

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 13, 2000

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

April 19, 2000
5:30 p.m.

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

A G E N D A

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Kleger _____ Kortge _____ Lauritsen _____ Wylie _____
Bennett _____ Gaydos _____ Hocken _____

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--

A. Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations; pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed; and pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege, to hear an opinion of counsel 05

B. Development of New RideSource Operations/Maintenance Facility 06

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

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH—May 2000 08

VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A.	Consent Calendar	10
	1. Minutes of the March 13, 2000, Board Work Session	
	2. Minutes of the March 15, 2000, Regular Board Meeting	
	3. Approval of Project Ranking for CT/OTN Funds	
B.	Amended Ordinance No. 36, Governing Conduct on District Property	41
	1. Staff Presentation	
	2. Public Hearing	
	3. Board Direction to Staff	
C.	Second Reading and Adoption of Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35, Setting Fares for Use of District Services	46
D.	Amended General Fund Reserve Policy	51
E.	Comprehensive Service Redesign Follow-up Discussion	55
F.	Budget Committee Nomination	57

IX. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

A.	Current Activities	
	1. Board Member Reports	59
	a. Metropolitan Policy Committee	
	b. Statewide Livability Forum	
	c. BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input	
	d. Springfield Station Steering Committee	
	e. Board Finance Committee	
	f. Board Human Resources Committee	
	2. Commuter Solutions Presentation	61

3.	Monthly Financial Report—March Financial Statements	63
4.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	74
5.	Springfield Station Update	75
6.	TransPlan Update	76
B.	Monthly Staff Report	77
X.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	84
A.	Amendment to LTD Ordinance No. 36, 1999 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property	
B.	STIP Projects Request	
C.	Federal Triennial Review Report	
D.	Springfield Station Site Selection	
E.	Budget Committee Meetings	
F.	Budget Adoption	
G.	Resolution Reaffirming District Boundaries	
H.	TransPlan Draft Plan Approval	
I.	BRT Updates	
J.	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).

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

2

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: MARCH FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Financial results for the first nine months of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Passenger fares are on schedule to meet plan for the year. Total fare revenue year-to-date is about 6 percent ahead of the comparable period last year, which was anticipated by the current-year budget.

Payroll tax revenue is strong year-to-date, but was not correctly allocated by month in the current budget. The timing of payroll tax receipts and disbursements from the Department of Revenue has been atypical this year. Total receipts are up 6.1 percent. This resource is still expected to exceed current-year appropriations by \$800,000 to \$1,000,000 by fiscal year-end.

State-in-lieu revenue, for which a catch-up distribution was made at the end of November, remains \$112,000 ahead of budget year-to-date. Another problem has occurred with the Department of Administrative Services' (DAS) administration of this program. Ordinarily, funds from this resource are deposited directly into LTD's Local Government Investment Pool account by the fifth of the month following the close of a calendar quarter. As of April 12, no deposit had been made. DAS reports that distributions have been held for all properties pending an investigation into an apparent anomaly with the quarterly calculation. The amount accrued on March 31 was \$271,407, which is the best estimate of the amount due LTD at this time. No date has been set for resolution of the problem, and the actual amount of the eventual disbursement could differ from the current estimate. Additional information will be provided in a subsequent report.

Self-employment tax receipts are not expected until early May, at which time this resource will be analyzed. It is interesting to note, however, that the disbursement pattern for this revenue is also different this year from previous years. In the past, a significant percent of taxpayers (between 25

and 30 percent) paid the tax before April 1, even though it is not due until April 15. Fewer than 15 percent have done so this year.

Total General Fund expenses (before transfers) are \$768,097 less than budgeted through March. Non-payroll expenses (including transfers) are 3.7 percent higher than those of the previous year, primarily due to an 8 percent increase in personnel services expenses, and despite a decrease in non-bus rapid transit (BRT) capital project activity. (The transfer of operating funds to the Capital Fund as grant match is lower in the current fiscal year. It is customary to transfer the balance of the budgeted amount for Capital Transfers, regardless of current-year match required, at fiscal year-end to reserve local capital funds for future use.) Personnel services expenses are as anticipated by the current-year budget.

As reported last month, a source of concern in recent months has been the sharp increase in diesel fuel costs. In the past month, the price per gallon has risen to a high of \$1.07, up from last month's high of \$1.04. Fortunately, as predicted, the price has fallen more recently, and was \$.85 per gallon for the most recent fuel purchase. This component of the Fleet Services budget should still show a negative variance in excess of about \$100,000 by fiscal year-end. It should be possible to offset this overage with savings in other materials and services categories. (If not, a transfer from General Fund contingency will be requested before June 30.) No other adverse financial circumstances exist at this time.

Special Transportation Fund expenses are as anticipated through nine months. Year-to-date Capital Fund expenses also are as anticipated given that the BRT project expense was overappropriated in the current fiscal year. This line item will show a large positive variance throughout the year and at year-end. As previously reported, year-to-date revenues continue to exceed expenses because of a large grant contract that was delayed until after the beginning of the current fiscal year. Approximately \$800,000 in expenses were incurred last year and reimbursed this year.

The Board-appointed members of the Budget Committee met on April 11, 2000, for a briefing on strategic planning issues, BRT, and the Comprehensive Service Redesign project. The first of the annual budget meetings on the FY 2000-01 budget will be held on Wednesday, April 26, at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Room of the Glenwood LTD facility.

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

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 10, 2000, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District met in regular session on Wednesday, March 15, 2000, 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
Gerry Gaydos
Pat Hocken
Virginia Lauritsen
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Dean Kortge, Secretary

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

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: Ms. Wylie announced that there were several changes to the meeting agenda. Item X.E., the Board Position on Ballot Measure 82, would be deleted from the agenda, and Item X.G., regarding an extension of the TransPlan public comment period would be added to the agenda. Ms. Wylie also stated that she had a letter that she wished to read into the minutes of the meeting, and she would do so immediately following the Employee of the Year item.

WORK SESSION – DRAFT COVERAGE AND PRODUCTIVITY PLAN FOR COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN (CSR):

Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora said that this would be the first in a series of work sessions in which the Board would consider results of the CSR work. The purpose of the CSR was to address some operational problems that the District experienced, including running time problems and complexities that resulted from the many years of annual service adjustments.

Mr. Vobora reviewed the CSR design guidelines, which included reducing total travel time along some of the routes, minimizing the inconvenience of transfers to ensure more efficient use, matching the frequency of service to the level of population and employment density, scheduling service to meet peak demands, and simplifying service to make it easier to understand for the customers. The decision factors included the Board's objective of moving toward a system that was 75 percent productivity based, 20 percent coverage based, and 5 percent discretionary based.

Staff also used current available data to design the first draft of the CSR, including the current zoning patterns, the population and employment density, the areas where ridership was the strongest, future projections, and input from riders, non-riders, and employees.

Mr. Vobora displayed the total productivity model map that had been produced by consultant Jarrett Walker of Nelson Nygaard, which focused resources along major travel corridors with frequencies of 7.5 minutes during peak hours. Mr. Vobora then displayed a map produced by staff, which blended aspects of the current system with aspects of the

Nelson Nygaard model. A route under this model could have a coverage segment as well as a major corridor segment.

Staff conducted a route segment analysis on the entire system to determine which routes were the most productivity and where that high productivity occurred. Staff then determined areas that would be best covered as turn-around locations and in some instances linked the ends of routes together, which provided some cross-town features. Also, in the coverage category, staff had designed some neighborhood circulator service, which would link to the corridor services.

Ms. Hocken asked if it would be difficult to track the evaluating data on those routes that had both productivity and coverage segments. Mr. Vobora said that overall the system would be evaluated on a segment-by-segment basis.

Ms. Hocken said that when Mr. Walker had presented his productivity model, he had started from scratch with the demographics, while staff began the CSR modeling by reviewing existing routes. She asked if it was possible that there were routes that currently did not exist, but that could be productive. Senior Service Planner Paul Zvonkovic said that the staff model included some new routing to new areas. Mr. Vobora added that Mr. Walker had considered segment data and had indexed those segments based on employment and existing trip data. Ms. Hocken said that while an index was helpful, it was a raw number, and there could be other factors that were difficult to quantify.

Mr. Vobora said that staff then considered areas where service had been completed deleted and had considered service to those areas based on coverage category. He displayed a map of the coverage options. A model based only upon productivity would miss some key neighborhood services.

Mr. Vobora said that the CSR would result in the major corridors being well covered, and while some neighborhood service would be lost, some new neighborhood service would be gained. Overall, the CSR would not result in significant changes that would cause an uproar in the community.

Mr. Vobora then reviewed the proposed route frequency map.

Ms. Wylie asked if staff were considering adding additional Park & Ride lots as service continued to be streamlined. Mr. Vobora said that typically, LTD looked for opportunities to lease parking spaces in areas along routes. Long-term Park & Ride plans were being made in conjunction with the bus rapid transit system planning. Staff paid attention to where Park & Ride locations currently were located and to fill the gaps when necessary.

Ms. Wylie said that if there were whole neighborhoods where there would be very limited or no bus service, staff should consider adding Park & Ride service.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff were considering Park & Ride service in connection with the downtown shuttle service. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that one philosophy with Park & Ride service was called peripheral park and rides, in which Park

& Rides were located just on the edge of downtown so that people drove most of the way, but remained outside of the most congested areas where parking costs were high. A short shuttle service was provided for that type of service. The drawback was in terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), people continued to drive many miles; however, it did preserve downtown land for more intensive uses. One of the obvious locations in Eugene for such a system would be Autzen Stadium.

Mr. Gaydos asked how the staff viewed the relationship between increased corridor frequency and neighborhood connector frequency. Mr. Vobora said that there was a close relationship between the two, which included the consideration of stop frequencies. It also had been proven that people were willing to walk a bit further if there were high-speed, frequent service along the corridors.

Mr. Gaydos asked if there was a way to determine if high-frequency corridor service was being considered near where neighborhood service had been cut. Mr. Vobora said that staff could provide that information.

Ms. Hocken noted that Mr. Walker had made a presentation to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), and one of topics was flex-route neighborhood shuttles. She asked if staff had considered that type of service. Mr. Vobora said that flex-route service basically was a route into a neighborhood that had several deviations built into it. Those deviations only were made if someone called in either directly to the bus operator or to the company to request that the deviation be made. Staff did not know enough about the service at this time, but Mr. Vobora thought that this type of service would make the system more complex

than was desired. It was thought that flex-route service could achieve more coverage. Staff were researching the service. Mr. Vobora added that staff were looking at ways to create neighborhood connectors by linking two routes together when possible.

Mr. Vobora provided an overview of the proposed CSR routes by segment including the Barger, River Road, Ferry Street Bridge, Gateway, Springfield, and South Eugene areas.

Ms. Wylie asked if staff had taken into consideration the relocation of the Springfield Station and if there would be a shuttle in downtown Springfield. Mr. Vobora said that staff had planned routes from the current station and could easily be adjusted to a new location, and there was a loop route that emulated a downtown shuttle. Ms. Wylie added that she thought there was some confusion in the community about a circular downtown Eugene shuttle as opposed to short routes to other destinations. She asked staff to address the downtown shuttle plans with the Board in the near future. Mr. Vobora said that staff currently were proposing a downtown shuttle, which also could be considered another route, that connected the train station, UO, and Valley River Center.

