

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 21, 1999.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

October 27, 1999
5:30 p.m.

LTD BOARD ROOM
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Springfield
(off Glenwood Blvd. In Glenwood)

A G E N D A

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Kortge _____ Lauritsen _____ Wylie _____ Bennett _____
Hocken _____ Kleger _____ (vacancy, subdistrict 5) _____

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

III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

IV. WORK SESSION--TRANSPLAN UPDATE 04

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

V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH--November 1999 05

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A. Consent Calendar 06

1. Minutes of the September 15, 1999, Regular Board Meeting
2. Minutes of the Canceled October 20, 1999, Regular Board Meeting
3. Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Recommendations

B.	Springfield Station Environmental Assessment	24
1.	Staff Presentation	
2.	Opening of Public Hearing by Board President	
3.	Public Testimony	
	▪ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.	
4.	Closure of Public Hearing	
5.	Board Discussion	
C.	Bus Service Recommendation for Cottage Grove	30
D.	First Reading, LTD Ordinance No. 24 (1998 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District	34
1.	Staff Presentation	
2.	Opening of Public Hearing by Board President	
3.	Public Testimony	
	▪ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.	
4.	Closure of Public Hearing	
5.	Board Discussion and First Reading of Ordinance	
E.	Glenwood Segment Alignment for BRT Pilot Corridor	37
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.	Executive Search Committee	
f.	American Public Transit Association Annual Meeting	
g.	Announcements and Additions to Agenda	
2.	Monthly Financial Report—August and September Financial Statements	51

3.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	69
4.	Travel Attendant and Transit Training Program Report	77
5.	Correspondence	78
B.	Monthly Staff Report	111
IX.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	116
A.	Fall Board Strategic Planning Work Session	
B.	BRT Phase 1 Recap	
C.	Amendment to LTD Ordinance No. 36, Second 1998 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property	
D.	LTD Ordinance No. 24, 1999 Revision, Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District	
E.	Budget Transfer	
F.	Special Service Policy Revision	
G.	Comprehensive Annual Financial Report	
H.	Airport Survey Discussion	
I.	Long-Range Financial Plan	
J.	Federal Triennial Review Report	
K.	TransPlan Draft Plan Approval	
L.	Fall Board Strategic Planning Work Session	
M.	BRT Updates	
N.	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).

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

2

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 1999

ITEM TITLE: SEPTEMBER AND AUGUST FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Financial results for the second and third months of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Total General Fund revenue was \$104,389 below budget for September, due to a state-in-lieu revenue processing error on the part of the State Department of Administrative Services (DAS). As of October 18, 1999, no quarterly receipts for the period ended September 30th had been credited to Lane Transit District. A telephone call was placed to DAS on October 14. DAS acknowledged that the department is experiencing difficulties related to employee turnover, but that the revenue distribution was scheduled. DAS reported that the amount due to LTD is \$51,000, which is more than \$150,000 less than a conservative estimate of what should be expected. Finance staff are actively pursuing the recovery of the missing funds. LTD has experienced administrative problems with DAS in the past, and monitors the state-in-lieu revenue carefully.

Year to date, the budget variance for all revenue sources is positive by \$328,460. Payroll tax receipts account for the majority of the year-to-date variance. Because the Oregon Department of Revenue collects and processes the payroll and self-employment taxes (in addition to many other forms of taxes), the disbursement pattern can vary from quarter to quarter and year to year. It cannot be assumed that a positive tax variance at this point in the fiscal year will carry through to fiscal year end, even though tax revenues are estimated conservatively in the annual budget.

Total General Fund expenses are \$621,176 less than budgeted through September, and 8.2 percent higher than those of the previous year. This positive variance is the result of expenditure timing, and does not represent anticipated year-end savings. As of September 30, approximately \$600,000 in planned future expenditures were encumbered by contract and/or purchase order. As these goods and services are received over the balance of the current fiscal year, the encumbrances will be relieved and expenditures created. No adverse financial conditions exist at this time.

Total passenger fares for the first three months of the current fiscal year showed an increase of \$45,314 over the previous year. September fares were \$2,660 short of monthly budget. Special services revenue is behind

budget, because the budget did not correctly reflect the timing of the University of Oregon home football games and the billing associated with the provision of those services. Special services revenue is expected to meet plan for the fiscal year.

In order to make personnel expenses easier to understand, a change in the way that they are reported has been made, effective in September. As previously discussed during the budget process and reported in a monthly financial report, a change was made in the current fiscal year that assigned the personnel expenses of the entire Planning and Development Department, as well as partial wage expense for a number of other positions, to capital projects. The majority of the expenses are assigned to the BRT project, but there are other projects to which such expenses are charged (for example, the scheduling system software project). The effect of this change is to significantly reduce personnel expenses in the Operating Fund, and incorporate those expenses in the project costs in the Capital Fund. Effective with the September report, these "contra" personnel expenses have been broken out in the Operating Fund Financial Report. The report now shows that net total administration personnel expenses have increased by 2.9 percent over the previous year-to-date total. Gross administration personnel expense has increased 17 percent over the previous year, but was budgeted to do so.

As long as grant funding is available for major project expenses, this escalation in administrative personnel expense can be accommodated as planned. It should be remembered, however, that a reduction in federal support would require a reduction in staffing costs, or measures that result in a significant slowing of growth. In general, long-term financial strength depends on the growth of net Operating Fund personnel expense staying about equal to or less than the growth of the major source of operating subsidy: the payroll tax, and, secondarily, self-employment and state-in-lieu revenues.

In November, the Board will be asked to approve an Operating Fund budget transfer from contingency to fund the first six months of Cottage Grove service. The radio project is still under evaluation as of mid-September. Should the project be completed satisfactorily, an additional transfer in the Capital Fund will be requested to pay for the balance of the original contract work. The balance remaining on the original contract is \$236,500.

The independent audit of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1999, has been completed, and the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report is in production. The audit results and FY 1998-99 CAFR will be presented to the Board at the November meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attached are the following financial reports for September and August for Board review:

1. Operating Financial 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 DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, September 14, 1998

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 11, 1998, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Monday, September 14, 1998, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Kirk Bailey, President, presiding
Patricia Hocken
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Dean Kortge
Hillary Wylie, Secretary
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Rob Bennett, Vice President
(One Vacancy, Subdistrict #2)

II. CALL TO ORDER

Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:38 p.m.

III. WORK SESSION

Bus Rapid Transit Walkabout Public Relations Report: Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron was present to provide a progress report on the bus rapid transit (BRT) public involvement process. Mr. Bergeron distributed a market research report to those present. He discussed the personal contacts he had made (walkabout contacts) and the results of market research.

Mr. Bergeron stated that many of the people he had met with actually were enjoying, for the first time, the opportunity to talk with someone from LTD in any length or detail regarding some of the issues they had. Well over 100 individual contacts were made during the course of the last year, and staff attempted to document those contacts in order to share information with both the Board and LTD staff.

Mr. Bergeron said that during the walkabout meetings he had focused on three themes: what LTD had been doing in the past 10 years, its successes and challenges, and how those were met; what LTD's vision was for the future, with particular focus on BRT, which was the key project for the future; and to set the stage so people would feel comfortable providing feedback.

Overall, Mr. Bergeron found that LTD was regarded highly in the community. People who were aware of LTD were favorable, while those who were not as aware of LTD typically had a more negative view of LTD and needed more information. In general, the majority of the contacts believed that LTD was attempting to be innovative and successful. They very much appreciated LTD's planning for the future. There was much concern for fiscal responsibility. People recognized that LTD was a tax-supported agency, and they wanted LTD to always convey that it takes that role very seriously and would move forward with the best interests of the taxpayer and the community-at-large at heart. People realized that part of LTD's job was to balance the issues of today with planning for the future.

There also was a unanimous response from people who felt that LTD needed to do more in the area of communication. People did not realize some of the things LTD was doing, such as the depth of the partnership with the University of Oregon and how that had allowed bus service improvements to football games at Autzen Stadium; or the partnership with School District 4-J. People were astounded to learn the depth of these issues.

While the payroll tax was an issue with some of the people Mr. Bergeron met with, he also sensed that there was some misunderstanding about that. Mr. Bergeron said that one theme for LTD would be to do more in terms of communicating with key people in the community and the community-at-large.

BRT generally was perceived as a very positive vision for the future. People understood the need, liked the incremental approach to BRT, and were very curious to know what it would look like.

With regard to other issues, people generally were favorable of the Eugene Station, and appreciated the effort that had gone into making it a pleasant-looking and safe place. The Park & Ride program scored well in awareness, but people wanted to know more about how it would tie into the BRT plan. And, while there were many positive comments about bus operators, there was an opportunity there to communicate how LTD operators were trained, the high value placed on safety, and the good safety record that LTD had.

Referring to the market research survey Mr. Bergeron distributed at the beginning of the presentation, he told the Board that a Seattle research firm conducted the market research survey telephone with more than 600 respondents. Mr. Bergeron stated that the consultant from the research firm would attend the October Board meeting to further discuss the data.

Mr. Kleger asked if there was a distinction between the attitudes of people who were in a leadership role and the general citizen. Mr. Bergeron thought that the leaders were more informed about LTD because they had occasion to participate in previous walkabout efforts and attend presentations about LTD in the past.

Mr. Kortge asked how often this type of research had been done in the past. Mr. Bergeron replied that the Board and staff held a walkabout campaign on a smaller scale at the time the Board had considered implementing the self-employment tax. Mr. Kortge stated that he was amazed at the thirst for knowledge that people had about LTD, and he asked how this effort could be continued in an efficient way. Mr. Bergeron replied that the question was one that should be considered carefully during the strategic and action planning processes. There were many options to consider, such as continuing with the one-on-one technique, or mounting a broader education campaign.

Mr. Bailey asked if, given the fact that there appeared to be a demand for more information from LTD, there had been any suggestions made as to what that communication from LTD should look like. Mr. Bergeron replied that one piece of advice he received was that LTD needed to be more visible in the community. The management team had discussed this issue and was making the attempt to become more involved in community-wide organizations, such as the Rotary club and Chamber of Commerce committees. Mr. Bailey stated that he hoped there would be more suggestions arising from the conversations with community members.

Mr. Kleger stated that he noted that several respondents had expressed frustration at the need to go through downtown Eugene in order to get anywhere else. He asked if during Mr. Bergeron's discussions with people there had been any understanding that the service was substantially driven by the street network. Mr. Bergeron did not think that people understood that, but were more accepting once it was explained. He also sensed that there was not a lot of awareness of how much cross-town service LTD already had. He thought that maybe the solution was not necessarily more cross-town service, but more education. Mr. Kleger then asked if anyone had suggested that LTD run buses on the freeway system. Mr. Bergeron responded that he did not hear that particular suggestion.

Revised Board Strategic Planning Work Session Proposal: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that the Board was given a draft agenda for the two-day work session being planned for October 10 and 11, 1998, at the Eugene Hilton. She reviewed the draft agenda for the Board. Consultant Susan Phillips would be present to lead the work session. The Board members had no opposition to the proposed agenda.

1999 Legislative Session Preparation: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch was present to request Board direction in matters related to the 1999 legislative session. She asked the Board to keep some time available on their calendars to meet with various legislators.

Ms. Lynch reviewed the calendar year as it related to the legislature. She said that prior to the November election was a time for talking and listening to gain an idea about what the issues would be. Following the elections was a time to prepare for how to take information to the legislature and to review what Congress had done and what likely would come up during the next year. December was the time to write statements of positions or policies for both the state and federal level. In January, the legislature began, and the annual United Front lobbying trip was scheduled for early in the

appropriations process, late February or early March. In a year when a new president had been elected, the United Front trip would occur a little earlier. Also early in the year, there would be newly-elected local officials with whom the Board would want to meet.

The time between the legislative adjournment and the time the legislative measures went into effect, usually 90 days after adjournment, was the time to assess the impact of legislative actions. It also was the last chance to make an effort on federal appropriations.

