

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, February 16, 2005

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 10, 2005, 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 16, 2005, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room, 3500 E. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Gerry Gaydos, President, presiding  
Susan Ban, Vice President  
Dean Kortge  
Debbie Davis  
Mike Eyster  
David Gant, Secretary  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Clerk of the Board  
Elise Self, Minutes Recorder

**CALL TO ORDER** – Mr. Gaydos called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

**ROLL CALL** – General Manager Ken Hamm called the roll.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA** – Mr. Gaydos thanked all of the Board members for their attendance at so many extra meetings recently. He said that he was impressed with everyone's commitment to Lane Transit District (LTD).

Mr. Gaydos reported that LTD had been very well represented at a recent meeting with Representative Peter DeFazio. He said that those present met Representative James Oberstar from Minnesota, who was the ranking member of the U.S. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He thanked the staff and said that their presence at the event would help further important relationships with the federal government.

Mr. Gaydos noted that committee assignments were on the agenda. He added that while the Board would touch on the issues of "productivity and coverage" at this meeting, he would like to have those issues on an agenda in the future so that the Board could have a more lengthy discussion and give direction.

**BOARD CALENDARS** – Mr. Gaydos and Mr. Kortge both said that they would be gone in March and would miss both of the Board meetings. Ms. Ban said that she would have to leave the March 14 meeting early.

**WORK SESSION**

**Region 2050 Status Report – Carol Heinkel, Tom Schwetz** – Ms. Ban introduced this topic by explaining that Region 2050 was a regional approach to looking at and anticipating growth in a cooperative way, not governed by regulations, but governed by collaboration and consensus. She introduced Carol Heinkel, LCOG principal planner and project manager, and Tom Schwetz, LCOG transportation program manager, to make a presentation about the Region 2050 project and the importance of transportation planning in that project.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Heinkel gave a brief background and overview of the project, noting that there was a lot of information available on the Region 2050 Web site, [www.Region2050.org](http://www.Region2050.org). She said that the process began in 1999 when the Lane County Board of Commissioners and the cities of Coburg, Cottage Grove, Creswell, Eugene, Junction City, Lowell, Oakridge, Springfield, Veneta, and Westfir adopted a resolution “supporting the concept of a coordinated growth management strategy for the Southern Willamette Valley region and LCOG’s pursuit of funding to support strategy development.” She said that each of these local governments had appointed elected officials to serve on the Regional Policy Advisory Board and management or planning staff to serve on the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) to guide the process. She noted that Ms. Ban was a member of the Policy Advisory Board and that LTD planner Lisa Gardner served on the RTAC. She said that participation from all of the local governments, state agencies, federal agencies, school districts, LTD, League of Women Voters, and the utility companies had been very good.

Ms. Heinkel said that the product from the project would be a Regional Growth Management Strategy that would be submitted to the eleven local governments and state agencies for endorsement. The strategy would set out the population and employment each agreed to serve over the next 50 years. The strategy also would contain a set of goals, objectives, and actions in the following categories: land use and development, housing, economy, transportation, the environment, community facilities and services, and education. She emphasized that this was a visioning process with actions and steps to realize that vision. Ms. Heinkel said that this project was being done under the State Law, Collaborative Regional Problem Solving, which allowed entities to reach solutions that did not necessarily meet the letter of administrative rules. She said that this provided a lot of flexibility.

Ms. Heinkel said that an important part of the process was to develop potential growth scenarios. She provided information and graphic depictions of the following scenarios: Compact Urban Growth, Satellite Communities, and Rural Growth. She said that the alternative growth scenarios were tools to facilitate agreement about the use of land resources at a regional level and had been developed by experts in the seven categories of the strategy plan: land use, housing, the economy, transportation, natural resources, community facilities and services, and education. She noted that expanding the urban growth boundary (UGB) was a part of each scenario, but that it was configured differently in each one. Ms. Heinkel said that currently the project was in the process of evaluating the scenarios based on the seven quality-of-life categories. She said that the Lane County Board of Commissioners would be appointing a Farm and Forrest Lands Resource Committee to evaluate the scenarios also.

