

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 10, 1999.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

June 16, 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

Bennett \_\_\_\_\_ Hocken \_\_\_\_\_ Kleger \_\_\_\_\_ Kortge \_\_\_\_\_

Lauritsen \_\_\_\_\_ Wylie \_\_\_\_\_ Bailey \_\_\_\_\_

III. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

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

IV. WORK SESSION--PRESENTATION ON ORIGIN & DESTINATION STUDY (ON-BOARD RIDER SURVEY) 04

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

V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH--July 1999 05

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING 06

A. Consent Calendar

- Minutes of the May 19, 1999, Regular Board Meeting

B.	Adoption of Fiscal Year 1999-2000 LTD Budget	20
1.	Staff Presentation	
2.	Opening of Public Hearing by Board President	
3.	Public Testimony on Proposed Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Budget	
	◆ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.	
4.	Closing of Public Hearing	
5.	Board Discussion and Decision	
C.	BRT—Downtown Eugene East Design Alternative for BRT Pilot Corridor	37
D.	Revision of Ordinance 24 Governing District Boundaries—First Reading	44
E.	Revised Special Service Policy	46
VIII.	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING	
A.	Current Activities	
1.	Board Member Reports	49
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.	Federal Transit Administration Conference Call	
2.	Monthly Financial Report—May Financial Statements	73
3.	Review of Bus Designs—Presentation	83
4.	Government Relations Report—Legislative Update	84
5.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	86
6.	TransPlan Update	88

7.	1999 Pacific Program	89
8.	Summer Board Meeting Schedule	99
B.	Monthly Staff Report	100
IX.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	104
A.	LTD Boundary Ordinance	
B.	TransPlan Work Session and Draft Plan Approval	
C.	Government Relations Legislative Report	
D.	Long-Range Financial Plan	
E.	BRT Phase 1 Approval	
F.	Alternative Fuels Discussion	
G.	Fall Board Strategic Planning Work Session	
H.	BRT Updates	
I.	Quarterly Performance Reporting/Year-end Performance Report	
X.	ADJOURNMENT	

**Alternative formats of printed material (Braille, cassette tapes, or large print) are available upon request. A sign language interpreter will be make 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).**

## RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Lane Transit District hereby adopts the budget for the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 in the total combined fund sum of \$53,388,329 now on file at Lane Transit District offices.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the amounts for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 1999, and for the purposes shown below are hereby appropriated as follows:

### GENERAL FUND - OPERATING BUDGET

Personnel Services	\$ 15,499,114
Materials & Services	4,890,510
Total Operating	<u>20,389,624</u>

### GENERAL FUND - NON-OPERATING

Transfer to Special Transportation	789,000
Transfer to Capital Fund	2,900,000
Self-Insurance Contingency	1,000,000
Operating Contingency	500,000
Payroll Tax Fluctuation Contingency	<u>4,500,000</u>
Total Non-operating	<u>9,689,000</u>
Total General Fund	\$ 30,078,624

### SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION FUND

Total Subcontracting Costs	\$ <u>1,367,305</u>
Fund Total	\$ 1,367,305

### CAPITAL FUND

Capital Outlay	\$ <u>21,942,400</u>
Total Capital Fund	\$ 21,942,400

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board President

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000 BUDGET

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** (1) Hold public hearing on Fiscal Year 1999-2000 budget  
(2) Adopt Fiscal Year 1999-2000 budget by resolution

**BACKGROUND:** The Budget Committee approved the budget for Fiscal Year 1999-2000 on April 29, 1999. The operating budget is \$20,379,624. The grand legal total of all combined funds plus reserves and transfers is \$53,378,329. A public hearing on the budget must be held, and a final budget must be adopted by the Board of Directors before July 1, 1999.

The attached total budget for the General Fund is exactly the same as the authorized spending in the approved budget for FY 1999-2000. The Special Transportation Fund also has no change from the fund budget that was proposed to and approved by the Budget Committee.

The total appropriation for the Capital Fund has been increased by \$290,500. Two projects, both related to Information Services, account for this total. One of these projects is the first phase of the scheduling/operating system replacement plan, which was budgeted to be completed in FY 1998-1999. Of the \$175,000 included in the FY 1998-1999 amended budget, \$150,500 must be carried forward into FY 1999-2000, because the software selection process could not be completed before June 30, 1999. Therefore, this \$150,500 does not represent an increase in spending, but rather a reprogramming of project expenditures from the current fiscal year to FY 1999-2000.

The remaining balance of \$140,000 represents computer network hardware replacement that was not originally anticipated in the proposed budget. As the Board learned in April, Lane Transit District has recently hired a new Information Services manager, Steve Parrott. An early priority has been the assessment and evaluation of the network on which LTD depends for its ability to meet current needs, as well as its ability to meet the aggressive technology plans of the Capital Improvement Program. Based on the results of this evaluation, staff recommend that some of the

hardware upgrades that had been included in FY 2001-2002 and beyond be advanced to FY 1999-2000 to coincide with the system upgrades planned for Facilities Services, Finance, and Transit Operations.

Of this \$290,500 total, \$140,000 will be covered by unexpended grant funds that will be carried forward from FY 1998-1999, and the remainder will come from local funds earmarked for software this year. These resources are shown as an increase in the estimated ending balance for FY 1998-1999 and an increase in the FY 1999-2000 beginning cash balance in the Capital Fund.

The changes proposed for the Capital Fund are well within the scope of what legally can be approved by the Board without referral back to the Budget Committee. A description of the changes (if approved) will be reported to the citizen members of the Budget Committee, and a copy of the final budget document will be provided to each member as soon as a FY 1999-2000 budget is adopted.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Resolution  
General Fund Budget  
Special Transportation Fund Budget  
Capital Fund Budget

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

I move approval of the attached Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 budget and appropriating \$53,388,329 as represented in the Resolution.

H:\Board Packet\1999\06\Regular Mtg\00BUDSUM.doc

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** MAY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Financial results for the first eleven 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 5.0 percent ahead of the same eleven-month period for last year, and \$31,443 below budget for the year-to-date. While weekday ridership remains strong, weekend ridership has been disappointing. It is unlikely that this shortfall will be recovered by fiscal year end. Group pass receipts are slightly below year-to-date budget, but should meet or exceed plan by year-end. Special services revenue is nearly \$22,000 ahead of the eleven-month plan. 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 also are now ahead of budget through eleven months, and exceed last year's receipts by 3.4 percent. 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 eleven months of the current fiscal year. The Planning & Development Department budget, which appeared to have a negative variance in last month's report, now has been adjusted for the transfer of a

position from Public Affairs, and is on budget for the year. 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. More than \$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 eleven months of this fiscal year.

With one month remaining in the current fiscal year, LTD is on target to complete the year in accordance with current budget provisions. The FY 1999-2000 approved budget will go to the LTD Board on June 16 for adoption as a separate action item.

**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 COMMITTEE MEETING**

### **LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS EXECUTIVE SEARCH COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, May 19, 1999**

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 10, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a meeting of the Executive Search Committee of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Thursday, May 13, 1999, at 7:30 a.m. in the Conference Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, Committee Chair, presiding  
Pat Hocken  
Hillary Wylie  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Dave Dickman, Human Resources Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

#### **WORK SESSION ON LTD GENERAL MANAGER SUCCESSION:**

Mr. Dickman provided an overview of the organization of the Committee process, which would include a review of the draft Succession Plan, the selection of an executive search firm, selection and review of an ad-hoc committee, development of selection criteria, and a June 1999 report to the full LTD Board.

