

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 13, 1999.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

May 19, 1999  
5:30 p.m.

LTD BOARD ROOM  
3500 E. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Springfield  
(off Glenwood Blvd. in Glenwood)

### A G E N D A

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Bailey \_\_\_\_\_ Bennett \_\_\_\_\_ Hocken \_\_\_\_\_ Kleger \_\_\_\_\_

Kortge \_\_\_\_\_ Lauritsen \_\_\_\_\_ Wylie \_\_\_\_\_

III. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

**The following agenda item will begin at 5:30 p.m.**

IV. WORK SESSION--DEBRIEF SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL MEETING 4

V. WORK SESSION—PRESENTATION BY FAIR MANAGER MIKE GLEASON 5

**The following agenda items will begin at 6:30 p.m.**

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH—June 1999 6

VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

◆ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

- |    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
| A. | Consent Calendar  | 7   |
| 1. | Minutes of the April 12, 1999, Special Board Meeting/Joint Work Session with Eugene City Council                      |     |
| 2. | Minutes of the April 21, 1999, Regular Board Meeting  |     |
| 3. | Minutes of the May 1, 1999, Special Board Meeting/Joint Work Session with Springfield City Council                    |     |
| B. | Second Reading and Adoption: Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services | 62  |
| C. | Springfield Station Finalist Sites/Environmental Assessment Approval  | 67  |
| D. | Transit Coordination Agreements   | 75  |
| 1. | LTD, Eugene, and Lane County  |     |
| 2. | LTD, Veneta, and Lane County  |     |
| E. | Revised Special Service Policy  | 100 |
| F. | BRT Pilot Corridor Goals and Performance Objectives   | 103 |

IX. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

- |    |  |     |
|----|--|-----|
| A. | Current Activities   |     |
| 1. | Board Member Reports   | 108 |
| a. | Metropolitan Policy Committee                                      |     |
| b. | Statewide Livability Forum   |     |
| c. | BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input |     |
| d. | Springfield Station Steering Committee                             |     |
| e. | North End Scoping Group  |     |
| f. | Meetings with Springfield City Council                             |     |
| g. | Smoke-Free Air Award   |     |
| 2. | Monthly Financial Report—April Financial Statements                | 110 |
| 3. | Legislative Update   | 120 |

4.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	122
5.	LTD Service Area Boundary Revision	123
6.	Service Policy and Productivity Standards Work Session	124
7.	Lane Community College Term Pass Program Update	125
8.	Government Finance Officers Association Award	129
9.	Board Correspondence	132
B.	Monthly Staff Report	141
X.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	146
A.	Origin & Destination Study Results	
B.	Adoption of Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Budget	
C.	TransPlan Work Session and Draft Plan Approval	
D.	Review of Bus Designs	
E.	BRT Phase 1 Approval	
F.	Alternative Fuels Discussion	
G.	Work Session on Productivity Standards and Policies	
H.	Follow-up Work Sessions	
I.	Medical Reimbursement Account	
J.	Board Review of Tobacco Use at District Facilities	
K.	BRT Updates	
L.	Quarterly Performance Reporting/Year-end Performance Report	
XI.	ADJOURNMENT	

**Alternative formats of printed material (Braille, cassette tapes, or large print) are available upon request. A sign language interpreter will be made available with 48 hours' notice. The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. For more information, please call 682-6100 (voice) or 1-800-735-2900 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).**

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** APRIL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**PREPARED BY:** Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Financial results for the first ten months of the current fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Overall year-to-date performance is satisfactory at this time.

Passenger fare revenue is 5.2 percent ahead of the same ten-month period for last year, and \$4,357 below budget for the year-to-date. This shortfall will be analyzed when monthly ridership data becomes available to determine if it has significance. All other sources of earned income show positive results through April, with the exception of advertising receipts. As previously reported to the Board, this revenue source should show a negative variance of approximately \$24,000 by the end of the year.

Payroll tax revenues continue to be ahead of budget for the year-to-date, and ahead of the same period last year. Self-employment receipts are nearly identical to those through April of last year. All other major non-operating revenues are as anticipated, with the exception of interest earnings, which continue to reflect the slightly lower rates currently in effect. As previously reported, operating grant revenue appears to be low, but is a function of operating grant expenses and, therefore, does not have a material impact on the net General Fund position. (Grant funds are drawn down as expenses are incurred.)

Year-to-date expenses are generally as anticipated by the current-year budget. Both administrative and contract employee wages are on budget for the first ten months of the current fiscal year. The Planning & Development Department appears to be over budget, but the negative variance is the result of the transfer of a position from Public Affairs. (The appropriate budget transfer will be made prior to the production of the May financial report.) Additional information about the General Fund appears in the comment page that is now part of the standard monthly report.

Transactions in the Capital Fund are well within the annual budget plan. It should be noted that there is still one Federal Transit Administration grant contract that is pending FTA approval for programs in which expenditures already have been made. Approximately \$700,000 in year-to-date expenses are eligible for grant reimbursement. It has been LTD's policy to not accrue grant revenue until a contract with FTA has been executed. FTA continues to assure staff that the paperwork should be completed in the near future. Staff continue to monitor the progress of the paperwork, and will immediately process the draw down for all eligible expenses as soon as possible. The Special Transportation Fund is as anticipated for the first ten months of this fiscal year.

The LTD Budget Committee met on April 28 and 29, 1999, to consider the FY 1999-2000 proposed budget. The budget was unanimously approved as proposed at the conclusion of the April 29 meeting. The approved budget will go to the LTD Board on June 16 for adoption.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attached are the following financial reports:

1. Analysis Report - comparison to prior year
2. Monthly Financial Report Comments
3. Comparative Balance Sheets
  - a. General Fund
  - b. Special Transportation Fund
  - c. Capital Fund
4. Income Statements
  - a. General Fund
  - b. Special Transportation Fund
  - c. Capital Fund

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

None

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING/JOINT WORK SESSION**

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
AND  
EUGENE CITY COUNCIL**

**Monday, April 12, 1999**

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 9, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special joint meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District and the Eugene City Council was held on Monday, April 12, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present:	LTD Board of Directors	Eugene City Council
	Kirk Bailey, President, presiding	David Kelly
	Rob Bennett, Vice President	Bobby Lee
	Pat Hocken	Scott Meisner, President
	Dave Kleger, Treasurer	Nancy Nathanson, Vice President
	Dean Kortge	Gary Pape'
	Virginia Lauritsen	Gary Rayor
	Hillary Wylie, Secretary	Betty Taylor
		Jim Torrey, Mayor
	Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager	Jim Johnson, City Manager
	Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary	
Absent:		Pat Farr, Eugene City Councilor

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** LTD Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. He asked that the attendance be noted in the minutes of the meeting. Mayor Torrey asked the Councilors to introduce themselves and to note which Ward they represented. Mayor Torrey then thanked LTD for inviting the Council to discuss bus rapid transit (BRT). He stated that he felt that he already knew a lot about the BRT project, because he had been to Washington, D.C., on at least three occasions to lobby the Oregon Congressional delegation, and had witnessed LTD's presentations to the delegation.

Mr. Bailey then asked the LTD Board members to introduce themselves and note the subdistricts that they represented. Mr. Bailey stated that LTD had an excellent partnership with the City of Eugene, and that they had worked together on numerous issues, including parking replacement for the downtown station, the downtown station itself, locating a public safety station at the downtown station, and locating a new downtown library. LTD and the City of Eugene had a long history of working together on transportation projects in the community. This meeting was an effort for both jurisdictions to come together to continue that partnership, take it to a new level, identify new issues that had to be addressed in the future, and build trust among

the two organizations in order to address those challenges in a very positive fashion. He stated that the LTD Board was committed to doing that, and he believed that the City Council was as well.

Mr. Bailey then reviewed the agenda. He stated that LTD's intent was to hold a discussion exclusively about bus rapid transit. There were other items on the agenda that would be addressed if time allowed, but the Board wanted to allow time for all the discussion and questions that might be present around bus rapid transit.

Mr. Bailey noted that each of the Councilors had received a packet of background information about LTD and its services. The information contained in the packet would not be covered at the meeting, and Mr. Bailey asked the Councilors to be sure to ask questions about any of the information contained in the packet.

### **BUS RAPID TRANSIT**

Councilor Meisner stated that the City and LTD had a long history of an effective partnership, and that partnership continued with bus rapid transit. The City was involved both at the technical level and the policy level. Mr. Meisner served as a member of the BRT Steering Committee for the pilot corridor. He noted that this was a strong, active committee, with members representing all local jurisdictions and the public at large. It was not a "rubber-stamp" committee.

Councilor Meisner said that BRT had been talked about for a number of years and was incorporated into the draft TransPlan, which would be forwarded to local policy makers later in 1999. The pilot corridor, which would operate from east Springfield to west Eugene, was within three separate governmental jurisdictions. Each of those jurisdictions -- the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County -- would be approving the TransPlan.

Phase One of the BRT would be presented to the City Council during the summer of 1999 for preliminary approval. Final approval would be considered next winter following the environmental work.

Councilor Meisner said that the public involvement process for BRT had been extensive and intense. The pilot corridor was divided into eight segments. Currently, design work was occurring on the fourth segment, which included the downtown-east area of Eugene. Public involvement for each segment included one-on-one contacts with businesses along the proposed route; direct mail to every resident in the vicinity; presentations to neighborhood, business, and civic associations; open houses; and interactive design workshops. There were many opportunities for citizen and stakeholder input. This was a project of long-standing interest and long-standing cooperation among the Cities and County.

To date, Councilor Meisner reported, the Steering Committee had considered designs for segments along Franklin Boulevard from East 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue through the Glenwood area, downtown Springfield west, and downtown Eugene east. This area was considered Phase One.

Mr. Bennett said that he appreciated the opportunity to speak to the Council about the BRT issue. He noted that he also was a member of the BRT Steering Committee, and he appreciated the participation of the elected officials. He believed that the jurisdictional representation on the Steering Committee was indispensable and extremely valuable, because of the feedback received regarding decision-making and the proposed implementation.

Mr. Bennett said that BRT was an important initiative, which LTD had been developing for a number of years. BRT was not a new concept, but was one that had received a particularly large amount of attention during the past few years in terms of moving the transit system forward in the community. Nobody said it would be easy, and those who had reviewed the routing and listened to their constituents knew that trying to create the fundamentals in which the system could actually be competitive was difficult. It was important for people to firmly believe in BRT, because it would not work without exclusive right-of-way. There were a number of other issues, such as station location, vehicle design, and neighborhood feeder service, which also needed to be decided.

The idea behind BRT was to create a system that could better compete with the automobile. And, in order for LTD to have a reasonable chance to compete with the ever-increasing traffic levels, it needed the support of the Eugene City Council and other jurisdictions. Mr. Bennett asked the Council members to take a close look and make a conscious decision. BRT was an important part of the draft TransPlan and played a large role in land-use decision-making. LTD did not believe it could ever replace the automobile, but it did want to offer a competitive alternative. BRT would add capacity to a given right-of-way.

On behalf of the LTD Board of Directors, Mr. Bennett stated it was hoped that as the Councilors reviewed the proposal and prepared to make decisions about whether or not to support BRT, that they would keep in mind the seriousness of the LTD Board.

LTD Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano presented an overview of the proposed BRT project. He also explained several drawings and charts that had been posted on the walls. He explained that BRT had several elements, but it resulted in high-speed, high-frequency service along major corridors. In the neighborhoods, small buses would operate and connect with the corridor service. Along with the exclusive right-of-way, BRT would utilize a transit signal priority system to keep buses moving quickly through signalized intersections. BRT also would utilize new vehicles that more closely resembled a light-rail vehicle, a prepaid fare system to speed boarding at new stops and stations, and a whole new image for the bus system.

When LTD talked with people about BRT, the main question had been about implementation and what it would look like on the street. Exclusive lanes would be the key feature of the system and generated the most questions. Detailed planning of the pilot corridor was in process to answer that and other questions. Preferred designs were being created on a segment-by-segment basis. This initial design work essentially was a feasibility study that would result in a scenario of what BRT would look like on the streets. Following the initial design process, the proposed project would be presented to all affected jurisdictions for a decision. Those jurisdictions included the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, and Lane County.

Mr. Viggiano then reviewed the design work that had been completed to date for each of the four segments within Phase One of the BRT project. Those segments included Franklin Blvd. from West 11<sup>th</sup> to I-5, Glenwood, downtown Springfield, and downtown Eugene east. The four segments east and west of the downtown areas would be considered during Phase Two of the project. It was LTD's intent to complete the preliminary preferred design work on Phase One by early summer and forward a recommendation for endorsement to the various jurisdictions. Following the endorsement process, an environmental review would take place, followed by a request for approval from the jurisdictions. Construction would commence following approval by all jurisdictions, resulting in BRT service of the Phase One corridor in the fall of 2001.

Councilor Kelly stated that he was delighted to see BRT moving forward. Some people were talking about BRT as if it would be the answer for transit in the Eugene/Springfield areas, but he believed it was a piece of the answer that would help meet the demands of a growing population and traffic congestion. He stated that he was a great believer in mass transit.

Councilor Kelly commented that it was important to him that BRT be done to succeed and not to fail. The point about required right-of-way was very well taken. He also thought that the neighborhood connector service was as key as the high-speed corridor service.

Councilor Kelly referred to the Franklin/UO Alternatives Evaluation spreadsheet that had been distributed in the agenda packet. Under Alternatives B and C, it was noted that ODOT approval was unlikely to occur, but capacity was projected to be significantly higher. He asked how much that had been discussed with ODOT and what the prospects were to forward Alternatives B or C. He also asked what the Council could do to assist with gaining ODOT approval.

Mr. Bailey, referring to the issue of neighborhood feeder service, said that LTD currently was beginning a Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) of the entire LTD bus service that would take BRT into account and would address neighborhood service. A lot of energy would be placed on ensuring that the neighborhood service worked with the BRT service.

Councilor Meisner stated that ODOT did have veto power over the BRT project because the pilot corridor mostly was on state highway. ODOT would be looking for right-of-way that did not result in a significant reduction in the level of service on the existing roadway. He noted that an ODOT representative was a member and active participant on the BRT Steering Committee. One of the benefits of that was the immediate feedback from ODOT. ODOT liked what BRT hoped to accomplish and appreciated the high goals and expectations that had been set.

Mr. Viggiano distributed a copy of the Goals and Objectives for the BRT project. Councilor Meisner stated that the Goals and Objectives were the result of two meetings worth of discussion. Actual performance measures also had been included in the Goals and Objective statements.

Councilor Pape' echoed Councilor Meisner's statement. He had worked with ODOT during the planning and design of the Coburg/I-5 interchange. During that time, ODOT had been very interested collaborators on the project and showed a willingness to work things out.

Councilor Taylor asked at what point and to what extent the public was involved in the BRT project. Mr. Bailey stated that there were one-on-one contacts along each segment with business owners and/or residents along the proposed route; public open houses and design workshops; and presentations to neighborhood, community, and civic organizations. Additionally, letters, notices, and newsletters were mailed to all residents and businesses within each segment area, and advertising was placed in local media. Public hearings would be held in conjunction with the completion of the Phase One design process.

Councilor Taylor then asked how many stops there would be and if there were many stops, how travel time would be improved. BRT Project Engineer Graham Carey responded that the space between stops would be increased with the BRT project in order to increase the speed of the service. Currently, stops were planned in approximately one-half mile intervals, which was based on the theory that people would walk one-quarter mile to a bus stop. There were three stops along the Franklin/UO segment: One at Dad's Gate (East 11<sup>th</sup> & Franklin), one at Agate Street, and one at Walnut Street. Regular service stops generally were placed at two-block intervals.

Councilor Nathanson asked how BRT impacted the ongoing reviews and changes in regular bus service, and if it would take resources from regular service. She noted that it had not been too long since LTD had introduced direct, express routing that was quite successful. She also asked about the medians and how they would be maintained. In addition, she asked how LTD planned to achieve Goals 2 and 3.

Mr. Kleger stated that the factor for express route service was the high demand for a bus from one location to another, rather than a route that picked up two or three people at various stops along the way. Typically, an express route had only two or three stops. There were no indications that express service or service enhancements would be affected by BRT. Each year during the Annual Route Review (ARR) process, staff had good ideas for service enhancements where there was a demand. He could not see anything in bus rapid transit that would stop that dynamic from working.

Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora added that BRT would not compete with regular service. BRT was an evolution of what LTD currently offered. Staff would work to coordinate regular service with the BRT service.

Mr. Kleger added that LTD would not operate the typical 40-foot bus on the BRT line. The BRT vehicles would accommodate more people per bus operator, resulting in a lower cost per service hour of operation. Exactly how the vehicle would be configured had yet not been decided. Over the long term, the operator time, which was the biggest operating expense, would be more efficient. Operating expense was not much different than a light-rail system, except that LTD would not be able to hook two or three units together. If the community ever reached that level of traffic, LTD would want to convert to rail, and it already would have the right-of-way to do so.

Mayor Torrey said that he also was interested in maintenance plans for the median area and whose responsibility it would be. The Mayor stated that the community was very fortunate to have LTD. He thought that the community and the federal government believed that

Eugene/Springfield had an excellent transit system. He stated that he was supportive of the BRT project.

Mayor Torrey said that one of the things he had learned during his involvement in city government was to identify in advance where problems might be, and to take a proactive approach to resolving them. He did not believe that the public knew why BRT would be so much better. He also suggested that LTD take a proactive approach to tree removal. He asked if the Steering Committee also consisted of staff people from each jurisdiction, such as from public works or the planning department.

He cautioned that BRT could be a great program or a contentious program, and if different groups who had small problems with the project decided to tag on to one another, it could create insurmountable hurdles. Mayor Torrey's recommendation to LTD was to identify in advance where those hurdles were, reach out to those groups, and bring them into the decision-making process.

The Mayor questioned where the critical mass or major pick-up points were for LTD.

Mr. Bailey stated that the entire intent of the BRT public involvement process was to provide as many opportunities as possible for people to see the route and be involved in its design in order to identify hurdles. LTD was not simply holding open houses for people to come to. Staff and the Board were proactively identifying those stakeholders who would be impacted by the design in a particular area and on the entire route. It had been made very clear to the Board by all parties involved that this project had to be one that the community as a whole supported. The LTD Board was committed to the public involvement process. Mr. Bailey believed that there currently was a strong level of general conceptual support.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the maintenance and general upkeep of the medians most likely would be intergovernmental, but LTD would be responsible for maintaining any facility that it built. LTD placed a high priority on maintaining its capital assets in the community.

In response to operating costs, Mr. Viggiano stated that most of LTD's costs were tied to hours of service rather than miles. The major cost of operating buses was the operator wages, so if the operator could drive more quickly and provide more service, rather than being stuck in traffic, LTD would realize more efficiency. By moving the service along more quickly, LTD could provide an equivalent service at a reduced rate. Currently, a round trip from downtown Eugene to the Thurston area took 1.5 hours, and if LTD could operate that same route in one hour, the saved 20 minutes would represent significant cost savings.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the capacity goals were essential to the success of the project. As the community grew and congestion increased, the capacity of the corridor would need to be increased, and the BRT system would carry more people through the corridor in a much more efficient manner than adding more lanes. There were many examples of increased capacity using exclusive bus lanes. For example, in Curitiba, Brazil, the system carried 27,000 people in one lane per hour, in one direction. A typical freeway carried about 2,000 trips per hour. The theoretical capacity using exclusive bus lanes was very high.

Councilor Meisner added that BRT would work to the extent that the neighborhood connections were effective and worked. Costs and capacity depended upon all the other elements of BRT, such as pre-paid fares for rapid boarding, exclusive lanes for rapid travel, signal prioritization, etc.

With regard to the preferred design options, Councilor Meisner said that the Steering Committee was not making the design option decisions. Those decisions were being made during the public involvement process of the open house and the design workshops that were attended by affected citizens and business owners along each segment. The preferred designs were being forwarded to the Steering Committee from that process. Every problem could not be anticipated, but in regard to tree removal on the Franklin median, the choice to remove those trees actually came from the public involvement process. Staff and the Steering Committee were making every attempt possible to reach out and listen to the citizens and business owners and address problems as they were brought up.

Mayor Torrey added that he was confident that the public involvement process far exceeded the status quo, but he reiterated that LTD needed to make every attempt to reach out to the person who might say no to the process.

Councilor Rayor said that he hoped the project would maintain a lot of green space. He encouraged LTD to continue partnering with ODOT because BRT did a lot to help meet many statewide goals in terms of lowering emissions and developing a well-balanced transportation system. The perception of car drivers was the concern of taking lanes, but if ridership could indeed be increased, then the people who would not get out of their cars would have more room.

Councilor Rayor also suggested that LTD produce a newspaper insert for the local newspapers. He thought it would be more noticeable than an ad on an existing page.

With regard to the BRT Goal number 5, Councilor Rayor asked that LTD consider incorporating bicycle amenities into the BRT vehicles.

Mr. Bailey said that LTD continued to look at ways to promote bicycle use. With regard to the newspaper insert, Mr. Bailey was not sure it had been considered, but he thought it was a great suggestion.

Ms. Hocken stated, in response to Mayor Torrey's comment about reaching out to people who might have an objection, that in the Glenwood segment, staff had knocked on the door of every business within the Glenwood area to introduce the BRT proposal, invite them to the meetings, and discuss any concerns or questions they might have. The Glenwood businesses put together a committee to respond as a group to LTD, and she thought that it worked out very well. In fact, due to the public input in the Glenwood area, the seed design was changed and BRT would not travel on Franklin through Glenwood as was originally thought. The business owners were able to show enough problems with BRT on Franklin that alternate routing was selected as the preferred design.