Mr. Schwetz referred Board members to Attachment D about the Transportation Evaluation Overview. He said that a regional transportation system impacted and was impacted by surrounding land uses. It had impacts on the environment and was a key factor in the growth of

a region's economy. In addition there would be issues of safety, equity, efficiency, and long-term sustainability. He said that these impacts were affected by the way in which public agencies chose to regulate and make investments in the operation, maintenance, preservation, and modernization of the system. He noted that public actions were largely geared toward an attempt to maximize the benefits of the transportation system while minimizing the negative impacts. These impacts and interrelationships made the evaluation of alternative future transportation system performance relatively complex.

Mr. Schwetz pointed out that some of the risks inherent in planning for regional infrastructure even over a short period of time were potential changes in technologies, social behavior, and public policy. He said to address these uncertainties, it would be important to identify alternative solutions that were robust enough to be of use under multiple scenarios.

Mr. Schwetz explained to the Board why accessibility was the key measure of a transportation plan's performance. He said that in this sense "accessibility" meant reaching destinations with relative ease or within reasonable travel time, at reasonable cost, with reasonable choices. He said that any public infrastructure system would have the desired characteristics of being safe, efficient, environmentally sound, etc., but that accessibility was the distinguishing characteristic of transportation. From that perspective, he said that the alternative solution packages should be designed to help determine the relative accessibility of different combinations of strategies.

Mr. Schwetz referred Board members to **Figure 1 – Framework for Evaluating Region 2050 Transportation Alternatives** on page 40 of Attachment D. He reviewed the following factors that influence success or failure in working to increase accessibility in the Region 2050 area: funding levels, land use controls, rate of adoption of new technology, provision of other public infrastructure, demographics, growth, strength of economy, advances in practical technologies, existing fuel costs, and public trust and sentiment. Mr. Schwetz also reviewed **Figure 2 – Percent of Jobs in Small Cities held by Eugene-Springfield Resident-Workers (1990)** and **Figure 3 – Percent of Resident Workers in Small Cities Commuting to Eugene-Springfield (1990)**. Mr. Kleger said that it might also be useful to have a picture of the number of people who lived close to their work,

Mr. Schwetz said that there were many strategies available for providing accessibility and that the project would look at a menu of alternative solution packages. This menu was provided on pages 5 and 6. He cautioned that there would not be a "silver bullet" or one strategy that would solve all of the transportation problems. He said that a balance of transportation means would be needed. Mr. Kleger asked if there was consensus as to what "reasonable means" would be. Mr. Schwetz said that he thought that there was the possibility of reaching consensus on what would make sense for a transportation plan. He said that progress was being made and that there was general agreement at the regional level on a package of transportation tools that would be needed. Ms. Ban said that she thought that this process was "information rich" and that the more information people had to look at, the more people realized that the decisions were not "black and white."

Mr. Schwetz said that the alternative transportation solution packages would be developed based on results from the modeling of a reference case for each alternative growth scenario. He said that the alternate solution packages would be evaluated using a set of performance measures: accessibility/mobility, economic vitality, effectiveness/efficiency, equity, public support/financial feasibility, reliable/responsive, safety, and sustainable. He emphasized again how complex the

process for designing transportation would be and added that the policy makers would make the final decisions after looking at the information.

Mr. Hamm asked how much the Region 2050 Plan looked at the region's vitality in terms of the network that connected beyond. Mr. Schwetz said that the Oregon Plan was looking at that in the form of a statewide model.

