

**MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**SPECIAL BOARD MEETING/WORK SESSION  
JOINT MEETING WITH SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL**

Monday, May 14, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 10, 2001, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special meeting/work session jointly with the Springfield City Council on Monday, May 14, 2001, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: LTD Board

Hillary Wylie, President  
Rob Bennett, Vice President  
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Gerry Gaydos  
Robert Melnick  
Mark Pangborn,  
Assistant General Manager

Springfield City Council

Sid Leiken, Mayor  
Christine Lundberg, Ward 1  
Tammy Fitch, Ward 2  
Anne Ballew, Ward 3  
Dave Ralston, Ward 4  
Fred Simmons, Ward 5  
Lyle Hatfield, Ward 6,  
Council President

Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Pat Hocken, LTD Board Member  
Ken Hamm, LTD General Manager

**CALL TO ORDER:** LTD Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:48 p.m. Springfield Mayor Sid Leiken opened the Springfield Council Work Session.

Ms. Wylie said that LTD's General Manager Ken Hamm and Board Member Pat Hocken were unable to attend as the Eugene City Council was meeting to conceptually approve the bus rapid transit (BRT) project at the same time, and they were attending that meeting.

Mayor Leiken said that the Council and LTD had a very positive working relationship. This meeting would provide an opportunity for the Council to bring up concerns to be addressed by staff. It also was an opportunity for the LTD Board to hear and address those concerns. The joint meetings in the past had been very respectful and cordial, and he expected this meeting to be so as well.

**WORK SESSION – BUS RAPID TRANSIT:** Ms. Wylie said that the Board was present to provide support to the Council as it considered its conceptual approval of the BRT Phase 1 project and to answer any questions the Council might have.

Springfield Transportation Planning Manager Nick Arnis said that staff had prepared an aggressive work session agenda as there was much information to get through.

Mr. Arnis reviewed the September 20, 1999, Council work session, in which many issues were raised, some of which would be addressed as part of an intergovernmental agreement (IGA). The council was willing to approve a Phase 1 BRT conceptual alignment if the Council and City staff concerns would be met as assured through the IGA.

There were several conditions for approval, including that BRT maintain or improve the economic vitality of the BRT project area; maintain local street circulation for all modes and maintain mobility; decrease delay for all modes; and be consistent with long-range transportation and land-use visions for the project area; and that LTD include the City as an equal partner in developing BRT, including sharing BRT funding for involved City staff.

Mr. Arnis then reviewed the staff comments about the draft Environmental Assessment (EA). Staff believed there was a need for LTD to continue to coordinate the project with City staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council. The EA needed to address Council direction from the September 20, 1999, Council memorandums and minutes, and to advance the Glenwood Alternative proposed by Councilor Fitch.

The Springfield Planning Commission and City staff made the following comments and recommendations. They liked the fast lane option in mixed traffic through Glenwood and the Henderson Street station location. They took no position on the location of the Brooklyn Station. If LTD planned in the future to go ahead with the guideway option in Glenwood area, they asked that LTD engage in a public process. If the Brooklyn Street station was selected as the preferred site, then the proposed Station B design was preferred.

Mr. Arnis reviewed the IGA topics that were important to Springfield, including the continued collaboration and coordination during design and construction of Phase 1. The City was interested in reviewing, evaluating, and acceptance of designs. The IGA also should include a process for determining impacts and mitigation according to City standards, maintenance coordination, and a process for resolving conflicts. It also should include a process for future BRT phases in Springfield.

Mr. Arnis proposed that each Councilor list three concerns about Phase 1. Mr. Arnis categorized those concerns into three categories: IGA issues, major concerns to be resolved prior to the IGA, and non-IGA concerns, such as transit service and transit policy.

Mr. Arnis emphasized to the Council members that approving a resolution providing conceptual support of the BRT Phase 1 would not tie the City to certain conditions in the IGA. The City was the road authority in Springfield, as was the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). It was very important that the IGA state the importance of the road authority's approval. The IGA could come back to the Council during a work session and could be signed by the mayor.

Mayor Leiken said that he preferred to leave the details of the project to the staff, and he praised the professionalism of staff. Ms. Wylie reiterated that the LTD Board was available to answer questions from the Council.