Councilor Pape' asked if operating costs included the maintenance and depreciation of buses. Ms. Loobey responded that those costs were included. Councilor Pape' then asked

what the cost of the vehicles was expected to be. Ms. Loobey said that with a new design, the cost likely would be \$300,000 to \$400,000 per vehicle. A standard transit coach cost \$200,000, but it was expected that the BRT vehicle would carry a larger number of people. The design of the vehicle was largely unknown at this time. Several U.S. manufacturers were working on a prototype, and there were Buy America requirements that needed to be taken into account, so it would be some time before vehicle information would be available.

Ms. Loobey further stated that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was so excited about the project that it was giving LTD demonstration money and would assist in getting LTD into the new start program, from which the FTA funded light and heavy rail. LTD was developing a system unlike any other system in the country. There was not one single element of BRT that was new, but LTD was the first to put those elements together into one system. LTD could not make BRT work by itself. Local units of government had to be willing to either enforce the policies or write new policies, and to make sure that the cooperation and coordination were there. BRT was a big deal for this community in terms of land use and transportation and the future of the community.

Over the years, there had been many transportation documents and policies that were not implemented or enforced. If BRT was to be the community's future within the issues of smart growth and transportation and land-use planning, then it needed to have everyone's support.

Councilor Pape' asked how BRT would link to high-speed rail. Mr. Vobora replied that LTD currently was conducting a downtown shuttle feasibility study that most likely would provide bus service to the train station. It would be critical to have a downtown shuttle that would link the train station to the BRT line and the Eugene Station.

Councilor Pape' then asked if the proposed BRT system met with what Mr. Viggiano observed in Curitiba, Brazil. Mr. Viggiano said that the Curitiba system looked very similar to what LTD was proposing, such as pre-paid fares, dedicated busways, transit signal priority, etc. The Curitiba system carried 75 percent of the trips on transit, which was a phenomenal figure. It was a very productive system, and in Curitiba, land-use was tied to the transit system. Most commercial development was adjacent to the transit corridors. Automobile travel was funneled to streets located one block away from the transit corridors, and development density decreased in areas away from the corridors. A conscious decision was made 30 years ago in Curitiba to develop the city around its transit system. Compared with other Brazilian cities, Curitiba had a higher standard of living, it was a much cleaner community, and it was very environmentally friendly. Because of such successful planning, Curitiba was a model city that was visited by people from all over the world. LTD was operating in a different environment, but Mr. Viggiano said that there was a lot of what Curitiba had done well that would apply within the local environment.

Councilor Pape' stated that he was a believer in the BRT proposal and asked if the pilot corridor was successful, what LTD had planned beyond the pilot corridor. Mr. Viggiano referred to a map that depicted what the BRT system might look like in 20 years. The map depicted a total of five BRT routes, four of which would travel cross-town and one that would circumvent the cities. Mr. Viggiano thought that the second line most likely would be a north-south route.

Mr. Kleger stated that once the entire system was built, and thinking conceptually with the way the area was growing, at some point LTD would be planning to convert the BRT lines to rail. One of the issues that prompted the BRT proposal was the Rail Feasibility Study that was conducted as part of the early TransPlan drafting. One of the outcomes of that study was that in 20 years' time, the community would have the density to justify a light-rail investment, and it recommended beginning to reserve those corridors now. If LTD waited until the community had the density that would justify a light-rail investment, the costs to purchase right-of-way along the corridors would be prohibitive.

Councilor Taylor asked if LTD was planning a link to the airport from the Eugene Station. She also suggested that LTD consider allowing people to bring bikes aboard the BRT vehicles rather than having to stop to attach bikes to a bike rack located on the front or back of the vehicle. In addition, she asked if LTD had considered allowing people to bring their dogs on the bus. Lastly, she asked why LTD thought it could fill the BRT buses, and if the population was expected to grow that rapidly to justify the proposal.

Mr. Bailey responded that LTD continued to struggle with finding an effective way to serve the airport. Whether or not airport service would be a feeder route to the BRT system or an express route to the downtown area was unknown at this time. LTD was committed to seeking a way to efficiently serve the airport area. In response to Councilor Taylor's comments about bringing bikes and dogs on the buses, Mr. Bailey said that LTD was very committed to not only making travel times convenient, but also convenient to people's lives.

Mr. Bailey said that LTD believed that BRT would work well because ridership had been increasing for some time and it was expected to continue to increase because the community was growing much faster than LTD could keep up with standard service. BRT was a different type of service that could carve out a competitive advantage. It was similar to a rail or metro-type of service, which typically attracted choice riders.

Councilor Kelly stated that after the Council had deferred the funding for more airport parking, he had met with Mr. Vobora to discuss the airport transit situation. LTD had hired an intern who would work closely with the city and who would conduct an airport transit study.

Councilor Kelly agreed with the Mayor that LTD needed to be assertive in its outreach to potential opponents, and in terms of the tree issues, particularly the Eugene Tree Foundation. LTD needed to specify and be honest about what the trade-offs were.

Councilor Kelly then asked about the timeline for Phase Two of the pilot corridor, and about how LTD planned to mitigate the routing on West 11<sup>th</sup> where currently there was on-street parking. Mr. Carey responded that LTD would mitigate the loss of parking on the southern side of 11th Avenue on an individual basis.

Mr. Bailey noted that it was time for the Council to leave for its meeting at 7:30 p.m., and he said that LTD would make a note of any further questions or comments the Council had and respond to them in writing.

Councilor Nathanson stated that she would appreciate answers to several questions she had. She asked how the prepaid fares would work, given that there were many people who

already used prepaid fare instruments. In addition, she asked about purchasing of corridor right-of-way now rather than waiting until later. She asked if LTD already was looking for places where it might purchase property to straighten the route, rather than having to make many right- or left-angle turns. With regard to the airport service, Councilor Nathanson said that while it might not be practical for regular bus service, and she asked if LTD had considered a different type of shuttle for the airport, such as a smaller van-type bus or on-demand shuttle service. Finally, Councilor Nathanson thanked the LTD Board for its participation in the North-end Scoping Group. Mr. Bennett and Mr. Kortge had been participating, and Councilor Nathanson was very pleased that they could take the time to be involved. She also appreciated the presence of LTD staff at those meetings.

Mayor Torrey thanked the LTD Board for inviting the Council to this meeting, and Mr. Bailey thanked the Council for its efforts and time and recognized Councilor Meisner for his contribution to the BRT Steering Committee. Mr. Bailey reiterated that LTD would respond in writing to any questions and comments that had not been addressed during the discussion.

**Adjournment:** There being no further business, Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

---

Board Secretary

## MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 21, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 15, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, April 21, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, President, presiding  
Rob Bennett, Vice President  
Pat Hocken  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Dean Kortge  
Virginia Lauritsen  
Hillary Wylie, Secretary  
Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

#### **I. WORK SESSION**

##### **Preparation For May 1 Joint Work Session With Springfield City Council:**

Mr. Pangborn stated that a work session was planned with the Springfield City Council on Saturday, May 1, at LTD, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to attempt to come to an understanding with the Springfield Council about their participation in and support of bus rapid transit (BRT). The need for a meeting with the Springfield City Council resulted from a meeting in Washington, D.C., during the United Front lobbying trip, when Mr. Bailey, Ms. Wylie, Ms. Loobey, Ms. Lynch, and Mr. Pangborn met with Springfield Mayor Maureen Maine and Councilor Sid Leiken.

Mr. Pangborn said that the City of Springfield had requested that LTD hire a professional facilitator for the joint meeting. Mr. Pangborn had been in touch with Margot Helphand to facilitate the meeting.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if there was a resume for Ms. Helphand. Mr. Pangborn said that he only had made phone contact with Ms. Helphand, who formerly was the director of training for Lane County and now was a private consultant. The City of Springfield had provided two names, John O'Connor and Ms. Helphand. Mr. O'Connor was not available for May 1, but Ms. Helphand was available. Ms. Lauritsen said that she would have preferred to have a choice of three. Mr. Pangborn added that he had placed a call

to Peter and Susan Glaser, but had not yet heard back about their availability. He stated that he would keep the Board apprised of his progress in this matter.

Mr. Bailey asked if the Board had any objections to the use of a facilitator. There were none.

Mr. Pangborn then reviewed the draft agenda that had been distributed to the Board members, which included a list of resolved and unresolved issues. The value to the Board of talking about the agenda ahead of time was to be clear about and understand the Board's position. Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen, as the Springfield representatives, had met with the mayor of Springfield and Springfield staff to discuss some of those issues.

Ms. Wylie stated that her biggest concern for the May meeting was that attitudes of "we/they" were developing, and she felt that the two groups might be at that point. She said that she had written down many of the City's concerns, and she believed that the agenda would cover many of those concerns.

However, Ms. Wylie said that primarily the City of Springfield did not want to be viewed as obstructionists, nor did they want to feel threatened about being left out of the BRT plan. She said that City Manager Mike Kelly had summarized his thoughts that the City could speed up if LTD could slow down; the City wanted the BRT plan to be data driven rather than concept driven; and the City wanted to look at alternatives. One of the ideas that had come from the Washington, D.C., meeting had been for LTD to fund a traffic engineer who would be put on the City of Springfield staff to study the impacts of BRT on traffic on the preferred and alternate corridors.

Ms. Wylie said that many issues had been discussed, but the strongest issue had been to resolve the issue of the dedicated lane. Currently, the City believed that Main Street and South A Street were the two busiest streets in the community, and they had recently passed a bicycle plan that would add bike lanes to both streets. When they visualized one lane of traffic with a bus going by only once every ten minutes and all the rest of the traffic using another lane, it did not make sense to them. The City believed that BRT did not make sense for the 10 percent of the Springfield residents who currently rode the bus.

Ms. Wylie said that she was verbalizing their positions as elected officials to deal with their population and their concerns. She said it was very important for LTD to hear those concerns. The Council realized that BRT was the number one goal of LTD, and that LTD had excellent staff who used great visual aids to tell them how wonderful BRT would be, but they still did not see BRT as wonderful for their community right now.

The City favored some of the elements of BRT, and they wanted an opportunity to study those elements, such as queue-jumping. They also wanted to study 3rd Street as an alternate corridor with painted lines, not curbs. They favored a "BRT Lite" alternative scenario. One of the possibilities that was discussed was that LTD write the BRT plan in Springfield that addressed their needs and included different elements of BRT on different parts of the corridor. The City needed to see more data and needed to

have a realistic discussion about the impacts on their community. They also felt that they had not had their say, and they saw their transportation and traffic issues nearly in jeopardy at this point.

As a Springfield representative, Ms. Wylie said that she certainly did understand what the City needed, but at the same time, her heart was with BRT as an LTD Board member. She thought that as the structure of the May 1 meeting came together, she believed that the Board should be prepared to discuss and hear the needs of the City of Springfield and to be prepared to meet them in one way or another.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she agreed with Ms. Wylie's summary. It was a long-standing problem. She had attended the last Council meeting where LTD appeared and received a negative impression. She believed that it always came down to the same thing, which was communications. She did not think that the LTD Board could say that the City of Springfield had to "come around." They did not have to do anything.

She noted some of the comments at the meeting. One was that Ms. Loobey had made some agreements and the two staffs were to meet. She thought that was good, but the City was concerned that LTD staff and Board were so keen on and dedicated to BRT that they could not hear any deviation from the full gospel of that text.

Ms. Lauritsen distributed a copy of the 1997 Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Transit Signal Priority and a letter dated June 9, 1997, from Springfield Council President Greg Shaver that specified studies that LTD would conduct. She said that the City was not satisfied that LTD had done what was specified in the letter or that alternatives had been discussed properly. The City's perspective was that all LTD had to do was get buses up and down the street, while the City had to consider all forms of transportation for its streets, including bicycles, automobiles, and buses. In the meantime, they had to run a city and maintain the roads. LTD needed to back up and determine where it was that the two jurisdictions could come together again to have a shot at changing service in the community. Without the local support, it was unlikely that Congressman DeFazio would be as positive as he might otherwise be.

Ms. Lauritsen noted that the *Springfield News* that day had carried five front-page articles, three of which mentioned the Springfield Council. The *Register-Guard* carried six front-page articles, two of national interest, two about the County, and two about the City of Eugene. Springfield received no front-page coverage, and was relegated back to same page that EWEB was covered on. She thought that LTD should drop the BRT issue now or instead consider communicating with the City of Springfield. Ms. Lauritsen said that she did not want to see BRT go down.

Mr. Bailey asked Ms. Lauritsen if she believed that was where the issue currently stood with the City of Springfield. Ms. Lauritsen replied that she did not believe it was that extreme, but she did believe it would get there quickly if LTD did not listen to the City's concerns. Mr. Bailey asked if the Council had expressed any expectations for the meeting on May 1. Ms. Lauritsen said that the City very much wanted to get back on track and was willing to work through the issues. It would be LTD's challenge to determine how to move the City in the right direction. Additionally, whatever was

learned in Springfield would be needed for Eugene when LTD began work on the West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue portion of the corridor, and people began to realize that a lane and on-street parking would be lost and that bicycles would not be able to get through West 11<sup>th</sup> easily. LTD needed to take a broader view if it wanted to be successful in Springfield. She did not believe that the BRT proposal would be dropped soon, but if support just was lukewarm, she did not want to spend that kind of money. On the other hand, if LTD began to listen, BRT could be very successful. It was possible that a phase-in approach during the next five years would be successful.

The two cities had some short-term goals, and if more attention was paid to those short-term goals, LTD would gain more support in total.

Ms. Hocken commented that when LTD first approached the Springfield City Council, the Council members were cautious, but said that BRT sounded like an interesting concept. However, they also said that until LTD had more details about where the BRT route would go, they could not have an intelligent conversation about it. LTD now was at the point where it was attempting to provide those details that the Council had requested, and now LTD was being told that it was forcing the issue. LTD was trying to do what the City had asked it to do, and now the City was saying that LTD needed to do something else. The current feasibility study was being conducted to gather the data and provide options for where the BRT lines would go. This was the City of Springfield's direction to LTD.

Ms. Hocken said that admittedly, there was a different Council then, but that was one of the reasons LTD was conducting the detailed analysis. LTD needed a commitment from the City of Springfield about at what point enough analysis had been done before decisions could be made. She agreed with Ms. Lauritsen's and Ms. Wylie's comments about the we/they attitude and that the City had broader issues to consider. LTD had its vision and the City had its vision, and there was a need to determine where the two jurisdictions agreed in terms of visions and goals. She did not believe that the City of Springfield could accuse LTD of forcing the project, because LTD was, in fact, doing exactly what the City had asked.

Ms. Lauritsen said that one of the things she got from the meeting with the City of Springfield was that the areas of disagreement were not technical, but that the idea or concept needed to be further discussed. She did not believe that the City needed more technical data, but they did need to discuss with the Board what the City would do with the larger picture or the other 90 percent of the population that did not ride the bus. She said that they understood reserving rights-of-way, but if the two boards could discuss concepts together, she believed that was what the City desired.

Mr. Kleger thought that maybe the answers were not what the City wanted, but that maybe LTD had not understood the questions.

Ms. Wylie added that the City actually did want more data. They thought that a traffic engineer could study some of the alternatives. The City wanted to analyze the data, the impact of BRT on Springfield and the 90 percent of the citizens who did not use

transit, where alternative corridors might be, what the alternative choices were other than BRT, and what could be done with less impact.

Ms. Lauritsen quoted from the 1997 letter, "the City must exert enough influence over such a pilot project to ensure that those matters for which the City sets policy will not be adversely impacted by the BRT project." She said that the City was feeling left out. The City felt that suddenly LTD was digging dirt on the City's streets, making lanes, and the City was a little alarmed. One of the concerns was about the 24-hour exclusive right-of-way that would inconvenience the 90 percent of the population that did not use transit. The lane would be empty for nine minutes, then it would be in use for one minute by a bus. The City wanted to know where the need was for that.

The City liked the concept of Park & Ride lots with loop routes to the residents. There also was interest in trying a High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane (BRT lite), before committing to valuable road space.

Mr. Bennett asked if the City actually was trying to say in a nice way that it did not believe that BRT would work. Ms. Lauritsen replied that the City was tapping LTD's shoulder. Mr. Bennett stated that LTD had been seeking input during the past two to three years. LTD was listening, while at the same time moving forward with the planning process. During the two- to three-year period, it appeared that all jurisdictions were close to giving full support of the project. The City talked about phasing in BRT, and there was no evidence that it would work; and in fact, the City thought that there was evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Bennett continued to say that if BRT did not utilize an exclusive lane to be competitive, to carry a larger percentage of the trips, particularly during peak hours, it would not be successful. That was the fundamental basis of BRT. If the Board compromised down to the basic fundamentals of the proposal, where one must consider giving it up, and at that point, one must admit that one no longer believed in it either. BRT would have no chance of working, and simply would be a waste of resources. The community did not have a traffic crisis now, but it would have it sometime in the near future. The community would experience the same kind of congestion that every other growing community in the world had experienced. And, if the community did not begin planning for that now, it would become nearly impossible to do later. Land would become geometrically more expensive; decisions would have been made about where businesses were located on the streets and how the streets were used; and parking would become more and more dear and congested. Then, when there really was gridlock, and the community tried to make the case for rapid transit, the LTD Board believed it would be too late. Was the timing exactly right? Mr. Bennett said that he did not know that for sure, but the preponderance of evidence was that if LTD did not start early, it would not get there, and if LTD did not have a competitive advantage that would get people out of their cars some of the time, then why do it?

Mr. Bailey stated that he wanted to redirect the tenor of the conversation. He thanked Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen for giving the Board a little bit more insight on the Council's position. He did not want to replicate the conversation it was to have with the Council. He thought that the Board instead should talk about its position, and if the

members were comfortable with the position and the information that was available to support where the BRT project stood.

Ms. Wylie stated that everything was valid, and she thought that the Springfield Council would acknowledge that. She asked if that validity balanced with solving the lane problem in downtown Springfield. LTD might have the greatest idea in the world, but it still did not solve the City's problem of 90 percent of the traffic on the road.

Mr. Bailey said that this was a technical issue that the Board was attempting to get the answers to. The LTD Board had to decide on a comfortable answer to that question. Mr. Bailey's sense was that the Board had moved beyond policy and was attempting to get a sense of the technical items. Now the Board was hearing that, in fact, it had to go back to the policy issue.

Ms. Wylie asked if LTD had an answer to the traffic problem in downtown Springfield. Mr. Bailey said that he was not sure LTD had gotten that far yet. Somewhere along the line, the staffs were not having conversations about what the appropriate questions were and what research needed to be done. That process had ground to a halt, because there seemed to be some question about the policy level. The Board needed to understand and agree on its position in terms of the policy level of the BRT proposal. Mr. Bailey thought that the Board already had done that. He thought that the Board was now at a place to figure out the technical feasibility of BRT. The policy only would change if there were a non-disputable issue. For instance, if ODOT were to determine that something absolutely could not be done, that would be a non-disputable issue, or if LTD discovered that there were underground environmental problems that ran through half of the corridor, that also would qualify as a non-disputable issue.

Ms. Hocken said that she thought that what the Board needed to gain from the conversation was that LTD was not trying to tell the City of Springfield it' business, and the Board was not sure that the City should be telling LTD the bus business. Both jurisdictions have expertise in specific areas and need to work together to figure out and respect the expertise, knowledge, and background of each other. The City and LTD had different responsibilities in the same space, and those responsibilities needed to be coordinated. That was a policy decision that needed to be made. Any technical issue could be solved if the will was there to do it, or a decision could be made that a technical issue was not solvable, but LTD and the City had to have the will to do it.

Mr. Bennett said that the LTD Board made projections and set goals. One of those was that in a given period of time, LTD would produce the results. He asked if the goals and projections were believable and if they were believable enough to move people. Mr. Bennett said that he was an advocate for reasonable growth, and if Springfield shared his attitude, it must know that the congestion only was going to get worse; there were projections to back that up. He wondered if Springfield was going to allow that to happen, because that was what other communities had done.

Ms. Wylie said that the City did want to be concerned about transportation, and it wanted to be part of the transportation planning. The City Council was concerned about the same things LTD was. But Ms. Wylie thought that another piece of the concern was

sensitivity to the constituency and how people would react to some of the things LTD was deciding. LTD needed to be sensitive to that as well.

Mr. Bennett said that he was concerned about getting to the meeting on May 1, and discussing those things that were agreed upon, and then talking around the things that fundamentally were not agreed upon. Maybe it was the philosophical part of BRT that was the problem. Ms. Lauritsen agreed that part of the problem was philosophical differences. Mr. Bennett continued to say that he was not sure that he knew how to talk about BRT with the City of Springfield.

Ms. Lauritsen said that what she heard Mr. Bennett say was the same as what the City had been concerned about, and that was LTD staff and Board having a "my way or no way" attitude. Mr. Bennett said that he did feel that way.

Ms. Lauritsen thought it was important to note that the Board had compromised on its policy statement in TransPlan, and she thought it was equally important for the Board to be prepared to compromise with the City of Springfield.

Mr. Bailey stated that the Board needed to discuss the fundamental issues of exclusive rights-of-way and where each member stood on that issue. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure that the Board had a reasonable understanding of each member's position on the key fundamental concepts of BRT.

Mr. Bailey referred to page 5 of the draft packet for the joint meeting, and the policy direction question about the concept of exclusive busways. He asked the Board members to comment on the question.

Ms. Hocken stated that she had never heard anything to indicate that the Board members were not committed to exclusive rights-of-way. If someone disagreed, she believed now was the time to speak up.