Mr. Gant asked if Measure 37 would have an impact on this project. Ms. Heinkel said that most of what would be happening as a result of the Region 2050 plan would be urban growth boundary expansion areas, urban reserve areas, and increasing densities, which were more or less "up-zonings" that would improve the value of the property. She said that the real issue was the rural area, in that people had Measure 37 rights to do other things with their property. She said that she had applied for an EPA grant to develop actions or measures that mitigate impact to the environment. She said that, for example, tools could be developed that would allow a property owner with Measure 37 rights to transfer that development right to another area that would not have environmental impacts or impacts on the Farm and Forest Industries and to get density bonuses for doing that. She said that having the information from the Region 2050 project would be very valuable in knowing where those sensitive areas were.

Ms. Ban asked Ms. Heinkel and Mr. Schwetz to come back in the future when there was more information to report. Ms. Heinkel concluded by reviewing the next steps in the process of developing the strategic plan. She said that the evaluations would be completed and a public input process would begin in May 2005. She said that all of the information would then be used to develop a Preferred Regional Growth Management Strategy. She said that the goal was to have the strategy adopted by June 2006, and then to begin to develop implementation measures and to continue a monitoring program with the ultimate goal to create and sustain a legacy of sustainability in the region.

Mr. Gaydos thanked Mr. Heinkel and Mr. Schwetz for their excellent presentation. He noted that the position of alternate to the Regional Policy Advisory Board was open for any interested Board member.

Mr. Gaydos called for a ten-minute break.

Mr. Gaydos reconvened the meeting at 6:36 p.m. He said that the order of the agenda would be revised, as the Employee of the Month was not yet present.

**SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF MARYLEE TURNER** → Accessible Services Manager Terry Parker introduced Marylee Turner and acknowledged her for being a longtime advocate and supporter of accessible services. She said that Ms. Turner had served on numerous LTD committees and work groups to guide, direct, persuade, cajole, and push LTD to become one of the most accessible public transit services in the country. Ms. Parker said that Ms. Turner had been tireless in her pursuit to make services ever better for people with visual impairment and blindness and by doing so had made the system work better for every guest who boarded an LTD bus. She explained that Ms. Turner would be returning to her hometown of Portland.

Ms. Turner thanked the Board and said that it had been an honor to work with LTD. She said that as an instructor for the Oregon Commission for the Blind, she had worked to break the assumption of incompetence. She said that she loved to get people on the bus. She said that it

had been a privilege to be a part of the landmark program at LTD. She emphasized that access to public transportation was absolutely critical. She said that she gave bus tokens and maps as gifts to her friends instead of flowers or candy. She urged the Board to continue to be proactive.

Mr. Gaydos thanked Ms. Turner and presented her with a wooden bus with the following written in Braille on the roof: "Marylee Turner, your advocacy and guidance has made LTD a better service for all."

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** -- James Creech of Eugene said that he had heard that there was a proposal to eliminate routes 18 and 19. He asked how the people who used those routes would get around if they were eliminated. Mr. Viggiano said that this would be discussed later in the agenda.

### ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

**MOTION A. Consent Calendar** – Mr. Kleger moved adoption of LTD Board Resolution No. 2005-001: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for February 16, 2005, is approved as presented." Mr. Kortge provided the second. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the January 10, 2005, Special Board Meeting; the January 19, 2005, regular Board meeting; the January 27, 2005, emergency Board meeting; the January 31, 2005, emergency Board meeting; and the nomination of Charlie Kimball to the Budget Committee.

**VOTE** The Consent Calendar was approved as follows:  
 AYES: Ban, Davis, Eyster, Gant, Kleger, Kortge, Gaydos (7)  
 NAYS: None  
 ABSTENTIONS: None  
 EXCUSED: None

**B. Board Member External Committee Assignments** -- After a brief description of the committees, the following members volunteered for committee assignments:

Mike Eyster	Alternate to the Region 2050 Policy Advisory Board
Dean Kortge and Debbie Davis	BRT Steering Committee
Dave Kleger	Alternate to the Metropolitan Policy Committee

**C. Direction on Service Recommendations** -- Stefano Viggiano, Development Services director, reminded the Board that on February 7 it had held a public hearing on possible service changes for the fall of 2005. He said that the public testimony focused on the deletion of service on the Fairview loop of the #18/19 routes in Springfield and on the elimination/reduction of service in the southeast Eugene hills on the #76 and #22 routes. Mr. Viggiano said that staff were seeking direction from the Board.