Ms. Lynch reviewed a list of the issues that she believed the Board had an interest in and that she would be of assistance with as the government relations manager. Her list included local, state, and federal issues. Locally, she said that she understood that Bus Rapid Transit was of much interest to the Board, and that it needed to be agreed to by all affected road authorities, and TransPlan was in its final stages of modification prior to adoption. Also, there would be a new slate of city council and county commission members following the November election.

Ms. Lynch stated that, at the state legislature, there were many issues in the area of business operations, which the Board might not be very concerned with, but that did have an effect on the District, such as procurement procedures and collective bargaining. There also could be governance issues with regard to authority and financing. There could be some issues connected to preparing for the census, which was to occur in the year 2000. Typically the legislature would try to anticipate some of the questions about redistricting that would occur in the year 2001, and they would try to do some of the work ahead of time in 1999.

In addition, there would be many funding issues for uses of the highway trust fund, such as transportation for the elderly and disabled, light rail, etc. And she stated that when there was a lot of money involved, she would ask an LTD Board member lobby the legislature as well. However, she would be in Salem most of the time during the legislative session.

On the federal level, she assumed that everything had to do with funding, and the United Front lobbying trip would include a Board member.

Mr. Kleger stated that an issue had come up during the transportation panel discussion at the City Club about the assumed legal monopoly of transit districts. It had occurred to him that it might be prudent to research if there were any bars to somebody competing with LTD for local transit services.

Mr. Kortge asked what the realistic role of the individual Board members might be in lobbying the legislature. Ms. Lynch replied that the answer depended on the legislator and the issue. For some issues, it would help to have someone other than a staff person there to talk with the legislator, so that would be a time for a Board member's presence. Mr. Lynch said that she certainly would respect the Board member's time and would not call on a Board member unless she truly believed that it would make a difference.

Mr. Bailey added that on occasion in the past, Board members had accompanied staff to meetings with legislators and/or testified before legislative committees; however, it had not occurred very often. Ms. Hocken added that Board members also had conducted outreach to other key business people in the community to lobby on LTD's behalf.

Ms. Lynch added that if a Board member had working relationships with legislators, even those who were not representing Lane County, an opportunity to lobby existed there as well.

Ms. Wylie asked about holding a function either prior to or following the November election where the Board could meet with legislators. Ms. Lynch replied that typically the LTD Board held joint meetings with elected officials, including lunch meetings with the local legislators. Ms. Wylie thought doing that would make the Board members more comfortable in contacting those legislators.

Ms. Hocken asked if Ms. Lynch had anything in mind for the local elected officials. Ms. Lynch replied that joint meetings with the Eugene and Springfield City Councilors and the Lane County Commissioners would be held in January or February.

Mr. Kortge asked if there was enough commonality among the various Oregon transit district that a joint event could be held with the state legislators. Ms. Loobey replied that there was a day in Salem for transit districts to spend at the legislature. One of the problems during the legislative session was that calendars could be set for a meeting, but if something came up for the legislator, it could be canceled. Typically the transit community combined the day at the legislature with one-on-one meetings with the legislators. The transit day had not yet been scheduled for 1999.

Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors: 1) Directs staff to schedule meetings with legislators, staff, and Board members between now and the end of November; 2) Directs staff to work with the Oregon Department of Transportation, Oregon Transit Association, and other interested parties to prepare a legislative strategy to secure funding for elderly and disabled services; 3) Directs staff to work with Oregon Department of Transportation, Willamette Valley local governments, Tri-Met, and other interested parties to prepare a legislative strategy to secure funding for Willamette Valley passenger rail service; and 4) Directs staff to work with Department of Transportation, Oregon Transit Association, and others to investigate and prepare strategies for other legislative issues. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion.

MOTION

Mr. Bailey asked Ms. Lynch if, in her estimation, the election results in terms of majority control made any difference. Ms. Lynch responded that to some degree they would make a difference, primarily because Lane County typically sent Democrats to the legislature, and because a Democratic agenda would be more urban oriented, while rural legislators tended to be Republican. She thought it would help LTD and other local

agencies if there were a Democratic majority in at least one of the chambers, although the work was harder when the chambers were governed by different parties.

Ms. Wylie asked about the restrictions in federal grants about lobbying. Mr. Pangborn responded that the restrictions on lobbying were that LTD could not use federal dollars to lobby the federal government. At LTD, all federal dollars were placed in the capital program. The operational budget, which used local money, covered lobbying expenditures. LTD did not use any of its funds for political contributions.

Ms. Wylie asked if there were guidelines about the ethics of interacting with local and state elected officials. Mr. Pangborn stated that the State Ethics Committee had a whole set of guidelines, and LTD had to disclose costs associated with lobbying. Ms. Wylie asked if the Board members could receive a copy of the state guidelines.

VOTE

There being no further discussion, the vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously, 5-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

Board Committee Appointments: Two new Board committees were needed, and Board President Kirk Bailey was to make the appointments.

Pat Hocken, Dave Kleger, and Hillary Wylie were appointed to the Board Boundary Committee, which was a short-term committee to discuss issues related to the District's service boundary. Ms. Hocken was appointed to chair the committee. Staff would be represented by Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora and Finance Manager Diane Hellekson.

Appointed to the Board Legal Services Committee, a short-term committee to participate in the request for proposals process for the District's legal services contract, were Rob Bennett, Dean Kortge, and Virginia Lauritsen. Mr. Bennett was appointed to chair the committee, and Mr. Bailey agreed to act as an alternate if Mr. Bennett were not available.

Ms. Hocken asked about the time line for the Boundary Committee. Ms. Hellekson stated that the goal would be for the committee to meet as many times as necessary prior to the October Board meeting. It was expected that the committee would form a recommendation that would be presented to the full Board in October. Because of the time line for making a boundary change, action would need to be taken at the October Board meeting so that the first and second readings of the Ordinance could be held and the 30-day waiting period could pass in time to enact the Ordinance on January 1, 1999.

Ms. Hocken also asked about the length of the legal services contract. Ms. Hellekson stated that, under Oregon purchasing law, the contract would be set for a three-year period, with two one-year extension periods allowed.

New Human Resources Manager: Ms. Loobey introduced Mr. David Dickman to the Board as LTD's new human resources manager. She said that Mr. Dickman came to LTD from Josephine County, where he was the manager of human resources for nearly 10 years. Josephine County was a much larger organization than LTD, and during Mr. Dickman's employment there, he had an interesting array of issues to deal with, which included three or four different unions and an employee association. Prior to that, Mr. Dickman worked for the AFL-CIO in Utah. Mr. Dickman stated that he was pleased to make the acquaintance of the Board, and that he was impressed with the top-notch staff at LTD.

Adjournment: Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Board Secretary

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 16, 1998

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 11, 1998, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, September 16, 1998, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Patricia Hocken
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Dean Kortge
Hillary Wylie, Secretary, Presiding
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Kirk Bailey, President
Rob Bennett, Vice President
(One Vacancy, Subdistrict #2)

II. CALL TO ORDER

Board Secretary Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

III. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Wylie stated that she would chair the meeting in Mr. Bailey's absence. Mr. Bennett was expected to arrive late.

IV. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

Current Activities, Board Member Reports:

Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC): Ms. Hocken reported that the MPC met the previous Thursday. The committee discussed various road projects for the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). While LTD was not involved in these projects, Ms. Hocken stated that it always was interesting to listen to the people from the other jurisdictions interact with the representatives of the Department of Transportation, in terms of the rankings of the various projects.

The item that was of most interest to LTD was the proposed changes to the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The Land Conservation Development Commission (LCDC) passed a rule several years ago that included a goal to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) by 10 percent during the next 20 years. Locally, the jurisdictions had

found that it was a fairly difficult goal to achieve. In fact, all of the modeling that was done for TransPlan indicated that even with the fully operational bus rapid transit (BRT) and other improvements in place, that goal still could not be reached. Other agencies had given similar feedback to the LCDC. As a result, the LCDC had proposed to change the reduction goal from 10 percent to 5 percent. In addition, the LCDC was proposing a different method of measurement other than VMTs to determine if jurisdictions were progressing toward the goal of reducing overall vehicular travel.

One of the local issues was that most of the development that would take place during the next 10 years would be along the fringes of the urban growth boundary, so trips would be longer and VMTs would increase. If proposed TPR changes were adopted, it would give jurisdictions the ability to show a reduction in vehicular use in other ways.

The LCDC had not yet adopted the changes to the TPR, but was considering the proposals and gathering testimony from the various jurisdictions. The three smaller metropolitan areas, Salem, Eugene/Springfield, and Medford, were working together to propose changes to the TPR. Also, the LCDC was proposing different standards for Portland than for the other metropolitan areas.

Ms. Wylie asked if population growth versus vehicular use was being considered. Ms. Hocken replied that the VMTs were a per-capita number.

Statewide Livability Forum: Ms. Hocken stated that the next meeting was scheduled for October 29, 1998, in Salem. She would attend and report back to the Board in November.

BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano and BRT Engineer Graham Carey were present to discuss this topic.

Mr. Viggiano stated that an informal open house had been held, where people were invited to look at and comment on potential alternative designs for the pilot BRT corridor and potential station designs. The intensive part of the work had been a two-part workshop. Between 35 and 40 people participated, including neighborhood representatives, business owners, stakeholders, and agency staff. The workshop had been an interactive process in which participants worked together with LTD and other agency staff, engineers, and architects to discuss design options and to produce design alternatives and ideas. The intent was not necessarily to get to a single preferred design, but to have several options. The last step in this process was to hold a final open house where the public could view the options that resulted from the workshop and make final comments.

The design alternatives for the Franklin segment would be presented to the BRT Steering Committee, but no decisions would be made until all eight corridor segments had undergone the same type of process and the study was complete.

The three alternatives that resulted from the first part of the Franklin segment workshop were:

- A. Single-lane median busway, removing no existing travel lanes;
- B. Two-lane busway, removing one west-bound travel lane; and
- C. Two-lane busway, removing one travel lane in each direction.

During the second part of the workshop, the participants reviewed the three options and identified flaws and amenities for each option.

Mr. Carey discussed the details of the preferred designs from the workshop.

Ms. Hocken added that there was less interest in taking two travel lanes, but much interest in not expanding the pavement, and in keeping as much green space as possible.

Mr. Carey stated that while there was broad support for the single-lane median BRT line, there also was broad support for two lanes to be built on either side of the BRT stations in order to accommodate door openings on only the right side of the bus. Ms. Hocken added that she thought that the real value of the process was that this station design came entirely from the participants.

Mr. Carey reviewed the workshop designs of each of the intersections along the Franklin segment. The workshop participants also had discussed the "look" of the segment. The participants preferred that the central BRT line have its own look and theme, while the neighborhood connector stops blended into the overall look of each individual neighborhood.

Mr. Kleger asked about the stacked station illustration. Mr. Carey explained that in order to have buses at the station directly opposite each other, a very wide platform would be needed to accommodate customers. This particular design idea called for narrower, "stacked," or offset, platforms with inbound and outbound travelers separated by a level on a narrower platform.

Mr. Kleger also cautioned against using red brick for walkways, because with wear and tear, as was evident at 7th Avenue near Willamette Street, those walkways would become dangerous for people who used wheelchairs. Mr. Viggiano stated that the red coloring in the illustrations did not necessarily signify the use of brick, but could be colored concrete, or something different than the typical diagonally striped walkways. He also said that materials would not be identified until much later in the process. Ms. Wylie added that there was much new development in the use of colored concrete.

Ms. Hocken stated that, overall, she was very pleased with the process and how it worked. She thought that the participants and the designers enjoyed the workshop. She was somewhat concerned that there was not a good cross-section of the community represented at the workshop.

Ms. Hocken continued to say that in some ways, she saw a conflict of goals of the group. One of the real priorities was to retain as much as the median as possible and create a green, attractive boulevard entrance into the City of Eugene, and the other goal was to make transit as fast as it could be through the segment. There was no interest in widening the roadbed. The only choice to meet these goals was to take travel lanes away.

She felt that in another sense, this most likely was the easiest segment of the entire corridor. There was no need to take on-street parking, or to worry about heritage trees, or to be concerned about too many driveways. Yet, there would be problems if LTD tried to put exclusive bus lanes in this environment.