Mr. Kleger stated that he would be willing compromise somewhat in order to get a foot in the door. Maybe in the short-term, for a very limited time, he would be willing to give up on exclusive right-of-way west of the Springfield Station. For instance, the distance from the bridge in Glenwood to the downtown station, wherever that ended up, might be worth doing some initial compromise on. That area would be a tough problem, no matter what was done, because of the intense development. He would be a lot less willing to give up on an exclusive lane east of there, simply because it would be a lot easier to implement. He would be extremely reluctant to drop the BRT line somewhere west of the Willamette, because LTD would lose the time advantage to make it work. If that was what it would take, he would be willing to make the compromise. It was expected that Springfield would experience a one-third-population increase on the Thurston corridor, and the City of Springfield should be very concerned about how to accommodate that.

Ms. Lauritsen agreed with Mr. Kleger.

Mr. Kortge said that he was confused. He believed the Board was discussing the vision, and with a vision, work had to begin somewhere. BRT clearly was a way to move people. His sense was that the vision was to have a dedicated way to move people through an ever-increasing traffic congestion problem. He believed that the LTD Board should continue to promote that vision.

Ms. Hocken stated that she thought the problem was that typically people thought of vision in the long-term, distant future. BRT would be easier to implement now while property was still available and affordable. A compromise already had been made on the Franklin corridor that in some places BRT would not operate on two separate busways, but would operate in both directions on one shared busway. So, LTD was not being uncompromising. One of the things that LTD needed to accomplish at the joint meeting was to convince the Springfield Council that LTD had compromised and was willing to compromise, but that there were limits to those compromises. Each time LTD compromised, the value of the project was jeopardized.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she agreed with Mr. Kortge. LTD should promote the vision, and get as much lane as possible. However, promoting an attitude of 100 percent or nothing would surely put the project in jeopardy.

Mr. Bailey stated that the configuration of BRT could be the issue to compromise on, but still with exclusive busways.

Ms. Wylie said that she thought it was important for the staffs to meet before the joint meeting and to check off some of the tests and findings that had been performed in response to some of the things the City had asked for. She believed that some of the issues could be resolved before the meeting.

Ms. Lauritsen said that the research modeling had addressed the macro, but not the micro issues, such as the impacts on the other road users. She thought it was important to provide answers to the micro issues of the impact of BRT on others.

Ms. Hocken stated that concentrating on the micro level would mask some of the benefits of BRT.

Mr. Bennett was convinced that the opportunity for BRT was one that required all pieces to be in place. The commitment in this community as well as most communities in the country was heavily toward the automobile. So, unless LTD had something that was truly competitive, convenient, and futuristic right from the start, it would not sell and was not worth the investment. If BRT had to merge back into traffic, it would defeat the purpose, and that was one fundamental that he could not compromise on. Anything else was inaccurate and unrealistic, and he did not feel that he could be held accountable for something that did not accomplish the goals that were set. He would rather give up the project entirely if exclusive right-of-way were not possible.

Ms. Wylie said that the City had discussed 3<sup>rd</sup> Street as an alternative for dedicated lanes, and unless LTD could find a way to deal with Springfield's traffic issues, there would be a problem.

Mr. Bailey summarized that the Board still was committed to exclusive rights-of-way, but was open to the notion of how they were configured, such as what streets they might operate on, whether it was used a single, shared lane or a double lane, etc. He believed the Board was sticking to the notion that exclusive right-of-way would be required.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that she was committed to exclusive right-of-way over the life of the project.

Mr. Bailey stated that he thought it had been a good discussion, and he believed the Board was in agreement. He invited the Board members to provide additional comments throughout the course of the remainder of the meeting.

## **II. REGULAR MEETING**

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – May 1999**: Mr. Bailey introduced Diann Sheldon as the May 1999 Employee of the Month. Ms. Sheldon was hired on August 19, 1996. In November 1997, she was selected for the position of bus operator instructor, and currently she taught the Personal Injury Prevention segment of new operator training. In 1998, she achieved excellent attendance, two years of safe driving, and two years of correct schedule operation (CSO).

Ms. Sheldon was nominated by several customers for always being friendly, helpful, and very diplomatic in explaining company policy. One customer noted that Ms. Sheldon was a diplomat even with the most difficult customers and was quite an asset to LTD.

Ms. Sheldon's supervisor added that Ms. Sheldon always had a positive attitude and was helpful and happy. He noted that she also was involved with LTD's Y2K project and added that she recently was chosen as a mentor/coach in a mentoring program for new employees.

Mr. Bailey presented Ms. Sheldon with a certificate, a letter of congratulations, and a monetary award. Ms. Sheldon said that being selected as an Employee of the Month was a great honor. She had been with LTD for three years in August, and the time had flown by. She thought that LTD was a wonderful bus system, and she received feedback from the customers that they were happy with the direction of LTD and the work of the Board. She said it was a privilege to work for LTD and that she really enjoyed her job. She thanked the Board for the honor.

### **MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION:**

- a) Mr. Pangborn introduced new Information Services Manager Steve Parrott. He said that Mr. Parrott came to LTD from Ohio, where he managed the Information Services department for a manufacturing firm. Mr. Bailey welcomed Mr. Parrott to LTD.

- b) Mr. Pangborn reminded the Board members that the Budget Committee meetings would be held on April 28 and 29, 1999, beginning at 6:30 p.m.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** a) Grace Retford of Eugene stated that she knew the Board dealt with a lot of money and big issues, but she wanted to express an everyday story that endeared her to LTD. She worked at Goodwill and was proud of the work done there. Without other agencies, Goodwill could not do what she was so proud of. Several months ago, Goodwill contracted with a company to have clients and a skills trainer work in the McKenzie Bridge area. Three clients were traveling to McKenzie Bridge on a daily basis to work. She said that she was very grateful that LTD had such an interest to assist in transporting the three clients, who were doing productive work and gaining independence, because Goodwill otherwise would not be able to send them.

She commended Bus Operator Paul Headley, who drove the morning McKenzie Bridge route. Mr. Headley was very helpful in putting together the transportation for the clients and the trainer, resulting in a new bus stop location, and personalized service even in the most inclement weather. She reiterated her pride in Goodwill, but said that it could not be successful without the assistance of other agencies like LTD.

**MOTION**

**VOTE**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Ms. Hocken moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 21, 1999, is approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the Minutes of the March 15, 1999, special Board meeting, and the Minutes of the March 17, 1999, regular Board meeting.

**FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000 PRICING PLAN AND FIRST READING OF AMENDED FARE ORDINANCE:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that following a public hearing that was held at the March 1999 Board meeting, the Board had directed staff to proceed with amending Ordinance No. 35, which set the fares for service for LTD. Those service changes would go into effect on September 1, 1999, and would be in effect during Fiscal Year 1999-2000.

Ms. Hellekson directed the Board's attention to the first page of the proposed Amended Ordinance No. 35. She stated that there was a typographical error that staff would correct and which would be noted in the Minutes of the Board meeting. Under the Cash Fare section, Evening fare discounts were proposed to be eliminated. The asterisks next to Evenings were to be eliminated, as was the footnote they referred to, "evening fare reduction begins at 7:00 p.m."

**Public Hearing:** Mr. Bailey opened the meeting to public comment. There was no one in the audience who wished to address the Board about the proposed Pricing Plan, and Mr. Bailey closed the public hearing.

**Board Discussion:** Ms. Hocken stated that she had reviewed the written comments that had been received, which mostly were positive.

Mr. Kleger stated that he had attended the Special Transportation Fund (STF) Advisory Committee meeting, in which members supported the adjustment to the RideSource fare. The committee members were concerned about the impact upon those who had very limited means. The reality was that RideSource rides were very expensive to produce, and it was generally accepted that if there was not a better farebox recovery ratio, it would be extremely difficult to continue to provide the service. It still was unknown whether or not the state legislature would provide additional funding for special transportation.

Mr. Kleger said that there were a couple of misunderstandings in the letters that were contained in the Board packet. Some people thought that the RideSource Shopper fare was being changed. The Shopper fare was not being changed at this time. In addition, there were some who thought that the attendant who accompanied the customer would now have to pay the fare. That also was not the case. Staff were working to get the correct information out to the RideSource customers.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kortge moved that Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

**VOTE**

Mr. Bailey then read the Ordinance by title, "Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services."

**ROUTE #26C REVISION:** Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated that in addition to the service changes that the Board had approved in March, staff had identified a route, the #26C Willamette, that primarily served high school students, and while the route as a whole was productive, the midday trips were very unproductive. Staff now were recommending elimination of those midday trips. This remainder of the route would function as a school tripper, serving students in the area.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff had received any feedback from postings and flyers about the elimination of the route. Mr. Vobora responded that the feedback had been minimal, with only two callers, who said they would appear at the meeting to testify, and who apparently had not shown up.

Mr. Vobora added that with regard to the recent Board discussions about the Annual Route Review, there were two low-productivity routes, the #4x and 5x, that were in question. Staff had met with Hyundai and as a result would modify the arrival times of those routes to attempt to boost ridership.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution, "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the staff recommendation to eliminate four trips of route 26C Willamette effective with the fall bid in 1999." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

**VOTE**

**BUS RAPID TRANSIT PILOT CORRIDOR GOALS AND PERFORMANCE**

**OBJECTIVES:** Mr. Viggiano reported that the Goals and Objectives had been developed in response to questions regarding what LTD wanted to achieve with BRT. The Steering Committee had reviewed and recommended approval of the Goals and Objectives.

Mr. Bailey stated that his letter to the editor regarding BRT had been published in the *Register-Guard*, and he received a phone call from a gentlemen from Eugene, who indicated that he was a retired salesman from Gresham. He had been in this community for approximately seven years, and he called to say that he believed LTD was headed in the right direction.

He also asked if LTD was looking into electric buses, and Mr. Bailey had responded that LTD was considering a variety of vehicles, including electric buses.

Ms. Wylie asked if the Board was expected to adopt the Goals and Objectives. She was concerned that the first three goals seemed self-serving. One of the issues with Springfield was the goal of increasing the transit market share, rather than a goal of reducing congestion. She recommended that the Board not take action on the Goals and Objectives until after the joint meeting with the Springfield City Council. Ms. Lauritsen agreed with Ms. Wylie

Mr. Bennett thought that the Board should wait until everyone was ready to vote on the issue.

Ms. Hocken did not see a reason to delay. She stated that the Goals and Objectives were the Board's visions for BRT, and she did not believe there was anything in the Goals and Objectives that should offend any of the partner agencies. However, if all the Board members were not on board with the Goals and Objectives and a vote was postponed, she thought it would be useful to include a copy of the Goals and Objectives in the agenda packet for the joint meeting.

Ms. Hocken further stated that with all jurisdictions represented on the BRT Steering Committee, the Springfield City Council had an opportunity to provide input into the document.

Mr. Bailey said that he had no objections to holding off on approval of the Goals and Objectives, but the document had been produced in response to requests, specifically from Lane County. He believed that the Board was approving the document as a sign of good faith. The Steering Committee came to a decision on the Goals and Objectives as a response to the community. There might be some accidents of words in the document, because LTD obviously was attempting to reduce congestion, but had made the choice to call it improved bus travel times and carrying capacity. He was equally concerned that the Board not approve the goals prior to the joint meeting, because he believed the Council would question where the goals and objectives were.

Ms. Wylie said that she thought the Board could present the Goals and Objectives in draft form to show that LTD wanted feedback from the Council. She asked what the impact would be of waiting one more month to approve the document.

Mr. Kleger stated that perhaps it would be useful to get specific input from the Springfield Council. He thought that the document looked good, but it needed to be made clear that some of the current wording was specifically written to facilitate tracking and measuring performance, as well as to hold the Board accountable. He thought it could be advantageous to wait until after the joint meeting to approve the Goals and Objectives.

Mr. Bailey polled the Board about deferring a decision until the May 1999 meeting. All agreed, and the item was deferred until the May 1999 regular meeting of the Board.

**ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEE BENEFIT AND RETIREMENT CHANGES:** The Board Human Resources Committee recommended changes to the administrative employee benefit and retirement package. Mr. Bennett, who chaired the committee, stated that the committee studied the issue very carefully. As the chair, he did not believe that he had the experience and knowledge of this issue that the other committee members had, and he asked them to comment.

Mr. Kortge thanked Human Resources Manager Dave Dickman for providing him additional material and information. He stated that the summary in the Board packet was very clear. Basically, the changes were to make some trade-offs in benefits in order to improve the pension plan. There were two benefits to improving the pension plan. One was to give the pension plan some convertibility, so that new people could convert into it and people who left the organization could take some of the benefit with them. The other benefit was with the defined benefit account portion. Employees would have direct control and responsibility to manage their investment dollars. Mr. Kortge said that he believed it was a good proposal.

Ms. Wylie reminded the Board that during the last year, the administrative employees had formed an informal employee association rather than joining a formal union. The employee association had worked with employees and management to improve the pension plan by taking reductions in other areas of the benefits package. Staff felt that improvements to the retirement plan were the most important and, therefore, were willing to take cuts in other areas, which Ms. Wylie thought was very admirable. She believed that LTD had a quality administrative staff, and in order to keep those employees, they would want to make sure they had what they needed when they retired. As a Board, it was the members' responsibility to assist staff in this area. She thought that staff had done a good job in preparing the changes, and it was a good proposal.

Mr. Bailey thanked the Human Resources Committee for its work on this issue.

Ms. Hocken stated that she was concerned that the Oregon Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) was given fairly minimal treatment, and the reason for rejection of that plan, as stated in the agenda packet memo, did not seem adequate. She had discussed her concern with Mr. Pangborn, and he had explained that the PERS plan would be more expensive to the District than what was proposed.

Ms. Hocken stated that she also had expressed a concern about feedback from the Amalgamated Transit Union, and she was told that there was none that staff was aware of.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors accepts the recommendation of the Board's Human Resources Committee and approves the benefit reductions and retirement plan improvements as contained in the LTD Employee Association Proposal on Realignment of Benefits, and, further, that the amendments to the Salaried Trust Plan necessary to implement the features dealing with retirement are hereby approved and the President of the Board of Directors, sitting as the President of the Salaried Trust, is authorized to implement the Plan amendments." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**VOTE**

**GENERAL MANAGER SUCCESSION PLAN:** Mr. Bennett reported that the Human Resources Committee also discussed the draft succession plan, which was included in the Board packet. The Committee recommended the plan for full Board approval. The committee discussed the level of community involvement and how to treat that aspect of the succession plan.

Mr. Bennett said that Mr. Bailey needed to be very much involved in the succession plan, since he was involved in appointing the Board members who would serve as the Executive Search Committee.

The other Human Resource Committee members, Mr. Kortge and Ms. Wylie, thought that the plan was well thought out.

Mr. Bailey said that he thought the succession plan was the right approach, particularly in light of the broad scope of involvement LTD had in both Eugene and Springfield. He thought it was important to obtain feedback from the community about its expectations for a new general manager for LTD.

Ms. Hocken asked if the timeline was too ambitious. Mr. Dickman said that it was an ambitious plan, but that LTD already was behind the timetable. He thought that if the plan was adopted and Mr. Bailey appointed the Executive Search Committee, one of the first things the committee should discuss was how the timetable needed to be addressed and how much of the timetable needed to be extended.

Mr. Kleger asked about the absolute end date for Ms. Loobey's employment and if there was a fallback plan if the schedule were not met. Mr. Dickman said that he believed the date was irrevocable, but he also believed that the date largely was irrelevant to the plan. There most likely would be alternatives that existed within the District's current management for interim service.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adopts the proposed General

**VOTE**

Manager Succession Plan.” Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

Mr. Bailey then appointed himself, Ms. Wylie, and Ms. Hocken to the Executive Search Committee. Mr. Bailey would chair the first meeting of that committee.

**ENDORSEMENT OF SPRINGFIELD TGM GRANT APPLICATION:** Transit Planner Micki Kaplan stated that the City of Springfield had planned to apply for a State of Oregon Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant to develop a market-feasible redevelopment plan for a three-block area at and around the proposed Springfield Station. The grant would be managed by City staff, but would be a collaborative effort with LTD and the Springfield Renaissance Development Corporation (SRDC).

Ms. Kaplan introduced Mark Metzger, planner for the City of Springfield. Mr. Metzger said that primarily he worked in long-range planning for the City of Springfield. The City was excited about the plan for the new transit station in Springfield. When construction began, it likely would be the first new construction in downtown Springfield since 1974. City staff was committed to a rebirth of the downtown area. That vision was shared with a number of Springfield City Council members and with the SRDC, which was a relatively new community group.

Mr. Metzger said that he believed that the new Springfield station would be a catalytic kind of development that could spur redevelopment in the downtown core area. He was sold on mixed-use development in the downtown area. The benefit to the District from that type of development would be more people attracted to and working and living in the downtown area. Those people would be the ones who would take advantage of bus rapid transit and transit services in general.

Mr. Metzger said the City would request \$60,000 in state TGM money to help develop a redevelopment plan for the downtown area using the transit station as the central attraction. The City was interested in focusing on a three-block area surrounding the downtown station and developing something that was transit-oriented and pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. Metzger stated that LTD would provide a soft match for the grant, primarily in staff time. TGM staff feedback had been favorable. The application was due prior to the May 1999 LTD Board meeting, and staff were requesting a letter of support to the City for the grant application.

Mr. Kleger stated that the SRDC had been helpful to the Springfield Station Committee. He strongly supported the grant application.

Mr. Bennett commented that one of the most important decisions the City would make would be the selection of a marketing consultant. He asked if Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen were supportive of the grant application. Ms. Wylie stated that the

Springfield Station Committee was very supportive of the grant application. It fit in with everything the steering committee was doing.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that there was a great desire to have a core use of the downtown area that was both historic and picturesque. She supported the grant application.

Mr. Bailey stated that he thought it was a great idea and a wonderful project. When the Board worked on the plan for the Eugene Station, there were many discussions about the issue of creating some space for mixed-use opportunities. It appeared that some of those things would be more realistic with the Springfield Station. However, Mr. Bailey did believe that this item and the Springfield Station needed to be a part of the discussion at the joint meeting with the Springfield City Council on May 1. He suggested that the Board not move on the motion, and in fact, he did not think a motion was needed in order to forward a letter of support to the City on this project. He suggested that the Board wait until after the joint meeting to move on this item.

Mr. Metzger stated that the application for the grant was due on May 17, 1999, and he thought a decision could wait until after the joint meeting.

Mr. Kleger suggested that the Board take the action at this meeting, then wait until after May 1 to write the letter.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Springfield City Council supported the grant application. Mr. Metzger stated that the Council was in support of the project. Many of the Council members were involved with the SRDC, and there was a real interest in redevelopment of the downtown area. Because the Springfield Station would be the centerpiece, he believed it was appropriate to work closely together with LTD.

Ms. Hocken stated that she could not foresee anything in the May 1 discussion with the City Council that would influence the LTD Board not to support the proposed grant application. She believed it was an entirely separate issue from BRT.

Mr. Bailey stated that he would not sign a letter of support of the grant application prior to the May 1 joint meeting. He believed that all the issues were intertwined and that planning for one could not be divorced from planning for the other. He agreed with Ms. Hocken, and said that regardless of the May 1 discussion, he was willing to express to the state that projects like this one were a good thing to do, but he needed to be clear that he would not sign a letter prior to May 1.

**MOTION** Mr. Bennett thought that the Board could go ahead and approve the motion even if the letter was not sent until after the joint meeting. He moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors will submit a letter of support to the City of Springfield for Springfield's TGM grant application to develop a Springfield Station Specific Area Plan." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

**VOTE**

**VIII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING****BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:**

- a) MPC. No meeting had been held this month.
- b) Statewide Livability Forum. The next meeting was scheduled for May 11, 1999.
- c) BRT Steering Committee. There was nothing new to report.
- d) Springfield Station Steering Committee. There was nothing new to report.
- e) North End Scoping Group. Mr. Kortge stated that it was a fascinating committee. The entire north end would change with the new courthouse. There was a movement to make the railroad station publicly owned. The one thing that would affect the LTD Board was the large interest in having an affordable small bus circulator route downtown.

Ms. Hocken stated that she thought it would be important for a downtown circulator to travel past motels that were farther away from the train station. Mr. Kortge stated that the focus was concentrated on the north end of downtown.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Vobora to comment on the shuttle study. Mr. Vobora stated that the downtown shuttle advisory group, made up of stakeholders representing many different interests in downtown, had held its first meeting. The group discussed destinations and user groups. There would be three more advisory group meetings throughout the study. The train station, the university, and the hotels, were considered important links for the shuttle.

Mr. Kortge said that one focus of the Scoping Group discussion was how to have a place in the destination. High-powered streets, such as 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues in Eugene, did not attract business and did not create much of a place to go to. Typically, people used those two streets to travel quickly between east and west Eugene. The group discussed designing something that actually would slow traffic. They used a Danish model in which streets were designed for mixed-use, such as bicycles, cars, and pedestrians.

Ms. Wylie asked if sample shuttle routes had been designed. Mr. Vobora replied that sample designs were in progress. Ms. Wylie suggested that the shuttle bus be yellow and be called "ducks."

- d) Joint Meeting with the Eugene City Council: Mr. Kortge mentioned that both Councilor Nathansan and Councilor Meisner were members of the North End Scoping Group and had commented to him that they had been pleased with the joint meeting with LTD. Mr. Kleger stated that he heard similar feedback on the bus ride downtown after the joint meeting. Mr. Bailey stated that he thought it had been very effective.

- e) Fundraiser at Thurston High School. Ms. Lauritsen brought this subject up, and asked if LTD could sponsor a table at the dinner and silent auction. She and Ms. Wylie had planned to attend. The fundraiser would be held on May 15. Mr. Pangborn stated that staff would poll the other Board members for interest. Ms. Lauritsen said that this fundraiser was for needy students and not part of the victim fund.