Mr. Gaydos asked Mr. Viggiano to inform the Board members what the current Board policy was in terms of productivity versus coverage. Mr. Viggiano explained that the Board had gone through an exercise to look at how service could be categorized. He said that service could be looked at in terms of productivity, the goal of which would be to increase ridership, and in terms of coverage, the goal of which would be to provide service to as much area as possible. He explained that the Board did an exercise to arrive at percentages for each of those categories.

He stated that the Board had directed the staff to allocate 75 percent of the service based on productivity, 20 percent of the service based on coverage, and 5 percent of the service for discretionary service.

Mr. Gaydos interrupted the report to honor the Employee of the Month.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – March 2005** – Director of Transit Operations Mark Johnson introduced Training Supervisor/Bus Operator John Dahl, who was selected as the March 2005 Employee of the Month. Mr. Dahl was hired by LTD in December 1991 and was previously selected as the Employee of the Month in 1994 and 1996. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Dahl had done an excellent job of maintaining high-quality training programs for new employees, as well as senior employees and supervisors. He said that Mr. Dahl had been able to face the demands of a part-time position that required full-time attention, and that he had done it with great humor and professionalism. He said that Mr. Dahl was also an excellent bus operator who had a nearly spotless career as an operator. Mr. Dahl was nominated by a guest who said that she loved to ride his bus because she tended to get motion sickness when she rode the bus . . . but not with Mr. Dahl. She also appreciated his happy demeanor at 6:50 a.m. Mr. Johnson concluded by saying that Mr. Dahl had been an excellent employee in many ways and was always willing to help make sure that LTD looked good in the community.

Mr. Hamm said that he participated on the committee that selected the Employee of the Month and that Mr. Dahl's name often came before the committee as being nominated. He said that this selection was unanimous by the committee, which was indicative of the great job that Mr. Dahl did for LTD. Mr. Gaydos presented Mr. Dahl with a pin, a check, his letter of recommendation, and a certificate.

Mr. Dahl thanked the Board for the honor. He said that there were lots of employees throughout the organization who went above and beyond the call of duty. He said he was very appreciative of the recognition.

**Direction on Service Recommendations, continued.** Mr. Gaydos returned to the issue of route review.

In response to a question from Mr. Gant, Mr. Hamm said that an annual review of routes in concert with a longer more strategic look at the District was generally the way route review occurred. He said that there also would be ongoing "tweaking" of the system.

Mr. Gant asked if routes were ever categorized for potential change so that someone buying a house would have that information. Mr. Viggiano said that routes were not categorized for potential change but that, in general, coverage routes would be more likely to change. He said that the District could give a history of a route and how long it had been in existence. Mr. Kortge said that the District's policy on routes also could be provided to people.

Mr. Viggiano said that LTD did a comprehensive route review approximately every ten years. The last one was in 2000. He noted that the staff wanted to review the issues of coverage and productivity at the Board's annual strategic planning workshop.

Mr. Viggiano presented slides of maps that showed the proposed deletion of service on the Fairview loop of the #18/19 routes in Springfield and the elimination/reduction of service in the

southeast Eugene hills on the #76 and #22 routes. In response to a question regarding the deletion of #76 service in the summer, Mr. Viggiano explained that route #76 had good summer productivity, but that it was covered by other routes and that students could still get to the University of Oregon during the summer. He said that the loop part would not have any other summer service. Mr. Viggiano then explained that the #18/19 routes were not being eliminated, but service on the Fairview loop was being considered for elimination. He said that the reason for that was that there was a problem with timing and the loop did not meet the productivity standards. He said that adding time to keep the loop intact would add only about a half a percent in service, or about \$65,000 a year. He said that it would be a considerable cost to keep it as it was. He said that one option being considered was to add a smaller loop that also would serve McKenzie Village. Mr. Viggiano explained that whenever the buses traveled on new routes on Springfield streets, it had to be approved by the Public Works Department. He said that there had not been a response yet from Springfield about the new, smaller loop.