Councilor Simmons said that he was concerned about left turns, particularly at Brooklyn, Henderson, and Agate. The draft EA responses were cumbersome, and he planned to address that issue with the LTD staff at a later date. He was concerned with the left turns, particularly at Brooklyn, and that the Brooklyn Street station not be made permanent until the Glenwood refinement plan was complete. He also voiced his concern about noise congestion to adjacent structures, one of which would be sold in June and could be eliminated from noise congestion consideration. He wanted to protect the integrity of businesses along the route in a way that would allow them to maintain in-and-out access.

Councilor Fitch said that she would like assurance that if LTD took BRT a step further with fixed rail, the concept would be opened back up to the public process in Glenwood. In addition, she was concerned about the parking removal on Main Street in Springfield. She wanted to ensure that the mitigation process be undertaken to provide replacement parking. Mr. Arnis listed the parking mitigation as a major concern.

Councilor Ballew said that she was concerned about the impact on travel congestion. She was concerned about removing a lane on Main Street. Because Springfield was not quite as prosperous as other communities, she also was concerned about future fare impacts.

Councilor Lundberg said that along with the impacts on congestion, she was concerned about the safety of multi-modal transportation, pedestrians, and riders. Her concern about the IGA was the joint planning process. She wanted to ensure that those efforts were being shared. She had a major concern about the proposed neighborhood circulator service and what the impacts of that service would be on the neighborhoods.

Councilor Ralston said that he was concerned about the effect that BRT would have on other modes of transportation. If, for instance, BRT were extended out West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Eugene, where there currently were two lanes in each direction, removing one of those lanes would create a huge negative impact to the other modes of transportation. He also was concerned about the guideways, which would do too much to restrict cross movement, particularly in Glenwood where large trucks crossed Franklin Boulevard. He stated that he also was concerned about the Henderson Street station.

Councilor Ballew added her concern about the actual use of public facilities that were not built to withstand such use, such as Springfield streets. She wanted to see a lot of IGA cooperation between LTD and Springfield in this area, and thought some mitigation should take place in regard to the use and abuse of Springfield Streets and lights, etc.

Councilor Ralston emphasized his concern about safety. He wanted assurances that pedestrians, in whatever weather, could cross back and forth and safely access BRT, etc.

Councilor Hatfield stated his concern about how to measure success of the pilot corridor. He was not expecting great things out of the downtown-to-downtown segment, but realized that it was an opportunity to see BRT in action and to see how the public would respond. He did not believe LTD would experience a major jump in ridership until other BRT routes were

added, especially a Gateway, north Coburg, and Thurston route. He viewed the pilot corridor as a test bed of BRT options, such as guideways, mixed traffic, queue jumpers, etc. He thought a good issue for the IGA was how to determine the success of the pilot corridor.

Councilor Ballew added that she believed that with the existing bus system, LTD had done a good job of meeting the needs of the public. She thought that could be a baseline measurement to determine how BRT would be better than what already existed.

Mr. Arnis said that one of the major concerns was the parking mitigation and the proposed removal of parking along Main Street. LTD BRT Engineer Graham Carey said that original plans called for the removal of 16 spaces; however, staff had scaled back the impacts on parking to 14 spaces. The removal of parking would impact two blocks on the southern side of Main Street from Pioneer Parkway East to Mill Street. Staff had found that the five businesses along those blocks did not require much on-street parking. Staff had made this determination based on a three-pronged approach. 1) Staff talked with all the property owners adjacent to the parking bays. All of them would prefer to maintain the on-street parking, but they also offered off-street parking. The parking bays at that end of town were utilized between 30 percent and 40 percent of the time those businesses were open. 2) Staff also had surveyed the parking on the northern side of the street and found that there was much available parking. 3) Staff were proposing to mitigate the parking loss by reintroducing parking on South A east of Pioneer Parkway West. Creating additional parking at those locations would more than mitigate the 14 spaces that would be lost.

Councilor Lundberg asked how people would access those businesses' parking lots. Mr. Carey said that anyone could access them from the north off Main or by traveling around to South A. The bus lane would be traversable, so people would be able to access those businesses. Parking currently was located on the south and west sides of those businesses. The only exception was the Plasma center, where parking was available only in the front; however, its clientele tended not to drive.