Ms. Lauritsen added that when the Board held its annual retreat/work session, she would be interested in discussing the possibility of setting up a separate fund to assist needy students with transportation to and from school. She understood that LTD did have a fund that non-profit organizations were using for needy persons. This would help all of the schools in the area. Very often, fundraiser money was used to purchase bus passes. School counselors were very much in favor of keeping a child in his or her school of choice following such events as a divorce. LTD had nothing formally set up to assist in this matter, and it was her understanding that teachers often were covering some or all of the cost for bus passes out of their own salaries. There was not a mechanism set up for this, but it might be a good community service activity for LTD to be involved in.

**MARCH FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**: Ms. Hellekson stated that LTD was three-quarters of the way through the fiscal year and was on-track with the budget. This was a time of year when attention was focused forward to the next fiscal year's budget. The budget hearings were to begin on April 28. The citizen members of the Budget Committee had met earlier in the month for budget briefings.

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch reported that a list of current legislative issues that could affect LTD were included in the Board packet. She stated that with regard to Senate Bill 1090, which would substitute elected for appointed members for both Tri-Met and LTD, Portland Metro had submitted an amendment requesting that the law apply only to LTD and not to Tri-Met. That bill had been heard at the committee level, and Ms. Lynch expected it to be passed to the floor.

Ms. Hocken asked if Board members could assist Ms. Lynch's lobbying efforts. Ms. Lynch replied that she would contact Board members individually when appropriate.

**COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN**: Mr. Vobora stated that staff wanted direction from the Board in identifying issues and concerns. A new timeline had been developed after a careful review of issues that were brought up previously. The biggest issue was the competing needs within the District.

The second issue was that the Board had not reached consensus on the fundamental issues of service and fare policy. This issue prompted staff to attempt to organize a Board work session in June. Mr. Vobora said that until the Board held that discussion, staff could not move forward very effectively with the CSR. The timeline reflected the June work session as a starting point for the CSR process.

Mr. Vobora said that he was wrong to have pushed for a decision from the Board about productivity versus coverage without having had a public input process following

the Board discussion in June. The timeline would be extended somewhat resulting in implementation in September of 2001.

Ms. Hocken stated that she appreciated the staff response to the Board's concerns. This new timeline would remove much of the Board's frustration with the process.

Mr. Bennett asked if there had been a public process when the initial fare and service policies were set. Mr. Vobora stated that, while there were annual public hearings for fare and service changes, the initial policy was set when the District was formed as a response to a desire for a system that could provide a basic level of mobility in the community. It had grown to become much more than that, but it was one consideration for why LTDs formation in the 1970s.

Mr. Vobora stated that a Nelson Nygaard consultant would attend the work session in June. He had a learning tool for the Board to use to better get at the productivity versus coverage issue, and he would facilitate the discussion. It would be valuable to clarify some of the issues. Staff could prepare some scenarios that would model a higher productivity system and a coverage system.

Ms. Hocken stated that she thought it would be very important to develop some LTD-specific scenarios rather than general ones, so she hoped that staff could provide those for the June work session. Mr. Vobora added that the Nelson Nygaard planning tool actually would use the Eugene/Springfield map.

Mr. Kleger stated that he liked the new schedule. He thought that staff were heading in the right direction.

Mr. Bailey asked if there were any objections to the revised timeline. Mr. Bennett stated his concern about whether the Board could fully discuss the issue in one work session. Mr. Vobora stated that he believed it could be done, particularly with Nelson Nygaard's assistance. Staff were planning to schedule the work session for late June.

**YIELD LAW IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE:** Mr. Vobora stated that he had no further information than what was written in the agenda item summary, but would answer any questions. Mr. Bailey asked how local law enforcement felt about enforcing the new law. Mr. Vobora stated there had been a group that included law enforcement officials from all three jurisdictions that met when the law had first passed. At that time, the feeling was that it was a straight-forward law to be enforced. They would not go out of their way to go find people who might violate the law, but would enforce it upon observations, just as with other violations. Staff had requested a grace period to give the public education campaign an opportunity to work.

**BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE:** In addition to the information contained in the agenda item summary, Mr. Viggiano reported that Mr. Bailey had given a presentation about BRT to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The presentation went well, was well received, and the OTC pledged support for the project.

Mr. Bennett called to the Board's attention the articles that were attached to the agenda. Mr. Kleger added that he and Community Relations Manager Ed Bergeron had a discussion with the Association of Oregon Railway and Transit Advocates (AORTA) about a recent article it had published that indicated that BRT was anti-rail. He believed it was a good discussion. Mr. Bergeron added that he would be making the same presentation to the Portland Railway Passenger's group on May 20. The Portland group was the source of the newsletter for the entire state.

**SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE:** There was nothing to add to the agenda item summary.

**PILOT TRAVEL TRAINING AND TRANSIT ATTENDANT PROGRAM UPDATE:** Mr. Bailey stated that a celebration had been planned to acknowledge the success of seven people from the Alternative Work Concepts who had successfully transitioned from riding the bus with an attendant to independent riding on LTD buses. The celebration would be held on April 27, 1999, at 3:00 p.m., at the Hilyard Community Center, and Mr. Bailey would attend to present certificates to the seven people. Mr. Kleger added that he also would attend. He said that the participants were very excited to have participated in this program.

**EUGENE STATION ANNIVERSARY UPDATE:** Mr. Bailey reminded the Board that a one-year anniversary celebration would be held at the Eugene Station at 1:00 p.m., on May 8, 1999.

**EXECUTIVE TRAINING – PACIFIC PROGRAM AND APTA BOARD TRAINING:** Mr. Pangborn asked Board members to contact the executive secretary if they were interested in attending either of the training opportunities. Mr. Bailey stated that he previously had attended the Pacific Program, and it was an excellent opportunity to expand one's executive skills and knowledge of Oregon.

**MONTHLY STAFF REPORT:** Ms. Wylie asked about the number of accidents and how it compared to last year. Mr. Dickman stated that the number of accidents in February was higher than expected, but was typical for a month. He reminded the Board that accidents were any incident that occurred on or near a bus and actually could involve anything from someone falling on the bus to a multi-vehicular accident. The average was 15 to 18 accidents per month. In December 1998, there had been 7 accidents, and in January 1999, there had been 4 accidents. According to the American Public Transit Association (APTA), LTD had the second lowest accident rate of North American transit properties of LTD's size. Mr. Dickman added that Reliance Underwriters had sent a loss control specialist to LTD. One of the other improvements that would contribute to a lower accident rate in the future was the new operator training program. Ms. Wylie asked staff to please include comparative data with the monthly accident report.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** LANE COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS PRESENTATION

**PREPARED BY:** Ed Bergeron, Community Relations Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** The Lane County Fairgrounds represents the largest destination complex between Portland and San Francisco, hosting more than six hundred events and more than one million visitors each year. To accommodate the increasing demand for such activities in our community, the Fair Board has developed a plan to significantly upgrade and expand the Fairgrounds' facilities.

At the May 19 meeting, Fair Manager Mike Gleason will present the new Fairgrounds facilities plan, and discuss potential implications for LTD's future service plans, including the proposed downtown shuttle service and bus rapid transit.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** CORRESPONDENCE

**PREPARED BY:** Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**ATTACHMENTS:** The attached correspondence is included for the Board's information:

- April 8, 1999, letter from James K. Walsh regarding percentage of fares paid by riders, with response from Board President Kirk Bailey
- April 26, 1999, letter from Board President Kirk Bailey to Mayor Jim Torrey and Eugene City Council to respond to questions not answered at the joint LTD Board/Eugene City Council meeting on April 12
- May 7, 1999, letter from Board President Kirk Bailey to the Grant Review Committee at the Transportation and Growth management Program stating LTD's full support of the City of Springfield's grant application.

At the May 19 meeting, staff will respond to any questions the Board members may have about this correspondence.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION

Saturday, May 1, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 27, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District met in a joint work session with the Springfield City Council on Saturday, May 1, 1999, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:10 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present:

<u>LTD Board of Directors</u>	<u>Springfield City Council</u>
Kirk Bailey, President	Maureen Maine, Mayor
Rob Bennett, Vice President	Anne Ballew
Patricia Hocken	Tammy Fitch
Dave Kleger, Treasurer	Lyle Hatfield
Dean Kortge	Sid Leiken
Virginia Lauritsen	Fred Simmons
Hillary Wylie, Secretary	
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager	Mike Kelly, City Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary	

Absent:

Christine Lundberg

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by LTD Board President Kirk Bailey and Springfield Mayor Maureen Maine. Mr. Bailey welcomed everyone and turned the meeting over to facilitator Margot Helphand.

Ms. Helphand explained that she had met with Mr. Bailey, Mayor Maine, Ms. Loobey, and Mr. Kelly, and they had developed what they hoped was a constructive agenda that would move the Board and Council toward some decisions around the issues before them. Her understanding was that Springfield and LTD were partners for the long term, committed to a good working relationship in terms of transit and the quality of life in the city of Springfield and the community. She asked the group to keep that in mind as they talked about more specific issues, and asked that the day be a dialog about the concerns and issues about bus rapid transit (BRT). Staff had been working on BRT extensively, but this was an opportunity for the policy bodies to talk and understand the key issues.

Ms. Helphand discussed desired outcomes and working agreements for the meeting, and those present reached agreement about them. The working agreements included actions such as listening carefully to each other and asking clarifying questions, focusing on solutions and outcomes, speaking for themselves, participating, and keeping an open attitude.

The desired outcomes were to understand what the key issues were; to understand the options and parameters the groups were working under; to understand the purpose of BRT and what it was trying to accomplish; and to reach clarity about how LTD and Springfield would go forward: what the next steps would be and what LTD and Springfield were in agreement on, so that they could

leave the meeting with a clear plan. Ms. Helphand noted that consensus probably would not be reached that day on every issue, but that there should be clarity about who would do what, and when, regarding the issues on which agreement was reached.

Ms. Helphand then asked Mr. Bailey and Mayor Maine to talk about the shared vision, hopes, and partnership of the two entities.

Mr. Bailey stated that the groups had had opportunities to see maps and talk about specifics and the overall parameters of bus rapid transit in numerous work sessions. Therefore, he and Mayor Maine wanted to begin with a policy statement/global visioning segment. He said he saw BRT as a project for the entire community, which gave all the local jurisdictions—the county, the cities, LTD, and the state—an opportunity to work together on a project that would improve the quality of life in the community. He thought that the quality of life was what was at stake: how the community deals with issues such as congestion, air and noise pollution, the competition for road space, and trying to comply with federal and state rules about transportation and land use planning. He believed that there was a great deal of flexibility in how BRT would be accomplished. He described BRT as an opportunity for partnership, and said the Board was dedicated to continuing to work with the Council on a variety of projects, including the Springfield Station, and committed to finding joint solutions to solve mutual problems. He hoped that after the work session the Council would have a lasting and positive commitment to BRT, a long-term approach to dealing with transportation problems in the community, and an understanding of how there would be give and take on design and implementation.

Mayor Maine thanked LTD for hosting the meeting, and thanked everyone for coming. She explained that the genesis of the meeting was in Washington, D.C., on the most recent United Front trip. At that time, it was clear that the Board and Council had not had a chance to sit down in a work session with everyone, Council and Board members, at the table. She said that transit was very important to the city of Springfield; it was an economic development tool and a way to mitigate congestion and improve the quality of life, both in terms of the ease of using the streets and in air quality, as well as being important for the many reasons that people need public transportation. In dealing with other jurisdictions, she said, the Council had found that it generally did have shared goals, and where the entities differed was in how to get there. She was interested in finding out what flexibility there was, what roles the Council would play, and what authority they had in how to affect the design and implementation of BRT. She thought that would help the Board and Council go forward, which was what everyone wanted to do.

Ms. Helphand directed the discussion to the resolved and unresolved issues outlined in the agenda materials for the meeting, which had been prepared jointly by the Springfield and LTD staffs. She said that this was the Council's and Board's opportunity to comment on them, and reminded the group that they should be working on the key issues at the policy level.

The discussion began with the resolved issues:

1. Public transportation is important to the future of the community. Improvements to the existing transit system will be needed in the next 20 years. No issues raised.
2. BRT in Springfield will not be evaluated in isolation or exclusive of other transportation improvements that are needed for the community. Mr. Simmons said that he thought that BRT and the Springfield Station were inalterably hooked together but Nos. 2 and 4 did not make that connection, so were inconsistent. Mayor Maine thought that they referred to whether the

funding was linked and whether one was required of the other, so that they were independent in terms of projects, although not in terms of planning, which required coordination. No other issues were raised about this statement.

3. The City, LTD, ODOT, and Lane County (for the Glenwood portion) are equal partners in making decisions for the portion of the BRT pilot corridor that travels through Glenwood and Springfield. Ms. Hocken asked for more clarity, since this was a general statement. For instance, did it mean that agencies would have to reach consensus before something happened, or at some level would fall back on the legal responsibilities of the four jurisdictions? She thought it probably was good as a working statement, but did not say what it really meant for the implementation phase. There was agreement that No. 3 referred conceptually to “equal partners,” but that a lot would need to be filled in regarding implementation.
4. Decisions on the BRT project and the Springfield Station siting need to be coordinated, but are not necessarily linked. One project could move forward without the other. Ms. Helphand restated the understanding that the decisions were not necessarily linked. Mr. Hatfield thought that it could be clarified by stating that the planning needed to be coordinated; however, the funding and construction could be separate. Mr. Simmons thought, however, that as part of the overall design of intermodal transit in the community, it needed to be part of an inclusive plan that worked together, which he thought was the goal, so it was just a matter of stating it that way.
5. The following elements of BRT are supported:
  - Wider stop spacing and improved stops and stations
  - Prepaid fares to speed boarding
  - Transit signal priority (assuming adverse traffic impacts are mitigated)
  - Use of low-floor buses to speed boarding
  - Development of Park & Ride lots at strategic locations along the BRT corridor
  - Development of a “rail-like” image for the BRT line

Ms. Ballew asked for clarification about developing a “rail-like” image. She thought that assumed that the community eventually would have light rail, and she wasn’t sure there would ever be the population to do that. Ms. Hocken did not think that statement was there for that reason. She thought it was listed because, from a marketing standpoint, people would think of this as something different and exciting to do only if it looked like a rail vehicle. People seemed to make a distinction in their minds between getting on a bus versus a light rail train. This was an image issue, and whether BRT ever converted to light rail or not, LTD would like an image change to be part of BRT. She said that buses were equated, in a lot of people’s minds, with inefficient service or people who rode buses only because they could not afford cars, etc.—there was some negative perception. However, light rail trains did not have that same kind of perception. This led to other comments and questions from Board members and Councilors about perceptions in relation to vehicles and image, and to questions about whether wider stop spacing would negatively affect the current riders. Mr. Bailey suggested that since No. 5 had generated some issues that would require additional conversation, it be removed from the “resolved issues” list and returned later. Ms. Helphand stated that, in general, there was agreement on most of No. 5, but there were some issues in terms of adverse affects, the effect on the current stops, and what a “rail-like image” meant. Ways of serving the areas between BRT stops were seen as some of the flexibility issues that LTD and Springfield could explore together.

6. Exclusive right-of-way (EROW) for buses should be used if all of the following conditions are met:

- Impacts on traffic congestion are carefully evaluated and mitigated to the satisfaction of the City.
- Safety conditions along the pilot corridor show a net improvement.
- EROW will reduce significantly transit travel time and operating cost and will result in an increase in transit ridership (as projected for the TransPlan planning period.)
- Impacts on parking are carefully considered and mitigated to the satisfaction of the City.
- Impacts on businesses are carefully considered and mitigated to the satisfaction of the City.
- Impacts on nearby residences are carefully considered and mitigated to the satisfaction of the City.
- An environmental assessment for the project yields a finding of “no significant impact.”

Mr. Simmons quoted from page four of a programmatic document from the previous year, regarding street conversion: “Streets are suitable for conversion to exclusive transit uses only if they are not necessary to provide routine access to buildings by general purpose traffic.” He said that when talking about exclusive rights-of-way (EROWs) as part of that process, they needed to reflect on what happened in the Glenwood conversations about the resistance some of the adjacent landowners had about the loss of the left turn or access to their businesses. Mayor Maine asked what “considered and mitigated to the satisfaction of the City” meant, in terms of roles—theoretically it sounded good, but how would it play out in terms of some of the other issues?

Ms. Hocken asked how the safety condition showing a net improvement fit into the EROW. She wondered how safety would be degraded or improved by this particular project. Springfield Traffic Engineer Brian Barnett replied that the concept was that the introduction of signal priority, curbed lanes, exclusive lanes that may be contra-flow to the one-way grid that was presently in place—all of those were uncertainties in terms of how the existing traveling public would see them, including auto drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians, goods-movement vehicles, and how they would all work together. He said that all of those were significant issues in terms of violating the expectancy of the existing users of the facility. Ms. Hocken said it seemed that the standard that BRT would be held to would be a net improvement, rather than what was happening there currently. Mr. Barnett thought that was correct. Ms. Hocken wondered if that was an appropriate goal, or whether the appropriate goal was to not cause any additional degradation. Ms. Helphand asked if the group was in favor of a gain in safety. Mr. Hatfield said he thought the issue was whether it became a presumptive veto if they did not get that gain, and that was an issue that the group needed to discuss. This safety question was added to the list of continuing issues for further discussion.

7. The BRT pilot corridor process should include a high level of meaningful public involvement early and throughout the design process, provided that “conceptual level” fatal flaws are identified before the public is asked to identify a preferred option. No issues were raised about this statement.
8. Where feasible, the BRT project should allow for “non-transit” improvements in traffic flow, traffic safety, and bicycle facilities and pedestrian facilities to be implemented as part of the project (a “win-win” result). Ms. Maine stated that this language was taken directly from the goals and objectives of BRT. There were no issues regarding issue No. 8.
9. Through the initial public review process, the alignment on 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue appears to be the preferred BRT option for the Glenwood segment of the pilot corridor. It can provide improved

bicycle access through Glenwood, eliminates buses making stops in Franklin Boulevard travel lanes, and addresses Glenwood Boulevard business concerns regarding access property acquisition. Additional technical analysis, including the following issues, are still to be resolved and must be resolved in order for the 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue alignment to be fully supported by the City:

- Design of 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue to adequately accommodate local traffic, emergency vehicle access, resident access, bicycles, and pedestrians.
- Acceptable access routes through private property at the east and west ends of the segment.
- Access to and from Franklin Boulevard is designed not to cause substandard traffic congestion or traffic safety problems.
- Other technical issues may be identified.

Ms. Maine asked how final the 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue decision was and what preferred option actually meant, and what would move that to final. Ms. Loobey replied that at one point there would be an alignment for the corridor that still would have to go through major approval processes by the cities, MPC, ODOT, the FTA, etc., before contracts were signed. Ms. Maine said this was a process question raised by others, about how a preferred option would go forward. Ms. Helphand said that the group would get to that process question after moving forward through the bigger issues, including a discussion of how the group would agree to make those decisions.

10. Through the initial public review process, Alternative A-1 (the one-lane guideway through the downtown area, with split bus lanes on Main Street and South "A" Street east of 10<sup>th</sup> Street) is the preferred BRT alignment for Downtown Springfield provided additional technical analysis, including the following conditions, are satisfied:

- The project does not cause projected traffic congestion along this segment to reach substandard levels.
- Impacts on businesses are carefully considered and mitigated to the satisfaction of the City.
- Bicycle access can be accommodated.
- Acceptable traffic safety conditions are maintained.
- Needed parking is not eliminated.
- Other technical issues may be identified.

Mr. Bailey pointed out a language difference: In No. 10, line 3, the words "preferred BRT alignment" were used, and No. 9, line 2, used "preferred BRT option." In his mind, that language was equivalent. Others read it the same way, and it was agreed to use the word "option" in No. 10. Ms. Helphand stated that the real issue for the group to get to was how to go from preferred options to final, through the process they needed to follow.

11. The BRT pilot corridor project will not require additional funding from the City of Springfield. Agreement.
12. The Transit Signal Priority Agreement between the City and LTD will be honored. Agreement.
13. If the pilot project does not meet the original agreed upon performance objectives, the City and LTD will explore options to achieve compliance with the objectives. If these are not successful, other transportation improvement alternatives for the corridor may be considered. If the City determines that it is necessary to remove BRT-related improvements, LTD will bear the cost of doing so. Any decision on removing improvements will be done jointly with the City and (for state highways) with ODOT. The specific obligations and process for determining what

constitutes failure and subsequent response to that failure will be enumerated in a binding intergovernmental agreement between the affected parties prior to final approval of BRT.  
Agreement.

Ms. Helphand said that there was a lot of agreement about the resolved issues, and there were important questions about process.

The discussion about unresolved issues occurred next. Ms. Helphand asked Mayor Maine to provide a synopsis of the key questions for that day's discussions. Ms. Maine said she was not sure about timelines and drop-dead dates, what had to be done by when in order to satisfy LTD's federal funding requirements. She said the City of Springfield was not interested in jeopardizing funding that was to be used for obvious regional benefit, but they needed to be clear about the timing and the specific goals to be achieved. She said the goals were stated in terms of percentages, and she was not sure what those numbers were.

Ms. Ballew stated that BRT was a very good idea, but that, percentage-wise, until LTD reached 50 percent of the traveling public, it really was a minority. She said she would like to see BRT, but in such a way that the driving public was not unduly disadvantaged by it.

Mr. Hatfield said that, looking at Springfield in general, and predominately at the eastern leg of Phase 3, there were four lanes of traffic going east-west through Springfield, with a median in the middle. He considered the demands on those facilities, especially as Springfield grew; the conceptual bicycle plan for bike lanes on Main Street; and BRT, which he thought had to have dedicated lanes if it were going to be effective and gain a speed advantage over the traffic queues. He did not think that BRT was needed for travel times from the Thurston Station to the Eugene Station, because an express bus could get there just as fast on the freeway as a single-occupant vehicle or as a BRT bus making stops along Main Street and Franklin Boulevard. He said the concept was not an issue for him, but how it was carried out, especially in the east Springfield area where there was limited right-of-way to work with. He said he would almost like to see Phase 2 done before going beyond Phase 3, to see what West 11<sup>th</sup> or the western part of BRT worked or what impact that would have on traffic, because in a sense, East Main was West 11<sup>th</sup> with about a third of the traffic: four lanes, center left-turn lanes, businesses along both sides, and curb cuts every 30 feet.