In response to a question from Mr. Kleger, Mr. Viggiano gave the following statistics for boarding on the #18/19 routes:

Aspen through Rainbow – 11 average daily boardings  
Prescott through Mill – 18 average daily boardings  
Centennial and Rainbow – 6 average daily boardings

Mr. Viggiano noted that the ridership was throughout the day, including 15 to 20 bus trips a day. Mr. Eyster clarified that this would be a coverage route. In response to a question from Mr. Gant, Mr. Viggiano said that he thought that the proposed changes to the #18/19 routes would fix the timing for awhile, but that as congestion increased LTD probably would have to address these routes again in the future. Mr. Hamm said that the key was whether Springfield would approve travel on Prescott Street.

Mr. Kleger said that as he recalled, LTD was trying to keep the number of hours of service constant this year. He said that as costs increased, if LTD did not take it out of non-productive routes, then it would have to take it out of productive routes. He said that he did not like taking service away from people who had supported LTD and he did not like taking service from people who had no alternatives, either. He said that he did not like this dilemma. Mr. Kleger asked if there was any other place in the budget from which to take the money that did not take it from service. Mr. Viggiano said that LTD had gone through a series of budget cuts over the last several years and that service had been the last place to look for cuts. He said that in 2001 staff positions were eliminated, then materials and services. He said that LTD was close to having exhausted its options. Mr. Kleger asked if LTD was in any legal jeopardy because of those cutbacks. Mr. Hamm replied no to that question. Mr. Kleger asked if there were any capital commitments that LTD could back out of without costing more than would be saved. Mr. Viggiano said that most of the capital commitments were enhancements for service such as new buses or putting in new passenger shelters and that some of it was directly related to saving money by improving service. He said that some of it was for enhanced passenger safety or improving service to the customer. Diane Hellekson, director of Finance & Information Technology, also replied to Mr. Kleger's question and said that there was more "wobble room" than might be implied. She said that the Board did have the authority to keep the service and request that staff look at how that could be done.

Mr. Gant repeated Mr. Kleger's question about the capital budget. Mr. Hamm said that there was always the possibility to move what would be matching money or reserves back to the operating budget. He cautioned, however, that those were one-time moneys and were not a steady flow of money. Ms. Hellekson said that the majority of the capital projects were commitments. She said that the budget was very tightly committed.

Ms. Ban asked if there were options for people in the areas where the service was proposed to be cut. She wondered if Commuter Solutions would be helpful to these people. Mr. Viggiano said that Commuter Solutions could provide carpool matching services, Ride Share. RideSource could be an option for some people if they had a qualifying disability. Ms. Ban asked if LTD had any process for prompting former riders to think about options. Mr. Viggiano said that it did not, but that LTD certainly could provide information about Commuter Solutions.

Mr. Kortge said that he liked the alternative solution. Transit Planner Will Mueller said that this proposal was a little different from others. He said that the #18/19 was a closed system and that LTD was attempting to craft a solution that would not cost them those five hours a day to combine the 18, 19, and 13. He said that if things were left the way they were with the current running time, there was a lot of down time for the buses. He said that there were not as many options for these routes.

Mr. Eyster asked if there was a way to explain to the City of Springfield about the need for this proposal. Mr. Viggiano said that LTD had explained the issue and its importance. He said that LTD expected an answer in the next couple of weeks.

Ms. Ban wondered if the area could be served by a shuttle from Pioneer Parkway. Mr. Viggiano said that the current #18/19 was similar to a shuttle. Staff liked the alternate Prescott proposal and noted that it would be a problem if Springfield said no to running buses on Prescott Street. He said the question would then be whether or not to incur the \$65,000 a year. In response to a question from Ms. Davis, Mr. Viggiano said that he hoped that the City would say yes because it would mean less total reduced impact, but that if the City based its answer on street pavement tests, it would probably say no.