Councilor Hatfield recapped the parking mitigation. He said that the loss of the 14 spaces would be replaced by more than 14 spaces on South A as well as on 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and possibly through the Park & Ride facility at the proposed Springfield Station.

Councilor Ballew said that one of the options of the proposed Springfield Station was a combined parking lot for shoppers and Park & Ride lot for commuters. If that lot were built, she hoped it would be used more by bus commuters than by downtown shoppers.

Councilor Simmons asked what process would be used to establish the parking spaces on South A where currently there were three lanes. Mr. Carey said that staff were proposing using the northernmost lane, which currently was used mostly as a de-facto left-turn-only lane onto Pioneer Parkway East. While some of the lane would be used for parking, a bulbout would be constructed at the eastern side of the intersection, forcing the left turn. Mr. Simmons said that he did not see the hydraulic passivity of street and how it would translate to an actual plan. Losing a total lane on that block was an administrative process, rather than a policy question, and he thought staff should take a close look at it. Mr. Carey said that it would be relatively easy to restore the lane of traffic in the future, if the need were demonstrated.

Councilor Hatfield asked Mr. Arnis to take a look at it and make a recommendation to the Council. Mr. Arnis said that ODOT had reviewed the proposal, and ODOT was the road authority. Mr. Carey said that parking was a key development on that block and would help slow traffic, which, in turn, would make it safer for pedestrians as well. Mr. Arnis said that staff would review the proposed parking removal and would contact property owners. If a conflict existed, staff would be open to investigate other options. There also were lots across the street that could be used for mitigation efforts. In the IGA, the responsibility would be on LTD to contact adjacent property owners and work with them and the City to mitigate parking.

Councilor Lundberg said that the viability of small businesses was tied very closely to accessibility. Parking became a convenience issue, and the loss of parking could hurt small businesses. She would be very concerned about what was done to mitigate parking before she would support removing it.

Ms. Wylie said that with the proposed Springfield Station being located across South A Street, there most likely would be an increase in pedestrian traffic to those businesses.

Mr. Arnis said that another major issue was the impact of BRT on other modes. This had been a big issue, and he asked Mr. Carey to explain how LTD had dealt with it. Mr. Carey said that LTD had heard clearly the concerns about impeding auto and pedestrian movement. As a result, in Glenwood, BRT would operate in mixed traffic. The only impact on other modes would be at intersections where a queue jumper would be used to allow the buses to move ahead of other traffic. In downtown Springfield, a lane would be added on the southern side of South A Street for eastbound traffic. On Main Street, a parking lane would be removed, but all auto lanes would remain, with the exception of the left-turn lane at Pioneer Parkway East.

Mr. Kleger said that LTD fixed-route service already was beginning to create blockages on many corridors with buses currently using right lanes, particularly during peak periods. Buses did not get out of the traffic flow, which meant that traffic was backing up behind the bus as it stopped for passengers. It was occurring in all parts of the urban area, and it only would worsen over time. The only way to fix the problem was to remove the buses from traffic lanes. It was important to do that now when it would be more effective and less expensive to accomplish. The two modes of movement were incompatible, particularly on more congested streets.

Councilor Hatfield said that he typically commuted along West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Eugene and, currently, he would not even attempt to use the right lane because of the wait for every bus at every stop. Councilor Ballew noted that was 5 percent of the public using 50 percent of the resource. Councilor Hatfield said that was exactly where this community was moving to. The only way to correct the problem was to pull the buses off the road, such as on River Road in Eugene where buses used pull-outs to stop. The yield sign assisted the movement of buses back into traffic. In order to have an efficient transportation system, the buses could not be stopping in a traffic lane.

Councilor Simmons said that for future BRT phases, the Booth-Kelly-Haul Road was an ideal transit corridor that should be protected for transit in the future. As a bus operator, Councilor Simmons noted that it was easier to stop on the street than to use pull-outs because of the difficulty in getting back into traffic. Even with 10-minute service on Main, a

large percent of the traffic was turning right or left. The build-up behind buses was not as pronounced on Main. When considering the BRT stops being spaced further apart, the resistance to the hydraulic movement was decreased. He agreed with the notion of moving to a guideway at some point, but, currently, he thought BRT would perform fairly well without the guideways. However, it was certainly something to look at very carefully for the future. Pioneer Parkway was a classic example of a place that easily could accommodate guideways.