Ms. Maine asked for a definition of the three phases. Ms. Hocken said that the proposed phasing was Phase 2 in West Eugene and Phase 3 in East Springfield, for discussion that day. Mr. Bailey stated that currently LTD had been planning for two phases, which were downtown to downtown and then everything else. However, a proposal of downtown to downtown as Phase 1, then West 11<sup>th</sup> as Phase 2 and east Springfield as Phase 3 also was an option.

Mr. Simmons said he looked at the overall process, from Bertelsen and First to the Thurston Station. The impact on South A and Main Street had been stated well, and he reiterated his original suggestion of having alternative routing along the old Booth Kelly Haul Road, and working a joint-use agreement with Weyerhaeuser. He thought the downtown station in Springfield was important, but his concern was how to serve the growing population in the Jasper/Natron area with BRT-type facilities, and how BRT would be used to encourage both economic development and meet the long-term gains. In looking at the numbers in TransPlan, he said, the bus commuter numbers dropped from 5 percent to 3 percent, so some inroads had to be made into those categories outside

the conventional corridors. That was why he thought they had to look at how BRT was done very strongly.

Mr. Bennett said BRT could be discussed in phases, but the reality was that LTD thought the density would continue to increase in the proposed corridor. He said that as soon as they started considering some corridor with no current density, they would lose the opportunity to be accountable and meet their objectives to get people on the vehicle. BRT may be able to travel from Thurston Station around on the freeway back to downtown Eugene, but there were not any passengers there; there was no one to pick up. Even though the idea was to spread out the stops, there had to be a sequence of stops and a certain timing in order to pick up people.

As an aside, Mr. Bennett said that the vehicle was very important. Those talking about "function over form" were correct, but the image of the system and how the people felt about getting on, the seating arrangement, the lighting, the amenities on the vehicle all made a difference in terms of convenience, efficiency, and the ability to market the system effectively. A different image was very important.

Ms. Fitch said that the idea of planning for the future having a BRT system was very exciting to her. She had some concerns, however, about whether BRT could be done incrementally or with queue jumping, so that maybe there would be a carpool lane at first, and then a dedicated lane with ridership. One of her concerns was the degradation from five stops in a mile to two, in a population that was heavily dependent upon the bus. She wanted to be sure that BRT would not cut out part of the population.

Ms. Wylie addressed the issue of bus design. While in Washington, D.C., LTD representatives spent some time talking with FTA about bus design. Currently, the American bus manufacturers were building buses as they had been doing for a long time. The FTA officials told LTD that buses that were 10,000 pounds lighter could be built, but the American companies would have to retool. Several cities besides LTD had begun looking at BRT, and, in order for them to meet federal Buy-American requirements, the FTA was willing to loan money to bus manufacturers to retool if several cities could create a market. Secondly, she said, she was a Springfield resident and understood the issues around Main Street. She said that LTD certainly had an option of other routes, and Main Street could be taken out of the equation. South A, a three-lane road, could be broadened, and south of Main Street could be developed more. Some of the places being considered for the Springfield Station were on South A, and the design could consider a one-lane, two-way BRT lane, as in Glenwood. She stated that the design had a lot of flexibility, and that could be part of the future discussion.

Mr. Leiken said that one of the questions he had was about the current corridor location. He noted that light rail in other cities was along the freeway, so it seemed to him that BRT, as a less expensive form of light rail, should use a corridor where BRT could use speed, such as Highway 126, instead of eliminating the buses going along the corridor currently. He added that revitalizing downtown Springfield was a long-term project.

Mr. Bennett said that Mr. Leiken had raised technical questions, so wondered if a staff person could respond to those for clarification. Mr. Kleger said he wanted to know what the community would end up with if BRT were not done, given the expected growth.

LTD's BRT Project Engineer Graham Carey responded to the suggestion to use I-105 as a BRT route. He explained that LTD currently used I-105 as a route and it was a good test case. He was not sure how good ridership was, but it carried fewer riders than the direct Main Street line. The Route 11 Thurston service was very successful for LTD. In terms of other cities, he said, there were a variety of operations where light rail transit operated. He was somewhat familiar with Tri-Met, where it operated along the freeway on the east side, and through mixed land uses on the west side. He said that the east side had not been as successful as people had hoped, being about 30 percent short of projections.

Ms. Wylie asked Mr. Carey to explain some of the reasons that the corridor choice went from Thurston to West 11<sup>th</sup>, instead of I-105. Mr. Carey said that one important reason was the success of the current route as it linked the University of Oregon, Sacred Heart Hospital, and a lot of other major passenger points along the route. He said that staff had always thought that, when selecting a pilot corridor, it was important to link the two communities.

Ms. Hocken wanted to check an assumption. She wondered if the Council did not want to make it possible for people who lived in east Springfield to get to downtown Springfield, or for people who lived in Eugene to be able to get to east Springfield easily. She questioned if they really wanted people to get on a bus that took them into downtown Eugene and did not take them into downtown Springfield. She wondered if that was the other side of getting the buses to downtown Eugene really quickly from the Thurston station.

Mr. Simmons thought that travel from Thurston to Sacred Heart was one issue. He said he was involved in the corridor project on the Eugene/Springfield highway from I-5 to the juncture at Highway 20 in Santiam Junction. Enhancements of the use of the corridor would serve a population not just along Main Street, but on the north side, as well. He said that the 11X bus that traveled on Main Street was a case study in how efficient express actions were. He did not think anyone was saying that they wanted to deny access to transportation along that corridor. Whether or not BRT replaced that service and denied frequency access to those riders was another question. He thought that there was a lot of work to do, and that a lot of evaluation of alternatives had been pushed aside for the guideway process. He said he was a strong supporter of BRT, even though he did not have the same route in mind.

Ms. Hocken said she was not sure how the BRT project could assist with the revitalization of Springfield, which was one of the goals that she had heard, if it did not go there.

Mr. Hatfield said that no one was trying to disconnect anyone from anyplace. His experience in Seattle was that routes using Park & Rides to get to work quick and efficiently, from the population center to the employment center, was similar to the Thurston situation. One issue was to look at what volume BRT would carry and how that was best handled, and another was to look at Main Street very carefully, and if 95 percent of the people were going to drive cars somewhere, they needed to be careful what impact was put on those two major corridors. He said Springfield clearly was not opposed to connecting the cities, and that he fully agreed with the goals and targets that LTD was trying to accomplish, but "the devil was in the details."

Ms. Helphand said she was hearing that, in content, people understood and had shared goals of why to proceed with BRT, and their issues were about getting to the specifics of where and how it would be implemented.

Mr. Bailey said he appreciated the comments that had been made about the issues, and he did not hear anything that could not be worked through. He offered an observation about a fundamental concept that he thought needed to be addressed, in terms of how things were done in other communities and how those ought to provide guidance about how things should be done in Eugene/Springfield. He said that those systems did not work. They captured 3 percent of the trips, maximum, in any given community. He stated that LTD was one of the best transit systems in the country—one of the top ten in its peer group nationwide, and in the top twenty of all transit districts in the country—and LTD got 3 percent. He said that was not because LTD was doing anything wrong; it was because the concept itself did not work. He said he believed in transit, but if it was going to get up to 4, 5, or 6 percent of the trips, the community had to think a little outside the box. He wanted everyone to understand that the difference was between how transit was done in Seattle and how it was done in Curitiba, Brazil, where they got more than 50 percent of the population to use a transit vehicle. Thinking outside the box included engaging in the process the Board and Council were in currently, and recognizing that the community needed to take a slight step away from the idea that they could have the existing transportation structure and something that was a little new. He was not saying to do away with the independence of the automobile, but he was concerned that people were worried about threatening the automobile without realizing that something had to give.

Ms. Helphand drew the group's attention back to the unresolved issues listed in the agenda materials.

1. *What is the purpose and need for BRT? Does this justify the expense and possible adverse impacts the project may create?*

Ms. Helphand said she had heard from the group that they basically understood the purpose that LTD was trying to accomplish with BRT, but the concerns were more in the details of the flexibility. She asked if there was more discussion about this before moving on to a discussion of the parameters of implementation. Mr. Kortge said he was not sure it was a matter of flexibility. He thought he heard Mr. Leiken making a suggestion about using I-105 rather than traveling downtown to downtown, which Mr. Kortge described as a fundamental difference in purpose rather than an issue of flexibility. He thought that issue had to be on the table, as a real gap in very fundamental issues. He did not see BRT working on I-105. Mr. Kortge said that flexibility was more along the lines of traveling on Booth Kelly Haul Road or South A., and purpose was whether BRT traveled on I-105 versus going through downtown Springfield. Ms. Wylie talked about the vision of BRT as a transit system moving smoothly, not a bus, but something that was sleek and moved fast, was clean and neat and very accessible, which took people where they were going very easily. It was not an express bus; it was a transit system.

Ms. Helphand asked if others on the Council had the same issue as Mr. Leiken or if the majority could live with the downtown to downtown idea and were more concerned about working through the other issues. She asked if there was a shared vision that BRT essentially was a transit system that took people through the developed areas.

Mr. Hatfield said he had no objection whatsoever to essentially, give or take a few blocks, a Thurston Station to Main Street and out to West 11<sup>th</sup> type of an idea, because there was a purpose for that particular corridor. He thought that, in Thurston especially, that was a highly used bus route because it served two purposes. People drove their cars to the Station, which gave them the flexibility to make trips such as going to day care or the grocery store on the way home, and it gave

them the benefit of going from there to the Eugene Station, so it served the best of both areas. He agreed with Mr. Bailey that it would be wonderful to get to 10 percent, but he thought that how they got there was the issue. He thought that BRT stopping every half-mile or mile through downtown Springfield and the University district, which would mean about 12 or 14 potential stops, would not accomplish that.

Ms. Helphand asked the group to give a one-sentence answer to whether they could live with or support the vision of the BRT transit system that would serve the populated areas, using the general concept of the populated corridor, given that there were a lot issues to work out.

Mr. Kleger said that, provided it could be done in a way that allows comparable time to automobile commute times, he supported the existing proposals.

Mr. Simmons said that in Curitiba, the bus line had been built and then the city had been built around it, and he thought that there was a way to do that here. He said that I-105, west of I-5, Eugene/Springfield Highway east was a transportation corridor that had value to move people from the north side to downtown that BRT could not touch, and it provided an alternate route, so it was not bad to say I-105. He said there was a lot of support for the concept, and there were some specific objections about the loss of things.

Ms. Fitch said that in general she supported the concept, and thought that there were many issues to work through.

Ms. Wylie said that she was very supportive of the BRT transit system.

Mr. Kelly said that he supported the concept, that someday this would make a good system, but that several pilot projects and several phasings needed to take place before the concept was implemented.

Mayor Maine said that what she thought was missing was a multi-modal corridor study, or at least that information was missing to the Council. She said that the concept of providing better transit in Springfield was very important, but they had not evaluated what other alternatives could meet the goals and objectives stated in the BRT concept. She referred to the FTA's proposal that "the need to undertake an analysis of alternatives is not driven by a predisposed modal solution such as BRT, but rather is predicated on the identification of transportation needs for a given corridor or desired area." She thought that was why the I-105 idea came up, in terms of how this particular option could work and whether there were other options. She was in support of the concept, but there were other alternatives that had not been explored, at least by the Council.

Mr. Bailey supported the BRT system as envisioned.

Ms. Loobey thought that part of the conversation mixed up what the Board and Council were talking about. She said that what happened today would not be what would happen in 15 years. LTD was looking toward the future, with greater density and land use issues, in the TransPlan process. What LTD was trying to do today was prepare for that future. The community had had years of building up the system around the automobile and had not built a system at all around alternative transportation. BRT was only a little attempt to move toward that. She said she kept hearing the statistics about how badly LTD did in trip-making, but in the peak hour, there were corridors where LTD already was carrying 15 percent of the trips. She said that 60 percent of LTD's riders already

were employed or were going to school so they could become employed. She said that all of the questions had answers, and she hoped that LTD would have an opportunity to provide those answers, so they could start painting a fuller picture about the value of LTD to the community.

Mr. Bennett said that he was for the corridor. He thought it was good to go around the table as they were doing, but he thought the Board and Council were going to have to spend some more time on this discussion, because he did not want to leave without knowing pretty clearly where Springfield stood.

Mr. Hatfield said he agreed that BRT would be successful if it could compete with automobile travel time. He was happy that LTD carried 15 percent along some corridors. When talking about reaching 10 percent or 50 percent, how to get there was a very important question. He agreed with Mayor Maine that the Main Street corridor necessarily would shift a lot of people from their current traffic habits. He did not think that this corridor would get ridership to 5 percent or 10 percent. Also, a dedicated, limited right-of-way on Main Street would impair automobile traffic, and there would be more when Jasper Road opened and there was more growth in southeast Springfield. He thought that 95 percent of those people would be traveling by automobile and would need to be accommodated somehow. He said he was very supportive of BRT but had some concerns about how it would be implemented; his concerns were in the details, not in the concept.

Ms. Lauritsen thought that the accomplishment of the morning was that everyone was speaking about what was on his or her mind. She said that she supported the transit concept. The community lay east-west; that was where the people were, and one way or another the system would be east-west. She said it did not sound very likely that it would be right down West 11<sup>th</sup> or Main Street, but it would be east and west.

Ms. Hocken said that she was very supportive of the corridor as it had been proposed. She did not want to offend the people there, but felt that she needed to say that LTD and Springfield had a partnership, with different roles. She said they did not know exactly what all those roles were, but at a very basic level, LTD was the bus company and Springfield was the City. At some level, she said, the bus company should decide what would work for the bus company, and the City needed to decide how that affected Springfield and the responsibilities the City had. She said that LTD did not have the responsibility for the cars; it had the responsibility for the buses. In terms of flexibility, there were places along the continuum where accommodations could be made.

Ms. Helphand paraphrased Ms. Hocken's comments by saying that LTD and Springfield had core missions and some overlapping concerns in terms of their missions, and that was why they were meeting that day, and the issues for Ms. Hocken were figuring out where those overlapped and how they worked together.

Mr. Leiken said that he supported the concept of BRT, and was lukewarm toward the corridor. He thought that when gas hit \$2.50 per gallon, LTD would wonder what hit them, but he was only one vote on the Council. Ms. Wylie clarified that LTD was paying less than fifty cents a gallon for diesel.

Mr. Kortge said that he supported BRT.

Ms. Ballew said that she had difficulty with the corridor and giving 20 percent to 25 percent of the right-of-way to less than 10 percent of the users at the expense of 90 percent. Ms. Hocken asked to clarify that it was a right-of-way issue for Ms. Ballew, rather than where the corridor was located,

and wondered if that problem would go away if LTD bought additional right-of-way. Ms. Ballew replied that it also might go away if the corridor moved off Main Street. The issue was one of capacity. Mr. Bennett stated that BRT would add capacity.

At this point, the group took a ten-minute break. Mr. Hatfield left the meeting following the break.

After returning from the break, Ms. Helphand summarized the discussion before the break. She heard issues around the need for the Thurston to downtown corridor, and she stated that one thing did not preclude the other. As a group, the Board and Council could look at a broad range of solutions, and may have other things they wanted to have work done on in addition to the concept they had just talked about (the east-west BRT corridor), for which, in general, there was a shared vision.

She directed the discussion to the goals and timelines, to learn where the flexibilities might be.

Mr. Bennett was concerned that the group had not finished the last discussion. He did not want to get stuck on the fundamentals of the technical issues, just because the policy boards did not know enough about those. When Ms. Maine talked about needing a multi-modal corridor study, he thought that LTD already had done the basic work. When others talked about different routes than LTD had selected, he said, he had picked that route because the technical group from Eugene-Springfield had done the work and were on board with that. He said that if LTD were going to reach the next level of ridership, this was the route that would do that. He wanted to know if people were willing to give up something in order to give the transit system a chance to compete. Fundamentally, that was what LTD was asking for: a major change in the way public transportation competed. Although on some routes LTD carried more, generally it carried 2 percent to 3 percent of the trips. He wondered if that was the future in the Council's minds, because he did not believe that LTD would get any further by doing things incrementally. He thought he could see what was coming for this community by looking at what happened in other cities, such as Portland and Seattle. In order to buy into BRT, they had to believe that the crunch was coming, and if they did not want to have the problems of those other cities, they should be willing to give up something to get there. He stated that LTD was heavily subsidized, and the Board was trying to improve its business position, so that was why they talked about market share and attracting a different kind of clientele. He said it was not reasonable to ask LTD to be accountable in terms of the money it was spending unless they gave the District a reasonable chance to compete. He hoped they could agree on what route would give LTD the best cost-benefit chance to win. He said that the District thought that it was South A and the proposed routing. He wondered if staff could give some perspective of why the District thought its technical information was right.

LTD Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano referred to a large map showing the system as envisioned in 20 or 30 years. The map showed that BRT was not intended to be express routes overlaid on the system; rather, BRT was intended to be the LTD system, fully integrated into a system like a backbone that everything else (Park & Ride facilities, connector buses in neighborhoods, etc.) supported. Essentially, BRT would not work if it were just adding service to the existing system, because it would be tremendously expensive to do that. If LTD were to operate on I-105, it would still have to continue operating buses on Main Street, so essentially that would double the cost of providing some of the east-west connections. Instead, if LTD could replace the Thurston route and the buses out West 11<sup>th</sup> with the BRT service, LTD could reduce its costs, because buses operating more quickly would cost less to operate than the current service. Not only

was BRT intended to achieve the ridership goals, it also was an important component in reducing operating costs.

Mr. Viggiano said that the origins and destinations where people travel in the community were very much dispersed. He used a map to show boardings along Main Street, and explained that there was more ridership along the center part of Main Street than in the Thurston neighborhood. None of those people would be able to take advantage of an express bus on I-105. He reiterated that BRT was intended to be the main system, so it needed to serve the heart of that corridor, which currently was Main Street.

Mayor Maine asked for clarification that the BRT line would replace existing service. Mr. Viggiano said that was correct. In response to earlier questions about what would happen if stops were spaced farther apart, he said that LTD would try to reduce the impact by choosing the stops that currently were the busiest. It also was possible that the people between the stops would have alternate service available to them that would operate near Main Street on neighborhood routes, and then make connections to BRT buses. In terms of flexibility, he said, planning work on the east portion had not started. There had been assumptions that the only way BRT would work was if it ran down the center of Main Street, but that was unknown until further study was done. For example, during the Glenwood neighborhood process, it was determined that it made the most sense to travel off Franklin Boulevard. He did not think that assumptions could be made about exactly where BRT would operate in that east section.

Mr. Simmons said that he could appreciate that view in the sense that LTD had been developing along that part of the corridor for years. He thought that the origin and destination data currently being worked on was important in terms of where people came from who used the Thurston Station. However, he thought that to decrease the frequency of service along Main Street, considering that a good many of those people were transit dependent, would result in unintended consequences. He thought that the goal around the table was consistent, but that there were alternatives outlined in the original solicitation document that required a more inclusive look. He said there was a lot more to it in the human sense of the passengers who were the constituents of both groups. He wanted LTD to be open to look at those alternatives as part of a grander transportation scheme for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century for Eugene and Springfield.

Ms. Helphand asked to check out the statement that Main Street was the only corridor under consideration. Mr. Bailey said it was not. LTD was not looking simply at the dimensions of that street. He hoped that the experience of the Glenwood process would show that LTD was not committed to any particular street, but was committed to a corridor, a swath of area, that roughly represented that line through the community, whether it was 200 yards north or south. He thought LTD was flexible to exploring the options; however, if it became a half-mile or mile away, then there were problems, and that did become a fundamental shift in the type of corridor being considered. He noted that the map showed other routes to address the other areas in the community.

Mr. Bailey stated that during the early conceptual discussions with the cities and county, a number of different routes were discussed, including which should be first. At that time, every Springfield and Eugene representative said that the east-west swath should be first.

Mr. Kleger asked Mr. Simmons to clarify whether he had been talking about reduced frequency of service or of stops. Mr. Simmons said he was talking about reduced accessibility to the stops. Mr. Kleger wanted to make clear that the Board had never talked about running less-frequent buses,

and that every time they talked about spreading the stops out, they also talked about neighborhood service, although not necessarily on the same street, to close those gaps, to make it practical for people to get to the BRT stops.

Ms. Maine said that planning for the future was important, but she was not sure that the 20-year solution needed to be implemented tomorrow. She was troubled by the statement that phasing would not work. She said that one of the things that Springfield was very open to was an implementation that would lead to BRT, but did not mean full BRT right away. She said the Council would like to encourage LTD to take some different way to phase the corridor. One thing that troubled her about the full BRT concept was that it was a full 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week proposition with regard to exclusive right-of-way, and yet the goal was to increase peak-hour, peak-direction market share along the corridor by at least 40 percent within five years. Therefore, LTD was talking about a measurable, favorable impact in a short number of hours in a day, with a system affecting everybody 24 hours a day. That was why she wanted to look at phased implementation until the densities supported more.

Mr. Bennett asked where Ms. Maine stood regarding the route. Ms. Maine said she knew it was one route of many. She stated that she supported express service, because when you don't have critical mass, you get critical mass in other ways. She said that her neighborhood was not critical mass for ridership, but a Park & Ride was. She liked to gather critical mass, find out where they were going, and get them there. What she did not understand about the Main Street corridor was that it was the highest-riden route, but that did not tell her anything about potential. She said she would support it if there were the potential for another 200 percent increase to be obtained there.