He noted that the Committee would be responsible for selecting the preferred executive search firm, but that the full Board would approve the Committee's recommendation.

Applicants initially would be screened by the executive search firm according to selection criteria provided by the Committee.

Ms. Hocken said that she thought the timeline might be too tight. Mr. Dickman said that the timeline could be adjusted, but it was hoped that a selection could be made by March 31, 2000, as the Board might want to have a period of overlap. Ms. Loobey stated that her preference would be for no overlap.

Mr. Dickman said that the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for an executive search firm would be sent out in late May 1999. He reviewed the list of firms that staff recommended. The list included firms that had transit-specific experience as well as firms that had experience with positions of this magnitude. Ms. Hocken asked why there were no firms from Oregon on the list. Mr. Dickman stated that he was not aware of any search firms in Oregon that conducted the level of search LTD was looking for.

The Committee reviewed the draft RFQ and recommended some changes. The final draft RFQ would be sent to the Committee members for review prior to mailing it to potential firms. The Committee thought it important that the search firm be allowed to assist LTD in this search without too much LTD control.

The Committee then discussed Phase Two of the Succession Plan, which addressed information gathering and stakeholder input. Ms. Wylie stated that she was very concerned that the new general manager be a good fit with the existing employees, and she asked what involvement the employees would have. Mr. Dickman said that the general manager worked under contract to and was a direct employee of the Board of Directors. He thought that the LTD employee group was an important stakeholder, and the Executive Search Committee would want to solicit input from that group. Whether or not a staff interview group would be convened was yet to be determined.

The Committee directed staff to include the draft Succession Plan with the RFQ, but to omit the budget information, and to research executive search firms located in Oregon.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further business, and Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 1:35 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary

## MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 19, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 13, 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, May 19, 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  
Pat Hocken  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Dean Kortge  
Virginia Lauritsen  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Rob Bennett, Vice President  
Hillary Wylie, Secretary

**INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. Mr. Kortge was not yet present.

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

**Debrief Springfield City Council Meeting:** Mr. Bailey noted that there was a handout regarding the Springfield City Council's questions and concerns about bus rapid transit (BRT) and the Springfield Engineer position. Prior to reviewing the handout, the Board members discussed the May 1, 1999, joint meeting with the Springfield City Council and the Council's May 17, 1999, work session, in which they had discussed their questions and concerns regarding BRT. Board members generally were pleased with the May 1 joint work session as a first step, although there was some disappointment that the Board and Council were not able to make more progress on some of the particulars.

Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano reviewed the preliminary responses to the Springfield questions and issues. He explained that the responses were in draft form, and he invited the Board to comment on the draft. A cover letter also had been drafted for Board review. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff were going through the list of questions item by item and providing a response to each. In some cases, there still was information to be gathered.

Ms. Hocken asked if staff had a sense if there were questions that could not be answered for some time. Mr. Viggiano stated that preliminary responses were provided for many of the questions, especially with some of the modeling data, much of which was being done concurrently during the pilot corridor planning.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were working with road authority representatives from each of the four jurisdictions, who were developing a list of data requirements for design evaluation. It would include more detailed modeling and analysis. The goal had been to have the four jurisdictions agree on what the data needs were rather than receiving different data requests from each jurisdiction.

Mr. Bailey asked if staff had received the Springfield Council's questions in priority order. Mr. Brian Barnett of the City of Springfield replied that he was working with BRT Engineer Graham Carey, and the list of questions in priority order had not yet been presented to LTD staff. Mr. Carey added that there were a series of questions on page 172 of the handout that he had put together following the Council work session, but which were not included in the written list of questions that was received from the City of Springfield. Mr. Viggiano said LTD would respond to all the questions, whether or not they were official.

Mr. Bailey raised the question of the degree to which elements of BRT could be phased in, since the concept had been discussed both at the Board work session and the City Council work session. The current BRT plan included Phase 1, which essentially was the downtown-to-downtown segment for which LTD was seeking preliminary approvals by October 1999, and Phase 2, which included the east and west segments. He suggested that, in order to build more time into the Springfield BRT planning, the segments be reorganized so that the entire Eugene portion of the pilot corridor be designed first.

Ms. Hocken said that some of the questions were associated with the East Springfield segment. The Board could change the segment order to give the Springfield staff and LTD more time to respond to those questions. She thought it made sense to finish the Eugene segments.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if the development of the Springfield Station and BRT were dependent upon each other. Mr. Kleger replied that the Springfield Station Steering Committee viewed the two projects as necessarily linked, but something needed to be done with the Springfield Station regardless of BRT. BRT had its own set of imperatives, and the only critical link between the two projects was location.

Ms. Hocken recalled that a major environmental impact in the environmental assessment process on other LTD projects was the impact on traffic. Currently, the alignments of BRT in downtown Springfield were very tentative. She stated that she was very much in support of the downtown Springfield station, and she did not want to hold that project up, but she was concerned that many assumptions would need to be made about BRT in order to conduct any type of traffic impact analysis.

Mr. Bailey stated that the Board would discuss the Springfield Station environmental assessment later in the meeting agenda. He asked Mr. Viggiano to discuss the BRT Springfield Engineer issue that was included as page 148 of the handout.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the Board previously had agreed in principle to reimburse the City of Springfield for the cost of engineering services related to the BRT project. Staff were working on an agreement with the City of Springfield staff. There were two issues for which staff requested further direction from the Board. One was how much control LTD would have over the engineer's work that would be paid for by LTD, and the other was whether the agreement should include some deadlines for the endorsement of Phase 1 and the final approval. Staff were concerned that the alternatives that were considered and studies that were conducted by the engineer needed to fit within the confines of what the Board's vision was for BRT.

LTD had a fairly aggressive schedule for BRT, which could be met only by maintaining fairly active involvement from the other jurisdictions. In order to maintain that schedule, partner agency approval would be needed in a timely manner. Staff believed the intergovernmental agreement should reflect that.

Mr. Viggiano said that City staff had indicated that Springfield needed some flexibility in the amount of investigation and analysis that the engineer would perform to make the Council comfortable with the BRT project, and that work should be directed by the Council without LTD control.

Ms. Hocken stated that one reason to provide the funding was to allow LTD to keep to its BRT schedule. LTD was asking a lot of the City of Springfield, and Springfield wanted to accommodate LTD and help LTD meet its BRT schedule, but it did not have the staff time. This was one of the reasons it made sense for LTD to spend payroll tax revenues to fund a staff person for another unit of government. If meeting the schedule would not happen as a result of this agreement, Ms. Hocken said that she was not sure funding the engineer position would be a wise expenditure.

The Board members discussed the draft Intergovernmental Agreement on Reimbursement of Cost for City of Springfield Engineering Services on Bus Rapid Transit, particularly whether paragraph 9, which addressed termination of the agreement, should include specific reasons for termination of the agreement or if it should state only that either party could terminate the agreement at will. Several Board members favored including the BRT project timeline goals in the preambles portion of the agreement rather than in paragraph 9.