Ms. Wylie said that LTD staff had provided videos of BRT in action in European cities using all of the various combined elements of guideways, mixed traffic, and queue jumpers. Staff had reported and the videos had shown that it could be done very smoothly.

Mr. Arnis reminded the Council about the seven points of concern that were listed during the September 1999 Council work session. One of those was that BRT would not increase congestion or delay the current level of service. Springfield had a level-of-service policy that should be kept in mind when considering the impacts of BRT. When reviewing the various components, it was true that it would be good to get LTD on its own right-of-way (ROW), but there was a question about whether existing ROW would be used or whether new ROW would be created, which could infringe upon the surrounding businesses. With an IGA, Mr. Arnis proposed that staff be given the discretion to work with LTD and ODOT to determine the level of service delays.

Councilor Hatfield said that he wanted staff to work out the details of the IGA. From a policy level, the Council needed to be confident that the design for Phase 1 in Springfield and Glenwood would not yield any significant congestion due to BRT. The only area that possibly could be different was the area on South A Street, east of Pioneer Parkway East. Mr. Arnis said that the entire area, with the proposed Springfield Station, would be modeled to determine how it might work once all the components were implemented.

Mr. Arnis said that also of concern were fares and tax issues. The Council had stated that it was concerned about fares and what LTD was anticipating charging for BRT use. Ms. Lauritsen said that fares would hold steady for a while, but not for too long. Councilor Ballew said that many people in Springfield who used the bus were low income.

Mayor Leiken said that the Friends of Eugene (FoE) had put up a good argument to stop the project. He thought that part of that argument had resulted in LTD's not having put enough emphasis on the neighborhood circulator buses. The smaller circulator buses would use less fuel and would cost less to operate, which would offset some of the BRT expense and could eliminate the need to increase fares.

LTD Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn said that the fare transcended BRT as it applied to the whole system. LTD had a fare policy in place, and had been fairly consistent with fare adjustments throughout the years. But, the Board had a tough balance. Fares were subsidized at 80 percent, and only paid 17 to 21 percent of the cost of a trip. The majority of the subsidy came from the payroll and self-employment taxes.

The business community, rightly, had a very strong interest in what LTD charged for fares. Some people would argue that LTD should charge the entire operating cost to fares. The Board established the fare policy to balance the two. Staff considered several factors

when making fare-change recommendations to the Board, including the current fare, the rate of inflation, and what other transit agencies were charging. LTD attempted to keep fares to a reasonable amount. There were proven effects of fare increases, such as a loss in ridership, and LTD had been careful to raise fares in a consist manner.

BRT actually would be less expensive to operate than the current fixed-route service, because with an exclusive ROW, LTD would be able to guarantee headway (frequency of service) as traffic would not be a factor. Currently, as traffic increased, LTD added extra buses to a route to maintain a published 10-minute headway. LTD would be using the projected savings to pay for the neighborhood connector services. BRT, in a sense, would have no overall impact on fares. LTD's new fares would take affect on July 1, when the adult fare would increase from \$1.00 to \$1.25, which was very consistent with peer agencies. BRT fares would be the same as the regular system. The only difference would be the neighborhood connector service, which LTD was considering making less expensive to facilitate movement within the neighborhood. The new downtown Eugene Shuttle, that would begin operation in September 2001, would cost only \$0.25, and the same theory would apply to the neighborhood service – to get people to use it to make short trips.

Mr. Kleger added that LTD anticipated using articulated buses for BRT at some point, which would increase the capacity of the vehicle per driver hour by at least one-third, which was a major efficiency gain. The largest operational cost was personnel. Fuel issues also were significant, but small compared with personnel costs. The new shuttle buses would have hybrid-electric engines. If those buses worked out, LTD would have identified a way to make major efficiencies on fuel. The current fleet then would be replaced over time with the more efficient vehicles.