Ms. Hocken stated that an issue about TransPlan was brought up at the workshop. In the TransPlan, it was suggested that any time arterial improvements were made, bike lanes must be included. If LTD were required to include bike lanes on this project, it would take more space, and, therefore, right-of-way along the sides of the corridor would need to be purchased. The state actually allowed parallel bike paths, such as those found adjacent to Franklin, so the state would not require adding bike lanes to this particular improvement, but along other segments of the corridor where adjacent bike paths were nonexistent, then TransPlan suggested that bike lanes would be required. Ms. Hocken thought that issue should be researched further. Mr. Viggiano stated that it was the local street plan that required bike lanes. City Planner Allen Lowe was at the workshop, and his feeling was that bike lanes were to be added only if there was a demand or real need for them. He did not believe there was a great demand for bike lanes along Franklin Boulevard. However, staff would further research the issue as Ms. Hocken requested.

Mr. Kortge asked if cost estimates had been made for any of the segment designs. Mr. Carey replied that specific cost estimates had not been made. Mr. Viggiano added that cost estimates would be done as part of the project once it was more refined.

Mr. Kortge asked about the number of stops that were being considered for the Franklin segment. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff were considering three stops, one at the Robinson Theatre (East 11th Avenue, near Franklin), one at Agate, and one at Villard or Walnut. Staff had sketched the entire corridor and had identified 25 stop locations in each direction.

Mr. Kortge asked about the overall pilot corridor deadline. Mr. Viggiano replied that the intent was to try to have all the segments designed by the end of 1999, and have the pilot route in place by the year 2002. Ms. Hocken added that an attempt would be made to complete the initial design work on three central segments by the spring of 1999, in time for the United Front trip to Washington, D.C. Also, no final decisions would be made until more of the pilot corridor study was complete.

Ms. Wylie stated that it was very exciting to see so much progress. Ms. Hocken encouraged the Board members to attend the next design workshop.

Community Relations Manager Ed Bergeron stated that there was another piece to the segment design, and that was the community outreach that had taken place. He reported that 39 businesses had been contacted within the last two months. For each of those contacts, staff filed a call report, which documented what was discussed and who staff talked with. It all became part of the official database of public involvement for this process, ensuring documentation of all outreach efforts made by LTD. Mr. Bergeron added that the meetings had gone very well. The business owners were appreciative that LTD had taken the time to contact them individually and to show them what LTD had in mind. The reaction had been tremendously positive.

Springfield Station Steering Committee: Ms. Wylie reported that the committee had not met in August and would not meet again until September 17, 1998, so she had nothing to report at this meeting, but would have a report for the Board meeting in October.

Monthly Financial Report: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that the July financial report was distributed at the meeting. The August financial report would be mailed to the Board members within the next week. The first month of the fiscal year was good. Ridership was up 8 percent. There was not a commensurate increase in fares because customers were shifting from cash fares to low-cost instruments, which was a good sign, as pass holders tended to be loyal riders. She noted that the report had changed somewhat in response to Board comments. It now contained an additional comments page, which would be included with the report on a monthly basis. She asked the Board to let her know if the additional comments page met their expectations.

Seneca Station Update: Ms. Loobey stated that the report was included in the agenda packet. Transit Planner Micki Kaplan added that the station was expected to be in use for bus service on Friday, September 18, 1998. Grand opening activities would take place September 30 through October 2, 1998, and Board members were invited to go see the station at any time during the grand opening, as there would be no formal opening ceremony.

Mr. Vobora introduced two new members of his staff, Transit Planner Ken Auguston and Marketing Representative DeLynn Anderson.

Monthly Staff Report: Ms. Loobey stated that staff were available to answer any questions the Board members might have regarding the monthly staff report. Ms. Hocken commented that she appreciated reading about various staff member activities in the Transit Operations report. She thought it was good for the Board to hear about those activities.

V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Wylie introduced the October 1998 Employee of the Month, Kelly Perron. Ms. Perron was hired on May 1, 1996, as a part-time receptionist, and since then had been called on to assist with clerical tasks in several departments in addition to her receptionist duties. She was nominated by a co-worker who said that Ms. Perron went above and beyond the call of duty on a daily

basis. Additionally, Ms. Perron was enthusiastic about her work, put in a lot of effort to do the job correctly, and thought of new and better, more efficient ways of doing things. The co-worker also complimented Mr. Perron on the way in which she handled specific receptionist duties, including her interactions with co-workers, customers, and employment applicants and candidates; making good decisions regarding the transferring of calls; and always being willing to help out when assistance was needed.

Ms. Wylie presented Ms. Perron with a letter of congratulations, a plaque, and a monetary award. Ms. Perron stated that her job was fun, which was important to her. She thanked the Board for the honor, and stated that she could not have achieved it without the support of the great staff at LTD.

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Wylie asked for comments from any member of the audience. There were none.

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING: Mr. Bennett arrived at this time.

Consent Calendar: Ms. Hocken noted an error in the minutes of the LTD Board meeting on August 19, 1998. On page 4 of the minutes, in the last paragraph, reference was made to the Deschutes National Forest. That reference should have been made to the Willamette National Forest. The minutes would be corrected as noted.

**MOTION
VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kortge moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for September 16, 1998, is approved as presented. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 5-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

Employee Association Concept: Ms. Wylie stated that this item had been added to the agenda, and the Board members had received a handout at the meeting.

Ms. Loobey discussed with the Board the option for employees to form an informal employee association. Management staff had researched this option very closely, and Human Resources Manager Dave Dickman had experience with an association in Josephine County. Employees would be asked to consider an informal association as an alternative to unionization. Ms. Loobey asked the Board members for their support of her and other management staff efforts in this regard. She stated that there were many advantages of an informal employee association. Those advantages included allowing for direct representation of the employees to the management team, enhancing communications, improving the decision-making and task-teaming process, and boosting morale. Also, there would be no barrier to one-on-one communication, as there could be with a union.

In addition, Ms. Loobey stated that if an informal employee association were formed, the employees themselves would be organizing it by determining who their representatives would be, what the bylaws would be, on what kind of basis they would meet, and what issues they would entertain. She thought it would have great value to

the organization by allowing staff to concentrate on some internal issues that lately had not been given enough attention.

Mr. Kortge stated that he had never heard of an employee association. Ms. Loobey stated that it was not a brand new concept, but could have many different forms.

Ms. Hocken asked, if the employees chose to form the employee association, whether it would have official status so that management would be conferring with the group. Ms. Loobey said that it would be the institutionalization of two-way communication, and the association would have some status within the organization. It would ensure that communications were free flowing and consistent. Basically, it was a process to focus communication on day-to-day operational issues; however, the association would not address Board policy issues.

Mr. Kleger asked if legal counsel had reviewed the association concept. Ms. Loobey replied that it had. Mr. Kleger stated that he liked the idea.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved that the Board declare LTD's willingness to work with an informal employee association at LTD. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 5-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Permanent Funding of Two Full-time Field Supervisors: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson reminded the Board members that these two positions had been temporarily funded for a six-month trial period when the Eugene Station opened in March. Based on the expansion of service and the success of the positions at the station, he was asking the Board to approve the funding of these positions as permanent and to approve the transfer of funds to finance the positions.

MOTION

The Board had no comment or questions on this issue. Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the resolution approving the funding of two permanent, full-time field supervisor positions, including a transfer of funds from contingency. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 5-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Priority List for Transit Projects: Mr. Viggiano provided an overview of the STIP priority list that was included in the agenda packet on page 31. The STIP adopted a four-year plan, and this list was a request for the STIP that would be adopted in October 1999.

There were three different priority lists: one for roadway projects, one for transit projects, and one for transportation demand projects. The latter two would be reviewed and approved by the LTD Board. In October the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) would review the lists for approval.

The transit priority list was divided by funding type. Section 5307 funding was for capital expenditures, such as the Springfield Station. Section 5309 funding was the discretionary funding that was requested during the United Front lobbying trip. Local Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds were allocated to the region annually and by informal agreement of the regional agencies, LTD would receive 16 percent of those funds. In addition, there were STP funds that were allocated from the State on a discretionary basis, which LTD would apply for.

Transit projects for those discretionary STP funds competed against other areas, and included, in order of priority, the Springfield Station, Automatic Vehicle Location/Passenger Information systems, an Automated Fare System, a Coburg Park & Ride station, BRT Corridor Park & Ride facilities, and Passenger Boarding Improvements. Mr. Viggiano stated that \$4 million were available statewide for transit projects as part of the STP transfer, excluding Portland and Tri-Met.

Mr. Viggiano further explained that even though most of the high-priority projects were shown for the year 2000, if the State indicated that there would be money available in the year 2001, LTD would be willing to shift some projects over to that year in order to receive the funding.

Ms. Wylie asked about the \$11 million request for BRT pilot corridor construction that was split between the years 2000 and 2001. Mr. Viggiano pointed out that the request was for both Section 5309 funding and Transportation Efficiency Act (TEA 21) funding. TEA 21 was part of the new transportation bill that had been approved by Congress. That money was available to LTD if the decision was made to move forward with the BRT project. The \$4.4 million per year already was approved as part of the bill, and there was some flexibility as to how it could be spent. Although it could not be spent ahead of time, if it were not spent by the end of the year, it would carry forward for three years and would not be lost.

Mr. Kortge asked if staff were asking the Board to consider the priority of the projects. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff had identified these projects in order of priority, but that the Board could provide input if it disagreed with the order of priority. BRT was LTD's future, and the Springfield Station was a project in and of itself, but also had a direct relation to the BRT pilot corridor.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed 2000-2003 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program priority list for transit projects, and recommends that it be approved by the Metropolitan Policy Committee. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 5-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Ms. Loobey added that this was the hierarchy process of capital improvements, beginning with LTD's own Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which the Board adopted in the early spring, that reflected these projects. Then, because federal funding was involved, LTD projects needed to be approved by the MPC, and were forwarded to the

State as part of the Transportation Improvements Program (TIP). Ms. Hocken and Mr. Bennett were members of the MPC. Once approved by the MPC, the funding requests were forwarded to the State to be included in the STIP, or State Transportation Improvement Program. All of that had to be in place in order for the money to flow from the federal level.

Ms. Hocken added that MPC, of which she and Mr. Bennett were members, also approved the road projects that were forwarded to the State in the STIP.

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Priority List for the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program: Commuter Solutions Coordinator Connie Williams reviewed the TDM priority list. The first item on the list was to continue funding Ms. Williams' position. The second item was for a TDM/rideshare assistant, which would be a position to oversee the rideshare program within the community and to assist with other TDM projects.

The TDM projects mostly were programs and services rather than capital projects. In reviewing the various project-funding requests, Ms. Williams noted that without the TDM assistant, much of the program money would not be requested.

Ms. Hocken asked about the Air Quality Reader Board request. Ms. Williams responded that the reason the request was coming through the TDM program was that the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority had no avenue to directly request STIP money. It was a very valid project that would provide good educational information to car operators. A site had not been chosen for the reader board, and it was possible that it would be portable, much like the speed signs that were used by the police. Ms. Hocken cautioned staff to keep in mind concerns of the Eugene Station Committee of having such a reader board located at or near the Eugene Station.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed 2000-2003 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program priority list for TDM projects, and recommends that it be approved by the Metropolitan Policy Committee. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 5-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Bus Rapid Transit Policy Change: Mr. Viggiano explained that the draft TransPlan currently under review contained a policy on bus rapid transit. There were three conditions placed on BRT, and there were concerns about the condition that BRT must be shown to materially reduce existing or projected traffic congestion. Staff believed that this condition would be difficult to define, to measure, and to prove, since traffic congestion was affected by so many different variables, such as population growth, employment growth, and the number of new road, bikeway, and pedestrian projects. TransPlan modeling had shown that no matter what might be done, traffic congestion was expected to significantly increase in the community.

The second concern with the phrase was that it did not take into account other potential benefits of a BRT system, such as increased transit ridership, shorter travel times for bus users, and improved LTD operational efficiency. There were many benefits that were not reflected in the BRT policy statement.