Mr. Viggiano said that when the corridor was selected, LTD looked at population and employment along the optional corridors. This corridor had the highest population and employment. Mr. Bennett said that the question was whether LTD could attract people who did not currently ride, and what Springfield's sense of the growth of that area was. Mr. Bailey thought that LTD should provide those kinds of statistics, but for the sake of some sense of agreement at the end of the day, he would observe that they were talking about a hypothetical section of the corridor that was years away. He asked to discuss the timelines. What the group was discussing in terms of phasing was the downtown to downtown section, involving several hundred yards from the river into the downtown part of Springfield. He said that the process had not even gotten to the design segment that would run from downtown Springfield out to Thurston, so it was unknown what that would look like.

Mr. Bennett thought that this discussion was very important. He said that the issue about phasing involved needing to know a high probability about where the corridor was going. The question was whether to obtain the right-of-way in the beginning and phase in the use of it, or not getting the right-of-way in the beginning and hoping to obtain it later, when the money might not be available and density increased and caused the land to be more expensive, more intensively developed, and much harder to acquire. He asked what Springfield thought about this.

Ms. Helphand said she thought Mr. Bennett was asking where people stood on this issue at the vision level, and she thought they needed an answer to the givens and options within the goals and timelines.

Ms. Wylie said she had talked with Ms. Maine earlier and was hearing that day, also, that her questions were about how to delay the impact on downtown Springfield versus the user and

ridership. Ms. Wylie asked what impact it would have on ongoing traffic if LTD could design the downtown to downtown section so it did not impact Main Street through the downtown area. Ms. Maine said that this was the data that Springfield had always been asking for.

Ms. Helphand suggested looking at timelines, parameters, and some other specifics, because there still seemed to be some guessing around these issues that made people uncomfortable.

Ms. Hocken stated that there were many different timelines. Obtaining federal money was one. There was a lot of competition at the federal level for the money that LTD hoped to use to build the corridor, so there was a real impetus for LTD to get to the stage where it knew what the design would be and to show that it could be implemented, in order to receive the first level of funding and go on to receive other levels of money. She stated that the administration of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was very impressed with LTD's project at that point because it was a project that was very different than anything that had been done in a medium-sized city that would not be able to afford light rail for another 50 or 75 years down the road. She stated that the federal funding was critical, and one of the things that made the federal agency interested in LTD was the exclusive rights-of-way. Another timeline was that the longer the wait, the harder it would be to acquire exclusive rights-of-way. In talking about east Main, there currently were large undeveloped stretches, so it could be done now with less disruption to the community.

Mr. Bailey pointed out a timeline on page 2 of Attachment C that showed the decision schedule for phase 1, the downtown to downtown segment. He said he was willing to consider what happened with the other two ends of the pilot corridor. The timeline indicated final jurisdictional approvals in January to March of 2000. Ms. Fitch asked if this was geared toward requesting additional federal funding in 2000. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff believed that LTD could build phase 1 with the money that already had been earmarked for the project; however, the project was still being developed, so it was still a little early to say. LTD still had to apply for the earmarked money—the \$8.8 million, which, with a match, totaled \$11 million—but that was basically a formality. For phase 1, LTD would not necessarily have to go back to request additional money. Staff expected that the District would need to request the funding for phase 2 during the next United Front trip, in early 2000. According to the current schedule, phase 2 would lag about a year behind phase 1.

Ms. Helphand wanted to be sure that people understood what the fixed rules of the game were, and what aspects were open to discussion. She returned to Mr. Bennett's point, which was, in general, what the big picture looked like. She hoped that the participants could work out, conceptually, the phasing and location of the corridor, so that they were comfortable with the concept. She thought that the group had done that earlier, but it sounded as if some were not quite there, so she wanted to step back to check on that. It was too important of a concept to pretend to be in agreement.

Ms. Hocken asked to say something else about the timeline. She explained that LTD's plan as she understood it was to subject phase 1 to all the decision steps (the environmental assessment, preliminary endorsement, and final approval), while continuing with design of the other four segments of the pilot corridor. As part of that, LTD would be developing more and more information on what the new Springfield section would look like. When the Council would be asked to give final approval of phase 1, they also would have some idea of what the east Springfield segment might look like.

Ms. Helphand had heard people say that there was a lot to be gained as partners by proceeding with BRT, but it would take some "give." She said that it was defining that "give" that the participants were not yet clear about.

Mr. Kelly commented in response to Mr. Bennett's earlier statements about giving the concept a chance. He thought that said it well, and the idea of making the vehicles look different and have different schedules to attract people representative of all the populations in Eugene/Springfield and increasing ridership made sense. He thought that the issue for the policy makers in Springfield was how to accommodate that; how to take a chance and let that happen without alienating the other 97 percent of the driving public, the people who were not taking the BRT vehicle. Ms. Hocken had spoken to the issue of authority or different roles, and he said that what Springfield did not want to have happen was that in several years LTD would be holding celebration parties because ridership went from 3 percent to 4.5 percent, but City Hall would be hearing from angry motorists, property owners, and others who were not happy with that 1.5 percent increase in ridership. He wondered how to accommodate the desire, with Springfield having some ability to alter some things so that ridership could be increased within the wishes of the majority of citizens who were using the roadway, so that things were not done to alienate other motoring groups or people to be unhappy with the total transportation system. Ms. Helphand asked what each person needed in order to feel successful in this effort.

Mr. Bennett replied that eventually, assuming LTD could get Springfield the information it needed, the Council would have to make a decision whether to take the risk with LTD, based on the belief that no community would be successful in the long run unless it had a balanced transportation system of which the public transportation portion was competitive. He said that if the Council did not believe that there would ever be a need for that, the community would not get there.

Mr. Kelly's response to Mr. Bennett's comments was that he hoped it did not come to "either/or." He hoped it could come to a point where LTD could implement phases, or what Springfield called "BRT Lite," or some aspects of BRT to help grow the concept compatible with the wishes of all the motoring public.

Mr. Bennett said that the reality of that was that BRT would have no chance to succeed without an exclusive lane. Whether that lane was needed 24 hours a day, or whether it was phased in, he said he was trying to absorb those possibilities. But eventually, he said, it would not work; it would not get one other person out of the car. He said he hoped that no one thought LTD thought it would replace the cars; LTD was just trying to get in the game, with a reasonable chance, with a new marketing concept, over time, to actually increase ridership significantly to reach the next level. LTD did not think that this would happen overnight, either, but if they started ten years in the future, Eugene/Springfield would be like every other community, with gridlock, and then it would be much more expensive to try to do anything. He hoped that the group could come to some agreement on the basic fundamentals of what it would take to improve transit's competitive position. He said he was absolutely convinced that, as an example, queue jumping alone would not work; it would be very helpful and it would be better to have it than not, but it would not get LTD where it needed to be.

Ms. Maine said she had heard Mr. Bennett say that doing certain components one at a time, incremental implementation, probably would not work, but it was the Council's desire to consider incremental implementation leading to a full BRT line.

Ms. Helphand asked LTD to summarize the parameters that LTD thought were core to success. Mr. Kortge said that, in addition to exclusive lanes, LTD needed the game plan of where that line would be. He said LTD had to start obtaining that property and locking that in, whether it was built out today or in ten years. LTD needed a long-term plan of where the corridor would be located. Ms. Hocken added that a "can do" attitude also was needed, an attitude that said that the City would help LTD identify where the problems were and find solutions to those problems. That is, rather than pointing out to LTD all the things that would not work, Springfield would be a real partner and help LTD find ways to make it work.

Mr. Simmons said there was a piece of real estate that ran from 28<sup>th</sup> to 48<sup>th</sup> Street that was purchased with road tax dollars for future transportation uses. He said that there was a right-of-way available there, and that with the proper encouragement the Council would be willing to participate with LTD in offering that as a positive contribution. He said that he would be willing. He said that in looking at the '98 document, the other issues about traffic management improvement, faster boarding, the integration of traffic, incremental development, etc., all were bullets of equal weight. They did not seem to be stacked up in an exclusive basis, although the FTA people seemed to have given credence to the exclusive lane process. He said there were other factors there that could be done to make this system function quicker, more competitive, and better in the process, and those had to be part of the discussion. He said that they could not just focus on exclusive guideways or exclusive lanes; there was more to it than that, because if you built phase 1 from Eugene Station to Springfield Station, you would be all dressed up with nowhere to go.

Ms. Hocken said she thought so much time was being spent on exclusive right-of-way because that was really the nut of the discussion. She thought that the Council was fairly supportive of most of the other elements of BRT, but exclusive right-of-way would have the most impact on the Councilors' constituents who drove their cars.

Ms. Simmons suggested exclusive right-of-way along the Booth Kelly Haul Road as a supportive option from Springfield.

Ms. Helphand then asked what Springfield would need three years out to feel that BRT was worth it. She asked for the Council's drop-dead parameters.

Ms. Fitch said that one of the problems she had on the BRT Steering Committee was that Springfield was being asked to give up exclusive right-of-way at the beginning of the project, before there were any indicators that there was necessity for it. Just talking about the Springfield Station and the alignment that occurred along South A, it meant giving up one of the three lanes, or 33 percent of the capacity, immediately for the project. She said that this was of concern, because that meant giving up capacity for 3 or 4 percent of the ridership, but losing 33 percent of the capacity for the rest of the people, and that would be permanent. Ideas about carpooling in that lane had been rejected. In essence, she was asking LTD to not take the space until it was needed. Ms. Maine added to not go from zero to fifty; incrementally there were things that could be done in the meantime that could lead from queue jumping to an HOV lane, then to exclusive; not just from nothing to exclusive.

Mr. Kleger asked if she was saying that she was willing to designate the area or the location, but did not want it committed immediately and totally. Ms. Maine said that was correct.

Mr. Kleger said that, speaking for himself, he would take anything to get the foot in the door, as long as he had an assurance that he would get the rest in the future. Getting there was one of the things that needed to be worked out, and he said they needed to work out a staging plan to do that before he agreed to that kind of transitional process. Ms. Wylie said she felt the same way about this issue. Mr. Kleger stated that Springfield would lose to LTD two lanes of this corridor sooner or later, no matter what anyone did. He explained that six years ago, LTD was running two buses an hour out to Thurston, but now was running six because of ridership increases. In six years, the service on that route had tripled because of demand. He said he had asked Mr. Grimaldi to let him know how many new dwellings would be built along that corridor during the next five years. Mr. Kleger thought it would be a rather large amount and, in addition to what the community already had, would cause additional problems in the future. He commented on the increased number of cars stopped behind buses in every part of the urban area. In Danebo, there would be 3,000 new dwelling units in 18 months, and the trail behind buses was at least one block long and up to three blocks long. He was saying that the community already was reaching critical mass, or choke point, for buses in the stream of traffic that were stopping at 10-minute frequencies. When ridership forced additional buses, they would be running every five minutes, and those queues of cars behind the buses would not clear. In essence, sooner or later, LTD would own the curb lane in each direction, which he thought was bad traffic planning and would cause additional accidents. He said that the communities either would address this issue now, or would address it in much worse conditions in the future. LTD would "own" those two lanes, and everyone would be moving slower, which would mean much worse complaints from the driving public.

Ms. Fitch agreed that the communities were getting to that point of congestion. Her question was whether the solution was in taking a lane of traffic that currently existed out of the inventory for vehicles, or creating something new to move the buses along. Mr. Kleger said that in his view, if there were any way to build another lane, it should be done. Ms. Wylie agreed.

Mr. Bennett said that the Board was under the impression that there was no way to create another lane along this route. Mr. Simmons had brought up the issue of land east of 28<sup>th</sup> that Mr. Bennett did not know about, but his understanding was that west of that, there was not a big enough right-of-way to create another lane without putting a bunch of people out of business. Mr. Simmons said that this was wrong—the south side, east of 5<sup>th</sup> Street, to the Booth Kelly site was in public ownership, and the right-of-way along the south side of the railroad tracks. Mr. Bennett said, however, that he was talking about Main Street; LTD's proposed corridor, although he understood that the discussion might broaden.

Ms. Hocken wondered if anyone had looked at that stretch and determined that there was no way anyone could buy more right-of-way so that nothing would have to be taken from the lanes of traffic. She asked whether, if there were a way to buy the right-of-way, the problem would go away for Springfield. Ms. Wylie added that the guideway only needed 11 feet.

Mr. Barnett said that in talking about Main Street east of where the couplets came together, the right-of-way was in the order of 120 feet in width, with five travel lanes and sidewalks. There potentially would be additional width to add more lanes there. On the South A section, he did not have a number, but the right-of-way was not much larger than what presently was built out, so more right-of-way there probably would have to be purchased. Some of the businesses in some areas would be impacted, but there were other areas along the South A corridor where LTD could buy right-of-way and not have a tremendous impact on people.

Ms. Maine asked if the guideway actually would not be exclusive all the way; for instance, on the bridge. Ms. Hocken said that the long-term plan was to build another bridge, and that this might be the only place along that corridor where exclusive rights-of-way were not envisioned.

Mr. Bailey wanted to check an assumption that he may have created a problem by using the term "3 percent of trips." Now it seemed that people were talking about LTD being responsible for 3 percent of the traveling public (3 out of every 100), but that was not who LTD served. There were statistics that showed that within the last month, probably half of the population had taken the bus within the past year. He wanted to be sure that people did not think LTD was planning for three people out of every 100, and the cities and county were planning for 97. That assumption was wrong and was affecting the discussion. He thought the issue was how to get to the capacity issue for the number of people who moved through a corridor using all sorts of different options. He thought that LTD was flexible in how the alignments were done so that they were not making it harder for people in cars to get by, and did not want them to make it harder for buses to get by, so that people would have a choice.

Ms. Wylie clarified that in a year, up to 65 percent of the population would use the bus at least once. LTD provided nearly 6 million rides a year. It was not 3 percent of the population.

Ms. Helphand asked the group to look at page 1 of Attachment A. She thought there was agreement about many issues, but it was the adverse impact, specifically on the right-of-way, that was troublesome to Springfield. She wanted to use the last half-hour to try to reach agreement that if certain issues could be met, the policymakers would be ready to move ahead with allowing the staff to take BRT to the next level.

Ms. Maine said that they had this agreement in 1997, that if all the information came forward, Springfield was more than willing to look at the alternatives. That was the piece that had been missing. She said that if that was what was coming to the Council in June, then she thought they should get that in June, with the acknowledgement and agreement that Springfield was willing to go forward and find a way to make this work. She said the Council continued to be asked for its support, and it gave its support always conditioned on the absence of the technical data.

In response to a question from Ms. Helphand about what information Springfield would need in order to move forward, Ms. Maine said that Springfield had made the request and Ms. Fitch had made the request at the appropriate places, but they just hadn't received it yet. If that information was going to be available on June 7, she suggested that the Council and Board meet again after that time. Ms. Helphand said that the Council and Board almost needed to step back as a group and understand the problem they were trying to work through together. With a better understanding of where each group was coming from and the data they needed, they might be able to work through the issues.

Ms. Maine said she was not positive about all the requests that had been made, but one request the Council had made consistently was that other alternatives be considered in order to be supportive of BRT, so they could compare them rather than just evaluating one. Their request was to not just prove BRT in some modeling, but compare it with other alternatives.

Mr. Bailey asked Ms. Maine to clarify what she meant by alternatives: light rail, BRT, bus only, no option, etc., or also alternatives within a loose definition of BRT, such as left side of the street versus right. She said both, because she thought that was what the public questioned, as well.

In trying to understand what Springfield needed, Mr. Bailey asked if LTD needed to provide, in the course of the technical advisory review and the steering committee's work, some commentary on why light rail would not work, and/or why the existing bus system did not quite meet the goals, etc. Ms. Maine said that was not what she was asking for. Ms. Hocken thought that Ms. Maine was asking for a much more detailed study than LTD might have done. She thought the group had agreed that the BRT project was the project that LTD should be doing, but it seemed that they were going back to that issue again.

Ms. Helphand said that at the beginning of the meeting the group had started with resolved issues and agreed that they were not looking at light rail or doing nothing, that they considered BRT and were looking at the alternatives within BRT that could make it happen.

Mr. Simmons referred again to the demonstration grant document from last year. He said it should have been a part of this discussion early on, and the need for analysis in the document said, "If stakeholders in the metropolitan planning process, including local planners, decision makers, interest groups, and the general public, believe that bus rapid transit might help to address the problems and needs in a corridor, then it should be included as an alternative to be evaluated within a multi-modal corridor analysis." He said that this did not happen during the Glenwood segment discussions. They talked about the preferred alternative and staff proposals, but the other alternatives, including bus queuing, etc., needed to be part of that whole process.

Mr. Bennett said that queue jumping was not a major, fundamental answer for getting more people on a bus. Ms. Maine said it might be a way to get incremental support for more than just potential right-of-way.

Mr. Bennett said he was under the impression that the technical group had been meeting on a regular basis and that the technical information was available to answer the questions that each policy making body had. In the end, he said, there would be questions that would not be answered by all the studies, and one question to ask when asking for more studies was whether a person would never be able to get on board philosophically, or whether those studies really would make a difference. Ms. Maine said that they would make a difference to the Council, and she assured him that the Council discussion had always been about trying to find ways to make it work.

Mr. Bennett said that this was an example of a situation where people might just have to finally believe in something. LTD was saying to the Council that this was how it wanted to be accountable, and there was no data that would tell the Council that until it actually had a chance to work. Ms. Maine said, however, that the Council needed reasonable assurance from a broader perspective than just a transit rider's perspective.

Mr. Bennett said that LTD had a package of fundamentals (lighting, bus appearance, prepaid fares, etc.) that it believed to be a product development marketing approach to public transit that LTD thought would make a very significant difference over time.

Ms. Hocken said that the Board accepted the fact that the City of Springfield, and Mayor Maine in particular, felt that they needed more information. She said she would really like a list for staff of the alternatives that Springfield thought LTD should have considered or should consider now, whether in general terms or not. The community had been working on TransPlan for five or six years, and it was at some level a consideration of many alternatives for transportation for the entire area. She

was not sure what else Springfield needed to help them make a decision, so that was why she asked for a list. Ms. Fitch said that that list had been prepared and presented.

Mr. Kelly said he would provide the list of the kinds of information that the Council wanted, in terms of broad alternatives, as well as more information on the technical alternatives. Mr. Simmons said he would like to have an opportunity for the Council to review that list.

Ms. Helphand said it might feel that the group was stepping back in some ways, but she thought that if they got the list, they could quickly get right back to where they were. She thought the two groups needed a little more dialog with each other in order to feel comfortable moving forward.

Ms. Hocken said that LTD had gone through a public process in the downtown Springfield corridor, on potential alignments, and she did not know how much the Council itself had participated in that. Ms. Fitch replied that the Council had participated in all three meetings. Ms. Hocken said that the public had told LTD one thing about alternatives, and she wondered if the Council had something totally different to tell LTD about corridor alignment alternatives, as a Council. She wanted to receive some feedback from the Council as a whole if they had a different option for that corridor.

Mr. Simmons said that it went back to what he said about solicitation, that during those discussions, the predicate for response was based on the narrow vision of the plan rather than the alternatives. He disagreed with Ms. Hocken's statement that the Council was a stakeholder for the District. He said that the Council was a partner in this process, and being a stakeholder in the community, it might be looking at BRT inconsistent with the viewpoint of the District, but not inconsistent with the goal. He thought they could get there, but there was a necessary process to get the information in, digest it, suggest some alternatives, and work within the scope of what BRT in the global sense was all about.

Ms. Helphand wanted to be clear about what the Council needed for the next steps: they needed a big picture of what led this process to BRT; they would receive information on technical alternatives. When asked to clarify what that meant, Ms. Maine said that they had been bringing those issues forward for some time.

Mr. Viggiano asked to clarify the status of the technical review. He said that LTD had done technical analyses as they had gone through the planning, and a spreadsheet in the packet was provided as an example of what had been done. He had asked what other technical information the road authorities needed in order to make a decision from a technical standpoint on the project. Staff had asked for that but had not received a detailed list. The previous Thursday, an inter-jurisdictional staff team provided more information about what might be needed, but it was still not specific, such as whether the traffic model used was acceptable to develop the data. He said that the June 7 date would be contingent upon LTD receiving the request in a specific enough format in order to prepare the data.

Ms. Fitch asked Mr. Kelly if that information could be compiled and given to LTD during the next week, and he said that it could.

Ms. Helphand, remembering that Mr. Bennett's comment that additional information would be helpful but may not answer every question, asked where they wanted to go after they received the information, as policy boards wanting to solve the issue before them.

Mr. Bailey said that there was a process in place that he had not heard anyone object to, which was that the BRT Steering Committee and the technical advisory group would do their own review and present that to the councils according to the timeline that had been discussed earlier. The Board and Council might want to have another joint work session, and within the next two or three months they would have the opportunity to review all that information. There would be a preliminary decision point, an endorsement without final approval, at that point. He saw that as the next step.

Ms. Loobey explained that there was a technical advisory committee in place that had staff from both organizations, as well as a steering committee with representatives from both organizations. Information went to the technical group and then to the steering committee, and then to the policy boards.

There was agreement that it was vital for the two groups to get together again. Ms. Hocken said she did not know if the Council was saying that until they received a certain level of detail they could not allow the environmental assessment process, which was a process of studying more detail, to go forward. She did not know at what point the Council would have enough data or how difficult that data would be to gather, so it was difficult to say when the groups should meet again.

Ms. Maine said that the environmental analysis was another drop-dead point. She asked if it required the preliminary engineering to be basically set. Mr. Viggiano said that they would need enough detail to be able to do traffic studies and those types of things, so it was more at the detailed planning level. However, Ms. Maine said that it would need to review alignment and functions, so she sensed that the environmental assessment could not go forward until the groups got together again.