Mr. Pangborn said that implicit in some discussions was that if the community made a big capital investment in BRT, then somehow the fares would go up. Phase 1 of BRT would be 80 percent federally funded and staff anticipated future phases to be at least 50 percent federally funded, and the operational costs would be less. It was not anticipated that fares would increase wholly due to the implementation of BRT.

Councilor Simmons said that he thought the financial efficacy of the system was true at build out, but he did not believe it was true with Phase 1 because people would need to transfer off the BRT to complete a trip.

Councilor Ballew said that it was acceptable to raise the issue of fares, because the whole purpose of BRT was based on more people riding the bus. Supposedly, BRT would reduce traffic, and therefore reduce congestion. There were many assumptions related to BRT, but if those goals were not realized, then a lot of money would have been spent without a lot of product. Councilor Simmons believed that down the road, the cost efficiency would be facilitated. Cash fares might be more prohibitive, but a universal pass would be more cost effective.

Ms. Lauritsen asked for a process check as the time was getting short to complete the meeting. Mr. Arnis said that the Council already was at the third item in the list. Councilor Hatfield said that the issues being raised were real for Springfield, and unless resolved, the vote from the Council would be negative. He wanted the issues resolved at this meeting.

The fourth issue was with regard to safety. Mr. Carey said that LTD had a vested interest in safety. LTD was proposing to conduct an independent safety audit of the Phase 1 design to ensure that BRT would not create unsafe situations. Safety issues in the median stations, from a passenger/pedestrian point of view, were the most brought up concern. Currently, a bus trip typically would be taken in one direction, requiring passengers to cross the entire six lanes of traffic. BRT, operating in the median, would reduce the cross to three lanes in each direction. To facilitate safety, the stations needed to be at signalized intersections, with walk signals that allowed ample time to cross safely. In order for passengers to feel safe at the stations, staff were proposing that railings be built around the station, with the only exposed side being the side the bus operated on. The bus would arrive at a low speed in its own lane. The passengers would be fairly well protected while on the station platforms.

The stations through Glenwood had been difficult to place. One goal was to locate the stations out of traffic lanes, and median stations would limit the impact to properties on either side. Adjacent properties would be visible and accessible, which were benefits when compared with a curbside station. Mr. Carey compared drawings of both types of stations. On streets where the speed limit was more than 30 miles per hour (MPH), buses should not be stopping in a traffic lane. A pull-out, curbside station would require five times more property acquisition than would a median station.

Councilor Ralston thought that the railings were good idea, but during inclement weather he would be concerned about issues such as splashing water from passing motorists. Councilor Lundberg agreed. She thought that with a station on the curbside, a person could stand back until a bus arrived, but in the median, one could not step back away from traffic. She thought LTD needed to provide that safety factor. Mr. Carey thought that a small wall at the bottom of the railing would be a way to prevent that splashing from people at the station.

Mr. Arnis said that one of the ways to combat that issue would be the drainage or sewer project along Franklin Boulevard in Glenwood. He believed that LTD was very concerned about safety for both pedestrians and other modes. The issue was how much mitigation to require for median stations, such as mitigating drainage, the size of the sidewalks, the number of driveways that would be left open, etc. Staff would continue to discuss those issues as the IGA was prepared.

Councilor Simmons thought that as long as the station met the technical standards of truck turning radius, etc., it should not matter if it were located in center or on the side. The specific design issues should be deferred to staff.

Mr. Arnis noted that a transportation growth management study currently was underway in Glenwood. Staff were working through issues, such as where intersections and streets would be located.

Councilor Simmons thought it was acceptable to agree on the BRT concept and move forward. Mr. Carey said that LTD was willing to wait for the transportation growth management study to be completed and to work within the results of that study.

Mayor Leiken asked if Tri-Met had median stations in Portland. Mr. Carey said there were some median stations located along the MAX line. Mayor Leiken said that he assumed



that Tri-Met had regulations and guidelines for those median stations, and LTD should build its stations according to those regulations, particularly where ODOT was concerned. Because of the necessity to provide a turn pocket, Mr. Carey said that the design of the Henderson Street median station was somewhat unusual.

