

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, February 18, 2004

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 12, 2004, 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, February 18, 2004, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Gerry Gaydos, Vice President, presiding
Susan Ban
David Gant
Dave Kieger
Pat Hocken
Virginia Lauritsen
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Clerk of the Board
Lynn Taylor, Recording Secretary

Absent: Hillary Wylie, President

CALL TO ORDER – Mr. Gaydos called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m. with five members present. Ms. Lauritsen arrived at 6:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL - General Manager Ken Hamm called the roll.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT – Mr. Gaydos commended LTD for its compassionate response to the tragic death of Joyce Ziemiak, who was employed as a senior human resources specialist. He particularly commended the response of Mary Neidig, director of Human Resources.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA – There were none.

BOARD CALENDARS – There were no questions. Mr. Gaydos thanked Board members for attending a special Board meeting on Presidents' Day.

WORK SESSION

A. Commuter Solutions Presentation – Connie Bloom Williams, Commuter Solutions Program manager, highlighted elements of the program and discussed the growth in regional significance of the program and how it played a role in LTD's ability to be a transportation leader in the region. She said that the many tools available in the transportation options toolbox were part of the reason for the program's success. She listed Commuter Solutions' partner agencies, which, along with LTD, had developed and adopted the strategic plan for Commuter Solutions:

Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA), Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Ms. Williams provided examples of activities within the program's four main areas of emphasis: technical assistance; education and outreach; policy; and research.

Ms. Williams used mapping layers to illustrate the many transportation projects and plans in the region and how they were connected. She said the next two sites that would be the focus of future transportation management efforts were downtown Eugene and downtown Springfield. She indicated that the popularity of van pools for commuters in the I-5 corridor was increasing and referred the Board to the annual report on van pool impact in the agenda packet. She said there were now 11 vans operating. She also illustrated the location of the 12 Smart Ways to School project sites being implemented in three school districts in the region. She said that the program was currently at the elementary and middle school level and next year high schools would be added. She introduced Lisa VanWinkle, the project lead for the Smart Ways program.

Continuing, Ms. Williams stated that the group pass program had grown from 9 employers in 1994 to 47 employers in 2004. She reported that the Commuter Solutions Program budget was reliant on a Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) grant from ODOT, along with a local match that was split equally with local partners. She said this year the program had received a special Office of Energy grant to fund the Smarts Ways program position. She said that the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) had recently dedicated a portion of the local Surface Transportation Program-Urban funds to the Commuter Solutions Program, which reflected support for local transportation management efforts. She said the Board soon would review a proposed Commuter Solutions Program budget that included priority projects recommended by local partners. She concluded with the observation that the Commuter Solutions Program would continue to grow and could play an even more important role in helping LTD with two of its strategic planning goals: providing innovative services and progressive leadership in our region.

Mr. Kleger noted that some group pass employers had left the program and asked if there was a reason for those losses. Ms. Williams said that budgets and the economy were the cause. She said that early notice of the proposed group pass cost increase had been given to program participants and no comments had been received.

Ms. Williams announced the April 8, 2004, Springfield Chamber of Commerce quarterly membership meeting, which was being held in conjunction with a Gateway Transportation Partnership meeting. She said that invitations would be sent to Board members.

B. 2004-05 Pricing Plan Discussion – Andy Vobora, Service Planning and Marketing manager, presented staff recommendations for changes to the fare discount programs and asked for direction from the Board. He said that the Wholesale Discount program offered sales of passes and tokens through retail establishments and distribution of fare instruments through governmental agencies to their clients at a wholesale discount of 5 percent. He said the recommendation was to eliminate the wholesale discount for public agencies, but maintain the program for private sales outlets.

Mr. Vobora stated that the SSI Discounted Pass program served guests who suffered some form of illness or injury that was not severe enough to qualify them for the Reduced Fare program. He

said that guests who maintained their SSI certification were eligible to purchase half-fare monthly passes distributed through Senior and Disabled Services (SDS). He said that staff had determined through discussions with SDS that Medicaid covered the cost of transportation for those guests and elimination of the SSI Discounted Pass program, which was recommended, would have no impact on them.

Ms. Ban noted that Medicaid only reimbursed for transportation for medical services, but there were other reasons to take transportation. She asked if medical services were the original purpose of the program. Mr. Vobora responded that when the Board directed that the program be established, much of the testimony related to the income of those guests; however, the reduced fare program was not based on income, but rather the ability to access the system as effectively as other guests.

