

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD MEETING/WORK SESSION

Wednesday, April 21, 2010

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 15, 2010, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a regular Board meeting/work session on Wednesday, April 21, 2010, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Mike Eyster, President
Greg Evans, Vice President
Ed Necker, Treasurer
Michael Dubick
Doris Towery
Gary Gillespie
Mark Pangborn, General Manager
Jeanne Schapper, Clerk of the Board
Wade Hicks, Minutes Recorder

Absent: Dean Kortge, Secretary

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: Mr. Eyster convened the meeting and called the roll at 5:35 p.m.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Mr. Eyster commented that LTD planned to conclude a long process during this meeting and that substantial input had been provided from numerous individuals. He noted that Mr. Gillespie had commented at a previous meeting on the exemplary job performed by LTD staff in incorporating the multitude of input. He noted that the reconciliation between the needs of District and the available funding for those needs had been as inclusive a process as had been possible.

Mr. Pangborn added that LTD had collectively improved upon its service revision and subsequent public engagement strategies from the previous year. He noted that the more LTD worked to engage the public and provide information regarding the District, the better people understood the process.

Mr. Pangborn thanked the members of the LTD Board for their efforts regarding the District's service revisions and reductions.

Ms. Towery commented that while service reductions were not a fun subject matter, she was very pleased by the level of openness and candor provided by LTD's public meetings and other engagement efforts.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: There were no announcements or additions to the agenda.

Mr. Gillespie noted that a half-block no-smoking area had been instituted at the Eugene Library near LTD's Eugene Station. He further noted his concern that the smoking activities from the Library would soon shift to the Eugene Station. He hoped that LTD would monitor any changes and take appropriate action.

Mr. Pangborn noted that he had received a number of e-mails regarding the recent developments at the Eugene Library and that LTD staff had discussed the matter. He agreed that the shift of smokers and other people moving from the area in front of the Library to the LTD Eugene Station had caused a problem and that the shift had created an unfriendly environment for many LTD users. He noted that LTD staff were working with the Eugene Police Department's (EPD) downtown officers, City staff, and downtown business representatives to see if there might be other ways to address the problem.

Mr. Pangborn planned to speak to Eugene Mayor Kitty Piercy and Eugene City Manager Jon Ruiz to see if other solutions might be explored. He then suggested that the shift caused by the Library's non-smoking area might have a detrimental effect on LTD ridership.

Mr. Gillespie agreed that any attempts to ban smokers or groups of young people from LTD property would only shift the problem to another area of downtown Eugene. Mr. Necker stated his belief that the EPD was not legally allowed to tell smokers on LTD property to go home.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to Mr. Gillespie's comment, noted that the EPD had discussed issuing citations to underage smokers as a possible corrective measure to the problem.

BOARD CALENDARS: Mr. Pangborn noted the LTD Budget Committee meetings on May 19 and 20. He noted that the Board had scheduled a short meeting on May 19 from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m., prior to the Budget Committee meetings. Mr. Pangborn expressed doubt that there would be any surprising budget information presented at the May 19 Board meeting.

Mr. Pangborn expected that data on LTD's first quarter payroll tax collections would be available to the Board by May 14.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to a question from Mr. Eyster, said that there are no pressing matters for the Board to address at its tentatively scheduled May 10 meeting and, therefore, it was likely that the meeting would be canceled.

Mr. Necker noted that he would not be present at the Board's June 14 regular meeting.

WORK SESSION

Development and Coordination of LTD Vision Statement and Long-Range Transit Plan: Director of Planning and Development Tom Schwetz provided information on LTD's long-range transit planning efforts and how those efforts would relate to the development of LTD's vision statement.

Mr. Schwetz noted that the long-range transit planning efforts had been prompted by HB 3337, which had resulted in two urban growth boundaries for Eugene and Springfield.

Mr. Schwetz noted that the TransPlan regional agreement between Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, and LTD was to be decommissioned. LTD had subsequently intended to develop a policy document to be adopted by the LTD Board and serve as a basis for the transit elements for the local transportation system plans of Eugene and Springfield.

Mr. Schwetz briefly described the State grant from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), which LTD had received to prepare its Long-Range Transit Plan and noted the four project objectives contained therein.