Mr. Vobora said that as proposed, the CSR would result in a 6.3 percent increase in service, 5.1 percent of which was attributed to the downtown shuttle. Staff believed the plan maintained frequency along the major corridors, provided substantial coverage, and maintained rural service. In addition, it addressed many of the operational issues such as route timing. It was not quite as simplified as staff had hoped, but it was thought that it would become more so as routes were paired, named, and numbered.

Mr. Kleger asked how much of the lack of simplicity was due to the lack of simplicity in the local street network. Mr. Vobora said that was a factor as was the desire to provide coverage.

Ms. Hocken asked if the proposed CSR met the guidelines that the Board had set. Mr. Vobora said that it was very close. As proposed, 73 percent of the service was allocated to productivity routes, 21 percent to coverage routes, and 6 percent was to be allocated at the Board's discretion.

Mr. Vobora asked for Board direction in terms of overall service hours. Additional productivity could be achieved in a number of ways. If this proposed plan was approved as the direction the Board desired to take, the next step for staff would be to discuss the public input process. The productivity standard discussion would take place later, after the service were implemented and evaluated.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Board members would receive copies of the maps that were presented. She also wanted staff to provide information about the impact on *RideSource* eligibility and how it would be maintained if regular service was deleted from neighborhoods. Mr. Vobora said that staff would present information about how the *RideSource* boundaries extended out from the LTD service. Ms. Hocken said there was an issue about time of day and day of the week that she did not understand. Mr. Vobora said that if an LTD route did not operate on a Sunday, then *RideSource* riders in that area were not eligible to use *RideSource*. Ms. Hocken asked staff to provide more information in the future.

Ms. Hocken also said that this proposal was somewhat different than the model that had been presented at MPC.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was a discrepancy in productivity of neighborhood service. Mr. Vobora said that there was, but that it was hard to predict in planning routes. Staff typically looked at zoning designations and nodal development plans in an effort to predict neighborhood routes that would produce well. Mr. Bennett said that construction could slow for some period, so staff needed to frequently review development. Mr. Vobora said that the CSR was the basic set-up of service, and the Annual Route Review (ARR) fixed problems on an annual basis.

Ms. Wylie said that she thought staff were heading in the right direction with the proposed draft CSR plan.

Mr. Bennett recalled that during the discussion that the Board had in the fall about productivity versus coverage, there was agreement to save 5 or 6 percent for coverage or discretionary service, because there may be other compelling reasons to consider coverage. Since he was a productivity advocate, he thought it helped his case, because there would be an answer for those very difficult situations that were presented. However, if that 6 percent were used up for the rural service, then it needed to be a conscientious decision. Mr. Vobora said that he had thought that the 6 percent would be included in the 20-percent coverage guideline, and the 5 percent would be allocated for the shuttle route or something else, such as contingencies. The ability to respond to service opportunities needed to be maintained.

Ms. Hocken asked how the service hours were impacted by the proposed draft CSR. Mr. Vobora said that there was an increase of 6 percent, 5 of which were attributed to the shuttle. Mr. Vobora said that another option would be to review the frequency of the shuttle and neighborhood services to ensure that rural service was included in the coverage guideline in order to establish the discretionary fund that would not be used up by the proposed plan.

Ms. Wylie thanked staff for the proposal, and said that she thought staff were headed in the right direction.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – April 2000: Bus Operator and Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 757 Executive Board Officer Paul Headley was selected as the April 2000 Employee of the Month. Mr. Headley was hired on May 24, 1969, and had earned an award for 27 years of safe driving. Mr. Headley's co-workers nominated him for this award in appreciation of his long-term, continual efforts to help LTD be successful as an organization and to advocate on behalf of LTD's employees. Mr. Headley was described as going way above and beyond the call of duty, being responsive to urgent requests for information, and being a storehouse of information about the early days of LTD.

Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson added that Mr. Headley was an asset to LTD on many levels. Mr. Headley prided himself on being number one in seniority. If anyone needed an historical perspective on LTD, he or she only needed to turn to Paul. Mr.

Johnson also said that Mr. Headley had a genuine interest in making sure that LTD was a good place to work and had established an excellent relationship with employees.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Headley with a certificate, letter of appreciation, and monetary award. Mr. Headley said that his years as a bus operator and part of the LTD family had been an honor. He was on his fourth generation of bus passengers. The members of the Board had made some difficult decisions, which had put LTD where it was today. He expected as he became older and a passenger on the bus, LTD would be a transit system worth of him as a passenger. It was up to the Board to ensure that. It had been an honor to have Ms. Loobey as the general manager, and he thanked the Board for the honor.

EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR – 1999: Ms. Wylie announced that Executive Secretary Jo Sullivan had been honored at the recent annual appreciation banquet as the LTD Employee of the Year for 1999. Ms. Sullivan was hired in 1980 and had been selected for this award as a result of the exceptional quality of her work and knowledge that she willingly shared with others; her commitment to excellence; her leadership of the staff members who reported to her and as a member of the management team; her unqualified support of LTD, her fellow employees, the General Manager and Board of Directors, and the assistance she provided to ATU Executive Board Officer Paul Headley. Ms. Sullivan had received her award at the recent Employee Appreciation Banquet.

“EMPLOYEE OF THE 20TH CENTURY: Ms. Wylie announced that Ms. Loobey had been honored at the banquet as the Employee of the 20th Century. She read a letter of commendation that had been signed by each of the seven members of the Board.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Wylie noted that there would be two public hearings held during the meeting regarding the pricing plan and the annual route review. She asked that the audience hold their comments regarding those two issues until the public hearings. No one wished to address the Board at this time.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

MOTION
VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: The March 15, 2000, Consent Calendar consisted of the Minutes of the February 16, 2000, Regular Board Meeting and a Budget Committee Nomination re-nominating Gino Grimaldi of Springfield to the LTD Budget Committee. Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for March 15, 2000, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 PRICING PLAN AND FIRST READING OF AMENDED

FARE ORDINANCE: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that following the preliminary public hearing on the Pricing Plan that had been held in February, staff had made the following changes to the District fare structure. Token prices would be increased from 75 to 85 percent of cash fare; Group pass program prices would increase by 3.2 percent; RideSource and RideSource Escort fares would be increased from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per one-way trip; Youth fares would be decreased to match the child fare; Day passes would be replaced by a new instrument that only would be sold on the buses; the transfer instrument

would be eliminated; and the outlet discount policy would be changed to a flat 10 percent, regardless of quantities purchased.

Public Hearing: (1) Lee Duncan or Eugene, also an LTD bus operator, spoke about changing the age for the youth fare. He asked the Board to reconsider increasing the age for the child fare. He said that it created a problem in that it became an enforcement issue for the bus operators. He recognized that the issue generally was thought of as an operational issue and one that the Board expected staff to handle, but he wanted the Board to have his perspective as a bus operator. It was relatively easy for a bus operator to identify kids who were 12 and under. However, it was more difficult to easily identify those youth who were within the 18 and under age group. He compared it to the sale of cigarettes. He said that stores were required to check identification for people buying cigarettes through the age of 26, which was eight years after the legal age to purchase cigarettes. He was concerned that bus operators would need to check identification of about the same age group in order to enforce fare evasion issues.

Mr. Duncan suggested that youth be required to carry an identification card that would be checked once each month downtown. Some form of that could be very effective for the bus operator. Another suggestion was that if the Board expected the bus operators to enforce the new youth fare, the bus operators also should be given the authority to carry out the enforcement.

Mr. Duncan said that he hoped the Board would implement a system that would balance both LTD's needs and the youths needs and was respectful and encouraging to the bus operators.

(2) Mr. Ted Stevens of Eugene, the director of senior and disabled services with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), and a member of the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STF), spoke about the proposed *RideSource* fares. He urged the Board to adopt the STF proposal for the *RideSource* fare increases. The STF proposal was presented on the unanimous recommendation of the Committee following more than an hour of deliberation. The proposal retained the same features as the LTD staff proposal with the exception of the *RideSource* Shopper. The STF proposal maintained a single fare for all *RideSource* services, and it provided more of a break for those who purchased the 10-pass booklets. Many of the *RideSource* customers were on fixed incomes, and the proposed fares increase for the single user was 17 percent, while the fare increase for the 10-pass booklets was a 7 percent increase.

Mr. Stevens also said that while the STF committee recognized that there was a desire to incrementally move to the maximum fare allowed, there also had been significant changes in the environment during the past few years, primarily the infusion of an additional \$700,000 into the Lane County services for elderly and disabled people.

Mr. Stevens had submitted a letter as part of the supplemental testimony packet that the Board had received, and he encouraged the Board to favor the STF proposal rather than the LTD staff proposal.

(3) Mr. Ed Necker of Eugene, who also was a member of the STF Committee and a former *RideSource* user. Mr. Necker said that he now was using the regular system on a regular basis, and he was a volunteer at *RideSource*.

Mr. Necker said that with the regular LTD system, the lower price of passes was to encourage ridership, while the reduced price of the *RideSource* ticket booklet was to save money. It saved staff time as well as helped those on fixed and lower incomes. The STF Committee had deliberated this issue at great length, and had determined that it would be good for all concerned.

Mr. Necker also said that the Shopper was one of the most efficient services within the *RideSource* system, and the STF Committee also had spent much time deliberating that issue as well. *RideSource* was trying to encourage ridership on the Shopper, and felt that if that fare were raised, it would have the opposite affect.

He asked the Board to accept the STF Committee recommendation. It would be about \$480 per month in savings, which was what he saved the system by volunteering. He said that the STF Committee was a good representation of interest groups and should be listened to.

(4) Linda Reynolds of Eugene said that she was a *RideSource* user and a member of the STF Committee. The Committee had carefully considered the LTD staff proposal and had put much thought into its proposal. The STF was interested in the people who were on limited budgets, and she also was on a limited budget. Because she had a medical card,

her rides were paid for, but many others were not that fortunate. The STF Committee was interested in raising the RideSource rates incrementally to meet the standards. People were getting use to the idea of those incremental rates. The Shopper was very efficient because it was a shared ride by several people. It would be sad if the rates went up and people discontinued using it. She encouraged the Board to give the issue serious consideration, and she appreciated the opportunity to voice her opinion with the Board.

(5) Bob Cassidy of Eugene complimented the Board for the proposed change in the Youth fare price. He thought it would cut down on the car travel to the schools and other youth activities, which in turn would cut down on the pollution in the area.

Mr. Cassidy also commented about an article that had appeared in *The Register-Guard* regarding the proposed route changes. He thought that changing and reducing the routes provided an excellent opportunity for the Board to solve an age-old problem in the community about better service and lower fares. Obviously with LTD, the ridership had to be a certain level in order to keep a bus route.

Mr. Cassidy thought there might be an opportunity during the next six months to try a pilot program on just those buses that were proposed for deletion in September. The program would consist of offering free fares on those routes to determine if ridership would increase. It would give LTD an opportunity to gather data about the effects on ridership if fares were reduced or free. There would be little income lost and much knowledge could be gained.

Board Discussion and Decision: Mr. Kleger said that he had several concerns about the RideSource issue, and he was of a divided mind on the subject. It was fairly likely that in one year LTD would be addressing an adjustment in the adult cash fare, which would move the target rate of twice the adult cash fare on RideSource further away again. He wanted to get the RideSource fare brought into linkage with the standard service fares so the Board would no longer need to go through this agonizing process over and over again.

The STF proposal would be easier on many of the users of RideSource. The adjustment in price, by virtue of the lower price for ticket booklets, was somewhat more apparent than real because a very high proportion of the ridership were regular riders who purchased tickets in advance. He did not wish to put a squeeze on those people. He also strongly agreed with the STF proposal to not increase the Shopper fare. It was a service that encouraged grouped rides and that lower fare for the Shopper always should be maintained.