Mr. Viggiano stated that staff would remove paragraph 9 entirely, and would remove the wording in paragraph 5, limiting the engineer's time to specific work, that referred to the engineer's studies needing to be agreed to by LTD.

**Lane County Fairgrounds Presentation:** Fairgrounds Manager Mike Gleason was present to propose a loop route that would link all the visitor and convention venues in the community. He thanked the Board and Ms. Loobey for LTD's successful

partnership with the Fairgrounds. He said that LTD delivered 25 percent of the fair attendance via the fair shuttles, and he hoped to bring that figure up to 35 percent. The relationship between LTD and the Fairgrounds was very important. In addition, Mr. Gleason complimented the Board for the success of the downtown Eugene Station.

Mr. Gleason noted that the Eugene-Springfield convention and visitors industry was growing rapidly, and in fact, now employed more people than the logging industry.

He provided a brief history of the Fairgrounds and stated that it was the largest single destination venue between Portland and San Francisco. The Fairgrounds' mission was to respond to and support youth and family activities, to support the visitors and convention industry, and to be a cultural and entertainment center for the county. He provided an overview of the improvement plans for the Fairgrounds that would result in a facility, during the next 20 years, that would compete more effectively with other similar-sized communities for event and convention business.

Mr. Gleason stated that creating a bus route that would link the various venues in the community would accomplish many things both for the convention and visitor industry and for LTD. LTD also would benefit by forming a closer partnership with the industry that supplied a large amount of the payroll tax. He suggested that the existing downtown loop, route #1 Market District, was too small, and the proposed loop was too large, but if the larger loop existed, then hotels could purchase the bus headway.

Mr. Gleason thought that the visitor industry, which supplied nearly \$.5 million of the payroll tax, would be very interested in providing lobbying efforts on behalf of LTD to help ensure funding for transit concerns.

In response to questions from the Board members, Mr. Gleason said that the hotels could impose additional room tax to help pay for additional service. The Fairgrounds provided year-round operation, which would increase as the venue was improved. He added that the train station would be included in the loop.

Mr. Bailey thanked Mr. Gleason for his presentation.

## **II. REGULAR MEETING**

**Introductory Remarks By Board President:** Mr. Bailey reminded the Board members of the June 30, 1999, public hearing on TransPlan that would include both City Councils, the County Commissioners, and the LTD Board. It was scheduled for 7:00 p.m. at the Eugene Hilton. The Board would be briefed on the public hearing at its June regular meeting.

**Employee of the Month:** Mr. Bailey introduced the June 1999 Employee of the Month, Field Supervisor Shawn Mercer. Mr. Mercer was employed by LTD since September 1993. He was nominated by several co-workers at LTD, who praised him for his compassion with customers and his willingness to help others.

Mr. Bailey presented Mr. Mercer with a letter of congratulations, a plaque, and a monetary award. Mr. Mercer said that it had been an honor to be nominated and to be chosen as Employee of the Month. He added that he enjoyed his job and the people he served.

**Audience Participation:** (1) Tom Lester of Eugene spoke to the Board about its tentative approval of an environmental assessment for the Springfield Station. He was opposed to the two sites that were chosen for the study. He did not think those two sites would be good for downtown Springfield. He said that to his knowledge, the City of Springfield did not have a comprehensive physical plan for the downtown area. Without that type of plan to study the overall organization of the downtown area, he did not think it appropriate for LTD to site a downtown Springfield station without more serious consideration. He believed that the current two sites along South A were doomed to be failures for downtown Springfield.

(2) Mr. Olin Reed, a Glenwood business owner, stated that he was a member of the Glenwood Business Association. He wanted to point out that currently in the media, Springfield was being singled out as being unsure of BRT. However, the Glenwood Business Association also was unsure of BRT. While the Association had agreed that the 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue alignment best suited the Glenwood area, there still were many unanswered questions about the 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue alignment. There were no answers to what the east- and west-end alignments would be. When the media reported that Springfield had reservations, it left a false impression. Mr. Reed said that the Glenwood business people definitely were not for BRT as it currently was being presented.

He stated that currently there were approximately nine stops in Glenwood, which would be reduced to two stops with BRT. That would put a hardship on people who were between those two stops to get to them. Part of the rapid transit was to limit stops, and Mr. Reed was concerned that ridership would drop with limited stops. The other factor he was concerned about was the frequency of 10-minute service, which was fine if they were being used.

He asked the Board to give very careful consideration to BRT, because while it might be great to have, if it failed, the Board would not want to have been involved.

(3) Springfield Mayor Maureen Maine spoke to the Board about approving the BRT Pilot Corridor Goals and Objectives. In 1997, when LTD came forward with the BRT concept, the Springfield City Council had been in favor of the concept because of the specificity of the design elements and the fact that they were not individually required to make BRT work.

She stated that during the last two BRT Steering Committee meetings, a discussion had taken place regarding concern about the design elements. There was discussion about exceptions being made to the design elements and whether there could be different language about maximizing the use of 'when appropriate,' 'when feasible,' or 'when practical.' The vote went forward because the minutes were to reflect that these exceptions were inherent in any type of implementation strategy. However, the minutes did not reflect that language, so the draft minutes were amended to include

Springfield attorney Dave Jewett's (a member of the BRT Steering Committee) comments that the meeting minutes reflect that in adopting the goals and objectives as written, it was understood that exceptions could be made, notwithstanding the language of the goals and objectives as presented, and in particular, with those design elements.

Mayor Maine stated that although there had been no change to the language, she wanted it to be clear that the understanding about exceptions had been discussed and agreed to at the Steering Committee level. It was very important to go forward in Springfield with an understanding that exceptions were understood in the document, particularly with regard to exclusive bus lanes and bus guideways.

Mayor Maine suggested including a statement like that in the Bus Rapid Transit Overview section of the document much the same as the concept was presented to the Springfield City Council in 1997. She suggested stating that, "BRT is a system that has many design elements; components that could be applied." Phase I and Phase II had many different elements, and certainly not all of them, such as low-floor buses and pre-paid fares, needed to be implemented during Phase I or Phase II.

Mayor Maine encouraged the Board to consider that language, which would get to the heart of the discussion about the Engineer position. With regard to the engineer position, the Mayor stated that it had been Springfield's desire, based on the FTA report that specified that BRT would surface after the analysis of some alternatives, to have an engineer analyze those alternatives that would be BRT related, but that might be different than the alternatives suggested in Phase I and Phase II.

The Mayor suggested that there could be different components of BRT that were included in Phase I and Phase II that could be implemented in Springfield over a longer period of time. Those components should be studied to determine their effect upon all the other outcomes that were desired by the City.

Mayor Maine said that the topic that LTD and the City needed to discuss was whether or not there would be language in the BRT Goals and Objectives to address exceptions to any of the design elements as a standard option for implementation of the very broad concept. In addition, the two jurisdictions needed to discuss the engineer position and the fact that while the LTD-funded studies would be BRT related, they might be different than the alternative that LTD had suggested in Phase I and Phase II.

(d) Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer spoke to the Board about his concerns about increasing the person-carrying capacity along the BRT pilot corridor as stated in Goal number 3 of the Goals and Objectives, when studies showed that the corridor could accommodate 2,500 vehicles per hour, and the bus only 750 people. He did not understand how that would increase the carrying capacity, and what LTD meant by "increase the person-carrying capacity."