Mr. Evans asked what level of detail was required of Eugene and Springfield's respective transportation plans in order for them to effectively coordinate with each other and with the LTD system. Mr. Schwetz said that he thought that each city would develop its own plan under its own process with LTD providing input to each agency to help create a more regional transportation perspective.

Mr. Pangborn maintained that LTD might need to develop different long-term transportation strategies for each community. Mr. Evans noted that such actions would inevitably affect LTD's distribution of service.

Mr. Schwetz said that LTD staff had recently met with ODOT representatives to discuss the latest Beltline study and the facility planning effort for transportation options on the Beltline Highway between Coburg Road and River Road. He further noted that an EmX corridor had been proposed for that area. Mr. Schwetz added that LTD staff also had discussed at the meeting how the District might address transit competitive corridors as part of their long-term transportation efforts.

Mr. Schwetz, responding to a question from Mr. Evans, stated that ODOT representatives had engaged in analysis of transit competitive corridors, but that they were not generally used to thinking about how transit systems could be used to address the issues that they faced.

Mr. Schwetz, responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, noted that the project to determine LTD's long-term transit plan would terminate once the grant funding had been exhausted. Mr. Gillespie noted his concern that the governments of Eugene and Springfield might not be able to effectively coordinate their efforts before the grant funding had run out. He further noted his concern that LTD might have to duplicate certain efforts to coordinate with Eugene and Springfield.

Responding to Mr. Gillespie's comment, Mr. Schwetz stated that there actually had been quite a bit of staff coordination between Eugene, Springfield, and LTD. He added that representatives from each agency continued to meet on a weekly basis so that their respective transportation efforts might proceed in a parallel fashion.

Mr. Schwetz said that LTD's annual funding from the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization would help the District coordinate its long-term planning efforts as the cities of Eugene and Springfield developed their plans.

Mr. Pangborn reported that he had attended hearings for the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) in Florence earlier that day. He stated his belief that the OTC, under its current Chair Gail Achterman, was materially different from what it was twenty years ago with respect to its transportation planning perspectives.

Mr. Schwetz commented on the Scenario Planning efforts that had been incorporated into the Long-Range Transit Plan development process and noted that the scenarios basically comprised a set of structural markers to determine the direction of the Plan and to maintain its relevance to the community. Mr. Schwetz noted that additional details regarding the scenario planning activities would be provided in the coming months.

Mr. Schwetz described the relationship between the vision, scenario, and strategic elements of LTD's Long-Range Transit Plan.

Mr. Schwetz commented on staff efforts to standardize the definitions of the terms *Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals* as they each pertained to the development of the Long-Range Transit Plan. Mr. Schwetz directed the Board members to a document that clarified the definitions of *Mission, Vision, Values, and Goals*. The information highlighted the Ann Arbor Transportation Authority and several other transit systems as examples of how a standardized definition of the term *Vision* might be applied to regional transit concerns.

Mr. Schwetz noted that further information regarding the Long-Range Transit Plan process, as well as a draft version of the Plan, would be provided at the regular Board meeting on May 19.

Mr. Pangborn suggested an LTD Board luncheon might be scheduled in order to discuss elements of the Long-Range Transit Plan in more detail.

Legislative Update: April 7 Luncheon with Legislators: Director of Human Resources and Risk Management Mary Adams said that Mr. Eyster and Mr. Evans had attended the recent Board luncheon with state legislators on April 7. She noted that the luncheon had focused on providing those in attendance with information concerning LTD's budget, service reductions, Gateway EmX construction, and West Eugene EmX planning. She further noted that additional discussion during the Luncheon had addressed the various funding challenges for the next legislative session.

Mr. Evans indicated that the lunch meeting had gone well. He added that he had mentioned to Representative Phil Barnhart that the development of LTD was critical to the economic development of the region.

Mr. Evans reported that a discussion was held at the luncheon regarding a group that would be forming among transit Board members from across the State of Oregon. This group would like to form a coalition dedicated to addressing common transit issues with the state legislature.

Mr. Pangborn said that the group mentioned by Mr. Evans could be a highly effective means of lobbying for transit concerns with the state legislature.

Mr. Eyster felt that the legislators who had attended the luncheon had been very appreciative of the discussions.