In response to a question from Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Viggiano said that he thought that the Board had given direction to pursue the Prescott loop. Mr. Gaydos said that he thought that the area needed to be served by public transit. Mr. Kleger agreed wholeheartedly.

With the assistance of a map, Mr. Viggiano then described the #22 and #76 routes and the proposed changes. He noted that the proposed route was not the most direct route but that it did provide coverage. Mr. Gant asked if this route would get commuters downtown in time for work. Mr. Viggiano said that it would. Mr. Mueller said that South Eugene High School students would get to school about 7:30 a.m., University of Oregon (UO) students about 7:40 a.m., and downtown commuters about 7:50 a.m. He said that the trip would leave downtown at 5:20 p.m., UO about 5:25, and then back out. Mr. Viggiano said that the savings would be that the rest of the route would not operate in the summer and would save about one tenth of a percent. He noted that the decision to discontinue the #76 route in the summer was a separate decision. He said that the advantage to doing this was that it provided more options and that there would be three trips on the #76 instead of four, which would be a slight savings.



Mr. Gaydos asked how long the service had been provided to City View. Mr. Viggiano said that the service on 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue and City View had been there at least 20 years. He noted that it had been proposed for elimination many times. Mr. Kleger said that it would probably remain that way because of the dependency on cars and because of the gradient of the hills. Mr. Kortge pointed out that there was a big development that was being completed just west of the routes. He said that if he had to choose, he would prefer continuing to provide service to the Fairview Loop rather than to the #76 loop. Ms. Ban said that she agreed with Mr. Kortge but that she also thought that this was a place where people could be pushed to explore other commuting options. Mr. Kleger thought that there might be more flexibility here than in Springfield.

Mr. Viggiano reminded the Board that the proposal for the #22 route was to keep the two trips that provided school service because they did have good productivity. He said the option was to eliminate the last trip because of low productivity, but that also would eliminate the option for commuter use. He said that this was something that LTD still needed to make a decision about. Mr. Gaydos said that one person from the neighborhood suggested that they would like to work with LTD on this. Mr. Mueller said he had met with people from the neighborhood. He said that they were aware that the service was not well subscribed but that they viewed it as a safety net and a livability issue. He acknowledged that it was a difficult decision because it was a route that was not very well used but was important to those who used it.

## ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

### A. Current Activities

**Board Member Reports** -- Ms. Ban reported that the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) agreed to a resolution that would be forwarded to the state legislature encouraging legislators to consider a transportation funding package that would address: 1) Transit and alternative modes, 2) Support the Governor's ConnectOregon, 3) Intercity improvements.

**General Manager's Report** -- Mr. Hamm said that his report was included in the meeting packet for the Board's review.

**Monthly Financial Report – January 2005** -- Ms. Hellekson referred members to page 105 of the board packet. She reported that revenues for the year were on target. She said that there were some expense pressure points, fuel and personnel services overruns being two of them, and that these may require a supplemental budget. In response to a question from Mr. Gaydos, Ms. Hellekson said that a majority of the Budget Committee had to approve the proposed budget, and then their work was done. She explained that any changes to the budget that remained within 10 percent of a line item did not require additional action from the Budget Committee. She said that the items that would be considered in a supplemental budget would be within that range.

Mr. Kortge said that he appreciated having the approximation numbers. Ms. Hellekson said that the following month the Board would be reviewing the revised Long-range Financial Plan. She said that she would run models for the various assumptions and would provide the Board with three versions.

Ms. Hellekson informed Board members that the Supreme Court would hear the tax court case on May 5.

