

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on November 11, 1999.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

November 17, 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

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

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

III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA 04

V. WORK SESSION--TRANSPLAN UPDATE 05

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

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH--December 1999 13

VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A. Consent Calendar 14

1. Minutes of the October 27, 1999, Special Board Meeting
2. Revised FY 1999-2000 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program

B.	Acceptance of Independent Audit Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1999	35
C.	Second Reading and Adoption, LTD Ordinance No. 24 (1999 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District	41
D.	Budget Transfer—Cottage Grove Service Expense	44
E.	Executive Session pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege, to hear an opinion of counsel	47
IX.	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING	
A.	Current Activities	
1.	Board Member Reports	48
a.	Metropolitan Policy Committee	
b.	Statewide Livability Forum	
c.	BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input	
d.	Springfield Station Steering Committee	
e.	Meeting in Cottage Grove	
f.	Finance Committee Meeting	
2.	Presentation of Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year 1998-1999	50
3.	Monthly Financial Report—October Financial Statements	51
4.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	61
5.	Springfield Station: Greyhound Co-location	62
6.	Comprehensive Service Redesign	67
7.	Airport Service Study	68
8.	Correspondence	70
B.	Monthly Staff Report	74
X.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	77
A.	Amendment to LTD Ordinance No. 36, 1999 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property	

- B. Long-Range Financial Plan
 - C. Federal Triennial Review Report
 - D. Service Boundary Policy
 - E. Special Service Policy Revision
 - F. LTD Drug and Alcohol Policy Revisions
 - G. LTD Fingerprinting Policy
 - H. TransPlan Draft Plan Approval
 - I. Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Service Recommendations
 - J. Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Pricing Plan and Fare Ordinance
 - K. Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Capital Improvements Program
 - L. BRT Updates
 - M. Quarterly Performance Reporting/Year-end Performance Report
- XI. ADJOURNMENT

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

H:\Board Packet\1999\11\Regular Mtg\bdagenda.doc

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

2

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: OCTOBER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Financial results for the fourth month of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Total General Fund revenue was \$369,570 below budget for October, due to a lag in payroll tax receipts. More than \$2.7 million from this source has been received through November 10, however, so the October shortfall was due to collection/disbursement timing and not to a reduction in the total amount of payroll tax anticipated. Payroll tax receipts are expected to be on or slightly over budget for the current fiscal year.

Despite regular follow-up, the state-in-lieu revenue error on the part of the Oregon Department of Administrative Services has not been corrected. That error in the calculation and disbursement of first-quarter biennium revenue reduced Lane Transit District's expected revenue by more than \$150,000. Primarily for this reason, General Fund year-to-date total revenue is short of budget by \$41,110. Passenger fare and group pass receipts are on budget through the first four months of the fiscal year.

Total General Fund expenses are \$611,519 less than budgeted through October, and 16 percent lower 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 October 31, 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.

Special Transportation Fund expenses are as anticipated through four months. An analysis is underway of possible uses of revenue set aside in the most recent legislative session for capital expenses and service enhancements for the elderly and disabled. LTD's share of this new revenue source is expected to be approximately \$287,000 in the current fiscal year. This allocation has not been included in the FY 1999-2000 budget to date. When a proposed use for the new revenue has been developed, it will be reviewed with the Board, and appropriate budget amendments will be recommended.

Year to date Capital Fund expenses are as anticipated. Because the entire amount of the federal earmark for bus rapid transit (BRT) in the current fiscal year was appropriated for the BRT Phase I build out, but the project is not expected to progress to the point where all funds will be required in the current year, this line item will show a large positive variance throughout the year and at year end.

It still has not been conclusively determined if the radio project will be satisfactorily completed, but that information will be available at the December Board meeting. If the terms of the contract have been met, a budget adjustment will be requested in the amount of \$236,500 to make the final contract payment.

Work is underway to analyze four different fare-free models, as was requested by TransPlan hearing participants and partner agencies. The progress of that effort was expected to be reviewed with the Finance Committee at a November meeting. The Finance Committee also was expected to review Long-range Financial Plan assumptions, and alternative capital funding options. The Board agenda materials were prepared before the Board Finance Committee met on November 17. Committee Chair Pat Hocken can provide additional information, if desired, at the regular Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attached are the following financial reports 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

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: PRESENTATION OF COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR FY 1998-99

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1999, will be distributed to the Board of Directors on November 15. This report includes audited statements and the opinions of the independent audit firm of Grove, Mueller, Hall and Swank. Charles Swank, representing LTD's auditors, will attend the November 17 meeting to discuss the audit results. An overview of Lane Transit District's financial position at June 30, 1999, will be presented by staff at the November 17 Board meeting.

Board acceptance of the independent audit report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1999, is scheduled during the Items for Action portion of this meeting.

ATTACHMENTS: None (The Independent Auditor's Opinion and Reports are included with the audit report agenda summary on page 35 of this packet, and copies of the CAFR will be delivered to the Board under separate cover.)

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AMENDED MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, October 27, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 21, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special Board of Directors meeting on Wednesday, October 27, 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
Virginia Lauritsen
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: (Vacancy, subdistrict 5)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:38 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

WORK SESSION

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Wylie reminded the Board members of the work session scheduled for Friday and Saturday, October 29 and 30. She stated that it was the time once each year that Board members came together to discuss issues in more depth. She was sorry that Ms. Lauritsen would be unable to attend. Agendas for the session were distributed at the meeting.

TRANSPLAN: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano was present to discuss the draft TransPlan process to date. He stated that it would be inappropriate for the Board to begin deliberations about TransPlan as the public review period was not yet complete. He asked the Board, at this time, to provide direction to staff about additional information or research that might be needed.

Staff were planning a November 17, 1999, work session to discuss the approval process for TransPlan. The expectation was that all four of the adopting agencies would discuss a possible change in the process to include a more extensive review period based on the comments that had been received to date. At its meeting on December 9, the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) would discuss the process and a plan to bring the four jurisdictions together. It was likely that Board discussion of the content of the draft TransPlan would not occur before January 2000.

One of the issues that had been mentioned at the public hearings was the concept of a free fare system. Staff had begun researching the issue in preparation for anticipated questions from the Board. Potential issues involved in the free fare concept included revenue loss, operational savings, and various options for free fare, such as just for youth, certain time of day, etc. Mr. Viggiano stated that some of the other issues that had been raised during the public hearings were alternate fuels and neighborhood service.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff could research the impact on ridership for other transit agencies that had tried or currently were using the fareless system, particularly from the part of the community that previously had not used the bus, or the choice riders. Mr. Kleger said it would be interesting to know what ridership increases resulted from the same people taking more trips or from new choice riders using the service.

Ms. Wylie asked what the ridership difference was between a reduced fare and a fareless system.

Mr. Kortge added that staff already were researching a downtown shuttle, and he was interested to know what the difference in ridership would be to have a fareless segment, such as a downtown shuttle, as opposed to the entire system being fareless.

Ms. Wylie stated that it was suggested to her that the local businesses subsidize shuttles, such as the downtown shuttle, so that there would be no fare imposed. Another question that had been asked of her was if bus rapid transit (BRT) would have a separate fare system from the current bus system. She asked staff to look into options for subsidizing the fare.

Mr. Kleger stated that one of the things LTD had done throughout the years was to substantially discount pre-paid fares as an incentive to using the system. He was interested in knowing what the likely effect would be on choice riders of giving up the pre-paid fare incentive, such as, for example, if employer-paid passes were discontinued. He was concerned that the employer would lose the incentive to use the bus. He also was concerned about the impact to the overall mission of the District.

Ms. Lauritsen said it would be detrimental to lose the group pass participants, such as Sacred Heart Hospital and the University of Oregon.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff had an idea of where the revenue replacement would come from. He was concerned about cutting service to realize the operational savings. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff could research that issue. Ms. Wylie added that the downtown shuttle system in Orlando, Florida, was paid for by a parking lot tax.

