available at the City Shop space located at 14th and Main. The property would be on the market within the next few months, and it would make an excellent transit center for Cottage Grove. It was centrally located and within walking distance of most of the downtown area. It would answer the question of why would people come to Cottage Grove. Cottage Grove was in the process of developing the Row River Trail and other recreational opportunities, all very adjacent to the site. Also, the site already was landscaped.

Mr. Nordin had mentioned the idea to the Cottage Grove City Council and there were no real objections from the Council. He asked the Board to consider the request.

b) Tom Lester of Eugene suggested a correction to page 10 of the Minutes of the September 15, 1999, LTD Board meeting. Currently, the minutes stated that Mr. Lester said that he thought it (downtown Springfield BRT alignment) was a bad idea to the degree that it had nothing to do with the Springfield Renaissance Development Committee's Plans. He asked that it be changed to state that he thought it was a bad idea to the degree that it had nothing to do with the organization of downtown Springfield.

Also, he suggested that the next line also be corrected. It currently stated that Mr. Lester had said that 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. He recommended that it be changed to read that the Springfield Renaissance Development Committee's Plans pandered to real estate speculation interests . . . .

Mr. Lester stated that he also had a concern about the proposed Glenwood alignment of the BRT. In the memo on page 37 of the agenda packet, from Rob Bennett, Chair of the BRT Steering Committee, regarding the Glenwood segment alignment, Mr. Bennett stated that a hybrid 14th/15th Avenue alignment had been suggested by the Glenwood Business Association. Mr. Lester wanted to make sure that the hybrid 14th/15th alignment also was recommended for the Environmental Assessment, because it was not stated as such in the proposed motion. He recommended that a change be made in the motion to include the 14th/15th alignment to meet the wishes of the Glenwood Business Association.

There being no further testimony, Ms. Wylie closed the audience participation period.

CONSENT CALENDAR: The Consent Calendar for October 27, 1999, consisted of the minutes of the September 15, 1999, regular Board meeting; the canceled October 20, 1999, regular Board meeting; and Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Recommendations.

MOTION VOTE

Ms. Hocken moved the approval of the Consent Calendar for October 27, 1999, with the recommended changes to the September 15, 1999, regular Board meeting minutes as presented by Mr. Lester. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 6-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

SPRINGFIELD STATION ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: Ms. Kaplan introduced Jeff Heilman, from Parametrix, Inc., the consultant who assisted LTD in developing the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Ms. Kaplan provided a brief history of the Springfield Station project and presented the proposed locations that had been considered as part of the EA. She noted that there were no significant issues at any of the proposed locations that could not be mitigated. She stated that the public review period would be open from October 1 to November 8, 1999, after which staff would respond to any questions that were received and revise the EA for submittal to the FTA.

The next Springfield Station Steering Committee meeting was scheduled for November 18, 1999, at which time staff would ask the Committee to make a final site recommendation to the LTD Board. An update would be provided to the Springfield City Council at its December 6, 1999, meeting. The final site recommendation would be presented to the LTD Board at its December meeting. It was hoped that funding issues would be resolved prior to the annual lobbying trip to Washington, D.C., in February 2000.

Ms. Kaplan reviewed some of the design issues and findings of the EA. Ms. Hocken asked what the security issues were for moving the customer service center to the back of

Site I. Ms. Kaplan replied that the location at the back of the station would provide more site monitoring on the part of the customer service staff, much like at the Eugene Station.

Ms. Kaplan then discussed a new issue that recently had surfaced, which was a request by Greyhound to LTD to explore the possibilities of a multi-modal facility. The bank site most likely was too small, but Site I was large enough to accommodate both systems. This was a very conceptual idea at this point. Some of the key advantages of a multi-modal facility that staff quickly had developed were that, operationally, it could be advantageous to have longer staffing hours, shared restrooms, possible revenue from rental payments, and some funding opportunities that could offset the construction costs. Some of the negative impacts might be that Greyhound could be viewed negatively by some customers, and it would be very important to clearly spell out the operations and maintenance agreements.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if Greyhound was considering closing its Eugene terminal. Ms. Kaplan replied that Greyhound was considering moving its Eugene operation, but the multi-modal facility concept was not limited to the Springfield Station. It could be located at any of the LTD facilities, including BRT facilities.