Staff suggested that the phrase "materially reduce existing or projected traffic congestion" be replaced by the phrase "increase transit ridership." This phrase would not reflect the broad benefits that a BRT system could make, but it was easily measurable and verifiable.

Mr. Viggiano stated that he had a conversation with Mr. Bennett earlier in the day, and Mr. Bennett suggested the phrase "increase transit market share along the BRT corridors."

Mr. Viggiano reported that the current policy statement had been reviewed and endorsed by the local elected officials. The draft TransPlan currently was being reviewed by the planning commissions, which would make recommendations to the elected officials. If the Board agreed to this change, staff would take the proposed change to the staff Transportation Planning Committee for endorsement and a recommendation to the planning commissions. The planning commissions then would consider the change and make a recommendation to the respective elected officials. It was expected that the elected officials would formally endorse the plan in January or February of 1999. That would be the first time, formally, that the elected officials would see the revised wording.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff had received any informal indication of the views of the other jurisdictions. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff of other agencies were among those who encouraged the change in the wording.

Mr. Kortge asked how it would be known if BRT was shown to do anything before it was built. Mr. Viggiano stated that extensive research, modeling, and projecting had been and would continue to be performed by staff. Mr. Kortge said that it seemed more reasonable to assume an increase in transit ridership than a decrease in traffic congestion.

Mr. Viggiano pointed out that one of the other conditions was that local government had to demonstrate support for BRT. In a way, local government would be the judge of whether or not LTD had effectively proven that BRT was a good project.

Ms. Hocken stated that she liked Mr. Bennett's suggested wording. She thought it was a bit risky to try to change the wording at this time, but thought that it was better to try to change the wording now than to be stuck with something later on that would not work. It was the case that the original language was put together in a very short period of time, and Congressman DeFazio had said that LTD must show community support before he would release the money. She thought it would be a good idea to talk with some elected officials about the proposed change to gauge reaction.

Mr. Bennett stated that he supported the changed wording. He believed that LTD could make the case even if there was no change in the wording, but as written, it was harder to understand and measure. The proposed change gave LTD more flexibility.

Ms. Wylie stated that she supported the proposed wording suggested by Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Kleger stated that he also supported Mr. Bennett's suggested wording. The essence of what LTD was trying to accomplish was to have a more substantial effect upon the community, which to him was the whole justification for proposing BRT. The transit market share would be easier to sell than increased ridership.

Ms. Hocken stated that one reason for the current language was that some of the elected officials were more concerned about LTD taking traffic lanes to create exclusive right-of-way than they were about increasing ridership. She thought that the local elected officials would not be as concerned with market share as they would be with the streets that they controlled. She still believed that an attempt should be made to change the language, but the proposed language would not be the focus of elected officials.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved that the Board direct staff to pursue the suggested transit market share wording change to the BRT policy in the draft TransPlan. This was a slight change from the drafted motion. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Ms. Virginia Lauritsen, who was appointed but not yet confirmed for the vacant Board position, stated that Mr. Kortge had a good suggestion about taking another look at the wording to show that the system had to be in place prior to proving the condition, whether in the current wording or in the proposed wording.

Ms. Hocken stated that she did not want the Board to tinker too much with the words. There were some modeling based on projections that could prove the condition prior to BRT being in operation.

VOTE

Ms. Wylie called for the vote on the motion, which passed unanimously, 5-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

Comments by Board Secretary: Ms. Wylie asked Ms. Lauritsen to report about her recent confirmation hearing at the State Senate. Ms. Lauritsen said that the Senate Committee approved her appointment, and a recommendation for confirmation would be forwarded to the full Senate for consideration on September 17, 1998.

Ms. Loobey stated that staff were preparing for the Board Work Session that would occur on October 10 and 11, 1998, at the Eugene Hilton. The Boundary Committee was scheduled to meet on the following two Wednesdays. Mr. Bennett had been appointed to chair the Legal Services Committee, and Mr. Kortge and Ms. Lauritsen had been appointed to that committee as well. Ms. Lauritsen asked if she could obtain a copy of the Request for Proposals for legal services.

Adjournment: There being no further business, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Board Secretary

AMENDED MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 15, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 9, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, September 15, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Hillary Wylie, President, presiding
Rob Bennett, Vice President
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Dean Kortge, Secretary
Pat Hocken
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Virginia Lauritsen
(Board vacancy – Subdistrict 5)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

WORK SESSION:

DISCUSSION WITH FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) REGION X ADMINISTRATOR HELEN KNOLL: Ms. Wylie introduced Ms. Knoll, who had been visiting LTD throughout the afternoon. Ms. Knoll stated that she was interested to hear about LTD's plans for the future and about TransPlan. She said that by visiting LTD, she was able to get a better understanding of the topography and demographics of the area, which helped her to understand some of the challenges, opportunities, constraints, and issues that LTD faced. The FTA was very excited about the proposed bus rapid transit (BRT) project at LTD. BRT was a national initiative of much importance to the FTA because it was a suitable alternative to light rail for many communities. It was more affordable and flexible than light rail, but had the same attributes of serving the public with rapid transit. LTD had the opportunity to provide a model for other communities. There already was a vision in the Eugene/Springfield communities about what the BRT system and buses might look like, which the FTA believed would increase ridership tremendously. She thanked the Board for having her at its meeting.

Mr. Kortge asked if Ms. Knoll visited LTD very often. Ms. Knoll stated that she had not previously visited LTD, but it was her intent to visit more often. Ms. Wylie added that FTA Region X included Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was interested to hear what Seattle Metro was doing to more effectively compete with the automobile. Ms. Knoll said that in 1996, the voters had approved a \$3.9 billion package of transit projects, including about 81 miles of commuter rail using existing heavy-duty rail lines and building nearly 26 miles of light rail service that would operate from the University district in the north to the SEATAC airport in the south. The project included acquiring right-of-way and building tunnels and would take approximately 10 years to complete.

Mr. Kleger asked how transit agencies were dealing with the 'we do not need it yet' mentality. Ms. Knoll stated that other cities the same size as Eugene/Springfield were facing the same problem, but in places like Seattle, where congestion was so visibly heavy, people now realized that it was a problem that should have been addressed well ahead of time. Even if people were not concerned about future congestion problems, there were other reasons to do something like BRT and light rail. A project with a fixed visible presence in a neighborhood, like BRT, with its fixed guideways and stations, offered land-use planning and economic development opportunities that a normal bus system could not accomplish.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie thanked Ms. Knoll for her visit to LTD and invited her to visit again.

WORK SESSION – CONTINUE TRANSPLAN DISCUSSION: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano reminded the Board members that a public hearing on the draft TransPlan was scheduled for September 29, 1999, at the Lane County Fairgrounds. Mr. Viggiano introduced Tom Schwetz and Lee Shoemaker from the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) and Jan Childs from the City of Eugene, who were present to answer questions the Board raised at the August Board meeting as well as any new questions or concerns the Board might have about TransPlan or the public hearing.

Ms. Childs began the discussion by talking about the nodal development strategies that were contained in the draft TransPlan. She stated that she agreed with Ms. Knoll's earlier statement that a system like BRT brought with it opportunities to look at a more intensive development of the land use surrounding the key stations.

The nodal development in TransPlan was particularly relevant for the BRT corridors, but staff believed it also was an important concept in other areas of the region. Ms. Childs stated, for the record, that she preferred the term 'mixed-use centers' rather than 'nodal development' as it was presented. Three documents pertaining to specific nodal development plans were distributed to the Board members. Ms. Childs then reviewed the handouts. One of the handouts was the definition of nodal development as proposed in the draft TransPlan, which defined three different types of nodal development: Neighborhood Centers, Commercial Centers, and Employment Centers. The other two handouts were draft plans for the two pilot nodal development projects located in the Chambers Street area and in the Royal Avenue area that the City of Eugene Planning and Development department had prepared last year. Ms. Childs reviewed the processes and challenges of the two plans.

Ms. Hocken asked why nodal development of certain areas was being recommended in TransPlan and not required. Ms. Childs responded that the jurisdictions were being asked to adopt a new zone designation of nodal development for the recommended areas. Once

approved as part of TransPlan, the Cities and County would need to adopt the change to the Metro Plan. Once that was accomplished, each jurisdiction would have the right to zone nodal development areas within its jurisdiction without the approval of the other two jurisdictions. At this point, the nodal development designation proposal was considered a legislative action.

Mr. Kleger asked if there would be a substantive difference between the expectations of this zoning designation and its impact and the existing zoning provisions currently in place. Ms. Childs replied that in the more centrally-located areas, there would be little need for zone changes, but development and design standards and incentives would be reviewed very carefully for new developments. The Royal Avenue nodal development would be a good local example of how it could work.

Mr. Kleger also asked how the newly developed Barger/Beltline area compared with nodal development goals. Ms. Childs stated that the Barger/Beltline area was somewhat larger in scale commercially than what would normally be expected for a neighborhood-focused center. The Barger area was one that had been woefully underserved, and the commercial development had addressed that need. The Barger area development would be beneficial to the Royal Avenue nodal development project in that it would allow the developers to design a smaller-scale commercial center.

Mr. Kleger stated that the Board had received a number of letters from the public about the proposed Valley River Bridge, and he asked Mr. Schwetz if staff knew what the neighborhood impacts would be and to whom if the Bridge were built. Mr. Schwetz said that staff only had made an estimate of where the bridge might cross, but impact studies had not yet occurred. Ms. Childs added that LCOG was collecting the public testimony, and copies of any letters received by LTD should be forwarded to Mr. Viggiano, who would ensure that they were forwarded to LCOG.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was political support for a Valley River bridge. Mr. Schwetz replied that support was sharply divided. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) supported the project as a regional benefit, but the letters that had been received indicated that local support was low. Mr. Bennett stated that he had served on the North Ferry Street Bridge Committee. That committee, which had broad-based representation, supported a Valley River bridge. He wondered if that issue had been resolved. He said that he was a toll-bridge advocate, and there had been fairly strong agreement as to how that would help with the cost. Ms. Childs responded that the Ferry Street Corridor Citizen Advisory Committee that Mr. Bennett participated on had looked at alternatives to placing a second bridge adjacent to the Ferry Street Bridge. The committee strongly supported a new bridge, as did the City Council at the time, but at the Planning Commission public hearing on TransPlan, no one spoke in support of a new crossing or even the concept of a new crossing. The Planning Commissions agreed that an additional river crossing needed to remain in TransPlan as a project, but not necessarily one for the near future. The Ferry Street Bridge improvements needed to be completed and in operation for some time prior to again researching the need for an additional river crossing.

There was no further TransPlan discussion, and Ms. Wylie closed the Work Session.

REGULAR MEETING – 6:35 p.m.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Wylie introduced bus operator Don Matney, who had been selected as the Employee of the Month for October 1999. Mr. Matney had received awards for eleven years of safe driving and eleven years of correct schedule operation, and previously was selected as Employee of the Month in July 1992 and April 1998. He was nominated for this award by a co-worker because he embodied attributes that were highly prized by the District, such as his caring and concern beyond the call of duty to his customers and colleagues; his natural leadership capabilities that motivated others; his command of the big picture and his willingness to explore new concepts with attention to the greatest benefit to all employees; his work ethic, integrity, and follow-through; and his willingness to step up and be counted upon by his fellow employees. Mr. Matney's supervisor added that Mr. Matney thrived on being involved in District and employee functions in addition to his bus driving duties, impressing staff with how much he volunteered to help coordinate and represent LTD in many special events.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Matney with a certificate of recognition and a monetary reward. Mr. Matney said that he enjoyed working at LTD and working with people. He thanked the Board for the honor.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Tom Lester of Eugene stated his objection to the downtown Springfield BRT alignment. He thought that the focus on the Main Street thoroughfare was going to reinforce the existing development patterns of downtown Springfield and would not leave downtown Springfield anywhere. He thought it was a bad idea to the degree that it had nothing to do with the organization of downtown Springfield. The alignment pandered to real estate speculation interests for the area south of South A Street, and he did not believe it was a good motivation for developing a plan.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Lester if he had a suggestion for a different alignment. Mr. Lester said he thought there needed to be a more serious urban design study of downtown Springfield to understand the organization of the downtown area. Mr. Bennett then asked if Mr. Lester agreed that BRT ought to connect to the downtown Springfield Station, wherever Springfield decided that should be. Mr. Lester stated that he did agree with that. He said he thought that the decision of where to locate the station was following the BRT alignment decisions rather than vice versa. He thought the BRT alignment should be more sensitive to a good decision about where the station ought to be located and to the entire organization of the downtown area for a bigger and more complex downtown area.