The amount of money was relatively small in terms of the overall LTD budget, but the incentive effect on the target population was much bigger than most people realized. He noted that the ultimate target of twice the regular fare had been charged in the past with a lower price for tickets purchased in advance. The resources to assist people in paying the fares had been enhanced for some and considerably restricted for others. The impact on the population in question had changed and not in a manner that was easy to address by any formula.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger then moved that the Board adopt the STF Committee proposal for RideSource fare adjustments. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken said that it was an unusual position for the Board because during the last several years as RideSource fares had been raised, the Board always had received strong support from the STF Committee. She believed the STF continued to support the Board's efforts with regard to RideSource fares. She also believed there was a difference of opinion about how fast the RideSource fares should be brought into the standard of twice the regular system fare.

Ms. Hocken said that she liked the STF proposal because the basic fare would be raised by \$0.25 as staff also proposed. The deeper discount for the ticket booklet was not completely incomprehensible suggestion. She did not share the enthusiasm for the RideSource Shopper because by raising it to \$2.00, it remained a round-trip fare, which still was substantially cheaper than the regular RideSource fare. She said that she could support the motion on the table, except that she wanted to support a \$2.00 fare for the RideSource Shopper.

She also asked for discussion about the legislative funding that had been passed by the last session of the Legislature. She said that as she understood the rules associated with the spending of that funding, it would not do much to help with existing program operations. She believed it was to be spent for new programs and services. It did not address the basic question of funding the on-going service. In spite of the increased funding from the Legislature, she believed LTD should move forward with planned increases.

**AMENDED
MOTION**

Ms. Hocken then amended the motion to support the STF proposal on all RideSource fares except the Shopper service, which she moved should be raised to \$2.00. Mr. Kleger accepted the amended motion.

Ms. Lauritsen asked for further clarification about why Ms. Hocken favored the increase in the Shopper service. Ms. Hocken said that she supported the increase because the \$2.00 charge was a round-trip charge, which still was less than the regular RideSource service round-trip charge. The Shopper was curb-to-curb service for an elderly or disabled person to go grocery shopping. The only other option for this trip for many people would be taxi service, which would be considerably more expensive. Mr. Kleger said that technically, the Shopper fare could be raised to \$4.00 to match the twice the regular fare standard.

Mr. Bennett asked if Mr. Kleger was accepting of the motion as amended. Mr. Kleger said that he could accept the amended motion, and he thought it was a very practical way to address the issue.

The motion had been made to accept the staff Pricing Plan recommendations with the exception of the STF Advisory Committee recommendation to increase the RideSource Ticket Books by \$1.00 to \$15.00 for ten tickets. Ms. Wylie called for a vote on the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

MOTION Mr. Kleger then moved that Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35 as amended be read by
VOTE title only. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Wylie then read the Ordinance by title: "Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services."

Ms. Loobey said that the Ordinance would be presented for a second reading at the April Board meeting.

ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW – FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 SERVICE PLAN: Mr. Vobora presented a revised summary of the staff recommendations for the Annual Route Review (ARR) as a result of public testimony and input from the Board at the February 2000 Board meeting. He also presented three alternatives to the proposed deletion of routes 38 and 39. The revised summary resulted in a further reduction in service of 0.70 percent.

Ms. Hocken said that it appeared that each year there were minutes added to routes 60 and 61, particularly during peak-hour service. She asked if those two routes would ever reach an optimal operating time. Mr. Vobora said that typically when staff added timing to a peak-hour route, it was done on an incremental basis and only on those trips that had been proven to be unable to meet running times. Ms. Loobey added that the environment had a great impact on those routes. One of the amendments that was being forwarded from the LTD Board in TransPlan was that instead of adding very expensive, non-productive time to schedules, the entire Opticon system (signal priority) would be reviewed to ensure efficient

operation of the public transportation system. Ms. Hocken added that the additional time added to routes also was unproductive for the riders, as they would be traveling for longer periods of time to arrive at their destinations. Mr. Vobora said that signal priorities was one piece of a discussion that had occurred at the recent MPC meeting. Other considerations were Queue jumpers, the use of right turn lanes as priority lanes for buses.

Public Testimony: (1) Windy Kent of Eugene, who worked at the Northwest Youth Corp located in the Laurel Valley area, said that the Youth Corp was expanding and adding new programs for kids, but was located in an isolated area. The Corp. recently began an after-school program and 75 percent of the youth who attended the program were using the Corp. transportation or LTD. As the number of youth in the program increased, so would the demand for transportation alternatives.

There also was an alternative school campus that currently had 44 students. More than 1/3 of those students utilized LTD, and the scheduled worked well for them, for which the Youth Corp. was grateful.

As the Corp. program continued to grow and more youth were being served, there only was one bus pickup in the afternoons, so the Corp. staff were shuttling the participants to the Eugene Station.

Ms. Kent had sent a letter to Senior Planner Paul Zvonkovic that provided her description of what an ideal bus schedule would be for the Laurel Valley area. In addition to the Corp. program, the Corp. staff had surveyed youth who lived in the Laurel Valley area.

Also, there was a large staff at the Youth Corp., and the bus schedules did not accommodate the staff at all. She hoped that the letter she had written would be shared with the Board.

(2) Christopher Phillips of Eugene discussed his concerns about the proposed deletion of routes 38 and 39 in the ARR and the proposed deletion of route 35 with the CSR. If route 39 were deleted without replacement, Mr. Phillips would have no service outside of rush hours. If route 35 were deleted in the CSR, then Mr. Phillips would have no bus service at all. According to the plan, the nearest stop to his home would be at 22nd and City View, which was 0.8 miles and 350 vertical feet difference.

Some of the comments made during the CSR suggested that it was hoped that people affected by these deletions would utilize a park & ride lot. Mr. Phillips said that in order for him to utilize a park & ride lot, he would require another automobile. If he had another car, it would not be that much more expensive for him to drive it all the way to the University rather than leaving it in a parking lot somewhere. The main costs associated with a car are purchase, insurance, maintenance, etc.

Mr. Phillips said that service to the outlying areas, such as the City View neighborhood also brought passengers to the rest of the system. Since he used the bus to travel to work on a daily basis, if he needed to do errands, such as go to the dentist, shop, attend parent-teacher meetings, he also took the bus.

Mr. Phillips also said that LTD wanted to be seen as reliable in the community. He had purchased a house in a location specifically to be on a bus route. He realized that there were many places with bus routes where he could have bought a house, but he did not consider buying a house in a location where there was no bus service. He bought a house on a bus route because he had intended to ride the bus. It would be cheaper and more convenient for him to go ahead and buy another car than to sell his house. If LTD withdrew from neighborhoods such as his, the message it was sending was that people who bought houses, could not plan in such a way as to reliably use the system. He thought the Board should seriously consider this information for all the route changes.

(3) Jenny Phillips: Ms. Phillips asked if her dad would keep his bus. She said that LTD should keep her father's bus forever. She said that she sometimes rode her dad's bus too. Ms. Wylie responded that the Board would talk about it.

(4) Mr. Frank Lulidge of Eugene said that he agreed with everything that Mr. Phillips had said. He said that he did not ride the bus, but had previously. He had determined that the bus ride was too long to fit his schedule. He would ride if that were to change. He said that he appreciated LTD and the LTD Board. He thought that eliminating service completely from the City View area would affect the way most of the southwest community would feel about LTD. By eliminating service, LTD basically was amputating that entire section of town from service. He thought it was important not to cut off parts of the community.

Board Discussion and Decision: Ms. Hocken said that whatever was decided by the Board with regard to the ARR was a one-year commitment. Mr. Bennett said that the reality was that the Board now had the same decision to make that it would have in one year. The productivity numbers are single digit, and they would need to meet a minimum of 13 rides per hour. If the Board were not addressing the issue now, one could argue that a decision could be put off until next year. The Board and staff knew that things like this would happen when the decision was made to move toward a more productive system. Mr. Bennett said that he believed that the general ridership of LTD had to keep pace with the people who supported the system. He supported the deletion of the City View area routes both because of what he believed and because of what the Board had decided in earlier discussions.

Mr. Kleger asked about routes 38 and 39 and if the productivity was for those loop segments, where previously those areas were linked with service along 18th Avenue. Mr. Vobora said that was correct. Mr. Kleger then noted that when the loops were removed, the 18th Avenue routes would remain in service. The 38/39 represented a minority market segment that never had met the minimum productivity levels. Mr. Vobora said that the 34/35 loop routes were kept as commuter trips in response to testimony that had been received. A few of those trips generated the majority of the entire ridership for the route. It clearly was a lifeline-type coverage service. These routes were not meeting the minimum standard even for lifeline-type services.

Mr. Kleger said that he was frustrated with getting used to a product only to have it disappear. This was the nature of anything that attempted to survive by serving large numbers of people and was not economically viable any other way. Before the age of public

subsidies, bus services were based on coverage, and it did not work. He thought it was necessary to face the fact that these routes were not producing.

Mr. Kleger said that he was concerned about the deletion of the 11X express route, and he asked how staff were planning to combine the #11X with the #8X route. Mr. Vobora said that analysis of the loop portion of the #11X, which also was served by the 8X showed that approximately 75 percent of the passengers from the #11X were on that loop portion. Traveling west along Main Street, there were a number of the 11X riders who lived within a mile or so of the Thurston Station, and those people would be able to catch an outbound #11 Thurston to the Thurston Station to transfer to the #8X. Staff believed that the majority of the #11X passengers could easily make the switch to the #8X.

Mr. Kleger said that he was inclined to go along with the proposal alternative 1, which eliminated routes 38 and 39, as proposed in the February service proposal. This proposal would result in a reduction of 1,338 annual service hours, a loss in ridership of 20,447 rides, and approximate savings of \$91,196.

Ms. Hocken said that she believed routes 38 and 39 should be eliminated. There had been constant change with routes 34 and 35 throughout the past few years, and she was not sure if it had been given a chance to mature.

Ms. Wylie said that she had enjoyed listening to Mr. Phillip's description of how he used the bus service; it was the ideal type of bus client that LTD wanted. She regretted having to

delete the #38 and #39 routes. She asked the Board to further discuss the three alternatives that had been presented to determine which of the three the Board might select.

Ms. Hocken favored Alternative 2, which eliminated routes 38 and 39 and added additional commuter trips to routes 34 and 35. It would slightly reduce the mid-day gap in service. The cost was estimated to be \$35,717, and annual ridership was estimated to be 5,934 rides. Ms. Wylie also said that she favored Alternative 2.

Mr. Gaydos, Ms. Lauritsen, Mr. Kleger, and Mr. Bennett supported Alternative 1. None of the Board members supported Alternative 3, which would leave all 38 and 39 service as it currently stood and made changes when the CSR was implemented in September 2001. LTD would maintain the current level of ridership at an annual cost of \$91,196.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt Alternative 1, which eliminated routes 38 and 39, as proposed in the February service proposal. This proposal would result in a reduction of 1,338 annual service hours, a loss in ridership of 20,447, and approximate savings of \$91,196. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which

VOTE

carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

Mr. Bennett said that there would be many meetings such as this where agonizing decisions had to be made unless things were done differently. Either the productivity would need to be adjusted or something needed to happen, because 5 or 6 percent was needed

for what the Board thought might be in the best interest of the community without regard to productivity. That flexibility needed to be factored into the service equation.