**Progressive Corridor Enhancement** – Mr. Viggiano gave a brief review of the Progressive Corridor Enhancement (PCE) for the new Board members. He explained that the PCE was a proposal for incremental development of transit corridors, with the eventual goal of establishing a full EmX treatment on some of those corridors. With the use of a PowerPoint presentation, he showed a map of the EmX system as it would look upon completion, and identified the elements that LTD would want on all of those corridors to help save travel time and provide comfort, better information, or image. He said that PCE would not apply to the Franklin EmX Corridor, which was under construction, or the Pioneer Parkway EmX Corridor, which was undergoing environmental review. He said that some of the advantages to the PCE were that it would lower the front-end investment, allow the District to build more of the system faster, and distribute benefits faster to more corridors.

Mr. Viggiano said that through subsequent discussion with the Board, a plan was developed to consider four levels of development for transit corridors. The plan was summarized in a document attached to the agenda packet. Mr. Viggiano described the following four levels:

**Level 1** – Put in transit signal priorities – This could save several minutes per trip. There was a policy in TransPlan that supported signal priority for transit, and it was budgeted in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) to implement it. He said that LTD was putting out a request for bids to put the emitters on the buses and an agreement with the City of Eugene to begin implementing it in certain areas as soon as the emitters were installed.

**Level 2** – Corridor Enhancements – This level adds wider stop spacing, improved stops and shelters, and some queue-jumpers to transit signal priority. Mr. Viggiano said that the staff was requesting about \$3 million, which would fund about three corridors at Level 2 over a six-year period.

**Level 3** – At this level, the corridor reaches an EmX design with stations with raised platforms, wide stops, etc. Mr. Viggiano said that this was a point at which LTD would pick corridors in coordination with its partner agencies. He said that there was no current funding request for this level of improvements. He said that this option would not be implemented in the foreseeable future.

**Level 4** – Complete the EmX design, including extensive right-of-way – Franklin Boulevard and Pioneer Parkway are to be developed to this level. Mr. Viggiano said that one corridor at this level could be done once every transportation bill, which happened every six years.

Mr. Hamm said that it had been shown that these kinds of improvements in other parts of the country had resulted in savings in time. He said that the Service Planning team thought that, in dealing with tighter and tighter routes and the erosion of some of them and trying to band things together, these solutions would help enhance the basic quality of transit service and maintain a little bit of a lid on costs of transit services.

In response to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Viggiano said that most drivers did not notice when signal priority was implemented. He said that an analysis of each intersection had to be done to determine how much additional green time could be allowed for the bus. He said that

usually it was five, ten, or fifteen seconds and was not that noticeable. Mr. Hamm said that there were places in both cities that had timed grids and that signal priority would not be used in those places.

Mr. Kleger said that every time LTD had to stretch the running time of a bus the following things happened: 1) Connections would get messed up, 2) Choice riders would be driven away, and 3) It cost LTD more money. He said that the options were either to add time or pay more and that any time LTD could get back was good. He said that these improvements were a way to buy some time and that they were definitely worth the money. He said that he hated to take the money out of operations to make these improvements, but that if these improvements were not made the money would go out anyway.

**Franklin Corridor Design Review** – Mark Pangborn, assistant general manager, gave a brief history of the Franklin Corridor EmX project, which was approved in the spring of 2001. He said that the project was over budget and that the LTD Board had directed the staff to stay within the budget. Mr. Pangborn said that through a cost-reduction process, staff were able to cut 10 percent from the cost. He explained that this meant cutting some pieces of the project. He referred members to a table titled “Franklin EmX Corridor, Design Changes Since Project Approval in May/June 2001.” He said that the changes were driven by a number of factors, the most significant being creating a project “true” to the BRT concept that also met civil engineering design and safety requirements. Mr. Pangborn said that some people, including city councilors from Eugene and Springfield, had been asking if the project was still the original concept of BRT. He said that the table on page 81 identified what had been promised to the two city councils and the Lane County Commissioners, what the final design was, and the reasons for any changes than had been made.

Mr. Pangborn said that perceptions about what BRT was going to be differed in the community and that there was some skepticism about the project. He said that for those reasons, staff had been very cautious about what they promised. He said that the final design had been true to the original concept and acknowledged that there had been some changes. Mr. Pangborn reviewed some of the changes and the reasons for those changes. He emphasized that this was something new and that it had taken a lot of time to get ODOT, the City of Eugene, the City of Springfield, and the County Commissioners all to agree on the aspects of the project. He said that he hoped that the community would understand why it had taken longer and why some of the project had changed.