Mr. Gant asked for clarification on why the program was established when the provider agencies were being reimbursed by Medicaid. Mr. Vobora said LTD was not aware of that at the time.

Mr. Gant asked how many guests who were not eligible for Medicaid reimbursement would be affected by elimination of the program. Mr. Vobora said it was a small number and he would have to do more research to determine the exact number.

Terry Parker, Accessible Services manager, commented that administration of the program was onerous and costly because clients went on and off Medicaid frequently and it was difficult to stay current with their status.

Mr. Vobora related that the Non-profit Agency Discount program was begun in 1991 and had grown significantly. He said that discounts would be in excess of \$70,000 for the coming year and the need would continue to grow, particularly with the failure of Measure 30.

Ms. Lauritsen said the Finance Committee, during its discussion of the program, had acknowledged that the non-profit agencies and organization had valid needs, but asked whether it was the role of the LTD Board, as the steward of public funds, to fill those needs. She said it was important to remember the source of LTD's funds and questioned whether LTD could afford to continue the program at the same level, noting that the annual cost of the program was more than the Board had approved for community service.

Ms. Hocken commented that the Finance Committee did not want to make a decision on the Non-profit Agency Discount program until there had been further conversations with agencies about options for maintaining a much lower-cost program that would meet some of the needs.

Ms. Ban asked for clarification of the difference between the non-profit program and the discount tokens available to the general public. Mr. Vobora responded that agencies were receiving both discounts because the token prices were already discounted off the cash fare and agencies could purchase them at one-half of that cost. He said there were 108 agencies and programs using the non-profit agency discount, with ShelterCare and CentroLatino both having a large number of programs that qualified for the discount.

Ms. Ban remarked that the discount program represented a critical piece of what LTD could do for people and although a transportation agency was not a social service agency, she

appreciated the opportunity to take additional time to determine how better to provide that service.

Mr. Gant supported Ms. Ban's comments and said that most agencies did a great deal for the community with few resources. He said the cost of the program seemed small in comparison and did not seem outside LTD's role and mandate. Mr. Vobora responded that it was difficult to assess the true cost of the program to LTD beyond the \$70,000 per year because it would require assumptions about whether people who were accessing rides through non-profit agencies had the ability to pay full-price fares. He added that the program was designed to meet immediate needs such as job search and medical services and seemed to have grown into more of a group pass program for some agencies that had the resources to purchase large numbers of passes. He agreed that further discussions with agencies were necessary to address ways to meet their needs while limiting LTD's exposure.

Mr. Vobora reported that staff had determined during a review of current Reduced Fare Certifications that a number of individuals did not meet certification guidelines. He recommended that LTD begin a recertification process using the Federal Transit Administration definition of disabled and using a new interview certification process.

Mr. Vobora explained the distinction between General Public Token Sales and token distributed by agencies to their clients. He said the recommendation was to eliminate the sale of tokens, which were discounted 20 per cent from the base cash fare, to the public and retain token sales to agencies at the current rate. He said that guests could still obtain a discount by purchasing a monthly pass.

Mr. Vobora briefly summarized the recommendations to eliminate the Three-Month Pass Discount program and the Lane Community College Fastpass program.

Ms. Ban asked if it still would be possible to purchase three months worth of passes at a time. Mr. Vobora replied that only monthly passes could be purchased and LTD was looking at ways to make that more convenient through recurring orders over the Internet, one-year stickers for student ID cards, and other methods. He said the Lane Community College (LCC) Fastpass program had not sold well and those guests using it had the option of a monthly pass or participation in the LCC group pass program, if the college were to include them in the program.

In conclusion, Mr. Vobora noted that he had included a potential increase in the Breeze fare to 50 cents in pricing proposal summary because the issue had been raised in the past by the Board. He said that he could research more information on the fare increase if the Board was interested.

Mr. Kleger stated that he had heard several comments that the Breeze fare should not be so low if LTD was facing financial constraints.

Board members requested additional analysis on the impact of raising the Breeze fare.

C. Prepare for Joint Meeting with Eugene City Council – This item was moved to the end of the Items for Action section of the agenda.

EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH – Mark Johnson, director of Transit Operations, introduced Bus Operator Gaylene Shrope who was selected as the February 2004 Employee of the Month. He

said Ms. Shrope was selected because of her good attitude, driving skills, and leadership qualities. Ms. Shrope thanked the Board for her award.

Diane Hellekson, director of Finance and Information Technology, introduced Information Technology Manager Steve Parrott as the March 2004 Employee of the Month. She commended his professionalism, hard work, high standards, and generosity with his time. Mr. Parrott expressed his appreciation for the award and introduced his wife and thanked her for her support.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – David Sonnichsen, 2435 Skyline Boulevard, Eugene, introduced himself as chair of the Citizen Planning Committee (CPC) for the Whilamut Natural Area of Alton Baker Park. He described the committee as a 15-member group appointed by elected officials of Springfield and Eugene. He encouraged the Board not to consider a BRT route through Alton Baker Park, citing conflicts with the U.S. Transportation Act and the East Alton Baker Park plan, and the desire of local residents to protect the natural values of the park.

Beth Stein, 3135 Portland Street, Eugene, program director of Nearby Nature, described the activities of her organization within the park and expressed the opposition of board, staff, volunteers, and membership to any proposal to widen the Autzen Footbridge or create a new bridge to allow BRT or shuttles to operate through Alton Baker Park. She said that transit operations in the park would violate provisions of the park plan and negate the thousands of hours of effort from many organizations and agencies.

Carrie Ann Naumoff, 82 W. 27th Avenue, Eugene, a teacher with the 4J School District, said that she taught Oregon history and conducted classes about the area's indigenous people, the Calapooya, for approximately 120 children a year, using Alton Baker Park and the Whilamut Natural Area as her classroom. She encouraged the Board to leave the area as a natural area as it influenced many lives.

Esther Stutzman, P.O. Box 180, Yoncalla, a Calapooya Indian and descendant of people who walked the local land before the arrival of Europeans, said how much it meant when the park's eastern section was given a Calapooya name, Whilamut, which meant "where the river ripples and runs fast." She described the peace, beauty, and stillness of the natural area, which was watched over by 11 Talking Stones, each inscribed with a Calapooya word. She said that a road through the park would desecrate the land, which needed to retain its natural values so people could learn about her ancestors and the land. She urged that no road or vehicles be permitted through the park.

Rob Handy, 455-1/2 River Road, Eugene, said that he lived along the Willamette greenway and had lived in the area his entire adult life. He said he was drawn to the state as a young adult because of bipartisan efforts to preserve natural assets, such as beaches and the Willamette greenway. He said the bipartisan legacy of a vital greenway should be preserved and although he supported transit, he was concerned that LTD was looking at its own interests instead of the commonwealth interests.

Gene Holloter, 1385 Oksanna Street, Springfield, recited a history of the preservation of the natural area covering the eastern portion of Alton Baker Park, which was dedicated to passive recreation. He said the CPC completed a management plan for the area in 1996 and it was approved by both the City of Eugene and Willamalane Parks and Recreation District. He stated

that motorized vehicles within the natural area were prohibited and any LTD request to use the Autzen Footbridge for transit operations in the park would violate the plan and voter intent. He said he did not understand how LTD could propose such a project as it was not a viable transit alternative.

Jim Dotson, 1668 Willamette Street, Eugene, a life-long Eugene resident, said he was a biker, runner, and photographer and appreciated the natural areas in the region. He said he remembered when the Whilamut Natural Area was a landfill and had been restored. He stated that there was immense value to a natural area and that BRT through the park was a bad idea.

Bjo Ashwill, 1016 W. 12th Avenue, Eugene, listed a number of her community affiliations and said she was speaking to the Board as a person with a disability who used Alton Baker Park. She said that she, her grandchildren, and friends who used wheelchairs enjoyed the park as it was in its natural state: peaceful, quiet, comfortable, and safe. She noted Oregon's reputation for innovative preservation of natural beauty in the face of progress and meeting the accessibility needs of disabled persons. She urged the Board to remember that and look for another route for BRT.

Jane Dods, 569 W. D Street, Springfield, said that she moved to the area 12 years ago from Los Angeles and was awestruck by the natural areas within Alton Baker Park. She said as a runner, biker, and walker she had explored the opportunities for recreation and solitude in the park and urged the Board to protect the area from vehicular traffic.