Mr. Kortge asked if the free fare concept was just a feel-good concept or if it was truly meaningful operationally. Mr. Viggiano stated that other transit systems had tried all types of fareless options, and staff could gather information based on those experiences. Mr. Bennett added that the shuttle approach that operated in a very dense area where the key to getting people to ride was the ability to quickly get them on and off the system made sense to him.

Ms. Lauritsen asked how long it would take staff to provide answers to the Board. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff would have some of the information at the December Board meeting and more comprehensive information in January, when the Board began its deliberations on the draft TransPlan.

Mr. Kleger stated that he was aware that other agencies that had tried to have a fareless system had run into problems, such as increased vandalism, homeless sheltering, and childcare by bus. He asked staff to get answers as to what strategies had worked to address those problems. He was enthusiastic about doing something to encourage ridership as long as it did not discourage the choice riding market.

Ms. Wylie said that the Board was planning to discuss fares in relationship to all LTD services. She thought it might be prudent to look at fares for shuttles versus BRT versus the overall current bus system.

Tom Schwetz of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) stated that LCOG had asked the four jurisdictions to submit questions based on the TransPlan public testimony, and 157 questions were received. Staff were working on responding to all the questions, but it would take some time.

Mr. Kleger asked about the issue that was raised at the public hearing about LTD being a supposed legal monopoly and if there were statutes or ordinances that prevented competition.

Ms. Hocken said that several people had mentioned the difficulty of school children getting to school by biking or walking, and there were some suggestions made about how to approach that issue. She asked if staff could research the possibility of fitting a school-type program into the current Commuter Solutions program at LTD. Ms. Wylie added that staff also should consider the suggestion that was made for providing transportation to school kids who participated in sports after regular school hours. Ms. Lauritsen added that security issues pertaining to transporting school children also should be researched.

Ms. Wylie asked how the other jurisdictions were approaching the approval process discussion. Mr. Viggiano stated that LTD's November work session would concentrate on the TransPlan approval process discussion, and staff would propose options for Board consideration. Ms. Wylie also asked if there would be an opportunity for the four jurisdictions to meet together. Mr. Viggiano replied an attempt would be made to bring the four jurisdictions together after each jurisdiction had the opportunity to individually discuss and develop its issues.

Mr. Kleger asked staff to prepare a chart listing the earmarking of funding. Mr. Schwetz said that staff were working on that and would have it ready by the November 17 work session.

APTA NATIONAL CONFERENCE AND EXPO: Ms. Wylie used the remaining work session time to discuss her recent attendance at the American Public Transit Association (APTA) conference in Orlando. She said that the APTA Transit Expo, which was part of the conference, was very large and informative. One of the big issues she looked into at the

Expo was the bus rapid transit (BRT) concept vehicle and the Buy America requirement. Ms. Wylie stated that she had met with William Segal from the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) vehicle procurement program as well as others in the BRT Consortium, including two bus manufacturing representatives – one from Sweden and the other from Gillig, an American bus manufacturer. She had thought that all ten transit agencies that were involved with the BRT Consortium would be interested in a new design vehicle, but was surprised to discover that some were not so interested. She also was surprised to hear that the American manufacturers were not very interested in a new bus design because it would mean retooling their manufacturing plants.

Assistant Chief Counsel, Dorvil Carter, of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) spoke about the possibility of asking for a Buy America waiver if the equipment that LTD was looking for was not available in the United States. Ms. Wylie said that she hoped that LTD would go ahead and research the waiver in order to purchase the desired BRT vehicle. She distributed information that she had gathered at the Expo.

Ms. Hocken asked if Ms. Wylie had a sense about how many of the BRT Consortium transit agencies would be interested in the Buy America waiver. Ms. Wylie said that she thought maybe half of the participating agencies. Mr. Viggiano added that a survey was being conducted among the participants to determine vehicle needs and priorities. It was a big issue that divided the Consortium.

Mr. Kortge asked if the waiver truly was a possibility. Ms. Wylie responded that Mr. Carter had said that he was working with the railway companies on just such a waiver because they also were interested in the European-designed rails because those were more advanced than American designs.

Mr. Kleger asked if anyone had raised the issue of the effect on Buy America clauses of the Free Trade agreements. Ms. Wylie said that no one had, but there was much discussion about this particular waiver. Mr. Kleger said that the fact that American products were so heavily traded to Europe might help to open the door for a vehicle design waiver.

Ms. Hocken stated that one of the big BRT issues for people in the Eugene/Springfield area was the ability to get bicycles onto the vehicles. She asked if other Consortium agencies were researching that issue. Ms. Wylie said that the issue had come up, but the conversations were not yet at that level of detail.

Mr. Bennett said that the Board and staff had discussed providing a packaged BRT system, which included right-of-way, pre-paid fares, etc. He asked if staff were looking into the seating arrangements of the envisioned vehicle. Part of the success of BRT would not be the number of people that a vehicle could carry, but how those people felt when they stepped inside the vehicle. Ms. Wylie said that it was the Gillig representative who said that they could not design a vehicle with doors that opened on both sides because seating would be lost.

Ms. Wylie noted several other items of interest. She presented a copy of the BRT Consortium logo, which the participants were considering adopting. The FTA was planning a trip to Curitiba, Brazil, and three other cities during the summer of 2000. This could be the

time to plan to get key politicians involved to see what BRT was all about. In addition, Ms. Wylie said there was a lot of excitement about BRT, and she had seen some interesting simulations that depicted using various modes of transportation at different levels to meet the needs of moving people efficiently. She also brought back a lot of information about new technologies, such as automated fareboxes, which she would forward to staff.

All in all, Ms. Wylie was very proud to represent LTD and was very excited about the respect that LTD had from the FTA.

Mr. Viggiano, responding to Mr. Bennett's question about interior seating, said that he thought there was a great deal of flexibility in interior design. Any bus could accommodate many different seating designs. Fleet Services Manager Ron Berkshire added that there were many design ideas, and if LTD developed a design, it could be manufactured.

Ms. Wylie said that in Orlando, Florida, the transit agency had a downtown shuttle that was referred to as BRT because it operated on a 100 percent dedicated lane. The vehicles looked different because they were painted with copies of famous paintings. Ms. Hocken asked what the political process had been to achieve the dedicated lanes in Orlando's shuttle system. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn replied that the downtown business community in Orlando was very well organized, and there had been a massive redevelopment of the downtown area after Disney World was built. Also, the mayor was very supportive. They built parking structures on the perimeter of the downtown area and the streetscapes were designed for the bus. The politics were quite different than LTD's local political arena.

Mr. Bennett asked what role the Eugene downtown organization was playing in the design of the downtown shuttle. Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora said that Downtown Eugene, Inc., was represented on the downtown shuttle design committee. The discussions to date were quite preliminary, and staff would provide more information to the Board in the near future.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie closed the work session at 6:28 p.m.

REGULAR BUSINESS: The regular business portion of the meeting was called to order at 6:40 p.m.

NOVEMBER 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Wylie introduced Bus Operator Norm Bolden, who had been selected as the November 1999 Employee of the Month. Mr. Bolden was hired on March 10, 1975, and had achieved 20 years of safe driving. He had been 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. He 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. 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, Mr. Bolden was cheerful and professional, a pleasure to work with, and a positive representative of LTD. His supervisor added that

Mr. Bolden was a veteran operator who gave great customer service every day, showing the same care and professionalism that he demonstrated during the fire.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Bolden with a letter of congratulations, a certificate of appreciation, and a monetary award.