Commissioner Dwyer also stated that he was concerned about the policy banning the soliciting of signatures and other rights that were protected by the First Amendment at the Eugene Station. He did not believe that LTD had the authority to ban those protected rights, and he stated that even the legislature did not have that kind of



authority. The LTD Board was appointed by a vote of the legislature, which could not give authority to a public body that it did not have itself.

**Items For Action At This Meeting:**

**MOTION**

**Consent Calendar:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution, "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 19, 1999, is approved as presented." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote. The May 19, 1999, Consent Calendar consisted of the Minutes of the April 12, 1999, special Board meeting / joint work session with the Eugene City Council; the minutes of the April 21, 1999, regular Board meeting; and the minutes of the May 1, 1999, special Board meeting / joint work session with the Springfield City Council.

**VOTE**

**MOTION  
VOTE**

**Second Reading and Adoption – Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35:** Mr. Kleger moved that Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

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

**MOTION**

Mr. Kleger then moved 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." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken stated that she had talked with a co-worker of hers who had two high school students in her family. The co-worker had expressed her disappointment that the schools did not sell the three-month passes to the high school students. She requested that LTD consider making the three-month passes just as available as the one-month passes.

Mr. Kleger observed that the passing of Ordinance #35 followed the Board's usual practice of adjusting fares and fit into the long-standing pattern and was nothing particularly unusual.

**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

**Springfield Station Environmental Assessment:** Mr. Viggiano reported that the Springfield Station Steering Committee, after careful review, had selected three sites for further review. Staff were seeking the Board's authorization to conduct environmental assessments (EA) on each of the finalist sites. There were four assessments to conduct because a no-build alternative was required by the federal government. The three build options included the current station at 5<sup>th</sup> and B Streets (Site A); Site G on Main and South A Streets, between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets; and Site I on the south side of South A Street, between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Streets.

Staff had discussed these options with the Springfield City Council, and the Council had expressed concern about loss of parking if the current station were

expanded. The City had suggested that LTD not pursue that site for further expansion. LTD staff agreed because Site A was not a site that drew much public interest.

Staff amended the recommendation to include only a "no-build" assessment of Site A, and the assessments of Sites G and I.

Mr. Viggiano stated that there were two types of environmental assessments. An environmental site analysis was used to examine the property that would be bought to ensure that it was not contaminated. An environmental assessment would evaluate the impacts of the project on its surrounding environment.

Ms. Hocken asked staff to respond to studying the impacts on surrounding traffic when currently it was not known what the BRT routing would be through downtown Springfield. She added that it was her understanding that in the past, LTD was committed to studying site A because the Springfield Council had requested that LTD keep it as an active alternative throughout the process. She asked if the Council now was suggesting that it no longer desired that option. Mr. Viggiano said that the "no-build" alternative was still under consideration, which satisfied the Council's request.

Mr. Viggiano added that assessing traffic impacts regardless of the BRT alignment would be effective because the current Thurston service, which provided 10-minute bus service, would serve Sites G and I, so from a bus-service standpoint, the frequency would not change. The lane configurations with BRT could change, but Mr. Viggiano thought that this EA would evaluate the site assuming the current traffic patterns and configurations. LTD also would be required to conduct an EA on the BRT project should it move forward, which would address the other issues.

Ms. Hocken asked if the number of potential bus bays would be affected by the BRT decision. Mr. Viggiano said that the number of bus bays would not be affected because the Thurston route would replace the BRT service or vice versa.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if the difference between the no-build and build options for Site A only was the loss of parking, or if the EA would address the parking issue anyway. Mr. Viggiano said that the EA would evaluate the current station site only for the no-build option and would provide information about the impact of the current station on the current surrounding parking lots and businesses, but not the impact of the parking removal.

Mr. Kleger stated that the Springfield Station Steering Committee was not interested in expanding the current station if it meant taking the library parking lot. He added that currently, the District was not committed to any build schedule.

Mr. Viggiano also said that LTD was coordinating with the Springfield Partnership for Progress, Springfield Planning and Development staff, the Springfield Renaissance Development Corporation, and the Springfield Planning Commission, and that several of these organizations were represented on the Springfield Station Steering Committee. Mayor Maine added that the City had applied for a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant to study the area around the finalist sites for potential co-development.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution, "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors directs staff to conduct an Environmental Assessment on Springfield Station Site finalists A, G, and I, with a note that Site A is only to be evaluated as a no-build option." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion.

Mr. Bailey commented that there was a need for a larger comprehensive plan for downtown Springfield, and his sense of the answer to that need was the TGM grant that had been applied for. By virtue of conducting the EA, LTD was not committing itself to anything that could not be undone, but would get answers to many of the questions regarding the larger downtown area.

Mr. Kleger added that while it would have been nice to conduct the EA on every block in the downtown area, the field had to be narrowed somewhat. The Steering Committee had discussed the possibility of adding one or two more potential sites, but those sites were found to have fatal flaws that would prevent the building of a station. There was strong support for sites G and I.

**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, the Board voted unanimously to adopt the resolution as stated.

**Transit Coordination Agreements:** Mr. Viggiano said that ORS 195 required that every incorporated city develop a plan for provision of urban services, including transit. The plan had to address how those services were to be provided. Staff were requesting approval of agreements between LTD, the City of Veneta, and Lane County, and between LTD and the City of Eugene and Lane County.

Mr. Peter Watt of Lane Council of Governments provided additional information about how the agreements had been drafted, and he discussed the contents of the agreements.

**MOTION**

There was no further discussion, and Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved 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." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote.

**VOTE**

**Revised Special Service Policy:** Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated that LTD had two separate policies governing the implementation of charter and community event services. In an effort to create consistency between the two services, staff were recommending that they be combined into a Special Service Policy.

In answer to questions from the Board, Mr. Vobora stated that LTD charged more for charters than did private companies, partly because the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) mandated that transit could not be in competition with private

charter companies. And, private charter companies typically were not interested in the types of service LTD provided, such as two-hour charters.

The difference in pricing for charter service and special event service was that LTD charged the fully-allocated service rate of \$66.00 per hour, per vehicle for charter service and community event sponsors paid a direct-cost rate of \$52.00 per hour, per vehicle.

Ms. Loobey said that, in terms of community events, staff considered LTD's larger role in the community when evaluating the service request, and there were those occasions when staff determined that it was important to the community that LTD participate in order to assist in the goals and purposes of the sponsoring organization.

Ms. Hocken suggested that language be included in the policy to address other factors, such as if the event would have fewer expected participants than what was deemed to meet community goals. There was enough difference in the rates that LTD might want to specify a minimum number of participants for community-related events.

It was recommended that the Definition of Service to Community Events be amended to read, "Public transit service that is organized by LTD or an event organizer to address transportation needs arising from an event **typically** hosting 1,000 or more participants."

Mr. Bailey stated that he was concerned about the discretion on the part of the District to make exceptions to the minimum number of participants. Mr. Vobora stated that the FTA did not require a minimum number of participants, but that staff were trying to get to a sense of scale for pricing purposes. He added that smaller groups often did not have the resources to purchase the service at the fully-allocated cost.

Mr. Bailey stated that he appreciated staff efforts to achieve consistency, and with agreement of the other Board members, he asked staff to further consider the Board's comments and revise the policy accordingly for approval in June.