MOTION There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the Fiscal Year 2000-2001 service recommendations as presented on March 15, 2000, not including the supplementary service to routes 34 and 35 shown on the Summary Table for Annual Route Review 2000 Service

VOTE Changes." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken thanked the staff for preparing alternatives as requested at the February meeting. Ms. Wylie added that she thought it was important for the Board to reiterate its intent to increase ridership and reduce costs, and it was difficult to reach those plateaus.

LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLAN: Ms. Hellekson said that the Long-Range Financial Plan (LRFP) served several purposes. It identified funding for short- and long-term District plans, identified circumstances in transit that could affect funding, and affirmed that the financial goals supported the Strategic Plan. It was based on the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), which the Board discussed in February.

Ms. Hellekson said that the long-term agenda included three big goals: provide public transportation to people who did not have transportation alternatives, provide services that were attractive alternatives to private automobile use to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMTs) and single occupancy vehicle (SOV) use, and to maintain a long-term vision of the

community's needs in order to assure and enhance the quality of life. To accomplish those goals, the District needed to maintain its fixed-route service, maintain the demand-response service, and develop and implement cost-effective service enhancements to increase ridership and modal split. Service enhancements included vehicle improvements, system improvements, and bus rapid transit (BRT). The quality of life issues were addressed by the draft TransPlan Update. Community outreach and education programs were ongoing both for the BRT project and for LTD's image in general. The Commuter Solutions program was strong, and the Board received periodic updates about that program.

Ms. Hellekson reviewed the LRFP assumptions. The service requirements and capital projects formed the LRFP framework. The population growth and ridership increases would result in fare revenue increases. The District wanted to continue to preserve its assets and maintain its facilities.

The LRFP assumed that the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21) would be reauthorized and the new state support of special transportation services would be continued. Those were big assumptions.

The single largest component of the operating costs was personnel services, and in order to control operating costs, personnel costs needed to be controlled. Those issues would be addressed during the budget process in April 2000.

Ms. Hellekson said that local capital set-aside funds would need to be maximized. The local set-aside funds were funds that were removed from the capital budget and held aside

for such things as grant match funding and outright capital purchases. It was expected that grant match funding could increase by 30 percent. Local funds could be used at the discretion of the District. Ms. Hellekson said that also the District would incur debt, and local funds would be used to help leverage that debt.

Mr. Bennett asked about the future of the payroll tax. Ms. Hellekson said that LTD could push for a tax rate increase at some time in the future, but the order of magnitude by itself might not be enough. There could be other tax mechanisms or other local sources that could be instituted. Mr. Bennett said that he hoped to position the District for a tax-rate increase, and there were many different ways to do that, and capital needs often were the easiest way to increase taxes. Also, Mr. Bennett asked if staff were making the assumption that federal support would be reduced, including the funding of the BRT program. Ms. Hellekson said that, based on preliminary feedback from the recent United Front trip to Washington, D.C., LTD had a very good chance of getting earmarked funds in the near future. She did not think, at this point, that there was a realistic chance to get all of the money from that source. LTD' projects would be competing with light rail projects for money. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch would provide further review with the Board of federal funding.

Ms. Wylie said that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) had said that LTD could compete with light-rail for funding. There would be enormous competition for new start funds and a long waiting period, which would put LTD behind schedule. If there were some possibility that LTD could get in to the New Start Program, it would pay for everything. That could take several years, and LTD would need to compete with many other projects. There

also was the possibility of developing a BRT new-start type category, but it would have to be approved through legislation. At some point, the Board would need to have more discussion or direction about continuing with the TEA-21 programs and getting in line for the New Start programs. The District needed to be very clever about applying for everything that was available.

Ms. Wylie asked Ms. Hellekson to further explain what she meant by incurring debt. Ms. Hellekson said that the most common way to incur debt was through lease purchasing. There also were other ways to develop debt, such as joint development and the selling of various types of paper. Staff were looking at all of the options and reporting back to the Board Finance Committee.

Ms. Hellekson said that the District would need to put together a plan that would combine the use of the local, state, debt financing, and federal funds to accomplish its goals. She also believed that at some point in the near future, LTD would no longer be able to purchase buses at 80 percent grant funding. Even if 80 percent grant funding were available, the District most likely would not want to spend it on just buses, because there were so many other uses of the money.

Ms. Hellekson said that the projects in the LRFP included BRT, fleet expansion and replacement, passenger boarding improvements, and technological improvements. Staff were assuming that BRT would not increase operating costs but would increase ridership. Staff would monitor the validity of that assumption as the BRT project progressed.

The LRFP indicated that LTD somehow had to take its revenue projections and manage its expenditures to be less than or equal to over time, and continue to do everything that the plan called for, including covering the basic service requirements.

LTD could be seeking ways to generate from some other source other than grants nearly \$2 million in the next few years, and the LRFP needed to set the stage to do that. Staff already were seeking other long-term funding opportunities.

Ms. Hellekson distributed a General Fund Summary that provided the proposed budget funding for fiscal year 2000-2001. The Board Finance Committee recently had met and reviewed the General Fund Summary. The General Fund Summary assumed that a new General Fund Reserve Policy was in place. Ms. Hellekson explained that the Finance Committee had recommended the policy to staff in which a prudent General Fund reserve funds would be maintained and all additional reserve funds would be shifted to the capital fund where they most likely would be used. This would have no impact on the balance sheet because LTD reported a consolidated balance sheet, and it would have no impact on interest earnings because the General Fund kept the interest earnings on behalf of the capital fund. Mr. Gaydos added that those shifted funds could be returned to the General Fund at any time.

Ms. Hellekson said that instead of basing reserves in the General Fund at 25 to 40 percent of the total operating expense, the new policy would assume that the range would be 7 to 13 percent and would not be a total operating expense. It would be comprised of the

total operating expense less the capital. In the future, LTD may want to do the same thing with the STF funds.

Ms. Hellekson said that overall, LTD was well positioned for the future; operating income was stable and increasing; and the balance sheets were strong. The success of the LRF would depend on several things: community support, new funding sources for BRT, careful expenditure control, and meeting performance goals.

Mr. Bennett asked about the management of the reserve funds. Ms. Hellekson said that the Board had an adopted investment policy that stipulated that the legal limit allowed would be invested in the Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP) that was managed by the State of Oregon. The return on the investment was approximately 6 percent.

Mr. Bennett said that he would appreciate having the Finance Committee review the investment policy. Ms. Hellekson said that the LGIP was a very safe, low-risk, and non-aggressive investment. Ms. Hocken, who chaired the Finance Committee assured Mr. Bennett that the Committee would review the investment policy.

Ms. Hocken noted that the reserves left in the General Fund would be used as working capital, self-insurance, and contingency. She thought that the new policy would provide more detail about the reserves.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the proposed Long-Range Financial Plan for fiscal years 2000-01

through 2019-20 is approved as presented. Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor and none opposed.

BOARD POSITION ON BALLOT MEASURE 82: This item was removed from the agenda.

MOTION **RESOLUTION APPOINTING KENNETH P. HAMM AS PENSION TRUSTEE:**
Ms. Hocken moved that the Board adopt the Resolution naming Kenneth P. Hamm as successor trustee for the LTD Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan and the LTD/ATU Pension Trust. Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none against.

TRANSPLAN – EXTENSION OF PUBLIC HEARING: This item had been added to the agenda, and Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano was present with a handout that was distributed to the Board members. Mr. Viggiano said that this item had been discussed in February and now needed to be approved by the Board. He added that the Springfield City Council and the Lane County Board of Commissioners also had discussed the issue. The Springfield City Council was not interested in extending the public comment period, but thought that perhaps it could be reopened later if there were some significant changes in the draft plan. The Lane County Commissioners were interested in extending the comment period, and it was thought that the Eugene City Council would be interested in extending the comment period as well. Staff recommended extending the public comment period until June 30, 2000.

MOTION

There was no further discussion, and Mr. Gaydos moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors agrees to extend the public record to accept written testimony on the TransPlan update/Metro Plan amendments through June 30, 2000. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING**

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: (1) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken said that the top of discussion at the last MPC meeting was how the local jurisdictions provided input to the State of Oregon planning processes in the selection of projects to be funded in a way that would be heard more effectively. There were several proposals that staff presented. The proposal that was adopted was the simplest one and did not involve creating any new governmental agencies or structures. Once the metropolitan area list of transportation and transit priorities was completed and approved by MPC, it would be sent to the County Commissioners for combining with the rural projects list. In the past, there never was feedback to MPC in terms of how Lane County blended the rural and metropolitan lists together prior to forwarding the list to the State. Under the adopted procedure, Lane County would draft a blended list that would be forwarded for review back to MPC so the metropolitan jurisdictions could comment on the order of priority set by the County. Once the system was functioning, it was suggested that a presentation be made to the Oregon Transportation Commission to inform them that Lane County did have a formal process in

place that ensured that each jurisdiction was represented. The Oregon Transportation Commission then could regard recommendations from Lane County as having broad support in Lane County.

The other issue was a proposal to add Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) as a member of MPC. This proposal was rejected primarily because LRAPA already was an intergovernmental agency and not a primary government agency such as were the other members of MPC.

(2) Springfield Station. Mr. Kleger reported that the Springfield Station Steering Committee had met once more and had agreed to have staff review Site I West. A supplementary briefing was held for several members who could not attend the Steering Committee Meeting. The feedback on the site at the political level so far was favorable. There was more information available in the agenda packet.

(3) United Front – Washington, D.C., Trip. Ms. Wylie reported that there was a written report of the trip in the agenda packet. Ms. Wylie said that the participants had met with the acting administrator of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the BRT simulation video was shown, and the FTA continued to be very excited and supportive about what LTD was doing with its BRT plans. She thought it had been a very worthwhile trip.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE: Mr. Bennett asked if staff had conversations with the property owners with regard to mitigating parking on Main Street for a dedicated BRT lane. Mr. Viggiano said that discussions had gone well to date, and there were two business

owners who had not yet been contacted. The new proposed site made it much easier to get priority treatment on Main Street because one block would be avoided where parking was most heavily utilized.

SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE: Mr. Viggiano said that staff had learned that Greyhound was not interested in relocating to Springfield.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Government Relations. Ms. Lynch said that Senators Wyden and Smith had submitted their appropriations request, and she had been told that LTD was included in the list. The list typically was not shared.

Eugene Substation. Ms. Hocken asked about the status of the Eugene Police Substation. The Board had received written materials from the public about the substation, and she asked staff to provide an update. Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson said that when the initial agreement was made, it was for a two-year period. Staff currently were negotiating with the police department. LTD was not planning to continue funding of the Community Service Officer (CSO); however, LTD would continue to provide the space for free. Previously, LTD was contributing \$54,000 for the CSO, free space, and \$27,000 or 1/3 share of a Police Office. LTD was restructuring security issues related to service, which it was believed would be a more effective use of funds. The City of Eugene was not planning to close the substation. Negotiations were continuing.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: This agenda item provides a formal opportunity for Board members to make announcements or to suggest topics for current or future Board meetings.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBERS

(2000; for FY 2000-2001 Budget)

Note: Budget Committee members are not required to live in the same subdistrict as the nominating Board member.

SUBDISTRICT	NOMINATING BOARD MEMBER	BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBER	TERM EXPIRES
1	Hillary Wylie	Michael Bean	1/01/02
2	Virginia Lauritsen	Gino Grimaldi	1/01/03
3	Dean Kortge	George Rode	1/01/03
4	Rob Bennett	Russ Brink	1/01/03
5	Kirk Bailey <i>(Gerry Gaydos)</i>	Gerry Gaydos	1/01/01
6	Dave Kleger	Elaine Guard	1/01/02
7	Pat Hocken	Pamela Papp	1/01/02

A Board member whose name is in italics has been appointed since the last Budget Committee nomination in that subdistrict, and would make the next appointment in that subdistrict.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: BUDGET COMMITTEE NOMINATION

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of nomination to LTD Budget Committee

BACKGROUND: LTD Budget Committee members are nominated and approved by the Board members and serve for three-year terms. Budget Committee members must reside within the District's service boundaries, but are not required to live in the same subdistrict as the Board member making the appointment.