Mr. Bolden stated that he was very happy to receive this award. He said that even though he had come to be congratulated, he also wanted to congratulate the Board and staff for their good work for LTD. He said that Ms. Loobey had been a mentor to him. In addition to being a bus operator, he was a working minister of a church. He had watched the dedication and hard work that Ms. Loobey had and continued to have. He tried to capitalize on some of the things Ms. Loobey did to be very successful in her endeavors. He was glad for the opportunity to speak to that in light of Ms. Loobey's pending retirement. He was grateful to have known Ms. Loobey, and he appreciated the way she had shown care for all employees, but especially the bus operators. He said that in her position, Ms. Loobey was not too high to regularly visit the operators' lounge for a cup of coffee and some conversation. He again thanked the Board for the award and stated that he really liked his job.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: a) Mr. Don Nordin of Cottage Grove stated that he wanted to take the opportunity to express his appreciation and that of the Friends of LTD organization in Cottage Grove for the assistance provided by LTD, and particularly Mr. Vobora; Mr. Pangborn; Transit Planner Micki Kaplan; Commuter Solutions Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams; and Customer Service Supervisor Angie Sifuentez.

Now that the election had been successful, LTD was a member of the Cottage Grove community and now was in a position to build an infrastructure in Cottage Grove. To that end, Mr. Nordin suggested that LTD consider a bus station in Cottage Grove.

He noted that there was an opportunity available at the City Shop space located at 14th and Main. The property would be on the market within the next few months, and it would make an excellent transit center for Cottage Grove. It was centrally located and within walking distance of most of the downtown area. It would answer the question of why would people come to Cottage Grove. Cottage Grove was in the process of developing the Row River Trail and other recreational opportunities, all very adjacent to the site. Also, the site already was landscaped.

Mr. Nordin had mentioned the idea to the Cottage Grove City Council and there were no real objections from the Council. He asked the Board to consider the request.

b) Tom Lester of Eugene suggested a correction to page 10 of the Minutes of the September 15, 1999, LTD Board meeting. Currently, the minutes stated that Mr. Lester said that he thought it (downtown Springfield BRT alignment) was a bad idea to the degree that it had nothing to do with the Springfield Renaissance Development Committee's Plans. He asked that it be changed to state that he thought it was a bad idea to the degree that it had nothing to do with the organization of downtown Springfield.

Also, he suggested that the next line also be corrected. It currently stated that Mr. Lester had said that 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. He recommended that it be changed to read that the Springfield Renaissance Development Committee's Plans pandered to real estate speculation interests

Mr. Lester stated that he also had a concern about the proposed Glenwood alignment of the BRT. In the memo on page 37 of the agenda packet, from Rob Bennett, Chair of the BRT Steering Committee, regarding the Glenwood segment alignment, Mr. Bennett stated that a hybrid 14th/15th Avenue alignment had been suggested by the Glenwood Business Association. Mr. Lester wanted to make sure that the hybrid 14th/15th alignment also was recommended for the Environmental Assessment, because it was not stated as such in the proposed motion. He recommended that a change be made in the motion to include the 14th/15th alignment to meet the wishes of the Glenwood Business Association.

There being no further testimony, Ms. Wylie closed the audience participation period.

CONSENT CALENDAR: The Consent Calendar for October 27, 1999, consisted of the minutes of the September 15, 1999, regular Board meeting; the canceled October 20, 1999, regular Board meeting; and Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Recommendations.

**MOTION
VOTE**

Ms. Hocken moved the approval of the Consent Calendar for October 27, 1999, with the recommended changes to the September 15, 1999, regular Board meeting minutes as presented by Mr. Lester. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 6-0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

SPRINGFIELD STATION ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: Ms. Kaplan introduced Jeff Heilman, from Parametrix, Inc., the consultant who assisted LTD in developing the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA).

Ms. Kaplan provided a brief history of the Springfield Station project and presented the proposed locations that had been considered as part of the EA. She noted that there were no significant issues at any of the proposed locations that could not be mitigated. She stated that the public review period would be open from October 1 to November 8, 1999, after which staff would respond to any questions that were received and revise the EA for submittal to the FTA.

The next Springfield Station Steering Committee meeting was scheduled for November 18, 1999, at which time staff would ask the Committee to make a final site recommendation to the LTD Board. An update would be provided to the Springfield City Council at its December 6, 1999, meeting. The final site recommendation would be presented to the LTD Board at its December meeting. It was hoped that funding issues would be resolved prior to the annual lobbying trip to Washington, D.C., in February 2000.

Ms. Kaplan reviewed some of the design issues and findings of the EA. Ms. Hocken asked what the security issues were for moving the customer service center to the back of

Site I. Ms. Kaplan replied that the location at the back of the station would provide more site monitoring on the part of the customer service staff, much like at the Eugene Station.

Ms. Kaplan then discussed a new issue that recently had surfaced, which was a request by Greyhound to LTD to explore the possibilities of a multi-modal facility. The bank site most likely was too small, but Site I was large enough to accommodate both systems. This was a very conceptual idea at this point. Some of the key advantages of a multi-modal facility that staff quickly had developed were that, operationally, it could be advantageous to have longer staffing hours, shared restrooms, possible revenue from rental payments, and some funding opportunities that could offset the construction costs. Some of the negative impacts might be that Greyhound could be viewed negatively by some customers, and it would be very important to clearly spell out the operations and maintenance agreements.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if Greyhound was considering closing its Eugene terminal. Ms. Kaplan replied that Greyhound was considering moving its Eugene operation, but the multi-modal facility concept was not limited to the Springfield Station. It could be located at any of the LTD facilities, including BRT facilities.

Mr. Bennett asked when the Board would become involved in deliberating the issue. Mr. Viggiano responded that staff had some contact with Greyhound, and Greyhound had provided its space needs. At this time, the discussions were very preliminary. Mr. Bennett said that he had some concerns about the concept. Greyhound had its own set of issues that it needed to address on a regular basis. Perception issues were very real, and the Board needed a chance to discuss the concept. Mr. Bennett then asked if any particular place made more sense than another, and what would be the tradeoffs of sharing a facility.

Ms. Wylie asked what the impacts would be on LTD. She was concerned about LTD's strict standards being maintained. Also, the number of Greyhound buses per day would need to be considered. She asked staff to prepare a list of the pros and cons of operating a multi-modal facility.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she had heard that Greyhound was planning to close its Eugene terminal, and she asked if Greyhound was discussing opening another Eugene location in addition to a Springfield location. Mr. Viggiano said that he understood that Greyhound was considering a relocation at this time.

Ms. Hocken said that even though there were many factors to consider, she thought the concept should be considered because multi-modal connections were critical to LTD's operation. It was LTD's job to provide transportation to other modes of transportation. She thought it was important for LTD to work on the concept, but to ensure that the strict standards were upheld in any joint development.

Mr. Bennett added that it was not just the standards. LTD was attempting to move to the next level with BRT, and he asked if LTD wanted to depend on someone else's private decision on whether or not to do the same, which could include the type of vehicle, the type of fuel, etc. It was a big decision, and he thought it was important for the Board to discuss the issue of multi-modal facilities at the conceptual level. Ms. Wylie added that the bus system needed to be kept in consideration along with the BRT as a key piece of the station.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were gathering more information for Board discussion at the November 17 meeting. Staff could relay the Board discussion to the Springfield Station Steering Committee meeting. Ms. Kaplan added that the Springfield City Council would have provided input by then. Ms. Wylie added that the Board would receive some information from legal counsel about joint development at its October 30 meeting.

Mr. Heilman stated that an EA occurred whenever a federal action was about to be taken and the federal agency needed to review the proposed action under the National Environmental Policy Act. In this case, the federal action was the potential funding of the project by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The EA focused on likely impacts at each site and considered several elements, such as environmental elements that had been identified by the FTA guidelines. The impacts that would need to be mitigated included land acquisitions and displacements, noise, water quality, endangered species, traffic, parking, pedestrians, bicycles, and the disruptive impacts during construction of the facility. At this time, there were no apparent impacts that could not be mitigated.