With regard to the neighborhood connector service, Mr. Carey said currently there were seven routes that connected into the Springfield Station, and LTD was not proposing to increase that number at this time, as there currently was not a great demand to supply more service. The only new neighborhood service being proposed in conjunction with the BRT Phase 1 was through the Laurel Hill/Fairmount area in Eugene.

Councilor Lundberg asked if LTD would be cutting back on any routes as a result of BRT. Mr. Carey said that LTD was not planning to cut back any services that currently fed into the Springfield Station. A segment of the #11 Thurston route would be removed and replaced by BRT, but would continue to operate from Springfield Station to Thurston. People would continue to need to transfer. The proposed station would function much better than the current Springfield Station. The only impact would be on the #11 passenger who boarded west of Springfield or who was traveling out to that area and would be required to transfer at the Springfield Station.

Mr. Pangborn added that the bigger the BRT system became, the more efficient the service. A passenger would be able to buy a ticket in Thurston, and that same ticket would act as a transfer for the entire trip. Currently, passengers paid double the one-way fare and received a day pass to ride anywhere all day.

Councilor Fitch asked whether the Council had received answers to all its concerns to the point that if the issues were included in the IGA, BRT would be a go. Councilor Simmons said that he thought there remained some staff discussions about details, but the general consensus was there to go forward. Councilor Lundberg said that she was ready to move forward, but with a little hesitation. Councilor Ballew said that she would support it as long as staff could satisfy the remaining concerns through the IGA.

Mr. Kleger said that he had been on the edges of the BRT process, but had watched the periodic reports from LTD staff and had read the minutes of the BRT Steering Committee. He appreciated the willingness of the Council to be practical about BRT.

Mr. Arnis said that staff would bring the issue in the form of a resolution to the Council at its June 4 meeting. Councilor Hatfield said that ODOT was officially neutral, and whatever position the Council took, ODOT was willing to work with the City. ODOT Area Manager Bob Pirrie, who was present at the meeting, thought some ODOT opinions were being slanted in discussions. He wanted to emphasize that ODOT was neutral, but willing to work with the City.

Mr. Arnis said that a draft IGA also would be available at the June 4 Council meeting.

**WORK SESSION – SPRINGFIELD STATION:** Mr. Arnis said that Lane Transit District was seeking the Council's approval of the selection of Site I-West for the proposed Springfield Transit Station. Councilor Ballew had been a member of the Springfield Station

Steering Committee, which had approved Site I-West as the preferred site for the proposed station. Staff would provide a resolution for the new preferred Site I-West on June 4.

Mr. Pangborn said that the Springfield Station would be the interim eastern terminus until Phase 3 of the BRT project was complete, when Thurston would become the eastern terminus. He provided a brief history of the Springfield Station.

There was a demonstrated need for a new station. The current station was too small and required out of direction travel for the main Springfield routes. The Steering Committee had looked in downtown Springfield, and had narrowed the choices to two sites – Site G and Site I (now Site I-East). When the two sites came up for a vote, the Steering Committee was split. The Springfield City Council had voted for Site I-East, which currently was occupied by Les' Service Center and Canopies (Les' Canopies), which would have been displaced.

The LTD Board, in the interest of protecting Les' Canopies, had directed staff to continue to work on the siting of the station. Staff found a site (Site I-West), immediately west of the Les' Canopies site, that would work. Mr. Pangborn displayed an aerial photo of the entire area.

Site I-West was owned by Union Pacific and was mostly vacant. Union Pacific was interested in selling the property. The Steering Committee had recommended moving ahead, and the Environmental Assessment was positive. With the approval from the Springfield City Council, LTD would move ahead with the project. The site would utilize a small amount of Les' Canopy property, and the owners had indicated that they were willing to work with LTD.

Mr. Pangborn then displayed a site plan, which was the original plan for Site I-West, and most likely would be modified somewhat. The plan also showed the mitigated parking.

Ms. Wylie said that when the Steering Committee was meeting, Springfield Chamber President Dan Egan spoke about how fast traffic flowed by the station site on South A Street, and it was believed that the bulbouts and the addition of parking on the north side of South A Street would calm traffic.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff would look at continuing the parking addition east of 4<sup>th</sup> Street to maintain the slowing effect while in the heart of downtown. Buses would enter the station from South A Street, travel around a turn-around, and exit on South A Street. The station design addressed safety concerns. Mr. Pangborn presented the options for a guest service center to be located on the platform. A large building located on the site was being considered for joint development.