Board action was deferred until June 1999 on this issue.

**BRT Pilot Corridor Goals and Performance Objectives:** Mr. Viggiano stated that this item had been on the May regular Board meeting agenda, and the Board had chosen to wait to take action on the Goals and Objectives until after a scheduled discussion with the Springfield City Council.

Mr. Viggiano stated that there had been discussion at the recent BRT Steering Committee about whether a statement needed to be included about whether exceptions could be made to the BRT design elements. The Steering Committee was content with having the Steering Committee meeting minutes reflect the Committee's belief that exceptions were possible.

Mr. Bailey added that the intent of the Steering Committee was to allow for exceptions, but the discussion was focused on exceptions under various scenarios. The Committee realized that allowed exceptions would need to be specifically stated, and it

was impossible at this point to anticipate what the possible scenarios might be that would require an exception. The final decision of the Steering Committee was that a general agreement on the legislative intent was sufficient to recognize that there would be scenarios when exceptions might be made. The final opinion of the Committee was unanimous to forward the Goals and Objectives to the Board for approval.

Mr. Bailey added that the Steering Committee appreciated the opportunity to consider the issue and to focus on some of the goals. It helped to crystallize the Board's conversation about the vision of BRT and indicated the objectives with which to be accountable.

Mr. Kleger said that when the Board began discussing BRT, it was understood that there would be locations where exceptions would be made. However, he did not think it was appropriate to look for exceptions. He agreed that the document did not need to specify what exceptions could be made, but the Board should agree to be prepared to consider exceptions.

Ms. Loobey stated her concern about the use of the terminology of "BRT Lite," which was not terminology that was recognized by the FTA. The FTA was seeking as complete a system as possible. LTD would not get BRT funding or approval for a system that did not have the elements of BRT as defined by the FTA.

Mr. Kleger added that exceptions were costly, and in combination, would make a critical difference in the BRT system.

Ms. Hocken stated that BRT was a long-term plan, and the Goals and Objectives were for the long-term project plan and not necessarily for the short-term. It was LTD's vision, and it might be practical to consider some short-term exceptions.

Mr. Bailey, in response to Commissioner Dwyer's comments, stated that Goal Number 3, which addressed increasing the person-carrying capacity of the corridor, meant that BRT would increase the ability to move more people through the corridor in less time, a concept that was a key focal point of the BRT project.

Ms. Loobey added that Tri-Met had conducted a recent analysis of the impact of the westside light rail system on the Sunset Corridor. Ridership on that corridor had increased, and while there was no significant decrease in the number of cars traveling through the corridor, those cars were able to travel at a faster rate than before.

Mr. Kleger asked if the Board was in agreement that it had the authority to agree to exceptions, when necessary. Mr. Bailey stated that he sensed that the Board was in agreement that it could make exceptions, including decisions that would affect the entire project.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the March 17, 1999, draft of the Bus Rapid Transit Pilot Corridor Goals and Performance Objectives be approved." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by a unanimous vote.

**VOTE**

Ms. Hocken asked that the meeting minutes reflect the Board's conversation and agreement to consider exceptions to the design elements of BRT.

**Items for Information at this Meeting:**

**Board Member Reports:** (a) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken reported that there were no transportation issues on the MPC agenda.

(b) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken reported that the first report from the Forum had been published. She passed around a copy of the "Choices for the Future" report that supported land-use measures and the creation of an infrastructure that would support schools, livability, etc. The report also outlined plans for Forum action to promote the recommendations made in the report.

(c) BRT Steering Committee. Nothing further to report than what was discussed earlier at this meeting.

(d) Springfield Station Steering Committee. The meeting of May 20, 1999, had been canceled, and the Committee would not meet again until June.

(e) North End Scoping Group. Mr. Kortge reported that the last meeting of the Group was scheduled for June 10, 1999, and a final draft report would be forwarded to the Eugene City Council. The train station was the biggest issue of concern. There was no decision made about the location of the courthouse, and the LTD downtown circulator shuttle had been discussed. Eugene Water and Electric Board had no formal representation in the Group, but had sent staff to attend the meetings.

(f) Meetings with Springfield City Council. This item was discussed during the earlier work session at this meeting, and there was nothing further to report.

(g) Smoke-Free Air Award. Mr. Kleger reported that the Lane County Tobacco Prevention Coalition had presented LTD with its "Smoke-Free Air Award," in recognition of the no-smoking policy at the Eugene Station. Mr. Kleger stated that the April 28 ceremony had been pleasant. He added that he had yet to hear a negative comment about that policy.

**April Financial Statements:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that LTD was in good financial condition and on track with the FY1998-99 budget. Staff were looking forward to the year-end financial closing. She said that an on-sight audit review would occur in June with the field work to be completed in September. Ms. Hellekson added that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Triennial review would take place on September 7, 8, and 9, 1999.

**Legislative Update:** Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch reported that the Oregon House Revenue Committee had advanced the gas tax to the full House, but had rejected the repeal of the weight-mile tax.

**Bus Rapid Transit Update:** Mr. Viggiano commented on the Glenwood alignment that had been brought up at this meeting by Mr. Olin Reed. LTD had pledged to go through an extensive public process as the end segments of the Glenwood alignment were designed. Also in response to Mr. Reed's comments, Mr. Viggiano said that currently there were five eastbound and four westbound bus stops on Franklin through the Glenwood area. The proposed BRT system would have four stops on the currently proposed 14<sup>th</sup> Street alignment.

**LTD Service Area Boundary Revision:** Mr. Vobora reported that the service area boundary would be presented to the Board in June for approval. Staff were recommending two minor changes to address portions of the service area that were outside the 2.5-mile limit outlined in ORS 267.207. While the District had legal authority to establish boundaries beyond 2.5 miles, it appeared that there was no apparent reason to exceed 2.5 miles in those two cases.

**Service Policy and Productivity Standards Work Session:** Mr. Vobora stated that staff were recommending moving the all-day Board work session that was being planned from June to October. Staff believed that the discussion of the service policy and productivity standards would better fit into the larger strategic plan discussion that took place at the annual fall work session.

**LCC Term Pass:** Mr. Bailey stated that the term bus pass program had been fully funded in the LCC annual budget for the next school year.

**Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Award:** Mr. Bailey congratulated Ms. Hellekson for the achievement of receiving the GFOA award for the third year in a row. Ms. Hellekson acknowledged the work of staff, and particularly the work of Assistant Finance Manager Roy Burling. Ms. Hocken stated that this was an important award for the District, but it was important to know that LTD staff had performed the work required to receive the award, where most companies that received the award relied upon an auditor to perform the work.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Bailey pointed out the remaining items on the agenda, which included Board correspondence and the monthly staff report. None of the Board members had questions or comments about those two agenda items. Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

---

Board Secretary

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** REVISION OF ORDINANCE 24 GOVERNING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Complete first reading of revised Ordinance 24

**BACKGROUND:** Ordinance 24 describes the territorial boundaries of Lane Transit District. When there are no changes to the boundary, the Board affirms the boundaries each year in June. This action is done by resolution and does not require a reading of the ordinance. A revision to the boundary ordinance is required only if there is a change to the District boundary.