There were no others who wished to speak at this time.

CONSENT CALENDAR: The Consent Calendar for September 15, 1999, included the minutes of the canceled July 21, 1999, regular Board meeting; the minutes of the August 18, 1999, regular Board meeting; and the adoption of a resolution appointing Board President Hillary Wylie as successor trustee for the LTD/ATU Pension Trust and the LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan. Mr. Hocken moved approval of the Consent Calendar for September 15, 1999, as presented. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kleger, Kortge, Wylie, Bennett, and Hocken voting in favor, and none opposed.

**MOTION
VOTE**

DOWNTOWN SPRINGFIELD SEGMENT ALIGNMENT FOR BRT PILOT CORRIDOR:

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were seeking Board approval of the BRT Steering Committee's selection of the downtown Springfield BRT alignment as proposed in the agenda packet. The process for the BRT alignment in downtown Springfield began in February, and the downtown station location had been a key factor in the preferred alignment proposal. The downtown Springfield alignment included a three-block area east of the Willamette River to either of the proposed downtown station locations.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the two sites that were being considered for a new downtown Springfield Station were the U.S. Bank site at Main and South A, and the block immediately south of South A and 4th Streets.

The indications from the City of Springfield were that they liked the approach as outlined in Alternative A3. In addition, there were some recent developments with regard to BRT that Mr. Viggiano outlined for the Board members. Each Board member had received a copy of the agenda item summary for the TransPlan Review and Update from the Springfield City Council meeting agenda packet. The packet previously had been distributed.

The Springfield City Council would discuss several issues, including the BRT policy statement that was contained in the TransPlan document. There was a Springfield City staff recommendation to change the BRT policy statement back to its original wording, which was to "materially reduce traffic congestion." The current policy statement was "to increase the transit market share." No action would be taken at the Council meeting, and staff would prepare a response to Springfield explaining why that policy language had been changed.

Ms. Wylie stated that she was not sure that people understood what increasing transit market share meant. Mr. Bennett stated that whenever he talked about BRT, he used the term 'market share' because it helped him in his discussions with private business groups. The objective of BRT was not only to increase ridership among the current riders, but also to go to the next level, or to the people who currently were not using the bus. Whatever terms were used should recognize what the objectives of BRT were – increasing ridership in a specific, new approach.

In addition, Mr. Bennett added that he was fine with including a statement about materially reducing traffic congestion, but only if it was stated that traffic congestion would be materially reduced over what it would otherwise be. Most people did believe that there would be an increase in traffic congestion, and LCOG projections showed an increase as well.

Ms. Wylie added that she met with some disagreement when she stated that increasing ridership would serve to reduce congestion.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the alignment issues in the memorandum were more critical issues for discussion at this time. He stated that "market share" was intended to mean "modal split," and Mr. Viggiano thought some clarification on the issue would be prudent. Making the distinction about reducing traffic congestion over what it would otherwise be was important, but there were other problems with the term "materially reduce traffic congestion,"

such as its difficulty to measure and how influenced it would be by other factors. It also could invite litigation because it would be very difficult to interpret.

Ms. Hocken stated that the Board had not tampered with the phrase in the policy statement, "if local governments demonstrated support." She believed that the policy statement as written did not preclude the City of Springfield from considering the "materially reduce traffic congestion" factor when making a decision to support BRT. However, she agreed that as stated, the policy better addressed a measurable outcome and was more focused on what LTD was attempting to accomplish with the transit market.

Mr. Viggiano noted that there were six conditions included in the memorandum that Springfield City staff proposed as guidelines for the Council to follow in order to continue to support the BRT pilot project as well as future projects in the Springfield planning area. Staff currently were reviewing the guidelines and would spend more time discussing the guidelines with Springfield staff.

Mr. Kortge thought LTD and the City of Springfield already were in agreement with proposed guideline number six, providing for financial support for participation. He thought the guideline statement was very broad, but more importantly, he thought there already was agreement in this area, and LTD already was funding a traffic engineer for the City of Springfield. Mr. Viggiano stated that the current agreement was for a one-year period. He thought that this was one of the guidelines that needed further review, and one that staff would report back to the Board about.

There were two recommendations in the memorandum with regard to the BRT alignment. One was that the Council support the downtown Springfield alignment as proposed by the BRT Steering Committee. However, the recommendation did not include seeking priority treatment on Main Street. LTD had recommended that Springfield staff make the Council aware that LTD intended to aggressively pursue priority alternatives on Main Street.

The other recommendation was that the Environmental Assessment (EA) of the Glenwood alignment include a Franklin Boulevard curbside lane option. In addition, City staff recommended that a decision about the Glenwood alignment should be delayed until after the City conducted a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) study, which should be expanded to include an analysis of how BRT would fit into the transportation and land use mix. LTD previously stated its position that a Franklin Boulevard option would not be considered for the BRT alignment.

Ms. Hocken said that it was possible to conduct a supplemental EA that included several different options, and she thought it would be good to get the TGM results prior to making a decision, but she was concerned about the timing. Mr. Viggiano said that Springfield staff projected TGM completion of June 30, 2000, which could delay the BRT project if LTD waited for those results.

Ms. Hocken stated that Springfield Councilors Tammy Fitch and Scott Meisner were in agreement at the BRT Steering Committee meeting that nothing would be done to change the Glenwood Refinement Plan for at least five years. She asked how the TGM project

would fit into that commitment that both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield had made to the residents of Glenwood. Mr. Viggiano said that he assumed that the TGM projected development for the period of at least five years into the future.

Mr. Bennett asked if Springfield staff were aware of the right-of-way difficulties on Franklin Boulevard. Mr. Viggiano stated that they were, and also they were aware of the Glenwood Business Association's position.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff had a notion of what the travel time penalty would be for operating in mixed traffic on Main Street. Mr. Viggiano said that what had been analyzed was the peak direction flow, which was eastbound. Westbound travel time would be researched and projected as well. Mr. Kleger asked if agreeing to include Franklin Boulevard in the EA, at the request of the Springfield City Council, would compromise LTD's prior commitments to the Glenwood Business Association and residents. Mr. Viggiano responded that including Franklin Boulevard would neither commit the Board members nor the City Council. It would simply mean that it was being evaluated.

Ms. Hocken thought that since Springfield was taking such an incremental approach to a Franklin option, it was nearly the equivalent of the no-build alternative, which was where LTD currently was in regard to Franklin Boulevard, so she did not believe it was different than one of the alternatives that already would be included in the EA, and she did not think LTD could formally include it at this time. Mr. Viggiano stated that the Board did not need to take action at this time, but staff could review and present a more detailed analysis of that alternative.

Ms. Wylie said that since LTD was in a period of prolonged negotiations with the other jurisdictions, she thought it was important for the Board to be as open as possible to researching other alternatives when possible. She also wanted to be supportive of the work and processes that previously had been done. She looked forward to a report from staff about what the options were.

Ms. Hocken asked about the Springfield alignment, and if the Springfield Station were located on the south side of South A Street, whether LTD would be required to add a stoplight in order to travel north across South A to get back to westbound travel on Main Street. Mr. Viggiano said that a stoplight would be required at 4th and South A as well as one at 4th and Main. The US Bank site would require one additional stoplight, at 4th & Main.

Ms. Hocken then said that at the BRT Steering Committee meeting, the committee discussed the use of the three blocks on Main Street in mixed traffic. She did not hear a strong objection from the Springfield Council representative to pursuing a way to remove the parking and still satisfy the commercial property owners along that stretch. She asked that the Springfield Station EA include an alternative of parking removal for those three blocks. Mr. Viggiano said that staff could add that.

Mr. Bennett said that at the Steering Committee meeting, he had voted against the recommendation of Alternative A3 as the downtown Springfield segment alignment for BRT. His reason for voting against the alternative was the lack of right-of-way in the westbound direction, and he could not in good conscience vote for something that did not include the fundamentals that he believed were critical to the success of BRT over time. He was

convinced that right-of-way was crucial to the effective success of the project. He said that he understood that some concessions had to be made in the short run in order to achieve what was needed in the longer term, but as Ms. Hocken had pointed out, there was an honest opportunity to make a case at the local business level where two blocks of that stretch now had on-site parking. He was willing to mitigate parking on the third block in order to obtain the entire three blocks of right-of-way. At this level, he stated he would vote for the motion, because his position would be recorded.

Ms. Hocken said that Mr. Bennett had made a very good point during the Steering Committee meeting. He had said that even though it was only a three-block stretch of road, those three blocks would set the tone for the other BRT segments in Springfield, which was another reason not to accept mixed traffic, even if it was for only three blocks. Ms. Hocken stated that she voted for the motion, but she thought Mr. Bennett's was a very valid point of view. She also agreed with Mr. Bennett about mitigating parking for those businesses.

Mr. Kleger agreed with Mr. Bennett that exclusive right-of-way was critical to the success of the project, but was more willing to accept the foot-in-the-door approach. However, he was not willing to take a shared right-of-way situation without a clear declaration by the District that the goal was the exclusive right-of-way.

Ms. Loobey suggested that the motion be amended to reflect the conversation. Mr. Bennett said that he thought the Steering Committee had intended the recommendation as read in the motion. He thought the Board's conversation could be on record in the meeting minutes, but that the vote should go forward based on the current language.

Ms. Hocken said that she was comfortable with Mr. Bennett's approach as long as the Board was committed to including the removal of parking as an alternative in the Environmental Assessment. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff could take that direction with or without a formal motion. Ms. Wylie asked if mitigated parking also could be included in the language of the EA. Mr. Viggiano said that the EA would require that parking mitigation be considered.

Mr. Kortge said that he had difficulty envisioning BRT as a swift operation through the Glenwood area and across the bridge, then suddenly coming to a stop in traffic on South A. He also asked when the decision would be made for the remainder of the Springfield portion. Mr. Viggiano replied that the current funding covered only Phase I from downtown Eugene to downtown Springfield. Phase 2 would cover the area west of downtown Eugene, and Phase 3 would be east of downtown Springfield. Preliminary design work on Phase 2 would begin in the fall of 1999, and currently there was no schedule to begin Phase 3 because additional discussions were required with the Springfield City Council about the appropriate timing for that. The City Council had expressed a desire to see BRT in operation before they were interested in looking at further options.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors selects Downtown Springfield Alternative A3 as the preferred BRT alignment for the Downtown Springfield segment of the bus rapid transit pilot corridor with the understanding that the removal and mitigation of parking along Main Street will be considered as one of the alternatives in the environmental assessment."

MOTION

VOTE Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kleger, Kortge, Wylie, Bennett, and Hocken voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken added that she had attended the Eugene City Council meeting on September 13, 1999, for the presentation of BRT, and one of the things that Mayor Torrey asked was, if the only thing LTD could build was the downtown to downtown segment, or Phase 1, would LTD do it?

DISCUSSION OF REVISED DISTRICT BOUNDARIES: Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora reminded the Board that in May, some small revisions were made to the District's service boundaries. According to Board direction, staff had formulated a more comprehensive review of the boundary issue. The current boundary (distributed to each Board member for reference) included a 2.5-mile boundary revision for the eastern portion of the service area along Highways 58 and 126 that currently was based on census tract boundaries.

Mr. Vobora said that creating a boundary at one mile or at 2.5 miles established a service area defined solely by the mileage method and provided the District with a more consistent service area.

Mr. Kleger asked if LTD currently was not providing service to the businesses that would be dropped from the boundary. Mr. Vobora said that was correct, and based on caller input from taxpayers who were farther than 2.5 miles from bus service, staff believed the revision would treat them equally with other taxpayers throughout the service area.