Charles Biggs, 540 Antelope Way, Eugene, described himself as a political activist who had worked to save the park from a golf course and now was trying to save it from a potential BRT route. He characterized a BRT route through the park as "foolhardy" and referred to possible amendments to the Riverfront Urban Renewal District that would impact BRT by eliminating funding for the Onyx extension. He said creating a route through the park would be prohibitively expensive and urged the Board not to pursue the idea. He also discussed the Coburg Road BRT study and asked that the reasons that representatives on the stakeholders' group from the Cal Young and Harlow neighborhoods had rejected the study be publicized.

Rob Cook, 506 W. Centennial Boulevard, #15, Springfield, said that he and his family chose to live in the Eugene-Springfield, and Lane County area because of positive public transportation and a high level of accessibility, international and national travel access, and the quality of life. He said he was one of the founders of the Lane Independent Living Alliance (LILA) and listed a number of other activities in which he was involved relating to persons with disabilities. He related that according to a survey, well over 30 per cent of the working public in Lane County had significant disabilities and used mobility devices. He said that those individuals would be negatively impacted by the noise, avenue and arterial access to BRT, and the collage of traffic ramifications. He urged the Board to find another route.

Charlotte Behm, 731 Poltava Street, Springfield, past chair of the CPC, discussed the strong commitment to preserving the park and its natural area. She said that the CPC had been very involved in protecting the park from negative impacts during the expansion of Autzen Stadium. She asked the Board to keep in mind the many people in the community who cared about the park and the resistance any BRT route through the park would face.

Mr. Hamm commented that the Coburg Road stakeholders group had been asked to look at all potential options for a north/south BRT route in that area. He said the Autzen Footbridge option was explored and had been all but abandoned. He indicated that LTD viewed Alton Baker Park as a treasure and a BRT route through the park was not under consideration by LTD in the next 10- to 20-year range. He said he did not think a park route was being considered by the City either, since the Planning Commission had struck that option before forwarding its recommendation to the City Council. He said an analysis of the feasibility of a park route was conducted when the issue first arose and was necessary to obtain information for decision-making purposes.

Ms. Ban offered that she was a member of the Coburg Road stakeholders group and when the Autzen Footbridge alternative was raised, LTD conducted the research without taking a position. She said that from her perspective, that route was not considered by the group as a viable option to achieve the goal of connecting the downtown and Chad Drive areas.

Mr. Kleger commented that the concept of an Alton Baker Park transit corridor was first raised 20 years ago and did not receive favorable consideration then. He said to his knowledge the idea had not been favorably discussed by the LTD Board since that time. He said that a route through Alton Baker Park and across the river to the University of Oregon campus would give a natural advantage to public transit over the private automobile by greatly reducing travel times and the search for parking, which was why the idea continued to be discussed in the community. He agreed with speakers that it was important to preserve the natural area.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

MOTION **A. Consent Calendar** – Mr. Kleger moved adoption of LTD Board Resolution No. 2004-005: “It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for February 18, 2004, is approved as presented.” Mr. Gant provided the second. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the January 21, 2004, regular Board meeting.

VOTE The Consent Calendar was approved as follows:
 AYES: Ban, Gant, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen (6)
 NAYS: None
 ABSENTIONS: None
 EXCUSED: Wylie

B. FY 2004-05 Service Proposal – Preliminary Public Hearing –

Mr. Vobora presented the 2004 Service Proposal that staff had developed based on the Board's target of a 3 percent service reduction and analysis of routes by the Service Advisory Committee. He referred to the public testimony regarding cuts that was provided to the Board as a separate document. He said that criteria for the proposed reductions included integration with service reductions over the next two years, the Board's budgetary goals, productivity, available alternatives, and maximum cost effectiveness. He explained that categories of service considered included span of service, geographic coverage, frequency of service, and days of service.

Mr. Vobora reviewed the list of proposed service reductions and noted that the list would be refined further based on the Board's questions and comments, public testimony, and feedback from an open house on February 26, 2004. He indicated that the 4.32 percent of reductions exceeded the 3 percent target and included .3 percent in contingencies. He said the final list of service reductions would be adopted at the March 2004 Board meeting.