Two changes to the boundary have been discussed by the Board. The first involves a change to the boundary in southwest Eugene and the second to the boundary north of Coburg. Both changes involve the removal of taxpayers from the District. As discussed at the May 1999 Board meeting, these changes are expected to result in a loss of tax revenues totaling \$28,000 annually.

The ordinance has been revised and a new District boundary has been produced by Lane Council of Governments staff. The revised boundary map will be available at the June 16 Board meeting.

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** A second reading and adoption of the ordinance will be placed on the agenda for the August 18, 1999, Board meeting. Following a second reading and adoption, the ordinance will take effect on January 1, 2000.

**ATTACHMENT:** LTD Ordinance 24 (999 Revision)

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that Lane Transit District Ordinance 24, an ordinance describing the territorial boundaries of Lane Transit District be read by title only.

After an affirmative vote, the title should be read:

**“Lane Transit District Ordinance 24 (1999Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District.”**



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** CORRESPONDENCE

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

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

- ◆ June 4, 1999, letter to Board President Kirk Bailey from Federal Transit Administration Administrator Gordon Linton, with attached press release

At the June 16 meeting, staff will respond to any questions the Board members may have about this correspondence.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



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

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

## **MONTHLY STAFF REPORT**

June 16, 1999

### **SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING**

*Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager*

#### **SERVICE PLANNING**

Summer bid changes were finalized and the bus operator sign-up occurred during the week of May 24, for implementation on Sunday, June 13. Service hours drop during the summer to better match the demand for service created by fewer students attending the University of Oregon and Lane Community College.

Fall bid schedule writing is nearly complete. Finalized timetables are being formatted for the Rider's Digest printing. The graphics staff will be in full swing for the next eight weeks as the finishing touches are put on all fall service printed materials.

The Ferry Street Bridge project has reached a stage that will result in a single-lane configuration for approximately 12 weeks. Staff have decided to change most routes using the bridge to the Washington/Jefferson Street bridge. This routing normally would take a little longer; however, we are anticipating that the traffic on the Ferry Street Bridge would slow things down even more. We are hoping that the consistency of the routing will help customers to better plan their trips. Information is being posted at the Eugene Station and at affected bus stops.

#### **DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE STUDY**

A meeting of the advisory committee was held on May 26. The consultant presented two routing options for consideration. These options were developed in response to the group's concern that the shuttle be direct, frequent, and have short travel times. The routing recommendation links the University, LTD Eugene Station, 5<sup>th</sup> Street Public Market, Country Club Road, and Valley River Center. This option sacrifices service to the Coburg Road hotels and to the Lane County Fairgrounds, and therefore does not address the vision Fairgrounds Manager Mike Gleason has for a shuttle route. Staff will be

attending a meeting on June 14<sup>th</sup> to continue discussions with Mr. Gleason and the CVALCO staff.

### **YOUTH PROGRAMS**

In response to Board member and community requests for LTD assistance in transporting youth, staff are developing a recommendation to address the issue in a comprehensive manner. In the interim, General Manager Phyllis Loobey has approved an allocation of tokens to be used by organizations providing summer activities for youth. Youth who have transportation needs will be able to obtain bus tokens through the activity provider.

### **AIRPORT STUDY UPDATE**

LTD intern Ben Williams continues to gather data and investigate alternative service options to analyze the cost and projected productivity of airport bus service. Staff have met with City of Eugene airport staff to discuss the information gathered and what additional information should be considered. The City and LTD will jointly fund an intercept survey of airport users. The survey results will help to establish if there is interest in the options for shared-ride shuttle or transit service.

### **COTTAGE GROVE VOTE**

The citizens of Cottage Grove will once again vote on the issue of annexation into the LTD service district. The appropriate paperwork was filed by citizens, and the issue will be before the voters in a September 21<sup>st</sup> election.

### **YIELD LAW**

Installation of yield lights on the buses has gone well. More than 75 percent of the fleet is now outfitted and operators have begun using the lights. The media campaign began on June 5 and will continue through June 20.

### **FREEDOM PASS SALES**

Freedom passes went on sale in mid-May. Sales for May were lower than last year; however, the first few days in June showed very strong sales. Several City of Eugene Parks and Recreation events are scheduled in June and will be good opportunities to promote the pass. Sales typically begin to rise as the end of school nears and summer vacation is imminent. Our goal is to exceed last year's sales of 2,800 passes.

## **DOWNTOWN EMPLOYEE PASS**

As part of LTD's one-year anniversary events, the District offered downtown Eugene employees an opportunity to ride the bus and receive wonderful items from Eugene Station merchants. Sales totaled 81 passes, which certainly were fewer than expected. The biggest obstacle was reaching the individual employees with the special offer. Downtown Eugene Inc. assisted with the delivery of posters to each business in downtown; however, the flyer intended for inclusion in the May publication of the DEI newsletter inadvertently was left out by DEI staff. Of the employees who purchased the pass, 28 percent previously either "occasionally" or "never" rode the bus to work. These were the people LTD had hoped to reach with this promotion. Staff are hopeful that our partnership with DEI will allow us to continue targeting downtown employees with programs that will attract new riders to the system.

## **TRANSIT OPERATIONS**

*Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager*

## **NEW OPERATORS**

A class of five new operators began their careers at LTD on May 10, 1998. The new operators were necessary because of attrition caused by retirements and resignations. The class will be under the watchful eye of LTD's Training Coordinator Vern Rodgers and the instructors for the first few weeks, and will be ready for service in mid-June. This class ensures full staffing for the bid that begins on June 13.

## **RADIO SYSTEM**

The takeover agreement with the bonding company on the radio contract has been signed and authorized by all parties effective May 26, 1999. There are specific timelines for progress built into the agreement that LTD will be monitoring closely. By the end of August we should know the outcome in terms of the current system. Additional updates will be provided to the Board as progress is made.

## **SCHEDULING AND OPERATIONS SOFTWARE**

LTD is prepared to offer a contract to a company called GIRO for a HASTUS 5 scheduling system for the District's service planning and scheduling staff. GIRO is the most experienced company for this type of software. Staff are confident that not only is their product advanced beyond their competitors, but that their project management is

superior, as well. The installation process should begin next month. The Operations module of the software is still under review. Staff hope to make a decision by mid-July for that portion of the software.

### **LTD ROADEO**

The LTD Rodeo is scheduled for July 18 in the LTD bus parking lot in Glenwood. This is a skills event for operators to show off their driving abilities. Participation in the top division requires that operators have an excellent driving record, good attendance, and no disciplinary action for the year prior to the Rodeo. Top prize for the winner in this category is a trip to compete at the international level with other operators throughout the U.S.A. and Canada. This year the International Rodeo competition is in Orlando, Florida. Board members are all welcome on July 18 as spectators or volunteers.

### **DETOURS**

The summer construction period is getting into full swing. LTD's field supervisors will be working with the District's service planners and the contractors involved to minimize disruptions to LTD service. The Ferry Street Bridge project causes the greatest concern, and efforts are underway to develop a back-up plan for severe delays.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES**

*Dave Dickman, Human Resources Manager*

No report this month.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 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 June 10 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 June 1, 1999. At the June 16 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 did not meet in April or May. The next meeting is scheduled for June 17, 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 June 16 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 group's last meeting was held on June 10, 1999. At the June 16 Board meeting, Mr. Kortge can report on this group's discussions.
  