Ms. Wylie stated that she appreciated consistency wherever it could be applied. She asked if there was a strategy or timetable to achieve consistency across the entire boundary. Mr. Vobora replied that none of the changes restricted the Board from changing the boundary in the future; for example, if LTD were to reintroduce service along the northern side of the Willamette River in the Jasper/Fall Creek area, the boundary could be revised using the 2.5-mile strategy.

MOTION Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors directs staff to prepare a revised LTD Ordinance No. 24 that reflects the following revisions to the LTD service area boundary map:

1. Establish the service area boundaries at the 2.5-mile limit along the eastern portion of the service area, using the Willamette River as the boundary in the area west of Lowell and north of the Willamette River to Jasper.
2. Maintain the boundary following the McKenzie River in north Springfield and north Eugene.
3. Make changes to the boundary north of Coburg and in southwest Eugene using the 2.5-mile limit.
4. Maintain existing boundary lines where establishing the 2.5-mile boundary would exceed the current District boundary."

Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken stated that she did not want to get into a situation where LTD had to change the boundary frequently. She was concerned with revision 4 in the resolution, because maintaining those existing boundary lines would not be treating all taxpayers and potential taxpayers equally. She preferred to include a few more taxpayers so that LTD could not be criticized for unequal treatment of people in different areas.

Mr. Bennett said that it was his understanding that where there was a disparity, it was because of a significant disparity in the level of service or no service, or no reasonable access to service. The explanation, as he understood it, was that LTD could be consistent, which was an objective worth pursuing over time, but it would cause a significant reaction with very little additional revenue. He was concerned about losing the revenue, but he believed staff were in strong support of the revision.

Ms. Hocken stated she was concerned about the lack of consistency in the south Eugene area, where service was within the 2.5-mile limit, but the boundary did not reflect that. Mr. Vobora replied that since there was not a natural boundary, the urban growth boundary had been used.

Ms. Wylie asked why staff were not including a revision in south Eugene at this time, since the 2.5-mile limit was being applied elsewhere. Mr. Vobora stated that staff could revise that area, but were concerned that the number of concerns that LTD would receive from those taxpayers would outweigh the amount of revenue that would be realized.

Mr. Bennett asked about the service to south Eugene. Mr. Vobora stated that there were 16 payroll taxpayers who currently were outside the boundary but within the 2.5-mile limit, but there was no information about the number of self-employed in that same area. There were two bus routes that operated four buses per hour to the edge of the boundary.

Ms. Hocken asked if revision 4 of the resolution could be deleted from the resolution. Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that revision 4 was designed to ensure that LTD did not accidentally cross into another county. Mr. Vobora suggested amending revision 4, because even though the boundary would never go near a county line to the south, it could approach the county line to the north.

Mr. Bennett thought it was important that the amended resolution mention the geographical area, since service in that area was consistent. Ms. Hocken asked if Mr. Bennett meant to leave revision 4 alone, but add a revision 5 that addressed the south Eugene area. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn suggested that revision 4 be amended to read, "Maintain existing boundary lines where establishing the 2.5-mile boundary would exceed the current District boundary, consistent with state law" because the state law did not allow LTD to go outside the county boundary, which would solve the problem to the north, but would maintain the south Eugene problem. LTD must be consistent with state law.

Ms. Loobey added that the language in revision 4 could not remain as stated because it was contrary to what was being stated in the other provisions.

Ms. Wylie asked if it was urgent that the Board adopt the resolution at this meeting. Mr. Vobora responded that if the change were made, the Ordinance readings would occur in

October and November, and the Ordinance then would become effective January 1, 2000, to coincide with the publication of tax materials and the tax year. Ms. Wylie asked if the Board could delay the resolution for one month to give staff an opportunity to amend the language of the resolution. Ms. Hocken said that the resolution was what gave staff the direction to change the Ordinance with the intent of the Board's discussion. Ms. Loobey said that an Ordinance could be drafted without the resolution. Ms. Hocken wanted staff to be clear about the Board's direction in drafting the Ordinance revisions. Mr. Vobora stated that the Ordinance did not address the specifics of the boundary, but referenced the map, and he thought that staff could proceed with direction from the Board discussion.

Ms. Hocken thought that if the 2.5-mile rule were applied in one area, it should be applied in all areas for consistency, and Mr. Kortge agreed with that. Mr. Bennett stated that he did not agree with that statement, because of the lack of service or low-level of service in some areas where the 2.5-mile limit should not be applied.

Mr. Kleger said that he did not want to collect the tax from people who were a significant distance from service, but, on the other hand, there were cases where even though the taxpayer was within the 2.5-mile boundary from service, the roads to get there were often a lot longer than 2.5 miles.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken withdrew her amendment, and the original motion had been made and seconded. A vote was taken, and the original resolution passed by unanimous vote, with Kleger, Kortge, Wylie, Bennett, and Hocken voting in favor, and none against.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:

- a) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken stated that MPC met in September, and there were two transportation items. The first issue was about the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) request for input for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that would cover the period of 2002-2005. It gave MPC an opportunity to again discuss some of the funding lost during the last STIP. A decision was made by ODOT at the regional level to not provide the Surface Transportation Funds (STF) for flexible spending money for transit last year. MPC would send a letter to ODOT providing input for the STIP 2002-2005 request, which will include a comment regarding the STF funding.

The other issue on transportation was a request as a region to suggest road projects for the new gas tax money that might or might not be collected depending on how the referral to the voters went. The Lane County Commissioners went on record opposing the gas tax measure that the legislature passed. It did not affect LTD, but was an issue between the cities and the county.

- b) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken reported that the next meeting would be held in November 1999.
- c) BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input: No report was provided at this time.

- d) Springfield Station Steering Committee. Ms. Wylie reported that the EA was reviewed for the two finalist sites. There were no adverse conditions on the South A site report, but there was a possible oil tank buried on the US Bank site. The Committee was encouraged about going ahead.
- e) Executive Search Committee. Mr. Kortge reported that the Committee had hired The Oldani Group as the executive search firm. On November 1 or November 15, the entire Board would be invited to review the list of applicants for the position. The Committee was looking forward to holding final interviews around January 20. Ms. Wylie added that she wanted to invite Mr. Oldani to the November Board work session to provide an update to the entire Board. Mr. Kortge said that one decision the Board would want to make was whether or not the Board would hold a site interview for final applicants, where LTD representatives would travel to the current worksite of the applicant for the site interview.
- f) North End Scoping Group. Mr. Kortge said that the City Council had passed the recommendations of the Group. The direct impact on LTD was the issue of the downtown shuttle, which Mr. Vobora was working on. The other big issues were the location of the federal courthouse and what to do with the train station.
- g) Eugene City Council Work Session on Downtown Segment Alignment for BRT Pilot Corridor. Ms. Hocken added that the Eugene City Council remained very supportive of the BRT project, but saw its roll as advisor to the LTD Board about difficult questions that it wanted LTD to be sure to consider. The Council spent a lot of time asking questions and seeking staff response to those questions.

JULY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson stated that this was a very busy time for LTD. The federal auditors visited LTD during the second week of September and the District's independent auditors the following week. Staff had been very busy preparing materials for the auditors, and the July Financial report was a preliminary one. The August and September Financial reports would be presented during the October Board meeting.

Ms. Hellekson said that the Capital Fund appeared high because some grant funding had been received, but often LTD pre-spent grant funds in one year and received the funds in the next year, which was the case here. This meant that the additional revenue was reimbursement for expenses that occurred during the last year.

There was a possibility that staff would present a request for a budget transfer to amend the current-year budget for the radio project if it was completed. In addition, the budget did not anticipate the Cottage Grove election, and if successful, LTD would need to make some adjustments in the budget to accommodate the service.

At the request of Mr. Kortge, Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson provided a brief update of the radio project.

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS REPORT: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch noted that the Board had received the Final State Legislative Report by handout. The report

included a summary of every bill that LTD staff reviewed during the recent legislative session.

1999 FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) TRIENNIAL REVIEW: Ms. Loobey reported that the summary report was not yet completed, but would be provided at the October Board meeting. However, the auditors complimented LTD on its record keeping and there were very few instances of correction. The Triennial Review was a very important event for any agency using FTA funds. The Review helped to maintain the relationship and credibility with FTA Region X and the national office as well as keeping LTD out of trouble by ensuring that LTD complied with regulations. Ms. Loobey said that it was very gratifying to hear from the national level that LTD was one of the best in the nation. Ms. Wylie congratulated the staff on the good work and said it was reassuring to the Board to receive good audit reports.

BOARD STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION – OCTOBER 29 – 30, 1999: Ms. Wylie stated that there were several options for the Board to select, one of which was the location. Ms. Wylie polled the Board, and it was decided that an in-town location would be preferred. The Saturday session would end by 2:00 p.m.

Mr. Pangborn provided an overview of the topics that were planned for the work session. An outside facilitator would facilitate the session.

Mr. Bennett stated that it was his desire to allow time for a free-flowing, philosophical Board discussion about service development. In addition, Mr. Bennett said that he also preferred that some social time be spent together, such as a dinner on Friday evening of the work session.

Ms. Wylie added that in a very short time, the Board would be hiring a new general manager. The Board was accustomed to Ms. Loobey's knowledge, guidance, and abilities. How the new general manager viewed the Board and the agency was up to the Board. One of her objectives for the work session was that the Board and staff clearly know the goals of LTD that could be presented to the new general manager.

Ms. Hocken suggested that the Board wait until the new general manager had been on board for six months or so before making changes to the way the Board conducted its business. Ms. Wylie stated that she had a direct request from a Board member for the Board to discuss how it conducted business, particularly how agendas were determined.

Mr. Kleger thought it was a very ambitious agenda. Ms. Hocken thought that the proposed agenda items number 1 and 6 were the most important. Mr. Bennett asked if there was another time to schedule a review of the strategic plan.

It was determined that the proposed agenda item number 1, regarding service development, be held on Friday morning for ½ day, with some discussion of item number 2, farebox policy, mixed in. On Friday afternoon, the Board would discuss item number 3, the LTD Strategic Plan. On Saturday morning, item number 6, LTD's Preparedness for the Future, would be discussed. At lunch on Saturday, the Board would discuss how it conducted its business. As a wrap-up on Saturday afternoon, the work session would

conclude with a discussion of the general manager transition. The work session would end at 2:00 p.m. A dinner would be held on Friday evening. Ms. Wylie would work with staff both on a location and on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion regarding any of the other informational items in the Board packet, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** October 27, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** RIDER TRAINING AND ATTENDANT PILOT PROJECT REPORT
- PREPARED BY:** Patricia Hansen, Transit Planner
- ACTION REQUESTED:** None – Information Only
- BACKGROUND:** Copies of a report on last year's Rider Training and Attendant Pilot Project (RT&A) will be made available at the October 27 LTD Board meeting. The RT&A project was a State grant-funded program coordinated as a joint effort by LTD, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), and Alternative Work Concepts (AWC). The goal of the RT&A Project was to manage costs and enhance the availability of RideSource (demand-response paratransit) service by enabling some RideSource riders to use LTD's fixed-route system for one or more of their regular trips. This was accomplished through individualized rider training and transfer assistance at LTD's downtown Eugene station. The project also focused on empowering people with special needs and disabilities to travel independently and to expand their mobility options. Four of the seven program participants now are able to travel independently as fixed-route transit users. The first participant began individualized rider training on LTD's fixed-route bus service in September 1998. The project culminated with a graduation ceremony for seven riders in June 1999.
- Based on the reduction in trips taken on RideSource, approximately 25 to 30 rides per week were made available to other RideSource riders. There was an average savings of \$12.20 per trip for independent trips taken on LTD that otherwise would have been taken on RideSource. The cost savings for trips that required attendant assistance varied according to the time needed to assist with each ride transfer and whether or not assistance could be coordinated to accommodate more than one rider at a time.
- The LTD Board of Directors approved \$10,000 for fiscal year 1999-2000 for the continuation of the RT&A Project. AWC is continuing training activities with several of the participants from the original project. New program participants will be introduced as need and opportunities arise. LTD and AWC staff currently are exploring the idea of creating a regular station attendant position at the Eugene Station to provide on-going transfer assistance for customers with special needs.
- ATTACHMENT:** None (Copies of the report will be available at the October 27 Board meeting)
- PROPOSED MOTION:** None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 1999

ITEM TITLE: REVISION OF ORDINANCE 24 GOVERNING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: (1) Conduct a public hearing on proposed boundary revisions
(2) 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 ordinance is required only if there is a change to the District boundary.