Mr. Kleger asked if not implementing the fare changes discussed earlier would mean deeper cuts in services. Mr. Vobora said that possibly the cuts for 2004 would not be deeper, but the fare changes were factored into the 3-year timeframe and future cuts might be deeper. Ms. Hellekson said that revenue enhancements were not assumed in the financial projections and implementing the fare changes provided an opportunity to decrease future service reductions.

Mr. Gaydos opened the public hearing.

Bob Cassidy, 1401 E. 27th Avenue, Eugene, expressed concern about comments from Board President Hillary Wylie that were quoted in the newspaper. He said the comments suggested that BRT was competing for resources with regular bus service and it was LTD's responsibility to provide the services people needed. He said that LTD's mission was to provide a transportation system for the community and it was not possible to meet everyone's needs. He stated that BRT decisions were based on an assumption that funding was available and it should be not implemented if that meant cuts in services.

John Watkinson, 101 E. Broadway, Eugene, spoke on behalf of Bob Cochran regarding BRT. He said that Mr. Cochran was concerned about losing both a portion of his property and access to his building from a BRT corridor. He stated that a proposed center lane for BRT did not appear to be necessary. He encouraged the Board, if it wished to pursue BRT, to consider ways to save money and not impact property owners as substantially as it appeared they would be.

Kathy Jenness, 38 E. Main Street, Lowell, gave LTD credit for being one of the first fixed-route districts to be fully accessible before implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). She expressed appreciation for the vision and effort that went into BRT planning, but was concerned about the impact of proposed cuts on core services and non-choice riders. She said she hoped that BRT would not negatively impact LTD's most vulnerable customers and invited Board members to attend one of the open houses and listen to rider input and concerns.

Jeanne Knight, 1430 Gilham Road, Eugene, said that she had no car and was dependent on transit. She expressed relief that she did not purchase a home on Jasper Road because that route was cut. She said if the proposed reduction to the #60 route was implemented it would mean she would have to walk to Coburg Road. She remarked that her household had six members, all of whom use the bus and for whom the proposed service reductions would represent a hardship.

Christopher Phillips, 2865 City View Street, Eugene, said he lived near the intersection with 28th Avenue and rode the #76 University of Oregon bus route. He was pleased the service was not being cut and emphasized that the route was the only bus service available to him and he intentionally purchased a home on an LTD route. He commented that a number of individuals used that route to get to the Prospect Park Apartments on Chambers Street and encouraged LTD to consider a stop at 27th Avenue and Chambers Street.

Rebeca Bern, 1430 Gilham Road, Eugene, asked how LTD could afford BRT and a new Springfield Station when it could not keep buses running. She said there were elderly people who used the #60 bus and could not walk the distance to take an alternate route. She said that the service reduction would force people to purchase cars and drive more, thereby increasing pollution from vehicles.

Yuri Samer, 1790 Brewer Avenue, Eugene, stated that he had written extensively as a journalist about mass transportation. He said he was motivated to testify because he was a single parent raising two daughters. He related that previous cuts to the #61 and #63 buses had created major problems with his children's transportation to and from school. He indicated that he had purchased his home on Brewer Avenue when there were three bus routes and had long been an advocate of alternatives to single-car transportation. He said in order to successfully entice people to live differently, there should be an implicit agreement between LTD and citizens about the reliability of service. He asked the Board to consider the real student and family patterns, not the presumed ones and to not sacrifice community service in the name of the latest high-speed technological wonder. He shared his daughter's request that the afternoon buses run on time.

Mr. Gaydos closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kleger commented that ten years ago buses were causing major traffic jams when they stopped in major corridors; during the last ten years the delays for buses along major corridors were getting worse because of traffic problems. He stated that those problems would not be solved unless buses were gotten out of the traffic and the only way to do that was with a separate right-of-way, which was what BRT was about. He said when planning for BRT began, there were ample funds to maintain existing service; however, a declining economy had cut LTD's revenue while operating costs increased. He said that slow buses did not attract riders and LTD needed to take steps now to address the problem.

Mr. Gant requested an evaluation of what the budget scenarios and cuts would look like if only Phase 1 of BRT was built. Ms. Hellekson responded that those scenarios had been developed and discussed during the Board's annual strategic planning work session. She said that BRT had no impact on the proposed 2004-05 cuts and potentially no impact on the 2005-06 cuts because they were tied to the payroll tax revenue.