- f. **FTA Conference Call**: On June 9, LTD and several community partners participated in a conference call with Administrator Linton of the Federal Transit Administration. During the call, Administrator Linton announced the properties and projects, including LTD's BRT project, that were selected to participate in the FTA's Bus Rapid Transit Demonstration Program. Board President Kirk Bailey will report to the Board about this conference call and project participation at the June 16 meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## RESOLUTION

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

A RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING THE TERRITORY IN THE DISTRICT WITHIN WHICH THE TRANSIT SYSTEM WILL OPERATE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OREGON REVISED STATUTES 267.207(3)(a).

WHEREAS, ORS 267.207(3)(a) requires that the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District annually determine the territory in the District within which the transit system will operate;

THEREFORE, HEREBY BE IT RESOLVED, that for Fiscal Year 1999-2000, the Lane Transit District will continue to operate service within the boundaries specified in Lane Transit District Ordinance Number 24 (1998 Revision).

June 16, 1999  
Date Adopted

Board President



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 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 June 16, 1999:

- ◆ Approval of minutes: May 19, 1999, regular Board meeting

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- ◆ Minutes of the May 19, regular Board meeting

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for June 16, 1999, is approved as presented.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 1999

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

**PREPARED BY:** Joyce Ziemplak, Human Resources Specialist

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **JULY 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Executive Secretary Jo Sullivan has been selected as the July 1999 Employee of the Month. Jo was hired on December 15, 1980. She was nominated by a co-worker, who said that she appreciates Jo's kind and supportive manner. She said that even when a mistake occurs, Jo treats her with dignity and helps her to understand how things should be done. She wanted to thank Jo for the terrific job she does in keeping LTD "humming along." Another employee commented that she appreciates Jo's willingness to share her knowledge and expertise with her co-workers. This employee said that Jo's informal mentoring had contributed to her professional development and success as an LTD employee. She also said that Jo's professional and respectful demeanor to all employees, along with her dedication to LTD, make her an excellent role model for other employees.

When asked what makes Jo a good employee, General Manager Phyllis Loobey said that Jo not only produces a great deal of work, she does so with the highest standards of form, content, and style. She is a dedicated, loyal employee of the District and of the Board whom she tirelessly supports in all matters. Her attention to detail, her commitment to excellence, and her unqualified support of LTD, her fellow employees, and my office even extends to providing assistance to the local executive board officer of the Amalgamated Transit Union.

Jo pitches every inning; we all benefit.

**AWARD:** Jo will attend the June 16 meeting to receive her award.

## MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

June 16, 1999

### Revenue:

- **Passenger fares** are slightly behind plan year-to-date, but ahead of the previous year by 5.0 percent.
- **Group pass revenue** is slightly below budget for the first eleven months, but expected to finish the fiscal year on plan.
- **Operating revenue** is generally satisfactory, with the exception of advertising (down slightly due to the reduction in advertising space on buses). This shortfall is offset by a positive variance in special services revenue.

### 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 eleven 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:** June 16, 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. **LTD Boundary Ordinance:** The second reading and adoption of LTD Ordinance 24 (1999 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District, will be scheduled for the August 18, 1999, regular Board meeting.
  - B. **TransPlan Work Session and Draft Plan Approval:** The Draft TransPlan will be brought to the Board as an information item at the August 18, 1999, regular Board meeting. The Joint Elected Officials public hearing on TransPlan has been postponed until September, 1999. The LTD Board will be part of that public hearing. Approval of the Draft TransPlan is anticipated to occur during October 1999.
  - C. **Government Relations Legislative Report:** A final report on the 1999 Oregon legislative session will be scheduled for the September 15, 1999, regular Board meeting.
  - D. **Long-Range Financial Plan:** The Long-Range Financial Plan will be discussed with the Board during the fall of 1999.
  - 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. **Fall Board Strategic Planning Work Session:** The Board's annual fall strategic planning retreat will be scheduled for sometime in October 1999. A work session on productivity standards and policies will be included as part of this two-day strategic planning session.

- H. **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.
  
- I. **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:** June 16, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** Government Relations Report – Legislative Update

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** State Legislature: The Legislature is expected to complete its work and adjourn by the end of June or beginning of July. Because very little of its work was completed by the beginning of June, many decisions must be made very quickly, with reduced opportunities for public input.

To the degree that a legislative agenda depended on the legislature *not* acting, people are fairly comfortable at this point in the session. However, LTD's legislative agenda requires the legislature to act to increase funding for elderly and disabled transportation services, to continue and increase funding for Willamette Valley passenger rail, and to increase fuel taxes and vehicle registration fees to more adequately fund the transportation infrastructure. These issues have not lacked for attention, public hearings, capitol displays, constituent letters, and individual and corporate lobbying, but they do seem to lack legislative will. If they are addressed before adjournment, it is likely to be in the closing days of the session, something everyone hoped to avoid when the legislature convened five months ago.

LTD and Tri-Met attempted to regain some authority over firearms on transit district property and vehicles but appear to have fallen victim to the efforts of the National Rifle Association.

It is expected that both benefits and protections for people enrolled in group pass programs will be achieved and that energy tax credits will be extended to employers participating in group pass programs. There is a good chance that elderly and disabled transportation services will have a small but dedicated income from the tobacco settlement. LTD is a small player in this important debate, which is trying to please as many people as possible.

Congress – Both the House and Senate have marked up their transportation measures, and LTD is named in both versions. This assures that LTD will receive the \$4.4 million balance of the TEA-21 authorization. We

had hoped that being named in the Senate bill would be an indicator of funding for bus acquisition, but that is uncertain at this time. Staff to both Senator Wyden and Senator Smith have been helpful, and Senator Wyden will try to have the Congressional Record reflect a broad intent. This will position us better for conference committee later, but next year still appears to be more ripe for success.

Staff had hoped that being named in the Senate bill would be in indicator of funding for bus acquisition, but that is uncertain at this time. Staff to both Senator Wyden and Senator Smith have been helpful, and Senator Wyden will attempt to have the Congressional Record reflect a broad intent. This will position LTD better for conference committee later, but FY 2000-2001 still appears to be more likely for funding.

Both the House Subcommittee and Senate Committee proposals increase funding for transit over FY 99 by \$407 million. How this will translate locally is yet to be determined.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** 1999 ORIGIN AND DESTINATION SURVEY RESULTS

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** LTD conducts a comprehensive survey of current riders every four years. Due to the opening of the new Eugene Station in 1998, the O&D was delayed until 1999. For the first time, an outside consultant was hired to coordinate the survey. Selena Barlow was selected to perform this work. Senior Transit Planner Paul Zvonkovic staffed the project for LTD.

Data gathering occurred in January, data entry in February, and analysis in March and April.

Ms. Barlow has presented survey findings to staff and staff have had an opportunity to review the draft report. At the Board meeting, Ms. Barlow will provide a review of the findings and respond to Board questions

**ATTACHMENT:** None (Copies of the report previously were distributed to Board members.)

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**Ordinance 24**

**(1999 Revision)**

**Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District**

The Board of Directors of Lane Transit District does hereby ordain and decree the following Ordinance:

§ 1. On and after the effective date of this Ordinance the territorial boundaries of the Lane Transit District shall be as shown on a map attached hereto as Exhibit A.