Board member Gerry Gaydos has been in contact with a member of the community who is considering his schedule to determine whether he will be available to participate in this year's Budget Committee process. The position is vacant as a result of Mr. Gaydos' appointment to the LTD Board, causing the need for him to recommend a community member to fill his unexpired term on the Budget Committee. If his candidate has been identified before the April 19 Board meeting, a nomination form will be distributed at the meeting and the Board will be asked to approve the nomination at that time.

ATTACHMENT: List of Budget Committee Members and Terms

PROPOSED MOTION: I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that _____ is appointed to the LTD Budget Committee to fill an unexpired three-year term beginning immediately and ending January 1, 2001.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

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

- a **Metropolitan Policy Committee:** MPC meetings are held on the second Thursday of each month. At the Board meeting, LTD's MPC representative Pat Hocken and alternate Rob Bennett will provide a brief report on the April 13, 2000, MPC meeting.
- 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. Ms. Hocken 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 generally meets on the first Tuesday of the month. However, the April 4 meeting was canceled. A Downtown Eugene-East workshop was held on April 5 at the Lane County Fairgrounds. The next BRT Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for May 2, 2000, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. At the April 19 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 has continued to meet to consider an additional site for the Station. The Committee last met on February 24, and

the next meeting has not yet been scheduled for. LTD Board members Dave Kleger, Ginny Lauritsen, and Hillary Wylie participate 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 April 19 Board meeting, the LTD representatives can provide an update on this committee's activities.

- e **Board Finance Committee:** The Board Finance Committee has met recently to discuss issues having budget implications for next fiscal year. At the April 19 Board meeting, Committee members Pat Hocken (chair), Gerry Gaydos, and Ginny Lauritsen can provide an update for the full Board.
- f **Board Human Resources Committee:** The Board Human Resources Committee last met on April 10. Committee members Dean Kortge (chair), Gerry Gaydos, and Hillary Wylie can provide a brief description of the meeting for the Board.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: CORRESPONDENCE

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

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

□

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

PROPOSED MOTION: None

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION

Monday, March 13, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 10, 2000, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special meeting/work session on Monday, March 13, 2000, 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
Gerry Gaydos
Patricia Hocken
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Virginia Lauritsen
Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary
Ken Hamm, LTD General Manager, effective March 27, 2000

Absent: Dean Kortge, Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie. Four members were present (Bennett, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie), constituting a quorum. Ms. Hocken arrived at 5:40 p.m. and Mr. Gaydos arrived at 6:10 p.m.

WORK SESSION ON TRANSPLAN: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that this work session was a continuation of the Board's review of the draft TransPlan. In addition to the agenda packet, staff had distributed a copy of an e-mail message from Rob Zako and a TransPlan Adoption Process Work Session Tracking Summary, which was a matrix to show the progress of the work sessions by all jurisdictions.

This work session would cover Issue Area 3, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Issue Area 5, Transportation System Improvements: Transit System.

Mr. Viggiano discussed the question of extending the public comment period deadline through June. Originally, the deadline was extended through March 31, 2000, in order to allow public comment during the time that the adopting agencies were holding work sessions leading up to the joint work session. Staff had anticipated that those individual work sessions would be completed by March 31. It was unclear how long the work sessions would take, but staff were recommending extending the public comment period until the end of June 2000.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff anticipated any problems as a result of extending the comment period. Mr. Viggiano said that Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) staff member Tom Schwetz had indicated that it would not be a problem to extend the comment period. At the end of the comment period, staff would need to respond to those comments, which was a task that would be done regardless of when the comment period ended.

Mr. Bennett asked if a precedence had been set for this process. He was accustomed to a process where public comment was received and recorded, and it was not necessarily one group or even the public in general commenting throughout an entire process. Typically, following the recording of the public comment, the elected and appointed officials made the decisions. Mr. Viggiano said the extension of the public comment period was atypical, but it was not illegal. Lee Shoemaker of LCOG added that during the Planning Commission review of the draft TransPlan, the Planning Commission had extended the public comment period twice.

Mr. Viggiano said that extending the public comment period was in agreement with the original intent of allowing public comment during the work session period. The Board would be asked to take formal action on extending the public comment period at its regular meeting on March 15, 2000.

Ms. Hocken asked if the delay of the work sessions would set back the timeline for adopting the draft TransPlan. Mr. Viggiano said that he expected it would.

Another issue that Mr. Viggiano wanted to address was in Issue Area 1, General Issues. At the last work session, staff did not spend much time on Issue Area 1, and this particular issue had arisen subsequent to that. It was in response to a request by the Convention and Visitors Association of Lane County (CVALCO) to include in TransPlan the need to provide transportation to visitors to the community. CVALCO suggested that a TransPlan goal be added to that effect. The options provided were that no changes be made to the existing draft TransPlan, that a goal be added as suggested, or that the language be incorporated under Goal number 2. There were only two goals in the draft TransPlan. Staff recommended the third option of adding the language addressing visitor transportation needs under Goal number 2. It would become Item J under Goal number 2. Mr. Viggiano added that the item also would be listed as Item J under Definitions and Intent in order to explain what it meant.

Mr. Kleger said that with the high level of support for the northwest rail corridor activities, he thought it was appropriate and consistent that a visitor transportation item be included in TransPlan. Ms. Lauritsen said that she supported adding it to the existing Goal 2. There was general agreement among Board members to add information about visitor transportation as Item J under Goal 2.

TransPlan Issue Area 3 – Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM). Mr. Shoemaker said that a substantial number of comments were received with regard to TDM Policy #1, which expanded the existing TDM programs and developed new ones. Most of the comments were with regard to incentives to expand transit service by offering reduced or free fares and expanding the group pass programs. Some suggested incentives were to change travel behavior by implementing and increasing parking fees, odometer fees, and/or tolls on the bridges. A few comments were received regarding voluntary versus mandatory TDM.

Staff had prepared three options for discussion, including making no change to the TDM policies; prohibiting mandatory TDM; and establishing TDM benchmarks, and, if those benchmarks were not achieved, establishing mandatory TDM programs. With regard to educating the public on

travel alternatives, staff had prepared two items for discussion, including maintaining current education programs or expanding education programs.

Staff were recommending no change in the TransPlan TDM Policy #1.

Mr. Bennett asked if there were any working examples of mandatory TDM within the United States. Mr. Shoemaker said that Portland, Oregon, had a mandatory TDM program in place in which employers with 50 or more employees were required to have a trip-reduction program in place. LTD Commuter Resources Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams said that most of the mandated TDM programs were related to mandated air quality areas. She was not aware of any that were in areas where air quality was not the main problem. Mr. Bennett asked if she knew of any areas that had arbitrary parking fee approaches. Ms. Bloom Williams said that parking management strategies varied greatly from community to community. The only common denominator was that there should be parking management strategies. Mr. Viggiano added that this community had a fairly extensive TDM program, but one of the issues was lack of communication about what was being done. Many people who spoke out in favor of more TDM strategies were not aware of how much TDM already was being done.

Ms. Hocken said that voluntary versus mandatory could become a major political issue. Given the different approaches of the Councils and the Lane County Commissioners, she was not sure that mandatory policies would be adopted at the TransPlan level, but she did not think there should be anything in TransPlan that would prohibit individual jurisdictions from moving ahead with a mandatory TDM policy. She thought that the current TDM Policy reflected that. She said that it should be made clearer that mandatory TDM policies were not prohibited and there were options available for individual jurisdictions. Mr. Viggiano said that the intent of the policy was to allow flexibility. He said that the concern at the Eugene City Council was that some strategies made more sense on a regional basis than others, such as mandated parking costs that would place one part of the community at a relative disadvantage to another part of the community.

Mr. Bennett said that he did not support mandatory TDM. He thought that an arbitrary approach, such as increased parking costs downtown, would create dislocation and hurt the efforts of TDM. The better approach to a more balanced transportation system was to become more competitive with the automobile for infrastructure and funding. He favored the approach that Portland had taken because it was a more educational approach.

Mr. Kleger said that he was deeply concerned about mandates that were not strongly supported by the public. He did not, however, favor TransPlan preventing a particular jurisdiction's endeavors to implement mandatory TDM strategies.

Ms. Wylie said that she did not favor a mandatory TDM policy at this time because many of the TDM strategies were not yet in place to enforce a mandatory policy, such as a downtown shuttle and high-frequency corridor service.

With regard to stipulating that benchmarks be set and met, Ms. Hocken said that it was an issue that could delay the adoption of TransPlan, because she believed it needed much more review before it could be considered.

Ms. Williams said that there was discussion at the Eugene City Council work session with regard to being more aggressive with expanding TDM educational programs. Currently,

educational programs included a curriculum program that was produced in 1995 called "Road Trips" that was targeted to children in grades 3 through 5. It was distributed to local-area schools. It was not required curriculum and with the higher requirements for meeting state assessment levels, it had been given a very low priority within the school districts, although some teachers had taken the personal responsibility of teaching transportation education, and there were people who believed that transportation education should be required curriculum.

Ms. Hocken said that given the environment of controversy surrounding the new statewide testing program, it would be difficult to raise the interest level among grade school teachers for a transportation curriculum, particularly when it had not yet been tested in any way. A transportation curriculum also could be very difficult to mandate with the multitude of other state mandates that teachers needed to implement. Ms. Hocken said that she was interested in generating a commuter plan for the schools that was similar to the employer-based group pass program. Mr. Viggiano said that a suggestion was made at the Eugene City Council meeting for a task team that would include representatives from the City, LTD, and the 4J School District to discuss TDM options. Ms. Hocken said that she was thinking more about a school-by-school-specific program. She thought that if a few schools were willing to try it as a strong environmental project with the full support of staff, teachers, and parents, and if it were successful, other schools might be more willing to try it. She did not favor a mandate being sent to the schools from the district offices.

Mr. Bennett said that he liked Ms. Hocken's idea and also favored what Ms. Wylie had said about making sure that the tools were in place to carry out the strategies before mandating the strategies. He thought that if the teachers were reluctant to add transportation to the curriculum, then perhaps an educational program could be brought to their classrooms with guest speakers from LTD. Not only would the students learn about TDM, but also how to ride the bus, where the bus traveled, etc. Ms. Bloom Williams said LTD currently offered free field trips to area teachers, and staff recently had met to discuss broadening the field trip program to include more TDM education.

Ms. Lauritsen said she thought LTD staff already were working on expanding education programs to local schools, so she favored maintaining the current education programs, which she hoped would include the suggestions that the Board had discussed.

Mr. Kleger said that he presumed that there was nothing on the horizon that would cause a reduction in the present educational efforts. There was nothing in TransPlan, as presently drafted, that would interfere with further expansion of educational programs. He did not want LTD to get into a position where it was committed to something it could not pay for. He favored maintaining the current education programs.

Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn said that one advantage of expanding education programs was that it would be consistent with the Board's first position on non-mandatory TDM. In addition, agreement at the local level to expand education programs would send a message to the State of Oregon, which was the TDM funding source, that expanding those programs had broad-based support in the community. Ms. Bloom Williams added that the TDM Policy regarding education was not limited to schools, but applied to the general public.