Mr. Bennett asked when the Board would become involved in deliberating the issue. Mr. Viggiano responded that staff had some contact with Greyhound, and Greyhound had provided its space needs. At this time, the discussions were very preliminary. Mr. Bennett said that he had some concerns about the concept. Greyhound had its own set of issues that it needed to address on a regular basis. Perception issues were very real, and the Board needed a chance to discuss the concept. Mr. Bennett then asked if any particular place made more sense than another, and what would be the tradeoffs of sharing a facility.

Ms. Wylie asked what the impacts would be on LTD. She was concerned about LTD's strict standards being maintained. Also, the number of Greyhound buses per day would need to be considered. She asked staff to prepare a list of the pros and cons of operating a multi-modal facility.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she had heard that Greyhound was planning to close its Eugene terminal, and she asked if Greyhound was discussing opening another Eugene location in addition to a Springfield location. Mr. Viggiano said that he understood that Greyhound was considering a relocation at this time.

Ms. Hocken said that even though there were many factors to consider, she thought the concept should be considered because multi-modal connections were critical to LTD's operation. It was LTD's job to provide transportation to other modes of transportation. She thought it was important for LTD to work on the concept, but to ensure that the strict standards were upheld in any joint development.

Mr. Bennett added that it was not just the standards. LTD was attempting to move to the next level with BRT, and he asked if LTD wanted to depend on someone else's private decision on whether or not to do the same, which could include the type of vehicle, the type of fuel, etc. It was a big decision, and he thought it was important for the Board to discuss the issue of multi-modal facilities at the conceptual level. Ms. Wylie added that the bus system needed to be kept in consideration along with the BRT as a key piece of the station.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were gathering more information for Board discussion at the November 17 meeting. Staff could relay the Board discussion to the Springfield Station Steering Committee meeting. Ms. Kaplan added that the Springfield City Council would have provided input by then. Ms. Wylie added that the Board would receive some information from legal counsel about joint development at its October 30 meeting.

Mr. Heilman stated that an EA occurred whenever a federal action was about to be taken and the federal agency needed to review the proposed action under the National Environmental Policy Act. In this case, the federal action was the potential funding of the project by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The EA focused on likely impacts at each site and considered several elements, such as environmental elements that had been identified by the FTA guidelines. The impacts that would need to be mitigated included land acquisitions and displacements, noise, water quality, endangered species, traffic, parking, pedestrians, bicycles, and the disruptive impacts during construction of the facility. At this time, there were no apparent impacts that could not be mitigated.

The next steps in the process were a 30-day public comment period, a review of the public comment, submittal of the EA to the FTA and, finally, the FTA finding of no significant impacts. Once the FTA issued that, the EA process would be complete.

Ms. Hocken asked about the matrix on page 26 of the agenda packet, in particular, the section on land use and zoning. For both sites, the Park & Ride category stated, "Special Use; Generally Inappropriate in Downtown Core." She asked Mr. Heilman to explain that statement. Mr. Heilman said that generally, one would not see a Park & Ride facility in a downtown core area, because of the nature of the site and because it was a fairly extensive use of land. Typically, in a downtown area, that property would be preserved for more intense uses. Also, it depended on the land use preferences of the city.

Ms. Wylie said that a Park & Ride at the Springfield Station would facilitate the partnership between cars and buses. The FTA did not want the parking lot to be used by downtown employees and shoppers. LTD must prove the transit orientation of the Park & Ride. Another consideration for a joint development might be to have a shared parking facility both for commuters and for downtown employees and shoppers. Ms. Hocken noted that other Park & Ride facilities did not function that way.

Public Hearing: There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie opened the public hearing for comment.

Mr. Fred Simmons of Springfield stated that he had submitted to the staff of both the City of Springfield and LTD six pages of comments, which were part of the record. One of the comments was directed to Mr. Bennett's observation that the Greyhound issue was new. Mr. Simmons' comment was that there was no inter-modal capacity established in the station, and he thought that was something that should be reviewed very effectively.

Mr. Simmons said that he had some technical problems with the EA, and he did not want to imply that he did not support the concept of the Springfield Station at either appropriate

site; however, he did find fault with some of the science that was involved, particularly the noise study, of which he had not yet received the raw data that he had requested. He said that the consultant had used an incorrect noise decibel table that had been published by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for buses that were manufactured in 1975 and not the post-1978 buses that LTD currently utilized.