The next steps in the process were a 30-day public comment period, a review of the public comment, submittal of the EA to the FTA and, finally, the FTA finding of no significant impacts. Once the FTA issued that, the EA process would be complete.

Ms. Hocken asked about the matrix on page 26 of the agenda packet, in particular, the section on land use and zoning. For both sites, the Park & Ride category stated, "Special Use; Generally Inappropriate in Downtown Core." She asked Mr. Heilman to explain that statement. Mr. Heilman said that generally, one would not see a Park & Ride facility in a downtown core area, because of the nature of the site and because it was a fairly extensive use of land. Typically, in a downtown area, that property would be preserved for more intense uses. Also, it depended on the land use preferences of the city.

Ms. Wylie said that a Park & Ride at the Springfield Station would facilitate the partnership between cars and buses. The FTA did not want the parking lot to be used by downtown employees and shoppers. LTD must prove the transit orientation of the Park & Ride. Another consideration for a joint development might be to have a shared parking facility both for commuters and for downtown employees and shoppers. Ms. Hocken noted that other Park & Ride facilities did not function that way.

Public Hearing: There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie opened the public hearing for comment.

Mr. Fred Simmons of Springfield stated that he had submitted to the staff of both the City of Springfield and LTD six pages of comments, which were part of the record. One of the comments was directed to Mr. Bennett's observation that the Greyhound issue was new. Mr. Simmons' comment was that there was no inter-modal capacity established in the station, and he thought that was something that should be reviewed very effectively.

Mr. Simmons said that he had some technical problems with the EA, and he did not want to imply that he did not support the concept of the Springfield Station at either appropriate

site; however, he did find fault with some of the science that was involved, particularly the noise study, of which he had not yet received the raw data that he had requested. He said that the consultant had used an incorrect noise decibel table that had been published by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for buses that were manufactured in 1975 and not the post-1978 buses that LTD currently utilized.

Mr. Simmons stated that there were some technical problems in the EA, which he had pointed out in his written comments. In addition, there was some difference of opinion even between LTD staff and him. Upon further review of those issues, Mr. Simmons said that he still would hold to his opinions.

He asked that LTD perform a proper response and a proper evaluation of the technical data that currently was deficient. He thought that both sites G and I had wonderful potentials for both LTD and the community. He thought there was support for either of the sites. His objection now was for a thorough review for accuracy of the data contained in the EA. He said that he would continue to work with staff.

Mr. Simmons further stated that failing the staff providing the proper information, he felt that it was incumbent upon him to report directly to the FTA that those were the deficiencies outlined and to show why they were deficiencies. He stated that he preferred not to do that, but to have those answers resolved before then. If he did not get the answers; however, he was obliged to follow through in a formal way.

Ms. Wylie asked Mr. Simmons about the noise data on the aging buses and if the newer buses were quieter. Mr. Simmons said that the standards had been tightened as time had gone on. Unfortunately, LTD was in a unique position in that the DEQ had no enforcement people. He said that the inaccurate tables that were provided indicated that a bus produced 86 decibels (db) in 1975, and had dropped to 80 db in the process. All the buses currently in operation at LTD, including those that had been put through the Altuna test, met those standards. LTD was making progress, but there was some misuse of the technical data being used, and Mr. Simmons believed it was a clerical, innocent mistake. He did not believe that the consultant did that purposefully, but he believed it was a clerical mistake when the numbers were extracted out of the data from the DEQ. Based on prior experience with the consulting firm, Mr. Simmons did not believe that the error was made in a malicious manner.

Closure Of Public Hearing: There being no further public testimony, Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberations: There was no further discussion from members of the Board.

BUS SERVICE RECOMMENDATION FOR COTTAGE GROVE: Mr. Vobora said that staff were requesting that the Board modify the service area boundaries to include the Cottage Grove area. Information about how the service would be implemented was included in the agenda packet on page 30, and Mr. Vobora asked if there were any questions from the Board.

MOTION

Mr. Bennett moved 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." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion.

Mr. Kortge said that the issue was contentious, but that he supported the motion because he had no choice. LTD needed to be sensitive about how service was implemented in Cottage Grove. A meeting had been set in Cottage Grove for November 10. There was conflicting information about the payroll tax receipts versus the cost of the service. Mr. Kortge thought it would be prudent for LTD to get the correct information out as soon as possible.

Mr. Bennett asked if the tax revenues had been projected. Mr. Vobora replied that projections had been made, but the exact amount would not be known until a full taxing cycle had been completed. The latest figures from the Department of Employment showed that the Cottage Grove area would generate about \$233,000 in payroll tax revenue.

Mr. Kortge said that the other issue was the kind of services LTD would provide to the Cottage Grove area. Staff had a lot of work to do to design the service, and Mr. Kortge wanted the other Board members to realize the sensitive nature of the issue as the division in Cottage Grove was quite deep.

Ms. Wylie thought it would be very important to get good information out as soon as possible about the actual cost of the service and an evaluation about the ridership statistics. Mr. Vobora thought LTD had been very proactive in getting information out to the public, particularly during the pilot project that had operated during the previous year.

Mr. Vobora said that the meeting on November 10 was to solicit additional input about the initial service package. Also, it would be an opportunity for people to learn more about the partnership that LTD was forming with South Lane Wheels, the paratransit provider that would begin operating general public dial-a-ride service on November 1, 1999. That partnership could be enhanced to address some of the issues of intra-city movement by the general public. Mr. Vobora thought there were some good partnership opportunities as service was reintroduced, but it would take time, and he thought that as people began paying the payroll tax, they might realize that it was not as onerous as they originally thought. In addition, people would realize that LTD would be a good partner and needs would be addressed.

Mr. Bennett reiterated that it was important for the Board to have the best possible information as it began deliberating and discussing the issue. It occurred to him that each community had to decide, during its evolution, when it would have some kind of alternative transportation system. He said that while \$233,000 seemed like a lot of money, if Cottage Grove had chosen to provide a transit system of its own, that annual amount most likely would not go very far. Maybe some analysis had been done, but he hoped that LTD would provide a good value to the community.

Mr. Kortge added that it made sense to provide service within Cottage Grove, and not just a bus up and down the freeway.

Mr. Bennett said that once Cottage Grove decided that the value was there, then a comparison could be made between the cost for LTD service and the cost of operating its own service.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if there was data that showed how LTD was benefiting the businesses that paid the payroll tax. She thought LTD should address that issue.

Mr. Kleger said that if the Board did not act on the motion at this meeting, LTD would be in a position of discontinuity between the taxing schedule and the boundary adjustment. If at any point during the process that the Board decided there was a fatal flaw, the process could be stopped, but moving forward now moved LTD into the most cost-effective way of establishing the adjusted boundaries.

Ms. Wylie summarized the conversation by saying that it sounded like the Board was concerned that it be provided some data and that the process be facilitated in the best manner. At this point, however, due to the vote, the Board needed to work with the community to begin providing service. She thought Mr. Vobora had presented the Board with a good beginning, and she thought the Board's role needed to be to mediate the process and to be good ambassadors as well as to be sensitive to the needs in Cottage Grove.

Ms. Hocken said that she hoped the Board's discussion did not sound like a reluctance existed to providing service to Cottage Grove, because she viewed it as an opportunity, not a burden to LTD. She thought the Board needed to be sensitive to the disparate opinions and needs of the Cottage Grove community. She thought it was important to work out the best interests of both LTD and Cottage Grove.