§ 2. All addresses located within the territorial boundaries described on Exhibit A shall be identified in a computer file stored in the Lane County Regional Information System computer data base, which is maintained and regularly updated by the Lane Council of Governments, and such data base shall be available for public inspection at Lane County and at the offices of Lane Transit District.

§ 3. Disputes arising under this Ordinance may be resolved using the District's Hearing Procedure, adopted July 14, 1997, as now in place or amended hereafter.

§ 4. The text of Ordinance 24 (1998 Revision), adopted on November 18, 1998, is hereby deleted in its entirety and replaced by this Ordinance 24 (1999 Revision).

§ 5. This Ordinance 24 shall take effect on January 1, 2000.

ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board President

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

Effective Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 21, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** 2000 PACIFIC PROGRAM

**PREPARED BY:** Ken Hamm, General Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** The 2000 Pacific Program for State and Local Government and Non-Profit Executives will be held October 7-14 at the Inn at 7<sup>th</sup> Mountain in Bend, Oregon. Board members and staff have attended this conference in the past and found it to be a valuable experience. According to the Program organizers:

An eight-day, intensive residential training seminar, the Pacific Program is offered annually for men and women who have been elected, appointed, or promoted to leadership positions in public and nonprofit agencies. The Program provides the critical continuing education needed by elected and appointed public-sector executives in an era that requires increasing policy leadership at state and local levels.

The curriculum of the Pacific Program emphasizes development of both the analytical skills and the interpersonal skills required for effective policy leadership and public management, including the emerging context for leadership; strategic planning and management; collaboration and negotiation; group leadership and conflict resolution; and awareness of individual leadership skills.

Board members who might be interested in attending the Pacific Program this year are asked to mark the dates on their calendars and to immediately let staff know of their interest. Applications must be submitted by July 6, 2000. Additional information about the Program and presenters is available from LTD staff.

**ATTACHMENT:** 2000 Pacific Program Brochure

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 16, 1999

**ITEM TITLE:** REVISED SPECIAL SERVICE POLICY

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve revised special service policy

**BACKGROUND:** At the May 1999 meeting the Board reviewed the proposed revisions to the Special Event Service Policy. The Board requested a change to the "definition" section in the Service to Community Events area. The definition was rewritten to allow the District greater flexibility in responding to events attracting fewer than 1,000 participants.

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** All community events for which LTD provides bus service will be charged at the same rate.

**ATTACHMENT:** Special Service Policy

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution: The LTD Board of Directors hereby approves the Lane Transit District Special Service Policy as presented on June 16, 1999.

# **SPECIAL SERVICE POLICY**

## **Service to Community Events**

### **Definition**

Public transit service that is organized, by LTD or an event organizer, to address transportation needs arising from an event with a sufficient number of participants to cause negative impacts on the community's transportation network or on the neighborhood adjacent to the event site.

### **Access**

Access to the community event transit service must be open to all persons.

### **Restrictions**

1. Operating service for community events should not have a negative impact on regular service. There should not be a reduction in scheduled regular service levels. There also should not be a significant degradation in service capacity or scheduled timing of regular service.
2. Consideration will be given to the availability of buses and the type of bus appropriate for the event.
3. Consideration will be given to the availability of staff.
4. Consideration will be given to the availability of bus operators.
  - a. Service expected to use ten (10) or more bus operators must be scheduled in advance and accounted for in the bus operator vacation bid.
  - b. Service Planning & Marketing staff shall produce a service analysis for proposed special events not accounted for in the bus operator vacation bid. Transit Operations and Fleet Services must agree to the proposed service package before the District contracts with the event organizer.

### **Fees**

The District will charge fees equaling the sum of all direct variable and fixed operating costs (measured as a rate per schedule hour of service), as outlined in the District's Fully-allocated Cost Plan.

The event organizer will determine the fare charged.

## **Service Provided through Charter Agreements**

### **Definition**

Transit service that is organized to meet a transportation need of a private party or organization.

### **Access**

The contracting party or organization will determine access to chartered service.

### **Restrictions**

Charter service will be directed to local private providers to determine the availability and willingness of these providers to provide the desired service. The District will consider contracting, through subcontracting agreements with private providers, when service on fixed routes is not compromised and when bus operators are available.

The only exception will be for organizations that are exempted in FTA 49 CFR Part 604, which allows the District to contract directly with a government entity that is a qualified social service agency, or a private, non-profit organization serving seniors or people with disabilities.

### **Fees**

The District will charge fees equaling the sum of all direct variable and fixed operating costs, as well as indirect fixed costs (measured as a rate per schedule hour of service), rounded up to the nearest whole dollar, as outlined in the District's Fully-allocated Cost Plan.

The event organizer will determine the fare charged.

## **Maintenance of the Charter and Community Events Service Policy**

The Service Planning & Marketing Manager is responsible for maintaining this policy and recommending changes to the policy as necessary.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** June 21, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** SUMMER 2000 BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Board members have been polled about their availability to attend meetings during the summer months, and staff have discussed the urgency of specific items for Board action or discussion. There are, at this time, no urgent items requiring the Board's attention in July or August. Staff suggest canceling the work sessions and regular Board meetings in both July and August. If it is necessary for the Board to meet to select a final site for the Springfield Station, the Board could meet briefly just before the July 12 joint TransPlan meeting. Otherwise, if urgent issues for Board discussion or decision arise during the summer, staff will contact the Board to schedule a meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## **TRANSIT OPERATIONS**

Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

### **NEW OPERATORS**

A class of five new operators began their careers at LTD on May 10, 1998. The new operators were necessary because of attrition due to retirements and resignations. The class will be under the watchful eye of Vern Rodgers, our Training Coordinator and our Instructors for the first few weeks and be ready for service in mid-June. This class will make us fully staffed for the bid that begins on June 13.

### **RADIO SYSTEM**

The takeover agreement with the bonding company on the radio contract has been signed and authorized by all parties effective May 26, 1999. There are specific timelines for progress built in to the agreement that LTD will be monitoring closely. By the end of August we should know the outcome in terms of the current system. I will keep you updated as we progress.

### **SCHEDULING AND OPERATIONS SOFTWARE**

We are prepared to offer a contract to a company called GIRO for a HASTUS 5 scheduling system for our service planning and scheduling staff. GIRO is the most experienced company around for this type of software and we feel confident that not only is their product advanced beyond their competitors but that their project management is top notch as well. The installation process should begin next month. The Operations module of the software is still under review and we hope to make a decision by mid- July for that portion of the software.

### **LTD ROADEO**

The LTD Roadeo is scheduled for July 18 in the LTD lot. This is a skills event for operators to show off their driving abilities. Participation in the top division requires that operators have an excellent driving record, good attendance and no disciplinary action for the year prior to the Roadeo. Top prize for the winner in this category is a trip to compete at the international level with other operators throughout the U.S.A. and Canada. This year the International Roadeo competition is in Orlando, Florida. You are all welcome to join us on July 18 as a spectator or a volunteer.

### **DETOURS**

The summer construction period is getting in to full swing and the Field Supervisors will be working with our service Planners and the contractors involved to minimize disruption to LTD service. The Ferry Street Bridge is the biggest concern and efforts are under way to develop a back up plan to deal with severe delays.