Mr. Simmons stated that there were some technical problems in the EA, which he had pointed out in his written comments. In addition, there was some difference of opinion even between LTD staff and him. Upon further review of those issues, Mr. Simmons said that he still would hold to his opinions.

He asked that LTD perform a proper response and a proper evaluation of the technical data that currently was deficient. He thought that both sites G and I had wonderful potentials for both LTD and the community. He thought there was support for either of the sites. His objection now was for a thorough review for accuracy of the data contained in the EA. He said that he would continue to work with staff.

Mr. Simmons further stated that failing the staff providing the proper information, he felt that it was incumbent upon him to report directly to the FTA that those were the deficiencies outlined and to show why they were deficiencies. He stated that he preferred not to do that, but to have those answers resolved before then. If he did not get the answers; however, he was obliged to follow through in a formal way.

Ms. Wylie asked Mr. Simmons about the noise data on the aging buses and if the newer buses were quieter. Mr. Simmons said that the standards had been tightened as time had gone on. Unfortunately, LTD was in a unique position in that the DEQ had no enforcement people. He said that the inaccurate tables that were provided indicated that a bus produced 86 decibels (db) in 1975, and had dropped to 80 db in the process. All the buses currently in operation at LTD, including those that had been put through the Altuna test, met those standards. LTD was making progress, but there was some misuse of the technical data being used, and Mr. Simmons believed it was a clerical, innocent mistake. He did not believe that the consultant did that purposefully, but he believed it was a clerical mistake when the numbers were extracted out of the data from the DEQ. Based on prior experience with the consulting firm, Mr. Simmons did not believe that the error was made in a malicious manner.

Closure Of Public Hearing: There being no further public testimony, Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberations: There was no further discussion from members of the Board.

BUS SERVICE RECOMMENDATION FOR COTTAGE GROVE: Mr. Vobora said that staff were requesting that the Board modify the service area boundaries to include the Cottage Grove area. Information about how the service would be implemented was included in the agenda packet on page 30, and Mr. Vobora asked if there were any questions from the Board.

MOTION

Mr. Bennett moved approval of the following resolution, "The Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves the City of Cottage Grove's request to be annexed to the Lane Transit District service area, and directs LTD staff to establish the new portion of the service area boundary following the Cottage Grove urban growth boundary." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion.

Mr. Kortge said that the issue was contentious, but that he supported the motion because he had no choice. LTD needed to be sensitive about how service was implemented in Cottage Grove. A meeting had been set in Cottage Grove for November 10. There was conflicting information about the payroll tax receipts versus the cost of the service. Mr. Kortge thought it would be prudent for LTD to get the correct information out as soon as possible.

Mr. Bennett asked if the tax revenues had been projected. Mr. Vobora replied that projections had been made, but the exact amount would not be known until a full taxing cycle had been completed. The latest figures from the Department of Employment showed that the Cottage Grove area would generate about $233,000 in payroll tax revenue.

Mr. Kortge said that the other issue was the kind of services LTD would provide to the Cottage Grove area. Staff had a lot of work to do to design the service, and Mr. Kortge wanted the other Board members to realize the sensitive nature of the issue as the division in Cottage Grove was quite deep.

Ms. Wylie thought it would be very important to get good information out as soon as possible about the actual cost of the service and an evaluation about the ridership statistics. Mr. Vobora thought LTD had been very proactive in getting information out to the public, particularly during the pilot project that had operated during the previous year.

Mr. Vobora said that the meeting on November 10 was to solicit additional input about the initial service package. Also, it would be an opportunity for people to learn more about the partnership that LTD was forming with South Lane Wheels, the paratransit provider that would begin operating general public dial-a-ride service on November 1, 1999. That partnership could be enhanced to address some of the issues of intra-city movement by the general public. Mr. Vobora thought there were some good partnership opportunities as service was reintroduced, but it would take time, and he thought that as people began paying the payroll tax, they might realize that it was not as onerous as they originally thought. In addition, people would realize that LTD would be a good partner and needs would be addressed.

Mr. Bennett reiterated that it was important for the Board to have the best possible information as it began deliberating and discussing the issue. It occurred to him that each community had to decide, during its evolution, when it would have some kind of alternative transportation system. He said that while $233,000 seemed like a lot of money, if Cottage Grove had chosen to provide a transit system of its own, that annual amount most likely would not go very far. Maybe some analysis had been done, but he hoped that LTD would provide a good value to the community.