Ms. Loobey said that she had been involved with the Cottage Grove service issue for more than 10 years, and she agreed that while it was important to be sensitive to the needs, she did not believe LTD needed to be apologetic about anything. LTD had performed numerous studies that showed that people who made their salaries in Eugene typically took their earnings back to Cottage Grove. The studies showed that nearly 60 percent of the households in Cottage Grove had at least one person who worked or attended school in the Eugene area. No matter what the data revealed, the critics would never like what they heard, and no matter how the service was funded, Cottage Grove would be required to contribute. She assured the Board that staff would be as professional, diplomatic, straightforward, and honest as they could be in their dealings with Cottage Grove. She thought that going to Cottage Grove was a great thing that should have happened a long time ago. LTD's job was to provide transportation, and it did that effectively and efficiently and in accordance with the needs of the people it served to the best of its ability.

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the earlier motion to annex Cottage Grove to the LTD service area and establish a new service area boundary, which passed unanimously, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none against.

VOTE

FIRST READING, LTD ORDINANCE NO. 24 (1999 REVISION), DESCRIBING THE TERRITORIAL BOUNDARIES OF LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT: Mr. Vobora explained that two changes to the boundary previously had been discussed by the Board and were included in the revised ordinance. The first involved changes to specific sections of the existing boundary that included reducing the boundary along areas north of Coburg, in southwest Eugene, and along the Highway 126 and Highway 58 corridors. The second change involved a boundary expansion to incorporate the Cottage Grove service area, at Cottage Grove's request.

Ms. Hocken commented on the Cottage Grove boundary and noted that the reason the Board had decided to follow the I-5 corridor and not take in the 2.5-mile limit along the freeway was because there was no way to serve the area or people along the freeway. The buses could not stop on the freeway and there was no easy access on or off the freeway.

Public Hearing: There were no members of the audience who wished to address the Board in this matter, and Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing.

Board Deliberation: There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved that Lane Transit District Ordinance 24, an ordinance describing the territorial boundaries of the District, be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none against.

**MOTION
VOTE**

Ms. Wylie then read the Ordinance by title only: "Lane Transit District Ordinance 24 (1999 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District."

Mr. Vobora added that staff were working on policy guidelines for future use in adjusting boundaries for Board discussion at a future meeting. Ms. Hocken asked if staff and the Board had enough information to take to the Cottage Grove meeting on November 10. Mr. Vobora said that a specific map would be available.

GLENWOOD SEGMENT ALIGNMENT FOR BRT PILOT CORRIDOR: Mr. Bennett stated that the written material reflected the meeting of the BRT Steering Committee, which he chaired. Originally, Franklin Boulevard had been rejected because the right-of-way was too narrow and due to the concerns of area businesses regarding loss of access. The Springfield City Council then asked LTD to again review the Franklin option, but in another way, which was to develop the bus lanes incrementally as redevelopment occurred. The idea would be that as Glenwood became more developed and infrastructure and zoning issues were decided, area businesses would change over time. As a part of that transition, LTD could then make a case for exclusive right-of-way, but in the median. In the meantime, BRT would operate in mixed traffic and pull into a median station.

The Council made the point that if BRT became a reality, the area between Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River should not be ignored. That area needed access to the BRT system. While it was not a very wide area, it sounded as though there were plans to redevelop it. In light of those factors, the BRT Steering Committee chose the 14th Avenue alignment as the preferred alignment, which was just south of Franklin, but also

recommended that staff consider the Franklin Boulevard alignment in the Environmental Assessment (EA). Because of development planning, the Steering Committee thought it would be important to consider all options.

The decision to consider the Franklin option was recognized as potentially having a long-term advantage, but several Steering Committee members had expressed concern regarding the possible delay in implementation of the Franklin option if it were solely dependant upon the redevelopment of Glenwood. As a committee member, Mr. Bennett believed that if LTD did not achieve the right-of-way provision, it would not be accountable for the success of the pilot corridor. While it was true that LTD agreed on something less than exclusive right-of-way on the downtown Springfield segment, it was possible that parking could be mitigated in order to gain that exclusive right-of-way. Without the exclusive right-of-way, LTD would not meet the criteria to justify the capital cost.

LTD had made a promise to the Glenwood business community to not consider a Franklin Boulevard option, but in light of the Springfield City Council request, the Steering Committee recommended including the Franklin option in the EA. A meeting would be held with the Glenwood Business Association to explain the reasoning behind the addition of the Franklin option.

Ms. Hocken added that the reason that the 15th Avenue alternative had not been carried forward was that Springfield City Council did not think it was supportive of the current Glenwood refinement plan. The City of Springfield had committed to not changing the refinement plan as it was adopted by the City of Eugene for at least five years. In the refinement plan, the area south of 14th Avenue was to be residential, while the area north of 14th Avenue was to be zoned for commercial use. Operating BRT along 14th Avenue provided a division between the commercial and residential properties, which was in accordance with the land use decisions that had been made to date. If BRT operated along 15th Avenue, it would divide the residential area, and there was strong opposition to doing that.

Ms. Hocken further explained that at the last Steering Committee meeting, the Committee discussed the Springfield City Council proposal to reconsider a phased-in Franklin option. There was concern by the representatives of the Eugene City Council and Lane County that LTD would not provide rapid transit as promised. While the Committee was not prepared to endorse the Springfield proposal at this time, there was enough merit in the proposal to carry it forward into the EA.

The proposal was to have the EA review three options, the 14th Avenue alignment and two Franklin alternatives. The EA would provide some very good information, and if LTD were ever to consider Franklin, it needed to be reviewed now.

Mr. Kleger stated that the walking distance from 14th Avenue and Henderson to the Willamette River was three blocks, which really was not a long distance. He did not think the area north of Franklin should be considered a remote area. Ms. Hocken said that there also were opportunities with the 14th Avenue alignment that would not be available with the Franklin option.

Ms. Lauritsen clarified that what was being proposed was similar to the Springfield Station in that the EA would consider various possibilities while the Board pressed on with the decision-making process. She thought it made good sense to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation of the options.

MOTION**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that LTD staff are directed to consider the 14th Avenue alignment, the phased Franklin Boulevard alignment, and a second Franklin Boulevard alignment (yet to be determined) for the Glenwood segment in the Environmental Assessment for Phase 1 of the BRT pilot corridor." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none against.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: a) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken reported that the MPC had discussed the process for approving TransPlan. A general consensus was reached that after the public comment period closed, each jurisdiction should have several opportunities to discuss the process for approval of TransPlan and to establish positions, then MPC would bring the jurisdictions together to discuss and act as a conflict resolution group for any difficult issues where a difference of opinion occurred. In addition, MPC had discussed the proposal that had been presented by the Friends of Eugene to change the process, and it was hoped that a decision would be made at the December MPC meeting. The November MPC meeting had been canceled.

- b) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken stated that she could not attend the November 4, 1999, meeting that was scheduled in Salem from 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Ms. Lauritsen volunteered to go if her schedule allowed. Ms. Hocken said that the Forum provided an opportunity to network with others from around the state as well as with local representatives.
- c) BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input. Mr. Viggiano described the slight change in the process for Phase 2 public process. Phase 2 was the pilot corridor that would extend west from the Eugene Station. Phase 1 was divided into segments, and a public process was conducted for each segment, but the main corridor was clearly identifiable. It was different for Phase 2, in that it was not clear which main corridor would be used. A process was needed to determine which general east-west corridor made the most sense, and the segment approach would not work until that decision had been made. The process to determine the general corridor would begin in November with focus groups that would identify key issues. Ms. Hocken asked at what point the Board would be discussing the general corridor alternatives. Mr. Viggiano said that the focus groups would occur in mid-November, so the Board might want to spend some time discussing some of the findings at its December meeting.
- d) Springfield Station Steering Committee. Mr. Kleger had nothing further to report than what was discussed earlier in the meeting.
- e) Executive Search Committee. The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, November 15, with the entire Board at 5:00 p.m. At that meeting, the executive search consultant, Jerry Oldani, would be present. The Board would have its first opportunity to review some of the applicants for the general manager position and to discuss the process for selection. Mr. Kleger asked if there was a sense of how many applications had been received. Ms. Loobey responded that more than 30 people currently were in the application pool. Ms. Wylie said it was important for all Board members to attend the

- November 15 meeting, if at all possible, as choosing a new general manager most likely was the most important decision the Board members would make during their tenure.
- f) American Public Transit Association Annual Meeting. Ms. Wylie said that she had nothing to add to her earlier report.
 - g) Announcements and Additions to Agenda. Ms. Wylie said that this new, recurring agenda item would be moved to the top of the agenda for future meetings. She had one addition to the agenda. She said that Government Affairs Manager Linda Lynch had recommended that the LTD Board invite the Springfield City Council and their family members to a special dinner followed by a holiday lights joy ride tour of holiday light displays. The Board would have to agree to be present, and it was a nice way to have a political/social time together with the Council. There were very few possible dates available, but the 16th of December appeared to work best for most Board members. The event would occur between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. Ms. Loobey added that there were some wonderfully decorated neighborhoods in Springfield, and she thought the tour should be conducted in Springfield. Staff would contact the Board members for confirmation by the end of the week.