Mr. Gant said there appeared to be a conflict between statements that cuts were necessitated by economic conditions and yet the financial reports indicated that revenues were increasing. He expressed the opinion that LTD faced financial concerns because BRT was out of control and it was important to stop and consider the consequences of the path that BRT planning had taken, which was the need to cut services. He said that the Board needed to listen to the public's concerns that BRT expenditures could not be justified when people who depended on the bus to get to work were losing service. He encouraged the BRT Steering Committee and Board Finance Committee to reconsider ways to accomplish some of the BRT goals, such as faster buses, without unfettered consequences on the rest of LTD's services.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she echoed Mr. Gant's remarks.

Mr. Gaydos encouraged another work session to explore those issue as soon as possible.

Ms. Ban agreed that the financial information should be reviewed again, along with adjustments to the BRT timeline, which had been extended significantly.

Ms. Hocken said that another review of BRT costs and the timeline would be helpful, but did not agree with the statement that BRT was out of control.

Mr. Gant commented that priorities and guidelines relating BRT to fixed-route service and special transportation should be set in advance to avoid conflicts among services and help the Board determine what it was willing to give up to build BRT.

Mr. Gaydos agreed that a special work session should be scheduled to discuss BRT, service cuts, and financial forecasts.

Mr. Hamm remarked that Ms. Wylie's comments were taken out of context and the reality was that if BRT were abandoned, balancing expenses with revenues would still require that service cuts be made. He said the bottom line was that LTD was supported by payroll taxes and the community and the State suffered one of the highest job loss rates in the nation.

C. Martin Luther King Jr. Parkway Design –

Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn discussed the issue around the Pioneer Parkway BRT planning process. He said Springfield was moving quickly to develop plans and commence construction of the Martin Luther King (MLK) Jr. Parkway, which was the northern extension of the Pioneer Parkway to serve the Riverbend Medical Research campus. He said a major policy question of whether BRT would have an exclusive right-of-way or travel in mixed traffic along the MLK Jr. Parkway needed to be decided. He indicated that the Springfield City Council was holding a public hearing on the issue on March 15, 2004, and staff intent was to discuss the matter with the Board and possibly reach some conclusion on LTD's position on an exclusive right-of-way before the hearing. He said that the questions raised by Mr. Gant suggested that a discussion of the MLK Jr. Parkway issues was more appropriate and then the Board could discuss the overall policies related to BRT during a work session.

Mr. Pangborn said the issue for LTD was how important was an exclusive right-of-way in a BRT corridor. He illustrated on drawings the planned design for the corridor and explained that Springfield city staff were recommending that no space be added in the corridor for BRT lanes. He stated that projection models indicated that traffic over time would queue up at the intersections and BRT vehicles would be caught in traffic and delayed.

Project Engineer Graham Carey added that the corridor was very constrained. He said the old railroad right-of-way was 60 feet; the City would widen it another 16 feet and staff were very sensitive to the impact on properties along the corridor. He said even with a roundabout, which had fewer delays than a signalized intersection, there still would be delays during peak times. He indicated that LTD staff had taken the position that where there were no delays, BRT could be in mixed traffic and the problem was getting around queues. He said that queue jump lanes were proposed at both ends of the corridor and would extend to the middle, providing the future possibility of an exclusive lane the length of the corridor. He said that construction of a sound wall along both sides of the corridor would make widening of the corridor at a later date very unlikely.

Ms. Ban asked how BRT decisions might impact the development of RiverBend and Springfield's 15-year projection of traffic patterns in that area. Mr. Carey said that PeaceHealth's development and traffic calculations were not based on the presence of BRT, although the greater the use of transit, the more development could be done on the site. Mr. Hamm said that staff's concern was that if BRT operated in mixed traffic, at certain times of the day during peak hours it would come to a halt.

Ms. Ban stated her concern that any roadway constraints affected the future of BRT and growth in the area and impacted both LTD and Springfield.

In response to questions from Mr. Kleger, Mr. Carey said there were no intersections along the corridor and explained how a queue jump lane would function in conjunction with a roundabout. He said it was more complicated than a signalized intersection, but could be accomplished.

Mr. Kleger stated he understood that there might be less than ideal conditions for BRT on an existing roadway with opportunities for future redevelopment, but had a major problem with building a new road on a major corridor serving an area of high trip generation and not making provisions to get transit out of the stream of traffic.