Mr. Bailey said that the Board was slated to do its approval of phase 1 preferred alternative in July, so it seemed that the Council and Board needed to meet again before July.

Ms. Lauritsen said what she heard breaking down around the room were express service along the freeway, a parallel route to Main Street, and phasing in the project. She thought those were the stopping places, so the detail needed to address those issues. That might not be the engineering data, but it should be a sufficient amount of detail in order for boards to make policies on.

Mr. Kleger observed that there were some things that would not be available in a set sequence, and sometimes there needed to be some general decisions before it was possible to get an analysis that would answer another question that needed to be answered. He said that part of the reason for the corridor location and public input process was to help narrow the field before doing some of the very expensive calculating.

Ms. Helphand added that part of the process was talking together and listening to each other respectfully and having the trust to consider each other's issues.

Mr. Bennett asked about the issue of Springfield asking LTD to fund an engineering position. He wondered if that was part of getting the information that Springfield needed. Mayor Maine explained that this came up during discussions in Washington, D.C., about what it would take, since Springfield staff had not been able to participate as fully in the technical advisory committee as they would like, since it was not the most important issue on the City's docket and they had a lot of transportation issues. As part of the request, Springfield wanted LTD to slow down a little and, as a way to help Springfield catch up, backfill a traffic engineer for Springfield to assign to this project

full-time. She said that this would make a significant dent in having Springfield's participation go up to the level where the Council would get the information it needed in order to go forward and evaluate alternatives, make the decisions, etc. It was agreed to at that time.

Mr. Bennett asked if based on LTD's current staffing levels the staff should be able to provide the information the Council asked for. Mr. Viggiano replied that they could.

Dan Brown, the Springfield Public Works director, said he understood from his staff that LTD staff had not provided them with the kinds of information that they believed their Council needed in order to understand and ultimately endorse the concept. Therefore, their feeling was that if LTD staff were not going to do it, Springfield staff would have to do it. If they had the staff person, that person would work with LTD to generate the study and analysis to answer all the questions that the Council had, presuming that LTD staff would not be willing to start providing it.

Mr. Viggiano asked what specifically Mr. Brown was referring to. Mr. Brown referred the question to the traffic engineer, Brian Barnett. Mr. Barnett said that it would include some of the things that Mr. Simmons was talking about, looking at other alternatives, ridership, how to meet goals without exclusive bus lanes, impacts on businesses and access to side streets, how signal priority would affect the signals, etc. Mr. Viggiano again referred to the spreadsheet showing the type of analyses that had been done, which included some of the things Mr. Barnett was talking about. He said that those analyses might not include the type of detail that Springfield felt it needed, and those were the specifics that LTD had asked Springfield for. For instance, if the traffic models that LTD used did not meet Springfield's needs, then what model would meet those needs? He said it was difficult to respond to Springfield's request without a greater level of detail about those requests.

Mr. Barnett said that the spreadsheet did talk about different technical analyses. He described the depth of the technical analysis as skimpy, and said that Springfield had not had the staffing level to review it to the level of detail that they knew their Council expected. Secondly, he said, the spreadsheet did not consider any alternative other than full BRT from day one. He thought that HOV lanes and queue jumping had potential, but he did not know how good that potential was until he received some kind of analysis. He said he could not promote to his Council to go with BRT or with HOV lanes until he saw a lot more than a spreadsheet like this. An LTD-funded engineer could be used to evaluate LTD's analyses as well as the tasks that had been mentioned before.

Mr. Bennett said he wanted to know very specifically what the City staff wanted, and then work out who would do that, how it would be paid for, and when it could be reviewed in a timely fashion. He said that the objective was to be accountable in terms of increased ridership over time. It was not whether a bus could get to the next light or even to the same speed with queue jumping; that may be an important factor in the whole equation, but the issue was more one of who would be accountable for essentially getting a significantly increased percentage of ridership, particularly during the peak periods, but also as a whole on the system. He hoped that others agreed with that objective. Ms. Maine said that she did not agree with it at the expense of everybody else on the road. Mr. Bennett said it was not at the expense of others, because LTD would be increasing the capacity of the road. But Ms. Maine said that a big "if" was if people would choose to ride. Mr. Bennett said that this was why he was listening very carefully to the Council about phasing, but at the same time was trying not to give up the fact that if certain of those package issues were not available together, BRT would not have a chance to work at any time. In other words, he said, if there was not enough of a competitive change, the project would be doomed from the beginning, so they needed to find the right balance.

Ms. Hocken said she would hope that in the Springfield staff review of the information that LTD would provide them, that information would be shared with the Council in such a way to say that the information did not tell them conclusively one way or the other what had to happen. She thought she was hearing that the Springfield staff felt they had to make a recommendation to the Council based on technical information. She wanted it to be understood that there was a policy decision that would override the technical decision. If there were no technical guarantees, she hoped that would not be a reason to throw out the project. As Mr. Bennett said, the Board was asking for some accommodation so that LTD could make this project work, not that LTD could guarantee all the impacts 20 years down the road.

Mr. Simmons suggested reading the document he had been referring to that morning, and he thought the Board would see that the comments and suggestions were a part of that process that the FTA put a great deal of time and energy into. He said that it may not be consistent with particular viewpoints, but maybe they would reach a hybrid project that worked well for the people of Eugene and Springfield.

Ms. Helphand directed the discussion back to the purpose of the meeting, to lay some of the issues on the table, to look at options, and to leave the meeting with specifics about how they were going to go forward.

Ms. Maine thought that the fundamental reason for the meeting was accomplished. That was to get together and get the issues out, because even though there were technical and steering committees, until the two boards got together to understand the issues, they were not really understood. She thought that meetings of that type should have been built into the process, and she suggested that the Council should meet with its own technical staff and then meet again with the LTD Board. She thought it was a useful meeting, so the groups could get to a place where they were taking some issues on faith, but they would know what those issues were and not have things that were just plain missing because they didn't look.

Mr. Bailey endorsed Ms. Maine's comments. He thought the two groups had come a long way in terms of identifying the issues and having a chance to get all the issues on the table and build some trust. He thought this would help them take a step forward, and he felt healthier about the process. He thanked everyone for the hard work and for not giving up.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

---

Board Secretary



**Lane Transit District**  
P. O. Box 7070  
Eugene, Oregon 97401

(541) 682-6100  
Fax (541) 682-6111

## **MONTHLY STAFF REPORT**

May 19, 1999

### **SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING**

*Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager*

#### **DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE STUDY**

The first two meetings of the shuttle advisory group have occurred. The first meeting was a review of districts that are operating shuttle services and those that have discontinued operating shuttles. At the second meeting, the consultant presented various options for shuttle routing. This ranged from a limited downtown-to-University of Oregon (UO) loop, to a larger loop that included Valley River Center and the Lane County Fairgrounds. Additionally, spurs of the main route were examined to accommodate conference activities that involved the Gateway area hotels. Frequency of service was considered in the ten-minute to thirty-minute range. No recommendations on routing or frequency will be made at this point in the study. The group did agree that higher frequency would be better, which is consistent with successful shuttle programs in other cities.

#### **UO FOOTBALL SHUTTLES**

LTD staff were invited to meet with staff from Ellerbe Beckett, the consultant selected by the UO to perform the analysis and design of improvements to Autzen Stadium. Ellerbe Beckett was very open to LTD's input regarding the staging area and issues related to access and staging. Changes to the exterior of the stadium and the staging areas may happen sooner than the scheduled seating expansion in 2001. It is the UO's goal to increase transit riders to a 25 percent modal split, which is approximately two times the current 13 percent modal split. This effort will require a combination of activities to speed post-game turnaround time and increase carrying capacity. A UO partnership with a local bus provider will be very likely in order to create the extra carrying capacity.

### **YIELD LAW**

The first order of yield lights arrived in early May. Installation will continue through June, and activation has been scheduled for Sunday, June 13. This coincides with the summer operator bid and allows time to complete a public information campaign during the prior weeks. A combination of radio, newspaper, and outdoor media will be used. Additionally, a public relations campaign will be coordinated through the news media.

### **RIDER SURVEY**

The 1999 origin and destination rider survey has been completed. The draft report is being reviewed by staff and a discussion is scheduled for the June 16 Board meeting.

### **LTD PHOTO IDENTIFICATION UPDATED**

LTD is changing to digital photo identification cards. Staff will have the camera available to take Board member photos between 5 p.m. and 5:30 p.m., just before the May 19 Board meeting. The new ID cards will then be mailed to Board members.

### **AIRPORT STUDY**

UO intern Ben Williams is updating the previous airport service study. The final report will be completed in June. Staff will review the draft report and include a number of service options. The final report will be brought to the Board later in the summer.

### **DOWNTOWN STATION ANNIVERSARY**

The District celebrated its first year of operation at the Eugene Station with sunshine, balloons, clowns, and a host of guests. A historical photo display inside the Customer Service building was unveiled and everyone enjoyed cake and punch. Three television stations carried stories on Saturday evening, and the Register Guard printed a story on the historical information, BRT, and the celebration. While the event was brief, everyone enjoyed it, and the media coverage was very positive.

## **TRANSIT OPERATIONS**

*Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager*

*Written by Jill Howard, Transit Operations Administrative Assistant*

### **APTA SAFETY AWARD**

Mark Johnson, Operations Manager, traveled to Cleveland, Ohio, to attend the American Public Transit Association (APTA) Bus Conference. He accepted a safety award presented to LTD for placing second in the nation in safety, based on comparisons with other transit districts our size. This award is a tribute to Vern Rodgers, our Training Coordinator, Gayle Howard our Safety and Risk Specialist and the professional operators at LTD who make safety a priority on a daily basis.

This award application stemmed from Mark's efforts to begin establishing a method for measuring success in the Operations department. He has spread his idea District-wide and will be collecting and organizing information in many areas to be sent to APTA for consideration of other awards.

### **VIDEO CAMERAS ON BUSES**

The first week of operation of the bus video surveillance system was a success, as evidenced by the capture on video of a woman taking the "Say Cheese" poster notifying customers of the audio and video recording equipment on board. The woman was stopped outside the bus, the property was recovered, and the event was archived.

### **BOARDING AREA SECURITY**

Field supervisors are establishing a new working relationship with the Springfield Police Department to resolve the ongoing security issues at the Springfield Station.

Field supervisors also are working closely with the Eugene Police Department and local business owners to address the issue of persistent illegal activity at the 5th and Adams shelter, which prevents our customers from using it.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES**

*Dave Dickman, Human Resources Manager*

### **Human Resources**

Key department staff involved in the implementation of the ABRA HRIS database engaged in training during the third week of April. This training also included staff from the Finance department. The HR department is preparing the necessary plans and actions to carry out the changes in the administrative employee benefits for the new fiscal year.

### **RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION**

Human Resources commenced recruitment for a new pool of applicants for bus operators. We anticipate a larger need for operators than is typical due to an increased number of expected retirements from among current Transit Operations staff.

### **RISK, SAFETY AND BENEFITS**

Benefits – Transit Operations employees have initiated a petition regarding poor service and quality of benefits provided by Qual Med. During inter-shift meetings with Fleet Services, the human resources manager received numerous complaints regarding Qual Med. The majority of the time in the meetings was dedicated to discussing Qual Med issues.

In late April, Qual Med informed the District that it intended to renew the current coverage at the agreed-upon rate cap but with significant benefit changes, particularly in the area of prescription coverage. The changes, if made, would be material and violate our agreements with union employees. At present, the Human Resources Department is investigating alternatives to the problems surrounding the continued association with Qual Med.

The risk and safety specialist is continuing to receive training from the Transit Safety Institute. The latest training, conducted during the last week of April at Seattle's Metro facility, was on Transit Systems and Security. The Human resource Department is working with the Operations Training Coordinator, Vern Rogers, in preparation for the fall training that will focus on safety related to the prevention of workplace violence.

Risk - Reliance Insurance Company representative Steve Gilliland performed a complete Risk Control Survey of our facilities. Reliance is LTD's primary provider of insurance against property losses. The inspection resulted in very favorable findings for our facilities, which is a credit to the Facilities Department, the management, and the Board of Directors, who have always made safety and risk a priority for the District. Only one extremely minor recommendation was made in Reliance's final report. The Reliance loss control consultant suggested that we place a plastic bag over a fire sprinkler inside our open face spray booth. This would prevent buildup of paint over spray on the sprinkler and assure its proper function when needed.

Safety ---- The Facilities Safety Committee at the monthly meeting reviewed all on the injuries that occurred during March and April. The following table reflects the totals for the month and year to date (YTD).

<b>INJURY REPORT</b>					
	<b>March 1999</b>	<b>YTD 1999</b>	<b>March 1998</b>	<b>YTD 1998</b>	<b>YTD Difference</b>
<b>TOTAL INJURIES REPORTED</b>	9	20	11	20	0
<b>SAIF Claims Reported</b>	2	5	2	7	+2
<b>SAIF Claims Time Loss</b>	1	3	2	6	+3

The Accident and Route Review Safety Committee met this month on April 23. The table below contains the results of the accidents and incidents reviewed and are compared with the same month last year.

<b>ACCIDENT REPORT</b>				
	<b>March 1999</b>	<b>YTD 1999</b>	<b>March 1998</b>	<b>YTD 1998</b>
<b>ACCIDENTS REPORTED</b>	12	27	7	22
<b>INCIDENTS Reported</b>	2	12	2	9
<b>Defensive Techniques Used</b>	10	25	5	14
<b>Defensive Techniques not Used</b>	4	14	4	17

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Board members have been appointed to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), and on occasion are appointed to other local or regional committees. Board members also will present testimony at public hearings on specific issues as the need arises. After meetings, public hearings, or other activities attended by individual Board members on behalf of LTD, time will be scheduled on the next Board meeting agenda for an oral report by the Board member. The following activities have occurred since the last Board meeting:

- a. **MPC:** MPC meetings generally are held on the second Thursday of each month. At the Board meeting, LTD's MPC representatives Pat Hocken and Rob Bennett can provide a brief update about the May 13 MPC meeting.
- b. **Statewide Livability Forum:** Board member Pat Hocken has been asked to participate on a statewide committee called the Livability Forum as one of 12 participants from the Eugene/Springfield area. This committee has been meeting once every six months; the most recent meeting was held on May 11, 1999. Ms. Hocken will report to the Board on the Forum's activities as they occur.
- c. **BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input:** Board members Pat Hocken, Rob Bennett, and Kirk Bailey are participating on LTD's BRT Steering Committee with members of local units of government and community representatives. The Steering Committee last met on May 4. At the May 19 Board meeting, Committee Chair Rob Bennett and the other LTD Board representatives can report to the Board about this committee's activities.
- d. **Springfield Station Steering Committee:** The Springfield Station Steering Committee last met on March 18, and did not meet in April. The next meeting is scheduled for May 20, 1999. LTD Board members

Dave Kleger and Hillary Wylie are participating on this committee with representatives of other local units of government and the community, and former Board member Mary Murphy as committee chair. At the May 19 Board meeting, Mr. Kleger and Ms. Wylie can provide a brief report and respond to any questions about this committee's activities to date.

- e. **North End Scoping Group**: The mayor of Eugene has formed a group called the North End Scoping Group, to bring together the major stakeholders in the north downtown Eugene area to discuss what could be done to improve the area that includes the train station, 5<sup>th</sup> Street Market, and the new federal courthouse. Board member Dean Kortge is participating as the Board's representative. The most recent meeting were on May 4 and May 11, 1999. At the May 19 Board meeting, Mr. Kortge can report on this group's discussions.
- f. **Joint Meeting with Springfield City Council**: At the May 19 Board meeting, Board members will have an opportunity to discuss their May 1 joint meeting with the Springfield City Council.
- g. **Smoke-free Air Award**: The Lane County Tobacco Prevention Coalition has presented Lane Transit District with its "Smoke-Free Air Award," in recognition of our successful no-smoking policy implementation this spring at the Eugene Station. The award was accepted by Director Dave Kleger and Customer Service Manager Angie Sifuentez at the Oregon Tobacco Prevention Coalition's annual conference, which was held this year in Eugene on April 28, 1999. At the May 19 Board meeting, Mr. Kleger can provide a brief report on this event.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** LTD SERVICE AREA BOUNDARY REVISION

**PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None at this time

**BACKGROUND:** Each June the Board affirms the District's service area boundary. During the past year, the Board approved changes to the boundary to address the annexation of Creswell into the service area and to make minor modifications to address outstanding boundary issues. These changes took affect in January 1999.

As part of the annual process to affirm the boundaries, staff are suggesting two minor changes to address portions of the service area that are outside the 2.5-mile limit outlined in ORS 267.207. While the District has legal authority to establish boundaries beyond 2.5 miles, it appears that there is no apparent reason to exceed 2.5 miles in these cases. One area north of Coburg involves six businesses and the second area is southwest of Eugene and involves nine businesses. Total estimated payroll tax revenue is \$28,000.

If these two changes are approved, the District's service area boundary will be within the 2.5-mile limit or the census tract application defined in ORS 267.207. Staff will bring a revised boundary ordinance to the Board in June for the first reading, and the second reading and adoption will be scheduled for July. The ordinance will take effect in January 2000.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** CONSENT CALENDAR

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approval of Consent Calendar Items

**BACKGROUND:** Issues that can be explained clearly in the written materials for each meeting, and that are not expected to draw public testimony or controversy, are included in the Consent Calendar for approval as a group. Board members can remove any items from the Consent Calendar for discussion before the Consent Calendar is approved each month.

The Consent Calendar for May 19, 1999:

1. Approval of minutes: April 12, 1999, special Board meeting/joint work session with Eugene City Council
2. Approval of minutes: April 21, 1999, regular Board meeting
3. Approval of minutes: May 1, 1999, special Board meeting/joint work session with Springfield City Council

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Minutes of the April 12, 1999, special Board meeting/joint work session with Eugene City Council
2. Minutes of the April 21, 1999, regular Board meeting
3. Minutes of the May 1, 1999, special Board meeting/joint work session with Springfield City Council

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 19, 1999, is approved as presented.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** SERVICE POLICY AND PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS WORK SESSION

**PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Affirm staff recommendation to move the Board work session from June to October

**BACKGROUND:** Staff have been preparing for a daylong Board work session to examine the District's service policy and productivity standards. The date of this session was tentatively set for the end of June; however, staff believe that this discussion fits more appropriately in the context of the Board's fall work session. The Board's two-day fall work session focuses on the District's strategic plan, including the mission statement, vision statements, and values. Staff believe that this agenda time would be well utilized to address service policy issues as a part of the overall strategic plan. The results of the first day of the Board's work would feed directly into a discussion of how best to allocate the District's service resources to meet the strategic plan.

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Staff will work with the consultants to develop the agenda for the fall work session. The Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) work would follow the work session and be linked to the year 2000 annual route review process. Staff are confident that there is adequate time to complete the redesign of one sector during the ARR planning period and that subsequent redesign efforts can be processed during the year 2000.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** JUNE 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **JUNE 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Field Supervisor Shawn Mercer has been selected as the June 1999 Employee of the Month. Shawn was hired on September 8, 1993, as a bus operator. He was selected as a temporary supervisor in March 1996 and as a bus operator instructor in November 1997. In March 1998, he was selected to be a field supervisor on a limited-duration basis, and then was promoted to a permanent field supervisor position on October 18, 1998. Prior to becoming a field supervisor, Shawn earned four years of safe driving and four years of correct schedule operation (CSO). Shawn was nominated several times by co-workers at LTD, who praised him for his compassion with customers and his willingness to help others. In 1996, he was commended for his quick and professional response to a Sheriff's Department request, by providing a bus and driver, to evacuate a nursing home in Pleasant Hill that was in danger of flooding. More recently, he calmly performed the Heimlich maneuver on a diner in a restaurant who was choking and needed immediate assistance. He also received a compliment for the way he helped a customer with a brain injury who was having trouble getting to his next bus.

When asked what makes Shawn a good employee, Transit Projects Administrator Rick Bailor said that in 1998, Shawn was promoted to the new position of temporary Field Supervisor when the new Eugene Station opened. He took his new responsibility very seriously, and immediately began working on ways to make things better. He has become the resident computer expert in the Field department. He works hard at keeping the Eugene Station a safe and comfortable place for LTD's customers. If there is a disturbance during his shift, you can count on him to move it away from the other customers and resolve the situation. He takes pride in being "Johnny on the spot" to resolve a route problem that has affected an operator's ability to serve a customer.

Shawn is well respected by his peers, employees, and customers. Like a fish in water, he is a natural at field supervision. The District is very fortunate to have Shawn working here. Because of his abilities and dedication to duty, Shawn was promoted to a full-time Field Supervisor position in October of 1998.

**AWARD:** Shawn will attend the May 19 meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

## MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

### May 19, 1999

#### Revenue:

- **Passenger fares** are very slightly behind plan year-to-date, but ahead of the previous year by 5.2 percent.
- **Group pass revenue** is on track for the first ten months.
- **Operating revenue** overall is satisfactory, with the minor exception of advertising (down slightly due to the reduction in advertising space on buses).

#### Expense:

- **Administration personnel** expenses have increased over the prior year for several reasons:
  - ◆ The implementation of a new salary schedule last year resulted in the opportunity for all but two administrative employees to earn merit increases that became effective in July. Last year, the majority of administrative employees were at 100 percent of their authorized pay ranges.
  - ◆ Administrative employees were given a 1.7 percent cost of living adjustment in July. In addition, the cost of health insurance coverage increased 8 percent.
  - ◆ Three new positions funded by the General Fund were added in July. These positions were among those approved in the FY 1998-1999 adopted budget. In addition, one position vacancy was filled at a higher rate of pay than the previous incumbent earned. Additional planned positions were added in August.

Although administrative wage expense is higher than last year, expenses year-to-date are nearly exactly as planned and approved in the current-year budget. Wage expense is watched closely through the year.