Mr. Kleger added that he had made a presentation to a senior group, and it was gratifying to speak to a group of enthusiastic bus riders, who appreciated LTD services.

Ms. Wylie also announced that the Springfield Chamber / UO Alumni Auction would be held on November 19. LTD had reserved a table, and the Board members and a guest were invited. Staff would contact the Board about their availability for this event.

SEPTEMBER AND AUGUST FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that the report was fairly comprehensive in terms of getting the first quarter of the year underway. This was an important time in the fiscal year, in which the strategic plan and long-range financial plan were reviewed. Budget assumptions were developed and parameters were set for the next year's budget process and the years that followed.

The Board Finance Committee would be reconvened in November. There quite possibly would be a large agenda for that meeting, depending on what direction the Board took at its October 29 and 30 work session. The Finance Committee meeting would be the preparation for a December work session on the results of fare and ridership modeling and the projections. Also, there was a real possibility of a reduction in federal funding that the Board also needed to consider.

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) would be available in November. Once again, LTD had received an unqualified audit. The independent auditors would be available at the November Board meeting to present the CAFR.

Mr. Bennett asked about the budget variance that was mentioned in the agenda item summary on page 51. Ms. Hellekson stated that staff had a difficult time of predicting how tax revenues would come in. She did believe that LTD would realize a payroll tax revenue increase of about 3 percent for the fiscal year, as had been projected. Since staff could not accurately project when those revenues would be received, those amounts were not accrued.

Mr. Bennett asked if expenses were less for the same reason. Ms. Hellekson replied that expenses also were encumbered throughout the year. The budget was set in April of each year, and expenses were predicted in the budget. As those expenses were incurred, they were encumbered, but not necessarily expensed at that time. LTD could not expense goods or services that had not yet been received.

Mr. Bennett asked if expenses were projected to increase. Ms. Hellekson said that personnel expenses might increase slightly. There was more overtime and temporary system supervisor time this year, and, while it may not result in annual budget overages, staff were working on correcting the situation.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE: Mr. Bennett reported that he had attended the County Commissioners meetings to talk about the BRT project with the Commissioners. He felt that the meeting had been quite successful. In addition, he met and visited with several individual Commissioners and felt those were successful meetings. There was strong support for BRT from several of the County Commissioners. Mr. Viggiano added that it had been very positive.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion regarding any other informational items in the Board packet, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** November 17, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** AIRPORT SERVICE STUDY
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** None.
- BACKGROUND:** During the spring of 1999, LTD planning intern Ben Williams updated LTD's information on transit service to airports in cities throughout the United States. These cities represented communities with characteristics similar to Eugene-Springfield. Additionally, Portland, Oregon, was reviewed due to its proximity to Eugene-Springfield.
- In July 1999, surveys of airport users and airport area employees were funded jointly by the City of Eugene and LTD. These studies were conducted by Advanced Marketing Research of Eugene.
- Summary information gathered through these efforts was mailed to the Board in October 1999. The data collected suggests that airport service would be costly and would not meet productivity standards. The following points support this conclusion:
1. There are few disincentives to driving. Airline travelers do not experience high costs for leaving their vehicles while traveling. Airport-area employees receive free parking, and availability of parking is not an issue.
 2. Transit vehicles are not equipped to accommodate airline travelers. The survey illustrates that more than one-half of travelers bring three or more pieces of luggage. Loading, unloading, and carrying luggage would be difficult when customers are required to transfer between one or more transit buses.
 3. Scheduling trip times and ensuring transfers is difficult. Airline travelers may arrive to find that the bus has left to meet transfer connections at the Eugene Station. If the airport bus were held to pick up late-arriving travelers, the connections to other buses at the Eugene Station clearly would be affected. If the last bus of the night were missed, these customers would require a private vehicle or taxi to meet them at the Eugene Station.
 4. LTD's span of service would need to be expanded at the beginning and end of the current service day to meet the early start times and the late end times of the businesses. This expansion would allow the transit system to meet the most heavily-used departures and arrivals of airline travelers. An estimate of these costs ranges from 3 percent

to 5 percent of service hours or \$665,000 to \$1,109,000 in fully-allocated costs annually. Additional costs for new service would be incurred. These costs depend on the level of service designed.

Staff will be available to answer questions about the research at the November Board meeting.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: 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 routine addition to the monthly Board agenda.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: ACCEPTANCE OF AUDIT REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1999

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Board accept the independent audit report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1999.

BACKGROUND: At the conclusion of each fiscal year, an independent audit of Lane Transit District's financial statements and internal controls is performed. The results of the independent audit are incorporated into the District's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The completed FY 1998-99 CAFR will be distributed to Board members separately on November 15, and will be discussed during the information section of the November 17 Board meeting agenda.

Staff submitted FY 1995-96, FY 1996-97, and FY 1997-98 CAFRs to the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) for consideration of the award for excellence in financial reporting. The award was granted to LTD for all three reports. After Board acceptance, staff will submit the FY 1998-99 CAFR to GFOA in an attempt to continue a tradition of reporting excellence as evidenced by the financial reporting award. Special recognition should be given to Roy Burling, Assistant Finance Manager, for his work on the previous and current CAFRs.

Charles Swank of Grove Mueller Hall and Swank, P. C., will attend the November Board meeting to make a presentation and answer any questions Board members may have about the audit process or results.

ATTACHMENT: Independent Auditor's Opinion and Reports

PROPOSED MOTION: I move the following resolution: Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors accepts the Independent Audit Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1999.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** November 17, 1999
- ITEM TITLE:** REVISION OF ORDINANCE 24 GOVERNING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Board complete second reading of revised Ordinance 24 by title only and then adopt the ordinance
- 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 have 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.
- Before adoption, ordinances must be read at two separate meetings at least six days apart. The first reading of LTD Ordinance 24, 1999 Revision was held at the October 27, 1999, Board meeting. The Board can vote to

read the ordinance by title only. Staff will have additional copies of the ordinance available for anyone in the audience who desires a copy.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Following the second reading and adoption, the ordinance will take effect on January 1, 2000. A copy of the ordinance will be filed with the County Clerk and made available for public inspection, and notice of adoption will be placed in a local newspaper of general circulation.

ATTACHMENT:

LTD Ordinance 24, 1999 Revision

PROPOSED MOTION:

- (1) 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.”

- (2) I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adopts Lane Transit District Ordinance 24 (1999 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: CORRESPONDENCE

PREPARED BY: Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

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

- November 11, 1999, letter from Dan Egan, President of the Springfield Renaissance group (this letter will be included as part of the public testimony on the Springfield Station Environmental Assessment)

At the November 17 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

November 17, 1999

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager

FEDERAL

The District's federal lobbyists were in Eugene-Springfield Monday and Tuesday, November 8 and 9, to meet with client staff; to review progress from 1999, despite the fact that four appropriations bills were not yet enacted; and to advise on feasibility for new year's agenda. LTD's expected federal agenda for next year includes:

BRT - Planning, Phase 2	\$1.4 million
- Vehicles, AVL	\$3.1 million
Springfield Station	\$5.0 million
Fleet replacement	\$2.5 million
Total	\$12.0 million

Each of these items would need to be earmarked from a single source in the Transportation Appropriations measure, meaning that they compete with each other for funding. The likelihood of 100 percent success is small, but the path to any success begins with fully informing the District's D.C. representatives.