Ms. Hocken asked if the 4J School District still offered its community schools and other programs for adults. She said this also could be a good way to reach more people.

Mr. Gaydos said that the UO was attempting to get out of the parking business, which seemed like a perfect opportunity to be supportive and to share educational information. Mr. Gaydos also noted that all the area high schools had large parking lots, and it appeared that nothing was being done at the high school level to discourage automobile use. He thought the high schools would need to consider the issue in the near future, and it was another opportunity where LTD could provide support and education.

TDM Policy #2: Parking Management: Mr. Shoemaker said that TDM policy #2 was written to increase the use of parking management strategies in selected areas throughout the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. Staff were recommending no change to TDM Policy #2. The Board indicated agreement with the staff position.

TDM Policy #3: Congestion Management: Mr. Shoemaker said that staff were recommending no change to this policy, which implemented TDM strategies to manage demand at congested locations. Currently, there was funding in the TDM budget to develop a TDM program in the Gateway area. LCOG and Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff were very interested in this development. In addition, LCOG had performed a study that projected the effects of TDM strategies on the five most congested areas in the community. It was a program that could be expanded in the future. The Board indicated agreement with the staff recommendation.

TDM Finance and Implementation: Mr. Shoemaker said that ODOT was the primary funding source for TDM programs, and LTD also contributed. Additional funding sources would need to be identified. Local jurisdictions also had the option to develop TDM programs.

Ms. Hocken asked if increased parking prices downtown could be used to help fund alternative transportation. Ms. Bloom Williams said that parking fees could be used in that manner. Mr. Pangborn said that at one time, the City had considered using funds from the parking fees to pay for its Group Pass program. Mr. Viggiano added that a logical use for that money could be to pay for the downtown shuttle, which could connect some outlying parking lots.

Mr. Pangborn said that the TDM program would continue to apply for and use the current and projected funding from ODOT, but anything additional would become part of the annual budget process for LTD or another jurisdiction.

TransPlan Issue Area 5 – Transportation System Improvements: Transit

Mr. Viggiano said that TransPlan Issue Area 4 – Transportation System Improvements: Road System, would be discussed at a later date. There were four transit policies within Issue Area 5.

TSI Transit Policy #1: Transit Improvements: Mr. Viggiano said that there was very little public testimony related to this policy, which improved transit service and facilities to increase the system's accessibility, attractiveness, and convenience for all users, including the transportation disadvantaged. The testimony that was received related to free service and neighborhood shuttle service. The free service issue was one that the LTD Board previously had considered. Staff believed the neighborhood shuttle service would be addressed with the implementation of bus rapid transit (BRT). Staff were recommending no change to the policy.

Mr. Kleger asked if LTD had an effective way of funding a significant increase in neighborhood shuttle or circulator-type service regardless of the efficiencies that were envisioned

for BRT. Mr. Viggiano said that currently, the only way to do that would be to reduce service somewhere else. Mr. Kleger said that he was concerned that if the efficiencies of the BRT system were not realized, there would be no way to pay for an improved neighborhood circulator capacity.

Mr. Gaydos noted that there was nothing in the policy relating to economic feasibility that would suggest free fares. Mr. Pangborn added that the entire TransPlan was financially constrained, which meant that money had to be available to implement any and all of the goals.

The Board indicated agreement with the staff recommendation on TSI Transit Policy #1.

TSI Transit Policy #2: Bus Rapid Transit: Mr. Viggiano said that staff were recommending replacing the term "transit market share" with "transit mode split." There were many comments received about BRT. Most comments supported the concept, but there also were concerns about costs, impacts of design, and effectiveness of BRT. Mr. Viggiano said that, in general, the policy was written in such a way that BRT implementation would be contingent upon local support, financing, and meeting the market share requirements. The requirement for local support meant that issues, such as impacts on traffic, could be very carefully considered before any agreements were made with regard to implementing BRT. The issue about whether it was effective in increasing ridership was covered by the requirement in the policy to increase transit market share. The financing issue also was covered in the policy. Staff believed that the policy, as written, would address most of the concerns expressed during the public testimony.

Mr. Viggiano explained that staff had thought that the term "market share" would be more understandable than "transit mode split." Instead, staff had found that it was generating more questions and misunderstandings.

Mr. Bennett agreed with the staff recommendation. He said that he used the term "market share" often. He thought it suggested that LTD was dealing with the important initiative on a business-like basis, and that LTD was willing to be objectively accountable. It also indicated that this capital improvement would result in an infrastructure position to get more business. However, the term "market share" also tended to offend some people. Ms. Wylie said that to some people, "market share" sounded like LTD was trying to make a profit. When she had asked people how they would react to the term, "shown to increase ridership along transit corridors," people tended to be much more favorable about the policy. Mr. Bennett said that part of what BRT was attempting to accomplish was to attract a new kind of bus rider, which was a share of a new market.

Ms. Wylie added that people were being asked to understand transportation jargon, and it was important to ensure that issues were explained very thoroughly and that understanding was achieved. Mr. Hamm said that Mr. Bennett's comments were very valuable because modal split suggested a percentage of rider shift from one mode to another. The representation, in terms of the societal structure, was attracting a whole new type of guests aboard the transit vehicles, and when a new product was created, such as BRT, a new market opportunity was created as well, which could attract a different client base. There were two different perspectives to consider: one was increasing the percentage, and the other was attracting a different type of bus rider.

Other Board members agreed with the staff recommendation. Mr. Viggiano added that changing the terminology did not change the meaning of the policy.

TSI Transit Policy #3: Transit/High-Occupancy Vehicle Priority: Mr. Viggiano said that very little public testimony was received about this policy, which was to implement traffic management strategies and other actions, where appropriate and practical, that gave priority to transit and other HOVs. Staff were recommending no change to this policy.

Ms. Hocken said that Jarrett Walker of Nelson Nygaard had made a presentation to the Metropolitan Policy Committee in which he provided an overview of what the LTD Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) issues were in terms of productivity versus coverage. He displayed a schematic that showed the BRT corridors, other major transit corridors, and neighborhood collectors. Mr. Walker had said that there were other types of protection than exclusive lanes, such as queue jumpers and signal priority. Ms. Hocken said that this policy was needed for other parts of the transit system.

The Board indicated agreement with the staff recommendation on TSI Transit Policy #3.

TSI Transit Policy #4: Park-and-Ride Facilities: Transit Policy #4 called for expanding the park-and-ride system within the metropolitan area and nearby communities. Mr. Viggiano said that very little comment had been received on this policy, and staff were recommending no change to the policy. The Friends of Eugene had expressed a concern that large park-and-ride lots would have an impact neighborhoods, landscape, and social patterns. Mr. Viggiano said that LTD's approach had been to build a greater number of smaller park-and-ride areas rather than a few large ones, which made the system more convenient, since bus riders would be more likely to have one that served them better. Staff believed that direction would address the concerns of the Friends of Eugene.

Mr. Bennett asked what the typical Park-and-Ride lot size was. Mr. Viggiano said there was a Park-and-Ride plan that addressed lot sizes and LTD's philosophy of Park-and-Rides. The Land Use Code, currently being updated by the City of Eugene, also addressed Park-and-Rides. The draft Land Use Code plan stated that Park-and-Rides were not allowed in residential areas unless they fronted on a major corridor and were accessed from the corridor.

The Board indicated agreement with the staff recommendation on TSI Transit Policy #4.

Suggested New Planning and Program Actions: Mr. Viggiano said that the Planning and Program Actions were suggested ways in which the policies were implemented. These Actions would not be formally adopted. Staff provided a list of Actions that could be added to the Plan, including exploring free or reduced transit fares; protecting bus speeds along major arterials; providing transit priority as part of all new river crossings; creating a stronger and earlier LTD role in development review; requiring that certain new development be located in nodes along major transit corridors; revising parking codes to support alternative mode use; requiring alternative modes strategies for school and other youth activities; requiring that all major community events provide for transit service and other alternative transportation modes; considering allocation of a percentage of state motor vehicle revenues for transit projects; requiring local agencies' legislative agendas to include, encourage, facilitate, and fund alternative modes; and committing to alternatively-fueled buses.

Mr. Bennett said that LTD already had explored free or reduced transit fares, and a decision had been made. The discussion also included why it was not in LTD's best interest to address reduced or free fares on a wholesale basis. Mr. Bennett was concerned about LTD continuing to

fairly aggressively explore free or reduced fares system-wide or in a broader sense than what already was done. Mr. Viggiano explained the reasons for recommending the action statement. Since the Board previously had taken action on reducing youth fares, staff could track the fare change carefully to see what impact it had on ridership and if found to be very successful, the Board might want to consider other fare changes. Another reason was that other fare subsidies might be explored. This action suggested that LTD would continue to explore free or reduced fares, but would not commit LTD to providing free or reduced fares.

Mr. Bennett suggested that the action item be changed to read "continue to explore free or reduced transit fares." Other Board members agreed with the suggestion. Ms. Wylie said that LTD responded very quickly to the public testimony for exploring free or reduced fares. Mr. Gaydos suggested "Continue to explore transit fare alternatives that encouraged ridership."

Mr. Gaydos asked if there were other places besides major arterials that bus speeds ought to be protected. He was concerned about limiting that action item to the major arterials. He also thought that providing transit priority as part of all new river crossings was a limiting statement. He thought that in addition to new river crossings, a reference should be made to all congested areas.

Ms. Wylie suggested that the Board sign a letter to the federal General Services Administration (GSA) suggesting that the siting of the new courthouse be along a BRT or other major transit corridor. She had noticed that some of the sites being considered were well away from existing transit. Mr. Bennett said that wherever the courthouse was located could be part of a commercial neighborhood as opposed to locating it right along an arterial and could be served by a shuttle, such as a neighborhood connector. Ms. Wylie said that her goal would be to inform the GSA about LTD's current planning and to suggest that they consider it in their decision making. Mr. Viggiano thought that the Board should suggest that the courthouse be located in downtown Eugene or downtown Springfield. Upon the Board's agreement, Ms. Wylie would pursue drafting a letter.

Mr. Gaydos asked if there was a way to soften the statement about committing to alternatively-fueled buses. He also commented that he did not know what the future held, and the use of the term "alternatively-fueled" might be too restrictive. Mr. Pangborn said that staff had changed the term in the Strategic Plan to "alternatively powered" buses.

Mr. Kleger said he was concerned about the allocation of a percentage of the state motor vehicle revenues for transit projects. He thought LTD also should include a statement about its willingness to lobby for change in constitutional restrictions. He thought that the constitutional restriction stated that any taxes that were allocated for motor vehicles had to be spent on streets, roads, highways, and highway rest areas. Mr. Pangborn said that Tri-Met already was working on this allocation. Mr. Viggiano said staff could work on wording a suggested program action that addressed Mr. Kleger's concern.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff would revise the proposed Planning and Program Actions according to the Board discussion and present the revised list at the Board's next TransPlan work session.

Break: The Board took a brief recess at 7 p.m. and reconvened at 7:10 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h) and ORS 192.660(1)(d):

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to discuss current litigation or litigation likely to be filed, and pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which then carried by unanimous vote, 6:0, with Bennett, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed. The Board entered executive session at 7:11 p.m. Board Counsel Roger Saydack was present for the discussion on litigation. LTD's Human Resources Manager Dave Dickman and Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson were present for the discussion on labor negotiations.