Two changes to the boundary have been discussed by the Board and included in the revised ordinance. The first involves changes to specific sections of the existing boundary that include reducing the boundary along areas north of Coburg, in southwest Eugene, and along the Highway 126 and Highway 58 corridors. The second change involves a boundary expansion to incorporate the Cottage Grove service area, at Cottage Grove's request.

The ordinance has been revised to reflect appropriate dates, and has been drafted to provide reference to two pieces of information that will define the boundary. The first is a District boundary map and the second is a list of all addresses contained within the defined area. These documents are produced by Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) staff using a geographical information system. While the large reference map does not show a great amount of detail, individual address questions can be answered by the address listing. LTD staff has direct access to the computerized address file maintained by LCOG. This gives the District the most up-to-date address information available. Should additional information be needed, LCOG staff can provide detailed tax lot maps upon request. The boundary map will be available at the Board meeting and will be attached to the original ordinance.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Following the second reading and adoption, the ordinance will take effect on January 1, 2000.

ATTACHMENT: LTD Ordinance 24, 1999 Revision

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

Following an affirmative vote, the title should be read:

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

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** October 27, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** CORRESPONDENCE
- PREPARED BY:** Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** None
- ATTACHMENTS:** The attached correspondence is included for the Board's information:
- 1 September 17, 1999, letter from Board President Hillary Wylie to Springfield Mayor Maureen Maine regarding the wording of the Bus Rapid Transit Policy in the draft TransPlan
 - 2 Thank you card from Springfield Mayor Maureen Maine regarding LTD's sponsorship of the Mayor's ice cream social at the Springfield Filbert Festival
 - 3 October 7, 1999, letter from the Eugene Chamber of Commerce regarding the TransPlan process
 - 4 TransPlan input letters regarding proposed bridge to connect River Road and the Delta Highway area
 - a) September 8, 1999, letter from Paul Jasheway
 - b) September 9, 1999, letter from Doug Clark
 - c) September 11, 1999, letter from Paul and Beverley Spencer
 - d) September 20, 1999, letter from Dan Bessette and Karen Hecht
 - e) September 20, 1999, letter from Richard and Barbara Suter
 - f) September 22, 1999, letter from Greg Hume
 - g) September 22, 1999, letter from Catherine Brooke Shafer
 - h) September 23, 1999, letter from Kathleen Gent
 - i) September 24, 1999, postcard from Jim and Sophie Swircznyski
 - j) September 26, 1999, letter from Gail Hacker
 - k) September 26, 1999, letter from Richard Lari
 - l) September 28, 1999, letter from Kathryn Hall
 - m) September 29, 1999, letter from Martha Johnson
 - n) October 8, 1999, letter from Ernesto Maestas
 - 5 October 18, 1999, TransPlan input memorandum from Orval Etter regarding the relationship of fixed auto costs to auto use
- At the October 27 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

October 27, 1999

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager

FY 2000 FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

On October 9, 1999, the President signed the FY 2000 Transportation Appropriations Act, appropriating \$4.4 million to Lane Transit District for bus rapid transit. This is the second half of the \$8.8 million authorized in TEA-21. The Congress has made it clear that these funds are flexible and may be used to purchase buses or bus facilities or to meet other bus needs, such as fare collection systems, but there were no additional funds beyond the TEA-21 authorization appropriated for fleet replacement.

Beyond LTD's earmark, the Act appropriates record amounts for transit, funding the fully-authorized amount in TEA-21, despite attempts during the year to change allocation formulas.

It is hoped that now that the TEA-21 transit authorizations have been appropriated, LTD may be more successful in acquiring funding for new buses. That will continue to be the District's highest federal priority for FY 2001.

FEDERAL "UNITED FRONT"

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, Springfield School District, and Lane Transit District expect to work together again to prepare a regional unified federal agenda to present to Congress on February 8-9, 2000. The agencies' representatives in Washington, D.C., Jim Smith and Sherri Powar, are expected to visit the area in November.

APPOINTMENT TO LTD BOARD

LTD staff have mailed notice to or met with approximately 40 local agencies, community groups, and interested parties regarding the vacancy on the LTD Board of Directors. Working with the Governor's Office of Executive Appointments, October 15 was set as a deadline for applications for appointment to the Board. While this is not a legal deadline, it reflects the amount of time needed for the Governor to make his recommendation and for the Senate Rules and Executive Appointments Committee staff to prepare background information in time for Senate consideration in early December. As of October 18, only one application had been received, but others may still be considered by the Governor if they are received shortly. If the Senate is unable to consider this appointment in December, it will be February before the Senate meets again.

SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING

Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

UO DUCK EXPRESS TAKES FLIGHT

UO football shuttle ridership has been very strong this season. The addition of the Thurston Station has added additional capacity and the riders are responding. Average ridership for the first three home games is more than 6,300 riders, which represents an increase of approximately 10 percent over 1998. Post-game operations have gone well following the normal bumps in adjusting to new boarding locations and integration with Laidlaw buses. Staff are preparing for the final three home games, while also preparing for the first basketball game on November 7.

FALL BID

Implementation has gone smoothly. The staggered school start times allow the ridership to build during the month of September, giving operators an opportunity to adjust to the higher passenger loads and to their new fall bid runs. Overloads at the UO and LCC and in the system are being responded to on an as-needed basis. Additional trips have been added to the #79 UO route that serves the Centennial and Kinsrow housing area. Ridership continues to grow in this area and will grow further as all new University Commons apartments are rented. Growth in activity at Gateway Mall on Saturdays has resulted in the need for trippers. Evening ridership has grown to a point where the regular #12 was forced to leave customers at the Mall.

WEB PAGE UPDATE

LTD's web page continues to attract users. Weekly "hits" are now averaging 1,000 activities! Recent enhancements include front-page banners to highlight current events and information, upgraded information on taxation issues with links to State of Oregon sites, and on-line pass ordering and carpool matching services.

EUGENE CELEBRATION

Ridership during the Celebration weekend increased nearly 5 percent over 1998. LTD co-sponsored the event by allowing Celebration pin holders and children under twelve to ride free. Late departures were added to accommodate the evening performance schedule. Additionally, an LTD shuttle was used to take people to the top of Skinner's Butte for the Celebration's Breakfast on the Butte. One hundred eighty-eight rides were taken.

STUFF THE BUS

LTD will partner with radio station KDUK, Bi-Mart, and Food for Lane County in the Stuff the Bus holiday food and toy drive. This annual event has resulted in thousands of pounds of food and toys being gathered for distribution to local families. An LTD bus will be parked at local Bi-Mart stores in mid-November for this weekend event. A KDUK crew will be on the bus all weekend, broadcasting live in an attempt to encourage people to participate.

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN

An outreach process has been developed for the River Road sector and will be implemented during the next two months. The process includes two neighborhood transportation fairs and one-on-one contacts with neighborhood stakeholders. An extensive effort to communicate the fair dates and other input opportunities will occur in early November and early December. The location of the fairs has not been confirmed at this time; however, staff are looking into facilities near the River Road Station to provide easy access for residents and riders. An open house at the Eugene Station will be included as an opportunity for our regular riders to participate more easily. All residents also will be given an input opportunity via LTD's web page. All Board members will receive an invitation to the fairs and staff will meet individually with Board members who represent the sector being examined.

COVERED BRIDGE TOUR

On Tuesday, October 6, LTD will provide a field trip to five covered bridges in Lane County. This field trip is part of LTD's continuing partnership with a group of businesses and organizations in Springfield to provide activities to area seniors at little or no cost to the individuals. The covered bridge tour is very popular and has been expanded from one bus

to two in order to meet the demand. Other field trips that LTD has provided to this group during the past year include a tour of the Springfield Museum and the University of Oregon Museum of Art, a Dorris Ranch tour and picnic, and a trip along the McKenzie River to view the fall colors. LTD's partners in this program include Willamalane Senior Center, Liberty Federal Bank, Bi-Mart, Price Chopper, and the *Springfield News*.

TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

TRAINING

LTD Transit Operations is beginning its 1999-2000 training season. This year's bus operator training is focused on personal protection in the workplace. Vern Rogers and the instructors have collaborated with LCC and the Eugene Police Department to develop a comprehensive program that will help bus operators better deal with difficult people and potentially dangerous situations.

We have also recently completed an intensive three-day supervisory training program put on by the National Transit Institute and a one-day class entitled, Changing to Supervision, for new supervisors. The supervisory training is one step in ensuring that our supervisory staff has the knowledge and skills needed to adapt to the changing roles of the supervisor in the transit business.

MOBILE DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEM UPDATE.

The radio system has been operating for more than a month. There are some problems that staff are working through with the contractors but, overall, the system is stable and functioning as designed. Staff and operators are working to become accustomed to a completely new system and are revising current procedures to fit the new system. An evaluation of the system will be taking place during the next month. After a positive evaluation, the project would move into an acceptance phase.

BUS OPERATOR REPRESENTS LTD AT THE INTERNATIONAL BUS ROADEO

Bus Operator Mike Gutierrez participated in the International Bus Roadeo in Orlando, Florida, prior to the annual American Public Transit Association (APTA) meeting. Although Mike did not place in the competition, he represented LTD well and we are all proud of his efforts. LTD plans to participate again next year in San Francisco.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Dave Dickman, Human Resources Manager

The Human Resources report is being revised to provide better statistical information regarding LTD's employment- and employee-related activities. It is anticipated that a report in the new format will be included in the November Monthly Staff Report.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 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 **Metropolitan Policy Committee:** MPC meetings are held on the second Thursday of each month. At the Board meeting, LTD's MPC representatives Pat Hocken and Rob Bennett will report on the October 14, 1999, MPC meeting and answer any questions the Board may have about MPC meetings in general. The November MPC meeting has been canceled.
- b **Statewide Livability Forum:** Board member Pat Hocken has been participating 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 Hillary Wylie are participating on LTD's BRT Steering Committee with members of local units of government and community representatives. The Steering Committee last met on October 19. Unless additional discussion on the Glenwood BRT segment is needed, the November 2 meeting will be canceled, making Tuesday, December 7 the next meeting. At the October 27 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 September 16, 1999. The October 21 meeting has been canceled, and the next—and likely the

last—meeting is scheduled for November 18, 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 October 27 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 **Executive Search Committee:** The Board Executive Search Committee (Dean Kortge, chair; Pat Hocken; and Hillary Wylie) has held a series of meetings during the past few months, but has not met since the September Board meeting. The Committee has invited the full Board to meet in executive session on November 15, 1999, to discuss General Manager candidate applications. At the October 27 Board meeting, the Committee members can answer any general questions the Board members may have about the Committee's activities.

f **American Public Transit Association Annual Meeting / BRT Consortium:** Board President Hillary Wylie attended the October American Public Transit Association Annual Meeting. The second meeting of the BRT Consortium was held during the APTA conference, as well. Ms. Wylie will provide a report for the Board at the October Board meeting.

g **Announcements and Additions to Agenda:** Board President Hillary Wylie has asked that a formal opportunity be provided for Board members to make announcements or to suggest topics for current or future Board meetings. This will be a permanent addition to the Board Member Reports agenda item.

- 1) **Announcements**
- 2) **Additional Items for Consideration at this Meeting**
- 3) **Items for Consideration at a Future Meeting**

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None



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

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

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM:
APPOINTMENTS TO
SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Prepared by Patricia Hansen, Transit Planner
October 27, 1999

BACKGROUND: By law, local Special Transportation Fund advisory committees must be appointed by local governing bodies to review and recommend distribution of the STF funds administered by either districts or counties. An advisory committee also may propose changes to the policies or practices of the district or county that relate to the distribution of funds (Special Transportation Fund for the Elderly and Disabled: Handbook for Local Advisory Committees, ODOT Public Transit Division).