Ms. Adams provided a brief update on the human resources matters relating to the proposed service reductions. She noted that LTD planned to reduce its operator staff by 19 positions beginning on June 13, 2010. She further noted that one customer service center position and one bus cleaner position in the LTD shop had been eliminated. Ms. Adams noted that to accommodate the staffing reductions, LTD had offered retirement incentives, and, so far, eight eligible employees had submitted a retirement package application. She further noted that for the second year volunteer summer furloughs had been offered for up to five employees in the Operations Department.

Mr. Evans asked if any of the 19 positions slated for elimination were currently unfilled. Ms. Adams responded that all of the 19 positions had already been budgeted and filled.

Ms. Adams noted that LTD staff intended to meet soon to discuss the staff reductions in greater detail and also to provide resources for those employees whose positions might ultimately be eliminated.

Ms. Adams said that between two and six bus operator positions might be eliminated in the fall based on how the fall staffing bid turned out. Then Ms. Adams stated that some of the terminated employees might be called back when the Gateway EmX service begins in January 2011.

Ms. Adams added that there had been productive dialogues with the union with regard to the staffing reductions.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

Board Member Reports: Mr. Evans noted that he had attended the West Eugene EmX Extension (WEEE) Corridor Committee on April 7 with Mr. Kortge and Mr. Necker. He stated that a number of high-quality presentations and discussions had taken place at the meeting.

Mr. Schwetz commented that WEEE Corridor Committee member Josh Skov's experience as chair of the Eugene Sustainability Commission had been invaluable to the work of the Corridor Committee.

Mr. Eyster noted that the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) meeting on April 8 had involved a discussion of the implementation of a Park & Ride facility to complement the Gateway EmX Extension project. He noted that the exact location of the Park & Ride facility had yet to be determined.

Mr. Pangborn reported that the MPC had been asked to endorse three projects for ConnectOregon III, which is a state funded program developed to provide for non-highway transportation projects. He noted that LTD had proposed a purchase of state property in the Gateway area near the Northwest Community Credit Union; however, Springfield City Council member Christine Lundberg had raised concerns that such a purchase might adversely affect the execution of the Gateway EmX project. He noted that staff planned to continue discussions with Springfield staff regarding how a Park & Ride facility might be implemented as a joint development project.

Mr. Eyster commented on the continued development of the Lane County Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) as required by the Oregon State Legislature. He stated that the Lane County Commissioners currently serving on the ACT had hired consultant Rob Zako to lead the ACT development process. Mr. Eyster reported that the ACT was expected to be composed of approximately 25 representatives from various local government and service agencies. He further noted that the bylaws for the ACT were close to being finalized and added that LTD would have one voting member on the ACT.

Mr. Schwetz stated that once the membership format and the bylaws were finalized, they were to be reviewed by the Lane County Commissioners before being forwarded to the Oregon Transportation Commission for final approval.

Monthly Financial Report: Director of Finance and Information Technology Diane Hellekson directed the Board members to the March Financial Report.

Ms. Hellekson noted that additional first quarter benchmark figures regarding the payroll tax receipts would be available during the first week of May. She then said that recent ridership losses had not been as great as had been feared and that they had actually been relatively low in comparison to other transit systems throughout the country.

Ms. Hellekson reported that LTD fare revenue and collection figures for the Franklin Corridor had remained fairly stable and had more than covered the actual cost of the fare collection.

Personnel services expenditures were under control according to Ms. Hellekson. She then added that LTD staff was about to submit a proposed budget for the next fiscal year based on the Long-Range Financial Plan that had been approved at the March 17 Board meeting.

Ms. Hellekson noted that the LTD Budget Committee meeting had been scheduled for May 19 at 6:30 p.m.

Responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, Ms. Hellekson stated that approximately 200,000 gallons of fuel remained at LTD's Coos Bay storage site. Director of Maintenance George Trauger noted that the per gallon costs for the fuel stored at the Coos Bay site was approximately \$1.90 per gallon, to which Ms. Hellekson added that the fuel price was well below the market value.

Mr. Evans asked for further information regarding the payroll tax revenue collections. Chief Accountant Carol James noted that LTD staff continued to attempt to monitor the situation and that the new administration for the Oregon Department of Revenue in Salem had not yet notified LTD of their plans regarding payroll tax revenue collection. Ms. James added that while she could identify groups that did not appear to be compliant in paying payroll taxes, she could only forward that information to the Department of Revenue. She did not know how diligently that office addressed such matters.