- **Contract personnel** (employees represented by ATU) expenses increased due to the increase in the cost of health insurance, and the implementation of a 3 percent wage increase in accordance with the current ATU contract. Additional bus operators approved in the current-year budget were added in August.
- **Materials and services** expenses are generally as budgeted for the year-to-date.

**Capital revenue** lags expenses due to pending approval of a grant contract with FTA for a grant that already has been approved. The Oregon Transportation Infrastructure Fund loan, which was intended to fund a signal prioritization project, has been terminated due to a change in project timing. (The project has been merged with the BRT corridor project.) No funds were ever drawn against this loan.

**Capital expense** through the first ten months of the fiscal year are as planned. The bus purchase in the first half of this year is the major contributor to total expenses.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING
- PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary
- ACTION REQUESTED:** None at this time
- BACKGROUND:** The action or information items listed below will be included on the agenda for future Board meetings:
- A. **Origin & Destination Study Results:** Results of the District's Origin & Destination Study will be discussed with the Board at the June 16, 1999, regular meeting.
  - B. **Adoption of Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Budget:** Following approval of the proposed budget by the LTD Budget Committee on April 29, the FY 1999-2000 budget will be on the agenda for adoption by the Board at the June 16, 1999, regular meeting.
  - C. **TransPlan Work Session and Draft Plan Approval:** The Draft TransPlan will be brought to the Board as an information item at the June 16, 1999, regular Board meeting. The Joint Elected Officials public hearing on TransPlan has been scheduled for June 30, 1999. The LTD Board will be part of that public hearing. Approval of the Draft TransPlan is anticipated to occur during October 1999.
  - D. **Review of Bus Designs:** A comprehensive review of current bus designs will be scheduled for June or July.
  - E. **BRT Phase 1 Approval:** Approval of Phase 1 of the bus rapid transit (BRT) pilot corridor project is tentatively scheduled during the summer of 1999.
  - F. **Alternative Fuels Discussion:** A staff presentation on alternative fuels will be scheduled for a Board meeting during the summer of 1999.
  - G. **Work Session on Productivity Standards and Policies:** A work session on productivity standards and policies will be scheduled as part of the Board's fall strategic planning retreat in October or November 1999.
  - H. **Follow-up Work Sessions:** Various work sessions to discuss pending issues as a result of the Board's October 10-11 strategic

planning work session will continue to be scheduled throughout the coming year.

- I. **Medical Reimbursement Account**: At a future Board meeting, staff will discuss a proposal for administrative employees to use accumulated sick leave toward payment of medical benefits between ages 62 and 65. This is similar to an agreement reached with the District's union employees during the most recent contract negotiations.
- J. **Board Review of Tobacco Use at District Facilities**: At its March 18, 1998, meeting, the Board requested that staff place the issue of smoking at District facilities on the agenda for a future meeting. Issues of smoking at District facilities other than the Eugene Station will be brought to the Board at a future meeting.
- K. **BRT Updates**: Various action and information items will be placed on Board meeting agendas during the design and implementation phases of the bus rapid transit project.
- L. **Quarterly Performance Reporting**: Staff will provide quarterly performance reports for the Board's information in February, May, August, and November each year.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION AWARD

**PREPARED BY:** Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** The Finance Department is pleased to report that Lane Transit District's 1997-98 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) has received the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) award for excellence in financial reporting. This achievement is the third consecutive award for LTD's CAFR, and it continues the tradition of reporting excellence to which Finance staff are committed. Special acknowledgement goes to Roy Burling, Assistance Finance Manager, for his outstanding work on the CAFR project each year.

**ATTACHMENT:**

- (1) GFOA letter of congratulations
- (2) Copy of GFOA Award Certificate

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT REGARDING COOPERATIVE PLANNING FOR TRANSIT SERVICES: LTD, EUGENE, AND LANE COUNTY

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve Intergovernmental Agreement

**BACKGROUND:** The attached memorandum from the Lane Council of Governments provides background information on this proposed agreement. LTD signed a similar agreement with Springfield and Lane County several years ago. Eventually, similar agreements for all incorporated cities within LTD's service area will need to be developed.

District legal counsel has reviewed this proposed agreement.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Memorandum from Peter Watt of the Lane Council of Governments
2. Proposed Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Eugene, Lane County, and Lane Transit District

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that that the LTD Board of Directors authorizes the general manager to sign the Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Eugene, Lane County, and Lane Transit District.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT REGARDING COOPERATIVE PLANNING FOR TRANSIT SERVICES: LTD, VENETA, AND LANE COUNTY

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve Intergovernmental Agreement

**BACKGROUND:** The attached memorandum from the Lane Council of Governments provides background information on this proposed agreement. LTD signed a similar agreement with Springfield and Lane County several years ago. Eventually, similar agreements for all incorporated cities within LTD's service area will need to be developed.

District legal counsel has reviewed this proposed agreement.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Memorandum from Peter Watt of the Lane Council of Governments
2. Proposed Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Veneta, Lane County, and Lane Transit District

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that that the LTD Board of Directors authorizes the general manager to sign the Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Veneta, Lane County, and Lane Transit District.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENTS REGARDING COOPERATIVE PLANNING FOR TRANSIT SERVICES

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve Intergovernmental Agreements

**BACKGROUND:** LTD staff have worked with staff from the City of Eugene, the City of Veneta, Lane County, and Lane Council of Governments to develop agreements regarding cooperative planning and urban services for transit services. There is an agreement between LTD, Eugene, and Lane County, and a separate agreement between LTD, Veneta, and Lane County. The attached memorandum from the Lane Council of Governments and a copy of ORS Chapter 195 provides background information on these proposed agreements. LTD signed a similar agreement with Springfield and Lane County several years ago. Eventually, agreements with all incorporated cities within LTD's service area will need to be developed.

District legal counsel has reviewed this proposed agreement.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Memorandum from Peter Watt of the Lane Council of Governments.
2. Copy of ORS Chapter 195.
3. Proposed Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Eugene, Lane County, and Lane Transit District.
4. Proposed Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Veneta, Lane County, and Lane Transit District.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that that the LTD Board of Directors authorizes the general manager to sign an Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Veneta, Lane County, and Lane Transit District and an Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Cooperative Planning and Urban Services for Transit Services Between the City of Eugene, Lane County, and Lane Transit District.

\\ADMIN\VOL3\DATA\COMMON\WPDATA\IGA-Veneta-Eugene.doc

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** LCC TERM PASS UPDATE

**PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Lane Community College has completed its annual budgeting process. I am happy to report that full funding of the second year of the term bus pass program will be included. The budget documents show only \$100,000 for the program; however, LTD has received written confirmation from LCC President Jerry Moskus that the additional \$50,000 will be made available.

Staff are excited about this commitment and believe that the program will again be successful.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- (1) Letter from LCC President Moskus
- (2) Response from LTD Board President Kirk Bailey

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

**PREPARED BY:** Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** The lack of significant legislative accomplishments makes it difficult to report any progress during the past month. There is definitely a sense at the legislature that any minute something will happen – on a variety of topics. That sense has been present for over a month, but so far, legislative passage of the Higher Education budget is about all one could point to as progress.

Funding for transportation infrastructure is bogged down over the debate on the weight mile tax. The Oregon Trucking Association is committed to a repeal of Oregon's weight mile tax, a proposal that they have made revenue neutral by imposing a 25-cent per gallon diesel fuel tax and increased registration fees for heavy vehicles. Both substantive and political issues remain unclear. Would such a shift impose a heavier burden on in-state truck operators over out-of-state haulers? No matter what the answer is, people aren't sure of what it is or if it is important. Is this agenda being driven by the national association, or do Oregon-based companies have the same issues? Politically, the House Revenue Committee is prepared to send a measure to the floor, even if its outcome is negative, or perhaps assuming a lack of support in the full House. Whatever happens, the issue must be resolved before the increased fuel tax and motor vehicle registration fees are decided.

Increased funding for elderly and disabled transportation has been recommended against by legislative fiscal staff, but the Ways and Means subcommittee preparing the ODOT budget has not yet decided the issue. Both the House and the Senate Transportation Committees have sent measures to Ways and Means that would increase funding by \$10 million per biennium, paid from the state's general fund. Committee work sessions on the ODOT budget are scheduled next week, but they could go for a week longer than that.

Funding for Willamette Valley Passenger Rail is in about the same shape as funding for special transportation. Fiscal staff has recommended no

funding, but legislative interest remains. It is definitely a lower priority for legislators than funding for elderly and disabled transportation service. It, too, is part of the ODOT budget deliberations.

Legislative leadership has so far quelled any rebellion about prohibiting any more first hearings on bills in their first house, but the exceptions are still large. By now all work was to have been completed on bills in their original house, but some bills have been moved to Rules Committees to avoid this requirement, including the bill to dismember the Department of Transportation. Committees to which such rules do not apply include Revenue, Ways and Means, and Judiciary, leading some to conclude that there is very little coordination between the House and the Senate on priorities or that priorities remain undefined. It is still too early to tell whether this session of the Legislature will limp to a conclusion sometime near the first of July or if a large budget battle still looms.

The State revenue forecast is an important clue to how the session will conclude. It will be discussed in Revenue Committees Friday, May 14. If projected revenues are large enough, a battle over education funding may be avoided.

Local impact bills are dying. While nothing is dead until the last gavel falls at adjournment, bills to require the LTD Board to be elected, that change employment conditions, that require transit routes to go to bid, and that reduce the geographical base of the taxing authority of the District all appear to have died for this session.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## Operations Board Report - May Mtg

### APTA SAFETY AWARD

Mark Johnson, Operations Manager, traveled to Cleveland, Ohio to attend the APTA Bus Conference. He will be accepting a safety award presented to LTD for placing second in the nation in safety, based on comparisons to other transit districts our size.

This award stemmed from Mark's efforts to begin establishing a method for measuring our success in the Operations department. He has spread his idea District wide and will be collecting and organizing information in many areas to be sent to APTA for consideration of other awards.

### VIDEO CAMERAS ON BUSES - Update

The first week of operation of the bus video surveillance system was a success as evidenced by the capture on video of a woman taking the "Say Cheese" poster notifying customers of the audio and video recording equipment on board.

The woman was stopped outside the bus, the property was recovered, and the event was archived.

### BOARDING AREA SECURITY

Field Supervisors are establishing a new working relationship with the Springfield Police Department to resolve the ongoing youth issue at the Springfield Station.

Field Supervisors are also working closely with the Eugene Police Department and local business owners to address the issue of persistent illegal activity at the 5th and Adams shelter, which prevents our customers from using it.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** SECOND READING AND ADOPTION--EIGHTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35, AN ORDINANCE SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES
- PREPARED BY:** Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Hold the second reading of Seventh Amended Ordinance No. 35, which sets fares for Fiscal Year 1999-00, and then adopt the ordinance as amended.
- BACKGROUND:** Following a public hearing at the March 1999 Board meeting, staff were directed to make the following changes to District fare structure:
1. Eliminate the evening fare discount, which will result in the same cash fare applying to all regular fixed-route service at all times;
  2. Increase the price charged for group pass programs by 2.8 percent;
  3. Increase the price of the RideSource and RideSource Escort fares from \$1.30 to \$1.50 per one-way trip;
  4. Increase the price of the regular one-month adult pass from \$26 to \$28 and the three-month pass from \$60 to \$65;
  5. Increase the price of the youth one-month pass from \$19.50 to \$21.00 and the three-month youth pass from \$45.00 to \$49.00; and
  6. Increase the price of the child/senior/reduced fare one-month pass from \$13.00 to \$14.00 and the three-month pass from \$30.00 to \$32.50.
- The fare changes must be implemented by ordinance. The first such ordinance, Ordinance No. 35, was adopted in June 1992. This will be the eighth amendment to Ordinance No. 35. The first reading of Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35 was held on April 21, 1999. The second reading and adoption of the ordinance is scheduled for the May 19 Board meeting. The Board can elect to read the ordinance by title only. Staff will have additional copies of the ordinance available for anyone in the audience who desires a copy.

**CONSEQUENCES OF  
REQUESTED ACTION:**

A copy of Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35 will be filed with the County Clerk and made available for public inspection.

**ATTACHMENT:**

Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services

**PROPOSED MOTIONS:**

1. I move that Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only.

(Following an affirmative vote, the ordinance title should be read:  
**Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services.**)

2. I move that the Board adopt the following resolution:  
It is hereby resolved that the Board of Directors adopts Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services, effective 30 days after adoption.



**Lane Transit District**  
P. O. Box 7070  
Eugene, Oregon 97401

(541) 682-6100  
Fax (541) 682-6111

## **MONTHLY STAFF REPORT**

May 19, 1999

### **SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING**

*Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager*

#### **DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE STUDY**

The first two meetings of the shuttle advisory group have occurred. The first meeting was a review of Districts who are operating shuttle services and those who have discontinued operating shuttles. The group was engaged in the discussion and wanted to move to the topic of routing. Routing was the topic of meeting number two. At this meeting the consultant presented various options for shuttle routing. This ranged from a limited downtown to UO loop, to a larger loop that included Valley River Center and the Lane County Fairgrounds. Additionally, spurs of the main route were examined to accommodate conference activities that involved the Gateway area hotels. Frequency of service was considered in the ten-minute to thirty-minute range. No recommendations, on routing or frequency, will be made at this point in the study. The group did agree that higher frequency would be better, which is consistent with successful shuttle programs in other cities.

#### **UO FOOTBALL SHUTTLES**

LTD staff were invited to meet with staff from Ellerbe Beckett who was selected by the UO to do the analysis and design of improvements to Autzen Stadium. They were very open to LTD's input regarding the staging area and issues related to access and staging. Changes to the exterior of the stadium and the staging areas may happen sooner than the scheduled seating expansion in 2001. It is the UO's goal to increase transit riders to a 25% modal split, which is approximately two times the current 13% modal split. This effort will require a combination of activities to speed turnaround time post-game and increase carrying capacity. A UO partnership with a local bus provider will be very likely in order to create the extra carrying capacity.

### **YIELD LAW**

The first order of yield lights arrived the first of May. Installation will continue through June. Activation has been scheduled for Sunday June 13<sup>th</sup>. This coincides with the summer operator bid and allows time to complete a public information campaign during the prior weeks. A combination of radio, newspaper, and outdoor media will be used. Additionally a public relations campaign will be coordinated through the news media.

### **RIDER SURVEY**

The 1999 origin and destination rider survey has been completed. The draft report is being reviewed by staff and a discussion is scheduled for the June Board work session.

### **LTD PHOTO IDENTIFICATION UPDATED**

LTD is going digital with its photo identification cards. In case you missed the information that was mailed to your home, please be aware that you will need to have a new photo ID card processed to ride the bus for free. Staff will have the camera at the meeting if you would like your photo taken. Your new ID card will then be mailed to your home.

### **LCC TERM PASS**

Nothing new to report at this time.

### **AIRPORT STUDY**

UO intern Ben Williams is updating the previous airport service study. The final report will be completed in June. Staff will review the draft report and include a number of service options. The final report will be brought to the Board later in the summer.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** BUS RAPID TRANSIT – SPRINGFIELD ENGINEER
- PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Provide direction to staff on agreement with the City of Springfield to pay for engineering services for the BRT pilot corridor project.
- BACKGROUND:** LTD and the City of Springfield have agreed in principle that LTD would pay for engineering work by Springfield staff related to the BRT project. The intergovernmental agreement implementing this has been stalled on two issues:
1. How much control should LTD have over the engineer's work that is paid for by LTD? LTD staff have taken the position that LTD should be able to approve the types of studies and alternatives analysis conducted by the engineer that are to be reimbursed by LTD. Springfield staff believe that the City should have the flexibility to investigate issues related to BRT that are of interest to their Council.
  2. Should there be a deadline for Springfield endorsement and review of Phase 1? LTD staff have proposed that the agreement could be terminated, at LTD's option, if Springfield does not endorse Phase 1 by October 1, 1999, and approve Phase 1 (after the environmental work) by March 1, 2000. These dates are approximately three months later than the current project schedule. Springfield staff believe that there should not be any deadlines in the agreement.
- Staff are bringing these issues to the Board because they raise policy questions. Both the scope and the schedule of the BRT project have been clearly established by the Board. Staff are not comfortable signing an agreement that would allocate District funds for alternatives that are not endorsed by the Board and that does not support the project schedule.
- ATTACHMENT:** Draft Intergovernmental Agreement on Reimbursement of Cost for City of Springfield Engineering Services on bus rapid transit, which indicates two areas of dispute.
- PROPOSED MOTION:** None.

H:\Board Packet\1999\05\Regular Mtg\spfld eng 5-19-99 (handout).doc

## **DRAFT #3: May 19, 1999**

### **INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT ON REIMBURSEMENT OF COST FOR CITY OF SPRINGFIELD ENGINEERING SERVICES ON BUS RAPID TRANSIT**

This agreement is entered into by and between Lane Transit District, hereinafter referred to as LTD, and the City of Springfield, hereinafter referred to as CITY.

WHEREAS, LTD has proposed a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project that would operate on streets within the city limits or planning jurisdiction of the CITY; and

WHEREAS, CITY has a need to review, analyze, and conduct various traffic engineering studies of the proposed BRT project; and

WHEREAS, LTD is willing to provide reimbursement to CITY for reasonable costs associated with the engineering analysis of the BRT project.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is agreed that:

1. CITY shall hire an engineer to provide technical review and analysis of the proposed BRT pilot corridor. LTD staff will participate in the selection process for the new CITY engineering position. Participation will include assisting in setting qualifications for the position, screening applicants, interviewing applicants, and final selection. However, the engineer will be an employee of CITY for all purposes. CITY shall exercise reasonable efforts to complete the hiring process by July 31, 1999.
2. CITY may use consultant engineering services in lieu of or in addition to a staff engineer on the condition that LTD participates in the selection of the consultant and that total reimbursement by LTD does not exceed the annual maximum reimbursement specified below.
3. LTD will reimburse CITY from federal grant funds for the payroll cost (salary and direct benefits) of the engineer for time spent on the BRT project. BRT work will receive top priority for the engineer's time. LTD recognizes that when BRT work activities require less than full-time work by the engineer, the engineer will work on non-BRT activities and CITY will not charge LTD for that time. A rate sheet indicating reimbursable salary and benefit costs for the engineering position is included as an attachment to this agreement.

4. A timecard indicating the amount of time spent on the BRT project and a summary of work activities completed is required as a condition of reimbursement and shall be submitted monthly to the LTD BRT Project Engineer. As with all grant-funded items, this reimbursement must comply with the rules and regulations regarding the expenditure of federal funds and is subject to a possible audit.
5. Reimbursement by LTD for the payroll costs of the engineer shall be limited to the time spent by the engineer on the following work:
  - Review data and analysis provided by LTD on the BRT pilot corridor.
  - Work with LTD and other agency staff in collecting and analyzing data for the BRT proposal.
  - Attendance at BRT Technical Advisory Committee meetings and other BRT meetings as needed.
  - Assist LTD in BRT communications to the Springfield City Council, other Springfield staff, and citizens within the Springfield planning jurisdiction.
  - Assist LTD in the design and development of a transit signal priority system in Springfield.
  - Assist LTD with the design and review of road improvements necessitated by BRT.
  - Assist LTD with traffic engineering issues related to the Springfield Station project.
  - Conduct other analysis for the BRT pilot corridor that is consistent with the BRT concept as agreed between the CITY and LTD.
  - Conduct analysis as requested or desired by City Council as related to BRT, **as long as those studies have been agreed to by LTD.**
  - Conduct other BRT-related work as mutually agreed upon by CITY and LTD.
  - All work of the engineer will be in accordance with a time schedule that is agreed to by CITY and LTD.
6. Reimbursement by LTD to CITY will be made monthly.
7. The maximum annual reimbursement by LTD to CITY under this agreement is \$70,000.
8. The \$10,000 that LTD has agreed to pay for engineering work as part of the transit signal priority agreement signed in 1997 between LTD and CITY is assumed to be part of work conducted under this agreement, not in addition to it.
9. LTD may terminate this agreement upon notice to CITY if the CITY, through resolutions adopted by the Springfield City Council, does not provide

conceptual endorsement of Phase 1 of the BRT pilot corridor as proposed by LTD by October 1, 1999, or final approval of Phase 1 by March 1, 2000. (Phase 1 is the segment between downtown Eugene and downtown Springfield.)

10. This agreement shall be effective for the duration of the planning, design, and implementation activities pertaining to the BRT project in the City of Springfield's planning jurisdiction, including Glenwood, or until CITY and LTD mutually agree that no further BRT work will be done in the corridor.
11. The engineer's work performance is expected to meet appropriate professional standards. LTD will have the opportunity to comment to the engineer's supervisor on the work performance of the engineer. Should LTD and CITY determine that engineer's work does not meet professional standards, LTD can request that another employee be assigned to the BRT work. If CITY declines to appoint another employee of consulting engineer, LTD shall have the right to terminate the agreement upon notice to CITY.
12. The terms of this agreement shall be for one year from the date of the last signature. It can be modified or extended for one year by written agreement of both parties.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Phyllis Loobey  
LTD General Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Kelly  
Springfield City Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

H:\Board Packet\1999\05\Regular Mtg\Spfld Engineer 5.doc

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 19, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** Debrief Springfield City Council Meetings

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None – Discussion only

**BACKGROUND:** Bus Rapid Transit and the Springfield Station are the agenda items for the Monday, May 17, 1999, work session of the Springfield City Council. It is expected that at that meeting the Council will finalize its list of issues and questions regarding BRT. Some Board members and some staff will have attended that meeting and will be able to report on the discussion.

The minutes of the May 1, 1999, joint meeting of the LTD Board and the Springfield City Council are to be approved as part of the May 19, 1999, Consent Calendar.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None