Mr. Kortge added that it made sense to provide service within Cottage Grove, and not just a bus up and down the freeway.

Mr. Bennett said that once Cottage Grove decided that the value was there, then a comparison could be made between the cost for LTD service and the cost of operating its own service.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if there was data that showed how LTD was benefiting the businesses that paid the payroll tax. She thought LTD should address that issue.

Mr. Kleger said that if the Board did not act on the motion at this meeting, LTD would be in a position of discontinuity between the taxing schedule and the boundary adjustment. If at any point during the process that the Board decided there was a fatal flaw, the process could be stopped, but moving forward now moved LTD into the most cost-effective way of establishing the adjusted boundaries.

Ms. Wylie summarized the conversation by saying that it sounded like the Board was concerned that it be provided some data and that the process be facilitated in the best manner. At this point, however, due to the vote, the Board needed to work with the community to begin providing service. She thought Mr. Vobora had presented the Board with a good beginning, and she thought the Board's role needed to be to mediate the process and to be good ambassadors as well as to be sensitive to the needs in Cottage Grove.

Ms. Hocken said that she hoped the Board's discussion did not sound like a reluctance existed to providing service to Cottage Grove, because she viewed it as an opportunity, not a burden to LTD. She thought the Board needed to be sensitive to the disparate opinions and needs of the Cottage Grove community. She thought it was important to work out the best interests of both LTD and Cottage Grove.

Ms. Loobey said that she had been involved with the Cottage Grove service issue for more than 10 years, and she agreed that while it was important to be sensitive to the needs, she did not believe LTD needed to be apologetic about anything. LTD had performed numerous studies that showed that people who made their salaries in Eugene typically took their earnings back to Cottage Grove. The studies showed that nearly 60 percent of the households in Cottage Grove had at least one person who worked or attended school in the Eugene area. No matter what the data revealed, the critics would never like what they heard, and no matter how the service was funded, Cottage Grove would be required to contribute. She assured the Board that staff would be as professional, diplomatic, straightforward, and honest as they could be in their dealings with Cottage Grove. She thought that going to Cottage Grove was a great thing that should have happened a long time ago. LTD's job was to provide transportation, and it did that effectively and efficiently and in accordance with the needs of the people it served to the best of its ability.

VOTE

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the earlier motion to annex Cottage Grove to the LTD service area and establish a new service area boundary, which passed unanimously, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none against.

FIRST READING, LTD ORDINANCE NO. 24 (1999 REVISION), DESCRIBING THE TERRITORIAL BOUNDARIES OF LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT: Mr. Vobora explained that two changes to the boundary previously had been discussed by the Board and were included in the revised ordinance. The first involved changes to specific sections of the existing boundary that included reducing the boundary along areas north of Coburg, in southwest Eugene, and along the Highway 126 and Highway 58 corridors. The second change involved a boundary expansion to incorporate the Cottage Grove service area, at Cottage Grove's request.

Ms. Hocken commented on the Cottage Grove boundary and noted that the reason the Board had decided to follow the I-5 corridor and not take in the 2.5-mile limit along the freeway was because there was no way to serve the area or people along the freeway. The buses could not stop on the freeway and there was no easy access on or off the freeway.

Public Hearing: There were no members of the audience who wished to address the Board in this matter, and Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation: There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved that Lane Transit District Ordinance 24, an ordinance describing the territorial boundaries of the District, be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none against.

MOTION VOTE

Ms. Wylie then read the Ordinance by title only: "Lane Transit District Ordinance 24 (1999 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District."

Mr. Vobora added that staff were working on policy guidelines for future use in adjusting boundaries for Board discussion at a future meeting. Ms. Hocken asked if staff and the Board had enough information to take to the Cottage Grove meeting on November 10. Mr. Vobora said that a specific map would be available.

GLENWOOD SEGMENT ALIGNMENT FOR BRT PILOT CORRIDOR: Mr. Bennett stated that the written material reflected the meeting of the BRT Steering Committee, which he chaired. Originally, Franklin Boulevard had been rejected because the right-of-way was too narrow and due to the concerns of area businesses regarding loss of access. The Springfield City Council then asked LTD to again review the Franklin option, but in another way, which was to develop the bus lanes incrementally as redevelopment occurred. The idea would be that as Glenwood became more developed and infrastructure and zoning issues were decided, area businesses would change over time. As a part of that transition, LTD could then make a case for exclusive right-of-way, but in the median. In the meantime, BRT would operate in mixed traffic and pull into a median station.