It is expected that Congress will adjourn by the time the Board receives this report, and if appropriations matters have not been resolved, Congress will need to reconvene sometime closer to Thanksgiving. The local "united front" expects to travel to Washington February 7-10, 2000, but those dates are conditional on Congress being in session at that time.

STATE

Governor Kitzhaber has nominated Gerry Gaydos to the LTD Board of Directors. The Senate confirmation hearing for Mr. Gaydos is tentatively scheduled for November 29, with full Senate consideration in early December.

SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING

Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

MEDIA CAMPAIGN

Three new television spots are under production and will air after the first of the year. The spots focus on showing how LTD meets the riding needs of residents through the types of service the District provides and through the design of service, and how LTD continually strives to be the best transit system possible.

SCHEDULING SYSTEM

The second series of staff training on the new route scheduling system will take place at the end of November. Staff continue to work on data conversion. System testing is scheduled for summer bid 2000.

JOYRIDE

December 18–21 will mark the eleventh year of the Joyride Holiday Lights Tour. This year's event will include new hosts (Springfield Chamber Greeters) and a new departure location (Lane County Fairgrounds). LTD is looking forward to these new partnerships as we continue to provide a service that has become a traditional holiday activity for many families.

LCC TERM PASS

Staff were very pleased that all fall term passes sold out at Lane Community College. Before the end of October, all 2,000 passes were purchased by students, faculty, and staff. Discussions about the next step in the pass program will begin the first of December when the LCC/LTD task team will begin formulating options for future programs.

TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

FIELD SUPERVISORS BEGIN NEW SCHEDULE

The field supervisors recently began a revised work schedule. The purpose of the revision was to provide better support to the operators. The new schedule allows more time to respond to operator issues and also more coverage to offer timely responses to incidents.

FOOTBALL WINDING DOWN, BASKETBALL GEARING UP

LTD is preparing to provide service to the final University of Oregon home football game, and the operators have again stepped up and sacrificed their days off to ensure that we can provide the level of service that the Duck fans expect. Overall, they have done a great job. After several years of coordinating football game service, Field Supervisor Marylee Bohrer is going to turn over the responsibility to someone else next year. She has done an outstanding job and will be hard to replace. LTD already has begun providing service to basketball games and, again, the Operations staff is performing admirably.

POLICE TRAINING

Transit Projects Administrator Rick Bailor has been included as a presenter at the new police officer training program for the Eugene Police Department. Rick introduces the new officers to LTD and spends time telling them about the system, LTD's security needs, and the yield law. He has been well received, and this program helps LTD maintain a strong partnership with EPD.

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 December Monthly Staff Report.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 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. However, the November MPC meeting has been canceled. At the Board meeting, LTD's MPC representatives Pat Hocken and Rob Bennett can report on the October 14, 1999, MPC meeting and answer any questions the Board may have about MPC meetings in general.
- 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 November 4, 1999; however, Ms. Hocken was unable to attend. She will report to the Board on future Forum 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. The November 2 meeting was canceled, making Tuesday, December 7 the next meeting. At the November 17 Board meeting, Committee Chair Rob Bennett and the other LTD Board representatives can respond to any questions the Board may have about this committee's activities.
- d **Springfield Station Steering Committee:** The Springfield Station Steering Committee last met on September 16, 1999. 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 November 17 Board meeting, Mr. Kleger and Ms. Wylie can respond to any questions about this committee’s activities to date.

- e **Meeting in Cottage Grove:** Board members Dean Kortge and Pat Hocken attended a meeting with interested citizens in Cottage Grove on November 10, 1999, to respond to questions about service and the payroll tax and self-employment tax. They will provide a report for the Board at the November Board meeting.
- f **Finance Committee Meeting:** The Board Finance Committee (Pat Hocken, Dave Kleger, and Ginny Lauritsen) are scheduled to meet just prior to the November 17 Board meeting. At the Board meeting, they can report on the discussion from that committee meeting.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: October 27, 1999

ITEM TITLE: Modifying District Service Boundary Policy

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve Modifying District Service Boundary Policy

BACKGROUND: Over the past two years the District has made a number of changes to the service area boundaries. These changes were a result of including new areas of incorporation, correcting alignment errors, and contractions based upon service levels in rural areas. The attached policy provides the Board a framework to make future decisions surrounding boundary changes.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION: The Board, staff, and the community will have a consistent understanding of how District boundaries are modified.

ATTACHMENT: Modifying District Service Boundary Policy.

PROPOSED MOTION: I move the following, "the LTD Board of Directors hereby adopts the Modifying District Service Boundary Policy as presented."

MODIFYING DISTRICT SERVICE BOUNDARIES POLICY

OBJECTIVE

To define District policy regarding the modification of the LTD's service area boundary. The service area boundary establishes the area within which businesses and self-employed taxpayers are required to pay the LTD payroll tax.

APPLICATION

The LTD service area boundary is applied to an area with Lane County Oregon and is established based upon Oregon Revised Statutes 267.207.

POLICY

In accordance with ORS 267.207, the existing LTD service area boundary is affirmed on an annual basis each June. Modifications, expansions to incorporate new areas and/or contractions to eliminate existing areas, will be reviewed annually each September. Modifications adopted by the Board in September will follow the ordinance revision process. The first reading of the revised ordinance 24 will occur in October, followed by the second reading and adoption in November. The effective date of the revised ordinance 24 will be January 1st of the coming year. This date allows adequate time for notification of affected taxpayers and the Department of Revenue.

The LTD Board reviews requests for service area boundary modifications in accordance with the following guidelines:

1. Boundaries will be based upon an area extending out from each side of a bus route at a distance of 2.5 miles or less, except in cases where a non-contiguous area would be created; or
2. Along natural or man-made barriers that prohibit direct access to the bus route; or
3. Along urban growth boundaries in rural areas served by rural levels of bus service; or
4. Along County lines; or
5. Along existing LTD service area boundaries in areas served by rural levels of bus service.

Requests for extensions or contractions of the service area boundary may be brought before the LTD Board of Directors in two ways. First, the citizens who reside in the affected area may vote to request annexation into or removal from the LTD service area. Second, the elected officials representing the affected area may vote to request annexation into or removal from the LTD service area. In cases involving the contraction of the service area boundary, the LTD Board may choose to follow the "withdrawal of territory from district" section of ORS 267 described in sub-sections 250 to 263.

MAINTENANCE

The Service Planning and Marketing Manager is responsible for monitoring compliance with this policy and for proposing revisions when appropriate.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 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 November 17, 1999:

1. Approval of minutes: October 27, 1999, special Board meeting
2. Revised FY 1999-2000 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Minutes of the October 27, 1999, special Board meeting
2. Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program, Revised November 2, 1999

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for November 17, 1999, is approved as presented.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors has approved the annexation of Cottage Grove to the Lane Transit District service district effective January 1, 2000, an event not anticipated by the current 1999-2000 fiscal year adopted budget; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to transfer funds from Contingency to cover the additional expenses that will result when transit service is provided; and

WHEREAS, funds are available in Contingency to be transferred for this purpose;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that General Fund budget appropriations for the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 hereby are revised as follows:

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Contingency	\$86,000
Total Reduction	<u>\$86,000</u>

INCREASE IN APPROPRIATIONS

Personnel-Transit Operations	\$86,000
Total Increase	<u>\$86,000</u>

November 17, 1999
Date Adopted

Board President

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: BUDGET TRANSFER – COTTAGE GROVE SERVICE EXPENSE

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of a resolution authorizing the transfer of General Fund Contingency appropriations to fund the first six months of transit service to Cottage Grove.