Ms. Hellekson stated that LTD staff, in conjunction with TriMet, had discussed the potential funding of a payroll tax collection compliance position. She noted that further information regarding the feasibility of such a strategy would be available by the end of the current fiscal year.

Ms. Hellekson, responding to a question from Mr. Evans, answered that LTD had several years ago commissioned a study from economics students at the University of Oregon who had determined that the lost revenues from delinquent payroll taxes might be as much as six figures. Ms. Hellekson stated that it was unknown how much of the delinquent payroll tax problem had been caused by the economic recession.

Ms. Hellekson confirmed that payroll taxes could be levied against delinquent employers retroactively with penalties and interest.

Ms. James noted that the Department of Revenue did not seem to be actively pursuing delinquent payroll tax collection on a number of employers but rather simply reporting and recording the employers' tax liabilities.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Director of Transit Operations Mark Johnson introduced LTD Employee of the Month Jeff Hadden and noted that Mr. Hadden had been nominated by an LTD patron. He added that although Mr. Hadden had only been employed by LTD for the past couple of years, he had proven himself to be an invaluable employee and also had helped out at a number of LTD special events.

Mr. Eyster congratulated Mr. Hadden and presented him with the award.

Mr. Hadden thanked the Board and noted that while working LTD's mini-board, he had an opportunity to work nearly every available shift on the LTD service system. He noted that his work as an LTD employee had been very inspiring.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

Steve Davis, Blanton Heights Road, Eugene, said that his wife had previously presented an issue to the Board that related to the RideSource service area. He introduced his son, Jake, and thanked the Board and LTD staff for their quick response to his family's concerns.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

RideSource Request for Service and Boundary Review: Mr. Eyster noted that the RideSource action item would be addressed first as it pertained directly to Mr. Davis' previous public comments.

Accessible Services Program Manager Terry Parker noted that the Davis family had requested that the RideSource service be extended to an area near, but outside of, the current RideSource boundary. She said that LTD staff had driven to the requested stop and determined that a trial program that would allow RideSource to go outside the boundary for up to ten minutes would be a way to allow for situations like that experienced by the Davis'. She further described how LTD staff had worked to accommodate their request in an equitable fashion without creating an undue administrative burden.

Ms. Parker added that staff had recommended a two-year pilot study using a time limitation to consider case-by-case exceptions to the established RideSource boundary.

Mr. Evans asked if the recommended pilot study would be eligible for grant funding from the Federal Transit Administration or another agency. Ms. Parker answered that while LTD might apply for grant funding for the pilot study, such grants would compete with applications to fund RideSource service.

Mr. Evans then asked if LTD staff had examples of any best practice strategies similar to the staff proposal, to which Ms. Parker replied that staff had not yet learned of any applicable best practice strategies.

MOTION Mr. Evans moved to approve LTD Resolution No. 2010-015: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves a two-year test of a "fee-for-service" option for eligible RideSource riders requesting service to locations outside the RideSource service boundary. Mr. Dubick provided the second.

Mr. Necker asked if the motion would enable RideSource to pick up persons outside the boundary or would only enable RideSource to transport persons from within the boundary. Ms. Parker specified that RideSource trips as described would originate outside the boundary to bring them inside the boundary with a return trip available. She stated that the motion did not specify travel completely outside the boundary or for a trip originating from within the boundary to a destination outside of it.

Mr. Necker stated his belief that the language of the motion was not specific enough regarding the intent of the recommended action.

Mr. Pangborn noted that the minutes of the proceedings and the legislative intent indicated thereto would serve as an appropriate indication as to how the RideSource accommodation would be executed.

Mr. Evans noted that LTD staff could address any nuances in the language of the motion through its own administrative rules processes.

Mr. Eyster confirmed that the RideSource travel indicated by the motion would originate outside the regular RideSource boundary.

Ms. Towery offered an amendment to the previously stated motion to change the phrase "service to locations outside the RideSource boundary," to "service from locations outside the RideSource boundary." Mr. Dubick provided the second to the amendment.

Mr. Eyster read the motion as amended and called for a vote.