VOTE

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION: Following a motion by Ms. Hocken, the Board unanimously returned to open session at 8:23 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion, and Board President Hillary Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:23 p.m.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

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 April 19, 2000:

1. Approval of minutes: March 13, 2000, Board work session
2. Approval of minutes: March 15, 2000, regular Board meeting
3. Approval of Project Ranking for CT/OTN Fund

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Minutes of the March 13, 2000, Board work session
2. Minutes of the March 15, 2000, regular Board meeting
3. Staff Summary: Project Ranking for CT/OTN Fund

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 19, 2000, is approved as presented.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: CLEAN AIR CAMPAIGN 2000

PREPARED BY: Connie Williams, Commuter Solutions Coordinator

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Last year, Commuter Solutions joined forces with Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) and launched the region's first clean air education campaign that is modeled after a national program conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Funding was approved to continue this program another year.

Attached is a description of the Clean Air Campaign for the Board's review. A new addition to this year's campaign is the offer for a free LTD system should an Air Action Day be issued by LRAPA.

ATTACHMENT: Lane Transit District's Clean Air Campaign 2000 document

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: COMMUTER SOLUTIONS UPDATE AND PRESENTATION

PREPARED BY: Connie Williams, Commuter Resources Coordinator

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Commuter Solutions staff will show the Board a PowerPoint presentation program that has been created for employers. This presentation is planned to be shown to the Transportation Planning Committee members, planning commission members, elected officials, transportation and planning staff from local jurisdictions, and key organizations and civic groups. An accompanying booklet will be distributed to individuals inquiring about employee transportation programs.

Activities and accomplishments for the Commuter Solutions Program during the past eight weeks include:

- Signing Costco Wholesale and Sales Logix to the LTD Group Pass Program. Costco Wholesale has 200 employees; Sales Logix, on Country Club Road, has 52 employees.
- Held second quarterly Employee Transportation Coordinator luncheon for Group Pass Program participants.
- Delivered group pass contract documents to Mobility International USA and Center for Appropriate Transport.
- Attended City Council and Board of Commissioners meetings on TransPlan TDM discussions.
- Staffed employee benefits fair table for Oregon Medical Labs.
- Met with a representative of Monaco Coach regarding employee transportation programs.
- Met with School District 4J Board Member Chris Pryor regarding transportation programs and education issues.
- Met with representatives of LCOG, City of Coburg, Department of Land Conservation and Development, and ODOT regarding congestion and mobility issues in Coburg industrial area.
- Consulted with Bernadette Barrett, Transit Manager, City of Corvallis, on TDM strategies.
- Met with Eugene/Springfield Metropolitan Partnership Executive Director Lee Beyer regarding Coburg Industrial Park issues.

- Met with Eugene Mayor Torrey regarding TDM strategies.
- Defined strategies for summer 2000 Clean Air Campaign.
- Met with managers and staff of CardioVascular Associates and Sacred Heart Medical Center regarding parking and transportation issues.
- Met with a representative from Orthopedic & Fracture Clinic NW regarding transportation and parking issues.

ATTACHMENT: “Smarter Way To Go” booklet will be distributed at the Board meeting.

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** April 19, 2000
- ITEM TITLE:** COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Service Planning and Marketing Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Board direction on route analysis, resource allocation, and public outreach process.
- BACKGROUND:** At the March 2000 Board meeting, Service Planning & Marketing staff presented the first draft of what the route structure would look like using the productivity and coverage standards developed by the Board. Following the discussion, the Board directed staff to bring back information on the following:
1. How would the reduction in neighborhood service impact riders who are elderly or disabled? Specifically, would these riders be eligible for RideSource services? Would the RideSource boundary be changed in a way that existing RideSource riders would lose service? Would an increase in RideSource rides have a significant effect on the number of rides provided by RideSource?
 2. Flex routes were proposed by Jarrett Walker as an alternative in low-ridership neighborhoods. Are they feasible for use in our system?
 3. The Board agreed on a 5 percent discretionary reserve in service hours. How can the proposal be modified to establish this reserve?
 4. If the productivity route structure is the starting point, what criteria will staff use to introduce service back into neighborhoods, and what does the system look like when you apply this criteria?
 5. Using the route segment data as a basis for laying out the productivity routes may miss opportunities for developing new high-productivity routes. Did the staff use the future density information to determine if there are routes that may make sense as the community develops to the proposed levels?
 6. How will the public outreach process work?
- Staff will present answers to these questions and will seek additional direction from Board.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff will continue to refine the draft designs and begin the public involvement process.

ATTACHMENT:

None

PROPOSED MOTION:

None. The Board is asked to provide feedback and direction for further refinement of the draft CSR routing proposal.



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

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

**CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM:
APPROVAL OF PROJECT RANKING FOR CT/OTN FUNDS**

Prepared by Patricia Hansen, Lane Transit District, and
Terry Parker, Lane Council of Governments
April 19, 2000

Background: As part of the Governor's Livability Initiative, an additional \$19 million in Oregon Transportation Network (OTN) funds were made available to improve local transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities. This funding is for the biennium 1999-2001, and the majority of the OTN funds (51 percent) are targeted to increase transportation services to unserved seniors and disabled persons.

Discretionary OTN funds are distributed through the existing Community Transportation (CT) Grant Program which accommodates the rule structure from both the State Transportation Fund (STF) discretionary account and the Federal Transit Administration. The funds are divided into "targets" defined by region population. STF formula increases from OTN funds will be managed by the local governing bodies, which for Lane County is the Lane Transit District Board. The identification and ranking of projects to be funded by the CT/OTN grant program are subject to public review and approval by the local Special Transportation Advisory Committee (STFAC) and the Lane Transit District Board of Directors.

The STFAC approved a draft CT/OTN funding project list at its meeting on December 7, 1999. This project list was then presented at a public review forum held at the Hilyard Community Center on December 13, 1999. Taking into account input received at this public meeting, the STFAC approved an amended, final version of the project list at its meeting on January 11, 2000.

Guidelines for the grant applications state that the project requests should be ranked according to one of three categories using these priorities:

- 1) Projects that have a direct effect on the target user, that directly maintain or increase service availability, and have a defined coordination element. (Examples would be vehicle purchases and operation costs directly associated with service delivery.)
- 2) Non-vehicle or non-operations projects that have a direct relationship to service and/or service improvements but are indirect to the user. (Examples include planning, coordination, and marketing projects.)
- 3) Projects without a direct link to the user. (Examples include facilities and real estate acquisition.)

The deadline for submission of the grant applications for the discretionary CT/OTN funds to ODOT was March 31, 2000. Staff research and discussions with regard to the opportunity of co-locating a new RideSource facility with the new State Motor Pool facility in Glenwood delayed submittal of the project applications until the deadline date. Because there was not adequate time to have the LTD Board approve the ranking of the projects prior to the March 31 deadline, the application was submitted with a notation that the LTD Board would be voting on the recommended ranking at its April 19 meeting. ODOT staff confirmed that this would be acceptable, as many other agencies also had not had adequate time to have their project rankings approved by their local governing bodies.

The projects included in the application submitted to ODOT and their respective rankings are as follows:

1. Grant request of \$285,835 for 6 new vehicles.
The total project cost is \$318,550. Local match from STF formula funding is \$32,715 (10.27 percent), as required. ¹
2. Grant request of \$897,300 to partially fund special needs transportation facility.
The total project cost is estimated at \$2,575,140. STF Formula Funds of \$102,700 (10.27 percent) will be used to match the grant request, resulting in a \$1 million award. Approximately \$375,00 is needed for land acquisition and an additional \$1,200,140 to complete the project. ²
3. Grant request of \$67,320 for a coordination planning project.
The total project cost is \$75,025. Local match from STF formula funding is \$7,705 (10.27percent) as required. The goal of this project is to create a countywide coordination network that includes a variety of agencies that use transportation services for their respective clientele. Objectives include consolidating and integrating program resources, as needed, to reducing costs and duplication, streamlining planning activities, record keeping and monitoring, taking an inventory of existing rolling stock in order to maximize availability of vehicles and other equipment that might be shared across programs and encourage the development of sustainable transit services through inter-governmental agreements and cost sharing.

Attachment: Included in the Board packet is a copy of the governing body certification form required by ODOT, which was submitted along with the project applications, pending LTD Board approval.

Recommendation: That the LTD Board approve the project ranking for the CT/OTN funds for the 1999-2001 biennium as recommended by the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2000\04\Regular Mtg\ctotn.doc

¹ The vehicle requests fit ODOT's categorization guidelines under #1.

² The facility project fits ODOT's categorization guidelines under #3 but is deemed locally as a higher-priority project.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: MAY 2000 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: **MAY 2000 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Bus Operator Carl Faddis has been selected as the May 2000 Employee of the Month. He was hired on August 31, 1998, and has earned an award for one year of safe driving and one year correct schedule operation (CSO). He was active in the fall 1999 United Way campaign and received many positive comments for his innovative ideas and boundless enthusiasm.

Carl was nominated for this award by a large number of customers, including one five-year-old who said, "My favorite bus driver is Carl. He was so nice to me when I got on the bus with my peanut butter sandwich. He told me what a good boy I was when I got off the bus. He makes me laugh. And he even asked my mom if I could have a piece of candy." One customer nominated Carl because of his excellence in providing accessible bus service to customers with disabilities, and told how Carl provided special help for him when he missed the bus. Other riders made the following comments:

- ❑ When I came across the most pleasant ride I've experienced yet, I realized I must commend the fabulous driver for his positive attitude, his pleasantness, and his exceptionally great sense of humor.
- ❑ This driver had a beautiful attitude for a rainy day—Just wanted to let him know how much I appreciated him.
- ❑ As soon as my friends and I got on the bus he was extremely friendly and was completely personable with each one of us. He used humor and jokes the entire way to make sure feet were on the floor, conversations appropriate, etc. He spoke over the intercom like we were good friends and to top it off gave out candy canes to the young children and what he called "door prizes" (big candy canes) to us. He made my bus ride safe as well as extremely fun.
- ❑ I think it is very important that you identify this person because up to this day I have never had a bus ride quite like the one I had today. Never, never, never until today have I been greeted at the door with "Come on aboard." "Welcome, come on in" and other such greetings were heard. Not only that, but they were said with a beaming smile and a cheerful voice. To

make things even more impressive, this fella didn't stop at you boarding the bus. He continued to sparkle and shine the entire ride.

When asked what makes Carl a good employee, Field Supervisor Gary Taylor said that Carl receives more compliments and nominations for Employee of the Month than any other operators Gary is aware of. Gary thought that the best way to relate how well Carl does as an operator is to share some of the comments Gary had received about Carl from some of his customers:

- ❑ Never would one expect to take a brief bus ride and step off the bus feeling empowered. Carl gave me hope in humanity. He showed us that no matter what service we may be supplying, WE CAN BE A FORCE OF POSITIVE CHANGE.
- ❑ This looks like a job for "BUS MAN."
- ❑ Very good personality and attitude; he is super neat.
- ❑ I would like to send my compliments on the customer service attitude exhibited by Carl. He makes proactive contact with the majority of the riders he deals with and is especially good with young children.
- ❑ To say that this driver made my ride home pleasant and enjoyable would be an understatement. Two hours after arriving home his pleasant disposition and cheery "Elmo loves you" as I stepped off the bus still brings a smile to my face. Thank you for employing this wonderful driver.
- ❑ If you have in-house customer service training for your drivers, a presentation by Carl would probably be an asset to the program.

Gary added that Carl is a wonderful person to work with and that it is always a pleasure to interact with him. He has a great attitude and always shows that he likes and enjoys his job.