There were two possible parking areas – one associated with the building/development, and one for a Park & Ride. Another idea was to create an urban park setting rather than a large Park & Ride. The Council would have to decide the appropriate setbacks from the millpond.

Councilor Simmons asked if approval had been given from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Mr. Pangborn said that the NMFS had approved the site as part of the EA process.

Mr. Pangborn said that the advantages of Site I-West included direct access to Pioneer Parkway East, the use of land that was primarily vacant, and it allowed Les' Canopies to remain in business at its present location. It was a larger parcel with greater visibility, located closer to City Hall, with direct access to the south (Booth-Kelly). Site I-West issues included traffic calming on South A, a Park & Ride lot, and joint development.

Councilor Hatfield asked about the commercial building located along the street. He wondered if LTD had considered the architectural theme for the building, such as a turn-of-the-century theme. He thought a "Main Street America" theme would go well with downtown. Mr. Pangborn said that design decisions had not yet been made, and staff expected the design process to be a joint effort with the City. Private investments also would be a factor, if the joint development of the current building occurred. The process to select an architect to design the station had begun, and there was a station design committee that was comprised of both staff and City representatives.

Councilor Simmons said that the grant language needed to be carefully massaged to allow the greatest amount of flexibility, and the station needed to have a stylistic approach. He also thought staff should research what could be done for a Park & Ride with regard to the other side of the millrace as part of the Booth-Kelly property to see if a relationship could be established that would benefit LTD and downtown Springfield in providing extra parking.

Ms. Fitch said that she was excited with the idea for a common area. Safety and traffic calming were crucial. She agreed with the left-turn lane forcing the flow-through traffic to use the other two lanes, and she appreciated that LTD had continued with the process to find Site I-West.

Councilor Lundberg said she was concerned about the loss of access to businesses during rush-hour traffic and the loss of parking along Main Street.

Mr. Melnick said that the 5p.m. traffic backup already existed anyway. There was a discussion of current traffic patterns. A new traffic signal would be installed at Pioneer Parkway where currently there was none, and signals could be coordinated to queue up traffic. Mr. Arnis proposed looking out farther west to the bridge heads to begin traffic calming activities. Mr. Kleger believed that when all the traffic controls were in place, South A would be easier to cross for pedestrians.

The Council members agreed that Site I-West was the best choice for a preferred site and that they would take formal action at their June 4 meeting.

**WORK SESSION – BRT FUTURE PHASES:** LTD staff were seeking direction on the timing and process for selection and development of future BRT lines.

Councilor Hatfield thought that staff should look seriously at Phase 3 not being the Thurston link, but rather a Pioneer Parkway link to the Gateway area. Anyone who wanted to go from Thurston to Gateway could take the 8x Express route to Pioneer Parkway and connect to a BRT bus to Gateway.

Other Councilors agreed. Councilor Simmons noted that the #11 Thurston route and the 8x Express route already provided good service to the east.

Mayor Leiken said that a fiber optic line north from downtown and the possibility of more economic development in the Gateway area prompted the Council's request.

LTD General Manager Ken Hamm arrived at the meeting and announced that the Eugene City Council had voted 6 to 2 in support of BRT.

Councilor Ralston asked about the further possibility of joint development at the Springfield Station. Ms. Wylie said that it was hoped to have a café or a small store on the site. The joint development could take the form of a public/private coalition (private developer).

Mayor Leiken thanked LTD for hosting the meeting. He recognized former Mayor Maureen Weathers for her superb leadership in the BRT and Springfield Station projects. Also, he announced that this was the last meeting of Masood Mirza who was leaving the City for a private company in Miami, Florida, and who would be missed. Mr. Mirza had done an outstanding job with the City. The Mayor thanked Mr. Mirza for his services. Ms. Wylie also thanked Mr. Mirza for his assistance with LTD projects.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie thanked the Springfield City Council for meeting with LTD. She then adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

*Shelley Wylie, President*  
Board Secretary President