VOTE The motion was approved as follows:
AYES: Dubick, Eyster, Gillespie, Necker, Towery, Evans (6)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
EXCUSED: Kortge (1)

MOTION **Consent Calendar:** Ms. Towery moved adoption of LTD Resolution 2010-012: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 21, 2010, is approved as presented. Mr. Gillespie provided the second. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the February 11, 2010, Special Board Meeting/Public Hearing and the minutes of the March 10, 2010, Special Board Meeting/Luncheon.

Mr. Necker offered corrections to the minutes of the February 11, 2010, Special Board Meeting/Public Hearing and requested that Mr. Vobora's comments regarding revisions to the No. 30, 41, and 43 bus routes be clarified.

Mr. Gillespie stated that Mr. Eyster, as Board Chair, had the authority to pull the February 11 minutes from the consent calendar for separate reconsideration, leaving the minutes of the March 10, 2010, Special Board Meeting/Luncheon as the sole consent calendar item.

Mr. Eyster, noting no objections, pulled the February 11, 2010, minutes from the consent calendar for separate consideration.

Mr. Eyster called for a vote on the motion as amended.

VOTE The Consent Calendar was approved as follows:
AYES: Dubick, Eyster, Gillespie, Necker, Towery, Evans (6)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
EXCUSED: Kortge (1)

MOTION Mr. Necker moved to approve the minutes of the February 11, 2010, LTD Special Board Meeting/Public Hearing as amended. Mr. Gillespie provided the second.

VOTE The motion was approved as follows:
AYES: Dubick, Eyster, Gillespie, Necker, Towery, Evans (6)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
EXCUSED: Kortge (1)

Annual Route Review: FY 2010-11 Service Proposal: Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing Andy Vobora noted that many documents detailing certain aspects of the service proposal package had been distributed and that the complete 50-page document detailing the entire service proposal was available upon request.

Mr. Vobora stated the recommended service package proposal had incorporated a system reduction of 19.34 percent, with a net reduction in service of 11.98 percent after taking into account the increased capacity provided by the Gateway EmX Extension.

Mr. Vobora briefly described the three-phase time frame for the implementation of the service revisions and reductions.

Mr. Dubick asked if any proposal existed to accommodate the discrepancy between the 19.34 percent system reduction and LTD's previously stated service reduction goal of 20 percent. Mr. Pangborn answered that unless economic conditions significantly improved, additional cuts would be faced by LTD in the next two years and that the difference between the two figures would be addressed using LTD reserve funds.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to Mr. Dubick's comments, said that future LTD service cuts would most likely target those routes and service areas that had been on the cusp during the development of the current service proposal package.

Mr. Pangborn noted that to address productivity and coverage concerns in any future service revision strategies, it might be necessary for LTD to consider cutting Sunday service or to end service at 8:30 p.m. instead of 10:30 p.m.

Mr. Eyster reiterated that LTD staff completely understood the abhorrent nature of the service reductions. He noted that while the Board had been charged with helping LTD provide excellent and expanded transit services, the Board had reluctantly adopted a service reduction strategy in order to maintain the long-term financial viability of the District. He noted that LTD staff had done an amazing job in helping to minimize the adverse effects of the proposed service reductions.

MOTION Mr. Gillespie moved to approve LTD Resolution No. 2010-013: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the FY 2010-11 service recommendations, resulting in a net reduction in service hours of 11.98 percent, as presented on April 21, 2010, and as shown on the FY 2010-11 Annual Route Review Service Change Summary. Mr. Necker provided the second.

Mr. Eyster noted that more than 80 percent of public transit districts across the country had been forced to reduce services in a similar manner.

Mr. Eyster called for a vote on the motion.

VOTE The motion was approved as follows:
AYES: Dubick, Eyster, Gillespie, Necker, Towery, Evans (6)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
EXCUSED: Kortge (1)

Mr. Pangborn reported that the TriMet public transit system in Portland had, for the current fiscal year, reduced approximately \$30 million in services and planned \$27 million in additional reductions the following year.

Mr. Pangborn, responding to a question from Mr. Gillespie, stated that he did not know how many staff positions had been eliminated at TriMet. He added that unlike LTD, TriMet had a much higher rate of turnover and subsequently had a number of unfilled positions that could be eliminated.

Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Pricing Plan and First Reading Amended Fare Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services: Mr. Vobora commented on the revolving nature of LTD fare increases and noted that the current round of fare increases affected monthly pass prices. Mr. Vobora listed the exact fare increases for the Board.

Mr. Vobora noted that the second reading and adoption of the pricing plan would occur at the regular Board meeting on May 19 with the ordinance to take effect 30 days thereafter.

MOTION Mr. Necker moved that the Seventeenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Mr. Gillespie provided the second.

VOTE The motion was approved as follows:
AYES: Dubick, Eyster, Gillespie, Necker, Towery, Evans (6)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
EXCUSED: Kortge (1)

Mr. Pangborn read the title of Seventeenth Amended Ordinance No. 35.

LTD Support for City of Eugene's Urban Renewal Plan Amendment: Assistant General Manager Stefano Viggiano noted that LTD staff had asked the Board to make a formal statement of support for the City of Eugene's Downtown Urban Renewal Plan Amendment.

Mr. Viggiano referenced the City's Downtown Urban Renewal Plan and noted the various transit benefits of the City's plan.

Mr. Viggiano expressed that the development of Lane Community College's new downtown facility as referenced in the City's plan would greatly affect transit usage in downtown Eugene.

Mr. Pangborn noted that the City of Springfield had been competing for the new Veteran's Affairs clinic and further noted that the staff recommendation was to support the concept of Eugene's urban renewal plan and was not intended to indicate support for any one specific project within that plan.

Ms. Towery declared a conflict of interest with the recommended motion and asked if the language therein might be revised to more expressly state LTD's support of the urban renewal concept as opposed to any specific project within the City's urban renewal plan.

Mr. Pangborn alternatively suggested that any references to the City of Eugene's proposed Veteran's Affairs clinic project be redacted from all LTD communications and correspondence in order to preserve the District's neutrality with respect to the Cities of Eugene and Springfield.

The Board members and staff briefly discussed how LTD's formal support of Eugene's downtown urban renewal plan might be worded in order to protect its neutrality between Eugene and Springfield.

Mr. Eyster confirmed that the proposed motion would authorize him to sign a formal letter of support to the City of Eugene for their Urban Renewal Plan Amendment that did not mention any specific urban renewal projects.

Mr. Gillespie asked if LTD had received any requests from the City of Springfield to support its urban renewal plans. Mr. Pangborn noted that while LTD generally supported Springfield's urban renewal plans, no formal overtures of support had yet been requested by Springfield or offered by LTD.

Mr. Eyster noted that Eugene's downtown Urban Renewal Plan Amendment was somewhat controversial in the community.

Mr. Evans maintained that the most recent Eugene City Council meeting had demonstrated that the City's urban renewal plans were considerably less controversial than they had been in the past. He noted that the downtown LCC development project had received nearly unanimous support from the community.

Mr. Gillespie said that the union that he represented owned a building in the downtown area and was concerned that he might have a conflict of interest.

Mr. Gillespie expressed that the 4J School District might lose a sizeable amount of funding as a result of the City's downtown Urban Renewal Plan Amendment.

Mr. Viggiano noted that there had been public testimony by the School District that they supported the Urban Renewal Plan Amendment and had not actually been harmed by the City's previous urban renewal strategy.

Mr. Evans asked if the motion could be passed with an amendment. Mr. Dubick noted that the language of LTD's letter to the City of Eugene could be changed to redact references to the Veteran's Affairs clinic as it was written and that no specific amendments to the proposed motion would be necessary.

MOTION Mr. Evans moved that the Board adopt LTD Resolution No. 2010-016: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors supports the proposed amendment to the City of Eugene's Downtown Urban Renewal Plan and directs the Board President to write a letter to the City of Eugene Mayor and City Council indicating this support. Mr. Dubick provided the second.

Mr. Eyster noted that the letter indicated by the motion would be worded in accordance with the previous Board discussion and reflective of their intent.

Ms. Towery noted she wished to abstain from the vote.

Mr. Eyster called for a vote on the previously stated motion.

VOTE

The motion was approved as follows:

AYES: Dubick, Eyster, Gillespie, Necker, Evans (5)

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: Towery (1)

EXCUSED: Kortge (1)

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Eyster adjourned the meeting at 7:11 p.m.



Board Secretary

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2010\10\Reg Mtg 10-20-10\BDMIN_4-21-2010.docx