Mr. Gant said that he did not agree with the analysis presented by Mr. Pangborn. He said that he thought that the project was significantly different than originally presented. He said that this was one of the problems with being out on the leading edge of new projects. He said that was why he was more conservative about these kinds of things, because he knew there would be problems. He said that he was really worried about whether the community would support this project. Mr. Gant said that another problem was in actually realizing the cost of a new project like this. He said that he wished that the Board could reconsider at this point. He said that he hated that the future capital was so tied up in this approach. He said that the Board's job was not to dream but to spend public money prudently and to be careful and reasonably conservative to make sure that it spent money in ways that the community would support.

Mr. Kleger said that he thought very differently than Mr. Gant. He said that when he came on the Board, he realized that LTD was already beginning to lose time. He said that the runs were

getting slower and that in the last 11 years LTD had lost a large amount of time on its main-corridor routes at a considerable increase in cost. He said that LTD was spending more money to run the same service worse. He said that it would not get better unless LTD made an investment to allow it to make the runs in the same amount of time in which it used to make them. Mr. Kleger said that he thought that two thirds of the problem was just sheer traffic congestion. He said that if the buses did not get out of that stream of traffic by whatever means they could, the buses would just keep getting slower. He said that with a flat revenue situation and increasing costs, the Board would repeatedly be faced with the decision as to where to cut service in order to keep the main trunk running.

Mr. Kleger said that this area was growing faster than services could keep up and that he agreed that being on the cutting edge ended up being interpreted as a promise, even if it was only in concept. He added, however, that it was important to do this type of thing in order to keep from getting run over by other developments not in one's control. He said that operations had gotten slower since he began riding the bus and that LTD and the Board could not let that continue to happen. He said that at the very least the District's most heavily traveled corridor had to have some kind of enhancement or it would keep driving away the choice riders. He said that the problem he had was that doing something cost a lot of money up front. He said that if LTD did not move forward it would lose and if it did move forward, it would have to "pay the piper." He said that if LTD stood still it would still have to "pay the piper," only over a longer period of time. Mr. Kleger said that he came down on the side of future planning because he thought that it was the only way to keep LTD viable for any length of time. He added that he felt the same way about hybrid drive buses because it was important to improve fuel efficiency with the rise in fuel prices.

**Training Opportunities for Board Members** – Mr. Gaydos encouraged Board members to attend the APTA Annual Meeting and Expo in Dallas, Texas, September 22-25. He said that he had attended a previous Expo and found it to be very valuable.

Mr. Hamm said that there also would be a Transit Board Members Seminar in Memphis, Tennessee, July 30-August 2, 2005. He encouraged members to let the staff know of their interest as soon as possible so that arrangements could be made for them. He said that of the two, he would recommend the Expo, and that both of the meetings would be very good.

Mr. Hamm asked if a Board member could attend the re-signing of the Diversity Council's Memorandum of Understanding on March 4. Ms. Ban volunteered.

#### **EXECUTIVE (NON-PUBLIC) SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(2)(d)**

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations. Ms. Davis provided the second.

**VOTE** The motion was approved as follows:  
 AYES: Ban, Davis, Eyster, Gant, Gaydos, Kleger, Kortge (7)  
 NAYS: None  
 ABSTENTIONS: None  
 EXCUSED: None

The executive session began at 8:25 p.m. Members of the District's negotiating team were present for this discussion with the Board. Chief negotiator Jackie Damm was present by conference call.

**RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:** Upon a motion by Mr. Kleger and seconding by Mr. Kortge, the Board unanimously returned to open session at 9:05 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT:** With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Secretary

M:\WPDATA\BOARD\MINUTES\2005\BDMIN 02-16-05.doc