Mr. Gant noted that LTD had the power of eminent domain and asked whose decision additional space along the corridor would be. Mr. Carey replied that LTD had given veto power to the cities and the County on BRT, and that LTD could acquire property along the corridor through eminent domain but was not considering doing so at that time. Mr. Pangborn said the road would be built by the County and given to the City, raising the question of who owned the right-of-way.

Mr. Gant asked if an exclusive BRT lane eventually could be taken over for traffic use. Ms. Hocken replied that an intergovernmental agreement covering an extensive period of time would secure BRT's exclusive use.

Mr. Hamm remarked that it was necessary for LTD to provide some type of transit service to the hospital when it opened.

Ms. Lauritsen asked what the plan would be if the hospital were not constructed. Mr. Hamm said if there was no hospital, it was unlikely the road would be built, although it was later explained that the plan was to build the road regardless of hospital plans.

Senior Strategic Planner Lisa Gardner explained that federal approval had been received to use LTD's funds for a protected buy of right-of-way in the corridor if it appeared that property acquisition was necessary to assure the project could proceed. She said that did not mean the project itself was approved; it simply meant that local funds could be used and LTD would be eligible for federal reimbursement, conditioned upon project approval, and would position LTD to continue with Springfield's timeline.

Mr. Hamm said staff needed to know what direction the Board wanted to take before the Springfield City Council's public hearing on March 15, 2004.

In response to a question from Ms. Lauritsen, Ms. Gardner clarified that staff were asking the Board for direction to continue along with Springfield's timeline, which included assessments of

cost and right-of-way needs and engineering aspects of the project, not for decisions to expend funds or proceed with the project.

Following general discussion by Board members on BRT and MLK Jr. Parkway issues, Mr. Gaydos scheduled a special work session at 5:30 p.m. on February 26, 2004.

Mr. Pangborn encouraged Board members to contact Ms. Hellekson with their requests for specific budget information prior to the work session.

D. Salaried Employee Retirement Plan Amendments –

Ms. Neidig explained that the Board was being asked to amend the Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan to address a problem that arose when the recent death of an employee revealed that there was no designated beneficiary for her survivor benefits.

Ms. Lauritsen suggested that an audit be conducted to assure that a similar situation did not arise in the future. Ms. Neidig replied that her staff had audited records for those benefit areas administered by LTD and agreed that a broader audit would be conducted.

Mr. Gant expressed his concern with the situation and encouraged staff to take whatever steps were necessary to prevent another situation from occurring.

Ms. Neidig stated her understanding of the Board's intent was that the resolution was an immediate fix of a particular situation and the staff would continue to explore broader solutions.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved adoption of LTD Board Resolution No. 2004-0065: "It is hereby resolved that Lane Transit District Board of Directors approves the Third Amendment to the Restatement of the Lane Transit District Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan Dated June 19, 2002. Ms. Ban provided the second.

Ms. Hocken clarified that the resolution before the Board was the one that was provided on February 16, 2004, rather than the one included in the agenda packet. Mr. Hamm said that was correct.

VOTE The resolution was approved as follows:
 AYES: Ban, Gant, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen (6)
 NAYS: None
 ABSENTIONS: None
 EXCUSED: Wylie

D. Prepare for Joint Meeting with Eugene City Council – Government Relations manager Linda Lynch distributed a copy of the agenda with talking points for the February 23, 2004, joint meeting. She explained that agenda items and materials provided in advance to the council were based on discussions between Board members and councilors. She outlined the work session process and the materials that were given to council members.

Ms. Ban suggested that the council also be provided a list of the proposed service reductions in anticipation of interest in that issue.

Mr. Hamm suggested that Board members make the key points briefly and allow time for questions from the council.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

A. Current Activities – No verbal reports were presented.

B. Monthly Department Reports – Ms. Lynch referred Board members to the completed 2004 federal priorities document that had been provided to them. She said that staff from the six local governments would be briefing federal staff from regional offices, along with staff to Oregon's congressional delegation.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that she did not approve of the United Front approach to requests for federal funding, noting that LTD represented only 2 of 25 funding requests. She said that LTD would do better on its own instead of buried in a list of other agencies' requests.

C. Monthly Performance Reports – There were no questions.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.



Board Secretary