BACKGROUND: At the request of the Cottage Grove City Council, following a successful ballot measure requesting annexation of Cottage Grove to Lane Transit District's service district, the Board approved the addition. The amendment of the service boundary by ordinance is discussed in a separate agenda item.

Staff propose to begin limited shuttle service between Cottage Grove and Creswell on January 3, 2000. Regular service between Cottage Grove and Eugene is proposed to begin on February 6, 2000, with the implementation of winter bid service. Cottage Grove businesses and self-employed persons earning income within the Urban Growth Boundary will become subject to LTD's tax on January 1, 2000.

Although LTD will begin receiving tax receipts from Cottage Grove taxpayers (by way of the Oregon Department of Revenue) during the six-month startup period, it is not proposed at this time to adjust the General Fund budget for additional revenue. Instead, a transfer from Contingency to Transit Operations is proposed while staff work to incorporate the addition of Cottage Grove into the FY 2000-2001 budget and the Long-range Financial Plan. The estimated cost of the first six months of Cottage Grove service is as follows:

Shuttle Service to Creswell until 2/6/00:	\$ 15,800
Regular Service from 2/6 through 6/30/00:	\$121,500
(Less Creswell expenses already budgeted):	<u>(\$ 51,300)</u>
Net Additional FY 1999-2000 Expense:	\$ 86,000

Therefore, a transfer in the amount of \$86,000 is requested. Service Planning & Marketing staff will be present at the November 17th meeting to answer any questions that Board members may have about proposed Cottage Grove service.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

\$86,000 will be transferred from General Fund Contingency to Transit Operations expense in order to fund six months of bus service to Cottage Grove.

ATTACHMENT:

Budget Transfer Resolution

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move approval of the Resolution authorizing transfer of \$86,000 from General Fund Contingency to Transit Operations in order to begin service to Cottage Grove.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: The Board of Directors planning session on October 26, 1999, provided staff greater direction for the comprehensive service redesign project. Staff will continue their analysis of the current system and work toward implementation of a system that meets the Board's goal of allocating service hours to achieve a 75 percent productivity, 20 percent coverage, and 5 percent discretionary split.

A management team workgroup has been formed to develop a revised implementation plan. This plan will be brought before the Board at the December 15, 1999, meeting. This plan will include a discussion of CSR goals, implementation timing, public input processes, effect on current projects, and potential impacts on TransPlan.

Staff would be very interested in additional information the Board would like to see in the implementation plan and will be present to discuss this at the meeting.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: DECEMBER 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: **DECEMBER 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Bus Operator Ronda Murray has been selected as the December 1999 Employee of the Month. Ronda was hired on August 19, 1996, and already has ten Employee of the Month nominations in her file. She also has earned awards for three years of Correct Schedule Operation and two years of Safe Driving.

One of Ronda's most recent nominators praised her in glowing terms, saying that she has "personality plus," and that the ride was absolutely fun because of Ronda and her interactions with the other riders. Another customer said that Ronda is always pleasant, no matter what, and treats all passengers fairly. She added that Ronda is very helpful toward passengers with disabilities, and that the days Ronda works are a little more bearable because she makes each ride fun. A co-worker stated that Ronda is an extremely loyal and dedicated employee who knows what customer service means. Most customers know Ronda by name and know that they can count on her for help, and Ronda's positive attitude toward LTD, her co-workers, and her customers never falters--whether at work or at home, she consistently believes in LTD and giving 110 percent at all times.

When asked what makes Ronda a good employee, Transit Services Administrator Rob Montgomery said: "Ronda is an extremely loyal and dedicated employee. Her relations with her customers, fellow operators, supervisory staff, and LTD employees in general are exemplary. Her work ethic cannot go without mention, and she demonstrates pride in LTD each and every day. It is evident that she loves her job! Her customers have been recognizing her with employee of the month nominations since she began working at LTD, and I am proud to be able to recognize her as the December Employee of the Month. Thank you, Ronda!"

AWARD: Ronda will attend the November 17 meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive her award.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 40.225

PREPARED BY: Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege, to hear an opinion of counsel

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

November 17, 1999

Revenue:

- **Special service revenue** is lower than for the first four months 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. In late October, the District received \$51,546, which is substantially below what was anticipated. Average quarterly payment from this source for the previous eight quarters was \$231,771.
-
- **Payroll tax receipts** were incorrectly anticipated by the monthly budget, but are expected to meet or slightly exceed plan for the fiscal year.

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. BRT project expenses are also overstated in the current year budget, which will contribute to a yearlong positive variance.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 17, 1999

ITEM TITLE: ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None at this time

BACKGROUND: The action or information items listed below will be included on the agenda for future Board meetings:

- A. **LTD Ordinance 36:** LTD Ordinance 36, 1999 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property, will be brought to the Board for the second reading and adoption at the December 15, 1999, Board meeting.
- B. **Long-Range Financial Plan:** The Long-Range Financial Plan will be discussed with the Board at the December 15, 1999, meeting.
- C. **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, possibly at the December 15, 1999, Board meeting.
- D. **Service Boundary Policy:** A new service boundary policy will be brought to the Board for discussion at the December 15, 1999, meeting.
- E. **Special Service Policy Revision:** A revised Special Service Policy will be placed on the agenda for discussion at the December 15, 1999, Board meeting.
- F. **LTD Drug and Alcohol Policy Revisions:** At the December 15, 1999, staff will ask the Board to approve revisions to LTD's Drug and Alcohol Policy to conform with new federal regulations.
- G. **LTD Fingerprinting Policy:** A new fingerprinting policy, required by federal regulations, will be on the agenda for the December 15, 1999, Board meeting.

- H. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval:** It is anticipated that approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur during late winter or the spring of 2000.
- I. **Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Service Recommendations:** A presentation on preliminary annual route review findings will be scheduled for a work session in January 2000. A public hearing on proposed service changes for FY 2000-2001 will be scheduled for the February 16, 2000, regular Board meeting. Board approval of the final service change proposal will be scheduled for the March 15 regular Board meeting.
- J. **Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Pricing Plan and Fare Ordinance:** A public hearing and approval of the pricing structure for FY 2000-2001 will be scheduled for the February 16, 2000, regular Board meeting. The first reading of an ordinance setting the fares for FY 2000-2001 will be scheduled for March 15, and the second reading and adoption will be held on April 19, 2000.
- K. **Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Capital Improvements Program:** Discussion and approval of the District's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for FY 2000-2001 will be scheduled for the February 16, 2000, regular Board meeting.
- 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.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: November 11, 1999

ITEM TITLE: Amendment of Ordinance 36

PREPARED BY: Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Direction to review Ordinance 36

BACKGROUND: In order to insure the safety, convenience, and comfort of passengers and the protection and preservation of LTD employees and property, the LTD Board of Directors approved Ordinance 36. This ordinance regulates the use of transit property and the behavior of persons using LTD property and/or services. This ordinance does limit the use of District facilities and vehicles to passengers.

Since the Eugene Downtown station was opened, LTD has been approached by persons wishing to collect initiative or petition signatures on the boarding platform. LTD has excluded these persons from the platform under the provisions of Ordinance 36. One of those excluded persons has approached the American Civil Liberties Union requesting the ACLU's assistance in presenting their case to LTD. A representative from the ACLU has asked to address the Board at the November 17th meeting on this issue. LTD staff will discuss the history of this ordinance at the meeting on the 17th and the Board will hold an executive session to meet with legal counsel to discuss Ordinance 36.

A copy of Ordinance 36 is attached for your review.

ATTACHMENT: Ordinance 36

PROPOSED MOTION: None