(1) STFAC Appointment. On August 10, 1999, the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) voted unanimously to propose to the LTD Board of Directors the appointments of two new STFAC members. A brief synopsis for each of these newly proposed members follows.

Kathryn Jenness (LTD Rider)

Position: In-District/Rural

- Affiliations: Member, Mobility International, Senior & Disabled Services Action Committee, LTD Accessibility Issues Committee.
- Interests: Accessibility and funding issues, including lack of rural dial-a-ride services, and lack of consistent funding for STF

Marlene Black (LTD Rider and Conditional RideSource Rider)

Position: Member-at-Large

- Affiliations: President, Support for Independent Living with Visual Impairment (SILVI); Member, Emerald Council of the Blind; volunteer speaker on blindness and guide dogs
- Interests: Lack of consistent funding for STF

Both Ms. Jenness and Ms. Black would replace STFAC members whose terms had expired.

(2) Amendment to STF Bylaws to Create New AAA Position. A bylaw amendment is being proposed to permit the creation of a new position on the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee. The creation of this At-Large position provides an opportunity to encourage participation by the local Area Agency on Aging (AAA). The intent is to promote the coordination of resources and to provide information about service needs, as they relate to the provision of special transportation services within Lane County. Adding a position for a local AAA representative on the STFAC supports a request made during the previous legislative session. The

request was to make certain that representatives of senior and disabled services agencies were afforded the opportunity to participate in planning and decision making for special transportation funding throughout the state.

ACTION REQUESTED: (1) The Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee recommends that the Board approve the nomination of Kathryn Jenness and Marlene Black to two-year terms on the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee. (2) The STFAC also recommends an amendment to the STFAC bylaws. This amendment would add an At-Large position dedicated to representation from the local Area Agency on Aging. The addition of this position would increase membership from fifteen to sixteen members.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 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 October 27, 1999:

1. Approval of minutes: September 15, 1999, regular Board meeting
2. Approval of minutes: Canceled October 20, 1999, regular Board meeting
3. Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Recommendations

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Minutes of the September 15, 1999, regular Board meeting
2. Minutes of the Canceled October 20, 1999, regular Board meeting
3. Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Recommendations

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for October 27, 1999, is approved as presented.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 1999

ITEM TITLE: BUS SERVICE RECOMMENDATION FOR COTTAGE GROVE

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve Cottage Grove City Council's request to annex to the Lane Transit District service area boundary.

BACKGROUND: In September, Cottage Grove voters passed a ballot measure directing the Cottage Grove City Council to formally request annexation to the Lane Transit District service area. On October 11, 1999, the Cottage Grove City Council approved a resolution requesting annexation to the LTD service area. The official request from the Cottage Grove City Council is attached. It is likely that both proponents and opponents of service to Cottage Grove will attend the October 27 meeting to testify before the Board.

LTD staff examined the possibility of beginning service prior to the expansion of the District's service area boundaries. The staff chose not to bring forward a recommendation to begin service prior to January 1, 2000. This decision was made in consideration of the fact that District resources that have been generated within the current service area would be required to provide service to an area that is not a contributing part of the District.

Staff will be working toward the January 3, 2000, implementation of service. The following chart illustrates the level of service and the associated costs.

Type of Service	Level of Service	Period of Operation	Cost
Connector service between Cottage Grove and Creswell, and circulator service within Cottage Grove.	Six weekday trips, which includes three morning trips inbound and three afternoon trips outbound. Two Saturday trips. All trips include the circulation route used during the pilot project.	January 3 - February 5 (25 weekdays)	\$14,219
Route 98 reconfigured to provide service between Eugene and Cottage Grove.	To be determined. Board will review staff recommendation at December 1999 Board meeting.	February 6, 2000, continuing indefinitely.	To be determined.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The Lane Transit District service area boundaries will be modified to include Cottage Grove. The boundary will be established along Interstate 5 and will follow the Cottage Grove urban growth boundary. Bus service will begin on January 3, 2000.

ATTACHMENT:

Cottage Grove City Council Request

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move approval of the following resolution: “The Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves the City of Cottage Grove’s request to be annexed to the Lane Transit District service area, and directs LTD staff to establish the new portion of the service area boundary following the Cottage Grove urban growth boundary.”

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 1999

ITEM TITLE: NOVEMBER 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: **NOVEMBER 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Bus Operator Norm Bolden has been selected as the November 1999 Employee of the Month. Norm was hired on March 10, 1975, and has achieved 20 years of safe driving. He was nominated by a co-worker as a result of his professional behavior and quick thinking when a bus he was operating caught fire on Beltline Highway. Norm quickly and safely maneuvered the bus to the side of the road, directed his passengers to safety, and extinguished the fire before fire crews arrived. One of the people who was on the bus that morning later reported to LTD that the operator did a good job of getting everyone off the bus and to safety and appeared to know what he was doing. She was impressed by his actions because he seemed prepared to handle a situation that rarely, if ever, occurs. Norm extinguished the fire by spraying the fire extinguisher up into the engine compartment from underneath the bus. If he had opened the door to the engine compartment, the flames and/or heat could have come shooting out at him and it would have fed additional oxygen to the fire. His actions minimized the risk of injury to himself and others, as well as minimizing the damage to the bus.

The co-worker added that on a daily basis, Norm is cheerful and professional, a pleasure to work with, and a positive representative of LTD. His actions during the bus fire clearly demonstrate that he also can be counted on in an emergency situation to serve as an excellent representative of LTD through his quick thinking, safe actions, and professional demeanor.

When asked what makes Norm a good employee, Field Supervisor Kay Kinnish said that the selection of Norm Bolden as Employee of the Month is good news, and that there is much more to Norm than this one incident of professional conduct during a fire on a bus. Norm is a veteran operator who gives great customer service every day, showing the same care and professionalism that he demonstrated during the fire.

AWARD: Norm will attend the October 27 meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

October 27, 1999

Revenue:

- **Special service revenue** is lower than for the first quarter of last year, because last year included payments from the Cottage Grove pilot project that ended in November 1998.
- **State-in-lieu revenue** receipts were missing from the first quarter of the current year. A processing error has occurred in the State Department of Administrative Services, and is under investigation.

Expense:

- **Administration personnel** expenses have been restated to break out expenses charged to federally-grant-funded projects. Gross expenses have increased, because:
 - ◆ Staff positions have been added during the past two years to support bus rapid transit (BRT) and other capital projects. (All of the Planning & Development Department staff costs that previously were charged to the General Fund now are charged to the BRT project in the Capital Fund. Most of the Community Relations staff costs also have been charged to the project.)
 - ◆ A new administrative employee benefit plan resulted in increases in benefits expenses. All employee health benefit expenses increased by 8 percent by contract as of July 1, 1999.
- **Contract personnel** 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.
- **Materials and services** expenses generally are as anticipated by the budget.
- **Capital** expenses also are as anticipated by the budget. The long-awaited approval of the delayed new grant contract was finalized after July 1, 1999, and the grant receivable was posted in July. Since the expense occurred during last fiscal year, July capital revenue was significantly greater than expenses, and that surplus will carry through the current fiscal year.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 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. **Amendment to LTD Ordinance 36:** An amendment to LTD Ordinance 36, Second 1998 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property, may be brought to the Board for a first reading at the December 15, 1999, meeting, and for second reading and adoption at the January 19, 2000, Board meeting.
- B. **Budget Transfer:** Approval of a budget transfer to accomplish additional work projects encountered by the District for the current fiscal year will be on the agenda for the December 15, 1999, Board meeting.
- C. **Proposal for New STF Funding:**
- D. **Long-range Financial Plan:** The Long-Range Financial Plan will be discussed with the Board at the December 15, 1999, meeting.
- E. **Federal Triennial Review Report:**
- F. **Service Boundary Policy:**
- G. **Special Service Policy Revision:** A revision to LTD's Special Service Policy regarding restrictions on providing charter services will be brought to the Board for approval at the December 15, 1999, meeting.
- H. **LTD Drug and Alcohol Policy Revisions:**
- I. **LTD Fingerprinting Policy:**

- J. **Federal Triennial Review Report**: Staff will place the final report on LTD's federal triennial review on the agenda for Board discussion after it is received from the Federal Transit Administration.
- K. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval**: It is anticipated that approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur during late winter or the spring of 2000.
- L. **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.
- M. **Quarterly Performance Reporting**: Staff will provide quarterly performance reports for the Board's information in February, May, August, and November each year.

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, 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: October 27, 1999

ITEM TITLE: REVISION TO LTD ORDINANCE 36, REGULATING CONDUCT ON DISTRICT PROPERTY

PREPARED BY:

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Board discuss an amendment to LTD Ordinance 36, Regulating Conduct on District Property, and hold the first reading of the revised ordinance.

BACKGROUND:

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

ATTACHMENT:

PROPOSED MOTION:

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** October 20, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** Special Service Policy Revision
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Approval of revised policy.
- BACKGROUND:**
- Special service is provided by LTD in the form of community event service and charter service. The Board adopted a revised Special Service Policy earlier this year, however the recent FTA Triennial review provided clarification on how LTD can provide charter service.
- The fundamental change focuses on the FTA definition of “incidental.” LTD had interpreted incidental to mean that the number of charter service hours, in proportion to total service hours operated, should remain small. The auditor clarified that “incidental” in the FTA’s definition means that no FTA funded vehicle can be used for charter services operated during the peak service hours. This means that LTD cannot operate charter service between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. on weekdays.
- The District is further limited to providing charter services that have been subcontracted through local “willing and able” private providers. If LTD is not able to obtain agreements with all “willing and able” providers, then the District cannot provide any charter services.
- The revised policy makes these points in the Restrictions section under “Service Provided through Charter Services.”
- The Board should note that service to community events is not affected by this change. Community event service is open to the public and therefore falls into a different category.
- RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** The District will be in compliance with the FTA regulations. Local parties will be directed to private operators for charter services and LTD will most likely do many fewer charters.
- ATTACHMENT:** Special Service Policy
- PROPOSED MOTION:**
- 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.~~

Charter service, provided using FTA funded vehicles, must be conducted in “off-peak” operating hours. This means that no charter services can be provided between 6 a.m. to 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. weekdays. LTD is allowed to provide services during the “off-peak” operating hours if one of the following occurs:

1. There are no “willing and able” private operators in the area.
2. Agreements are signed with all “willing and able” private operators.
3. The organization needing service is a government entity that is a qualified social service agency, or a private, non-profit organization serving seniors or people with disabilities.

The District will only consider charter service when service on fixed routes is not compromised and when bus operators are available.

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.

TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

TRAINING

We are beginning our 1999-2000 training season and this year's Bus Operator training is focused on personal protection in the workplace. Vern Rogers and the instructors have collaborated with LCC and the Eugene Police Department to develop a comprehensive program that will help our operators better deal with difficult people and potentially dangerous situations.

We have also recently completed an intensive three-day supervisory training program put on by the National Transit Institute and a one-day class entitled, Changing to Supervision, for new supervisors. The supervisory training is one step in ensuring that our supervisory staff has the knowledge and skills needed to adapt to the changing roles of the supervisor in the transit business.

MOBILE DATA ACQUISITION SYSTEM UPDATE.

This, hopefully, will be the last update on the progress of this project. We have been operating the system for over a month and overall the system is working. There are some problems that we are working through with the contractors but overall the system is stable and functioning as designed. There have been some frustration among staff and operators but they have mostly been related to trying to get accustomed to a completely new system and revising or abandoning current procedures to fit the new system. An evaluation of the system will be taking place in the next month and after that we will move into an acceptance phase.

BUS OPERATOR REPRESENTS LTD AT THE INTERNATIONAL BUS ROADEO

Bus Operator, Mike Gutierrez participated in the International Bus Rodeo in Orlando prior to the annual APTA meeting. Although Mike did not place in the competition, he represented LTD well and we are all proud of his efforts. LTD plans to try again next year in San Francisco.