The Council made the point that if BRT became a reality, the area between Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River should not be ignored. That area needed access to the BRT system. While it was not a very wide area, it sounded as though there were plans to redevelop it. In light of those factors, the BRT Steering Committee chose the 14th Avenue alignment as the preferred alignment, which was just south of Franklin, but also

recommended that staff consider the Franklin Boulevard alignment in the Environmental Assessment (EA). Because of development planning, the Steering Committee thought it would be important to consider all options.

The decision to consider the Franklin option was recognized as potentially having a long-term advantage, but several Steering Committee members had expressed concern regarding the possible delay in implementation of the Franklin option if it were solely dependant upon the redevelopment of Glenwood. As a committee member, Mr. Bennett believed that if LTD did not achieve the right-of-way provision, it would not be accountable for the success of the pilot corridor. While it was true that LTD agreed on something less than exclusive right-of-way on the downtown Springfield segment, it was possible that parking could be mitigated in order to gain that exclusive right-of-way. Without the exclusive right-of-way, LTD would not meet the criteria to justify the capital cost.

LTD had made a promise to the Glenwood business community to not consider a Franklin Boulevard option, but in light of the Springfield City Council request, the Steering Committee recommended including the Franklin option in the EA. A meeting would be held with the Glenwood Business Association to explain the reasoning behind the addition of the Franklin option.

Ms. Hocken added that the reason that the 15th Avenue alternative had not been carried forward was that Springfield City Council did not think it was supportive of the current Glenwood refinement plan. The City of Springfield had committed to not changing the refinement plan as it was adopted by the City of Eugene for at least five years. In the refinement plan, the area south of 14th Avenue was to be residential, while the area north of 14th Avenue was to be zoned for commercial use. Operating BRT along 14th Avenue provided a division between the commercial and residential properties, which was in accordance with the land use decisions that had been made to date. If BRT operated along 15th Avenue, it would divide the residential area, and there was strong opposition to doing that.

Ms. Hocken further explained that at the last Steering Committee meeting, the Committee discussed the Springfield City Council proposal to reconsider a phased-in Franklin option. There was concern by the representatives of the Eugene City Council and Lane County that LTD would not provide rapid transit as promised. While the Committee was not prepared to endorse the Springfield proposal at this time, there was enough merit in the proposal to carry it forward into the EA.

The proposal was to have the EA review three options, the 14th Avenue alignment and two Franklin alternatives. The EA would provide some very good information, and if LTD were ever to consider Franklin, it needed to be reviewed now.

Mr. Kleger stated that the walking distance from 14th Avenue and Henderson to the Willamette River was three blocks, which really was not a long distance. He did not think the area north of Franklin should be considered a remote area. Ms. Hocken said that there also were opportunities with the 14th Avenue alignment that would not be available with the Franklin option.

Ms. Lauritsen clarified that what was being proposed was similar to the Springfield Station in that the EA would consider various possibilities while the Board pressed on with the decision-making process. She thought it made good sense to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation of the options.

MOTION

VOTE

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that LTD staff are directed to consider the 14th Avenue alignment, the phased Franklin Boulevard alignment, and a second Franklin Boulevard alignment (yet to be determined) for the Glenwood segment in the Environmental Assessment for Phase 1 of the BRT pilot corridor." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none against.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: a) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken reported that the MPC had discussed the process for approving TransPlan. A general consensus was reached that after the public comment period closed, each jurisdiction should have several opportunities to discuss the process for approval of TransPlan and to establish positions, then MPC would bring the jurisdictions together to discuss and act as a conflict resolution group for any difficult issues where a difference of opinion occurred. In addition, MPC had discussed the proposal that had been presented by the Friends of Eugene to change the process, and it was hoped that a decision would be made at the December MPC meeting. The November MPC meeting had been canceled.

b) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken stated that she could not attend the November 4, 1999, meeting that was scheduled in Salem from 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Ms. Lauritsen volunteered to go if her schedule allowed. Ms. Hocken said that the Forum provided an opportunity to network with others from around the state as well as with local representatives.

c) BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input. Mr. Viggiano described the slight change in the process for Phase 2 public process. Phase 2 was the pilot corridor that would extend west from the Eugene Station. Phase 1 was divided into segments, and a public process was conducted for each segment, but the main corridor was clearly identifiable. It was different for Phase 2, in that it was not clear which main corridor would be used. A process was needed to determine which general east-west corridor made the most sense, and the segment approach would not work until that decision had been made. The process to determine the general corridor would begin in November with focus groups that would identify key issues. Ms. Hocken asked at what point the Board would be discussing the general corridor alternatives. Mr. Viggiano said that the focus groups would occur in mid-November, so the Board might want to spend some time discussing some of the findings at its December meeting.

d) Springfield Station Steering Committee. Mr. Kleger had nothing further to report than what was discussed earlier in the meeting.

e) Executive Search Committee. The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, November 15, with the entire Board at 5:00 p.m. At that meeting, the executive search consultant, Jerry Oldani, would be present. The Board would have its first opportunity to review some of the applicants for the general manager position and to discuss the process for selection. Mr. Kleger asked if there was a sense of how many applications had been received. Ms. Loobey responded that more than 30 people currently were in the application pool. Ms. Wylie said it was important for all Board members to attend the

November 15 meeting, if at all possible, as choosing a new general manager most likely was the most important decision the Board members would make during their tenure.

f) American Public Transit Association Annual Meeting. Ms. Wylie said that she had nothing to add to her earlier report.

g) Announcements and Additions to Agenda. Ms. Wylie said that this new, recurring agenda item would be moved to the top of the agenda for future meetings. She had one addition to the agenda. She said that Government Affairs Manager Linda Lynch had recommended that the LTD Board invite the Springfield City Council and their family members to a special dinner followed by a holiday lights joy ride tour of holiday light displays. The Board would have to agree to be present, and it was a nice way to have a political/social time together with the Council. There were very few possible dates available, but the 16th of December appeared to work best for most Board members. The event would occur between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. Ms. Loobey added that there were some wonderfully decorated neighborhoods in Springfield, and she thought the tour should be conducted in Springfield. Staff would contact the Board members for confirmation by the end of the week.

Mr. Kleger added that he had made a presentation to a senior group, and it was gratifying to speak to a group of enthusiastic bus riders, who appreciated LTD services.

Ms. Wylie also announced that the Springfield Chamber / UO Alumni Auction would be held on November 19. LTD had reserved a table, and the Board members and a guest were invited. Staff would contact the Board about their availability for this event.

SEPTEMBER AND AUGUST FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that the report was fairly comprehensive in terms of getting the first quarter of the year underway. This was an important time in the fiscal year, in which the strategic plan and long-range financial plan were reviewed. Budget assumptions were developed and perameters were set for the next year's budget process and the years that followed.

The Board Finance Committee would be reconvened in November. There quite possibly would be a large agenda for that meeting, depending on what direction the Board took at its October 29 and 30 work session. The Finance Committee meeting would be the preparation for a December work session on the results of fare and ridership modeling and the projections. Also, there was a real possibility of a reduction in federal funding that the Board also needed to consider.

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) would be available in November. Once again, LTD had received an unqualified audit. The independent auditors would be available at the November Board meeting to present the CAFR.

Mr. Bennett asked about the budget variance that was mentioned in the agenda item summary on page 51. Ms. Hellekson stated that staff had a difficult time of predicting how tax revenues would come in. She did believe that LTD would realize a payroll tax revenue increase of about 3 percent for the fiscal year, as had been projected. Since staff could not accurately project when those revenues would be received, those amounts were not accrued.

Mr. Bennett asked if expenses were less for the same reason. Ms. Hellekson replied that expenses also were encumbered throughout the year. The budget was set in April of each year, and expenses were predicted in the budget. As those expenses were incurred, they were encumbered, but not necessarily expensed at that time. LTD could not expense goods or services that had not yet been received.

Mr. Bennett asked if expenses were projected to increase. Ms. Hellekson said that personnel expenses might increase slightly. There was more overtime and temporary system supervisor time this year, and, while it may not result in annual budget overages, staff were working on correcting the situation.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE: Mr. Bennett reported that he had attended the County Commissioners meetings to talk about the BRT project with the Commissioners. He felt that the meeting had been quite successful. In addition, he met and visited with several individual Commissioners and felt those were successful meetings. There was strong support for BRT from several of the County Commissioners. Mr. Viggiano added that it had been very positive.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion regarding any other informational items in the Board packet, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Board Secretary