AWARD:

Carl will attend the April 19 meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: WORK SESSION: EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO
ORS 192.660(1)(d); and ORS 192.660(1)(h); AND ORS 40.225

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations; pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to discuss current litigation or litigation likely to be filed; and pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege, to hear an opinion of counsel.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations; pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to discuss current litigation or litigation likely to be filed; and pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege, to hear an opinion of counsel.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

April 19, 2000

Revenue:

- **Special service revenue** is slightly lower than for the first nine 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 that were missing from the first quarter of the current year and the fourth quarter of last year were received on November 30. This \$278,548 special payment is a one-time correction. Total accrued receipts are more than \$112,000 ahead of plan due to the adjustment, and due to an anticipated healthy third-quarter disbursement. However, the disbursement itself, estimated at \$271,000, has been delayed by processing problems in the Department of Administrative Services.
- **Payroll tax receipts** were incorrectly anticipated by the monthly budget. If year-to-date disbursements are correct, this resource should exceed projections for the fiscal year by \$800,000 or more.

Expense:

- **Administration personnel** expenses for some staff have been restated to separate expenses charged to federally grant-funded projects. Gross expenses have increased due to the following:
 - 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. A notable exception is diesel fuel expense, which will exceed budget for the year, but may be offset by savings in other areas.
- **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 also are overstated in the current-year budget, which will contribute to a yearlong positive variance.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

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, 2000 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property, will be brought to the Board for the first reading on May 17, 2000, and for the second reading and adoption at the June 21, 2000, regular Board meeting.
- B. **STIP Projects Request:** At the May 17, 2000, meeting, the Board will be asked to approve a request for funding in the 2002-2005 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- 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 May 17, 2000, Board meeting.
- D. **Springfield Station Site Selection:** The Board will be asked to make a final decision on the site for the new Springfield Station, possibly at the May 17, 2000, Board meeting.
- E. **Budget Committee Meetings:** An informational meeting for the seven non-Board members of the LTD Budget Committee was held on April 11, 2000. Meetings of the full Budget Committee are scheduled for Wednesday, April 26; Thursday, April 27; and Wednesday, May 3, 2000.
- F. **Budget Adoption:** Following approval of the proposed budget by the LTD Budget Committee in April or May, the Fiscal Year 2000-2001 budget will be on the agenda for adoption by the Board at the June 21, 2000, regular meeting.

- G. **Resolution Reaffirming District Boundaries**: State law requires that the District annually determine the territory in the District within which the transit system will operate. This resolution will be scheduled for the June 21, 2000, Board meeting.
- H. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval**: It is anticipated that approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur in December 2000.
- I. **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.
- J. **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: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: AMENDED GENERAL FUND RESERVE POLICY

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve an amended General Fund Reserve Policy, as recommended by the Finance Committee.

BACKGROUND: In January 1994, the Board of Directors adopted a policy that created and maintained General Fund reserves that, with Board approval by resolution, could be drawn upon in the event of an unforeseen financial need. In recent years, reserve funds have been approved to pay for such additional expenses as security staff for the Eugene Station and the addition of Cottage Grove bus service following a successful local ballot campaign.

When the original policy was conceived, it was estimated that prudent reserve levels would fall in the range of 25 to 40 percent of total operating expense. In accordance with the policy, reserves have been maintained in this range since the FY 1995-96 year-end. (It took more than two years to build the reserve amount to the specified level.) In recent months, with the local economy healthy and stable and with the future need for a maximum local set-aside for capital expenditure identified, the Finance Committee reviewed the policy. Staff were directed to draft a revision to the policy that provided for the following:

- Establishes a new formula for General Fund reserve balances that fixes reserves at levels no higher than might be required under prudent assumptions of likely economic and financial scenarios;
- Divides the reserve balance between insurance/risk, contingency, and working capital; and
- Directs that excess unappropriated General Fund cash be transferred to the Capital Fund reserve for use in financing the bus rapid transit (BRT) project and other future capital needs.

The proposed revised General Fund Reserve Policy is attached to this summary report.

**CONSEQUENCES OF
REQUESTED ACTION:**

The FY 2000-01 proposed budget presented to the Budget Committee will reflect the policy change.

ATTACHMENT:

Revised Budgetary Reserve Policy and Financial Policy for Unreserved Fund Balances

PROPOSED MOTIONS:

I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the revised Budgetary Reserve Policy and Financial Policy for Unreserved Fund Balances is approved as presented.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
BUDGETARY RESERVE POLICY AND
FINANCIAL POLICY FOR UNRESERVED FUND BALANCES**

OBJECTIVE

Unreserved fund balances consist of working capital that the Board of Directors may choose to appropriate for expenditures or reserves during the annual budget process. This policy addresses the goals of the Board of Directors regarding the level of unreserved fund balance for the General Fund.

BACKGROUND

The LTD Board of Directors has always believed in and supported prudent financial management practices. A formal reserve policy has been in effect since January 1994. The policy is reviewed periodically to make sure that it reflects current needs based on the strength of the local economy, the outlook for federal funds availability, and the need to cover price volatility for major materials and supplies.

POLICY

It is the policy of the LTD Board of Directors that the total of all General Fund unreserved balances for operations and for self-insurance risk reserves shall be maintained as a percent of total annual operating expense, less the amount reserved for transfer to the Capital Fund. The reserve amount will be determined during the annual budget development process, but shall never be less than 7 percent of the base expense total and shall not exceed 13 percent of this total. When funds available for reserve exceed 13 percent, the excess shall be added to the appropriation for General Fund transfer to the Capital Fund. The Budget Committee will review the reserve recommendation and affirm a reserve in accordance with the range provided in this policy as part of the budget approval process.

The established annual reserve shall be allocated as follows:

Self-insurance/risk:	\$1,000,000
General Fund contingency:	\$1,000,000
Working capital:	Remaining balance

Regardless of the base on which the reserve is calculated annually, the total General Fund reserve shall never be less than \$2,500,000.

CRITERIA FOR EXPENDITURE OF BUDGETARY RESERVES

General Fund reserve allocations can be spent only in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors. Examples of possible uses of contingency reserve funds include, but are not limited to:

- Major bus or vehicle accident
- An unusually high number of liability claims
- An unusually high number of unemployment claims
- Accidental loss of a utility vehicle
- Fuel price volatility
- Economic downturn resulting in lower payroll tax receipts
- Loss of funding source

MAINTENANCE

The Finance Committee of the Board of Directors is responsible for the maintenance of this policy, with staff assistance from the Finance Manager.

Administrative Policies & Procedures II-M-2 (Revised) Adopted by the Board of Directors _____, 2000

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** April 19, 2000
- ITEM TITLE:** SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF NINTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35, SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES
- PREPARED BY:** Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Hold the second reading of Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35, which sets fares for Fiscal Year 2000-2001, and adopt amended ordinance
- BACKGROUND:** Following a preliminary public hearing at the February 16, 2000, Board meeting, staff were directed to make the following changes to District fare structure. A second public hearing on these proposed fare changes was held at the March 15, 2000, Board meeting. All changes were approved by the Board prior to the first reading of the amended fare ordinance. The changes to the fare structure are:
1. Increase token prices from 75 percent to 85 percent of cash fare
 2. Increase the price charged for group pass programs by 3.2 percent
 3. Increase the price of the RideSource and RideSource Escort fares from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per one-way trip
 4. Increase the price of the RideSource Shopper fare from \$1.75 to \$2.00 per round trip
 5. Decrease all fares charged to youth aged 12 through 18 years to the same fares charged to children under 12; make the youth fare reduction effective June 1, 2000
 6. Replace the current Day Pass with a new instrument sold only on buses and priced at twice applicable cash fare; eliminate the transfer instrument
 7. Change the outlet discount policy to a flat 10 percent, regardless of quantities purchased
- The fare changes must be implemented by ordinance. The first such ordinance, Ordinance No. 35, was adopted in June 1992. This will be the ninth amendment to Ordinance No. 35. The first reading of Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35 was held on March 15, 2000. The second reading and adoption of the ordinance are scheduled for the April 19 Board meeting.

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

**CONSEQUENCES OF
REQUESTED ACTION:**

The Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35 will be adopted following its second reading, and will become effective thirty days later. Following adoption, a copy of Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35 will be filed with the County Clerk and made available for public inspection.

ATTACHMENT:

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

PROPOSED MOTIONS:

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

(Following an affirmative vote, the ordinance title should be read:
Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services.)
2. I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Board of Directors adopts Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services, effective 30 days after adoption.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 36, GOVERNING CONDUCT ON DISTRICT PROPERTY

PREPARED BY: Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

ACTION REQUESTED:

1. Hold a public hearing on proposed ordinance 36 revision.
2. Discuss options and provide direction to staff

BACKGROUND: Under Oregon state law, LTD can pass, by ordinance, legally-binding restrictions that govern behavior on buses and at bus stations, bus stops, and shelters. Ordinance 36 is the ordinance that governs behavior on the LTD system. This ordinance includes restrictions on activities that can take place at the Eugene Station. Several months ago LTD was approached by the American Civil Liberties Union, (ACLU). The ACLU was representing an individual who was asked by LTD to refrain from collecting signatures at the Eugene Station because it is in violation of Ordinance 36. The ACLU's position is that gathering signatures is a free speech activity protected by the Oregon Constitution and therefore is allowable in public places and should be allowed at the Eugene Station.

LTD's position is that there are legitimate safety and operational concerns related to allowing signature gathering and other types of solicitation at the Eugene Station. The Eugene Station was not designed to be a public forum. It was designed to be a transportation facility where passengers can easily and safely navigate the corridors that facilitate movement from one area of the station to the next without delay. Space was and is very limited at the station. In order to design a facility that would accommodate 20 bus bays, waiting and circulation space was reduced to a minimum. There was some space at the station that could not be used for passenger boarding and was set aside for public space. LTD is willing to designate these areas of the station as safe for signature gathering. It is LTD's position that to open the entire station to signature gathering activities would create a safety hazard.

The ACLU has indicated that if LTD does not change Ordinance 36, the ACLU may file suit against LTD to allow signature gathering on the platform. Following are three options that have been proposed by the

ACLU or LTD staff to address this issue and the pros and cons of each option. The District's legal counsel believes that all three of these alternatives are permissible under both the state and federal constitutions, though there does not appear to be any legal precedent directly on point.

1. Open the entire station to signature gathering, either during specified times that are reasonable or based on activity levels. LTD personnel would monitor activity levels and ask the signature gatherers to refrain from gathering signatures if it created a safety problem.

Pro

This would avoid any legal challenges asserted by signature gatherers.

Con

This creates unworkable enforcement issues for LTD staff. It would be up to staff to allow activities to happen and then quickly respond when those activities appeared to create an unsafe situation, before an accident occurred. The liability would rest with LTD because we allowed the activity to take place and did not react soon enough to avoid the accident. Additionally, activity levels at the station change quickly and some are impossible to predict, so choosing specific blocks of time for these activities is difficult. Consequently, safety hazards would occur.

Suggestions that were discussed to alleviate some of LTD's concerns around this approach included offering a sign-up sheet for people who wanted to engage in free speech activities. LTD could allow a limited number of people during specific times and have some control.

An additional problem with this recommendation is that it would open the entire Eugene Station as a public forum. Once a public forum is created it is difficult, if not impossible, to legally take that away. This would allow other activities such as solicitation, speech giving, street musicians, etc., to take place at any location within the station. Even if people signed up, LTD would have to allow not only signature gatherers, but other activities as well.

This recommendation is not favored by LTD staff because of the monitoring and enforcement problems that would be encountered. Staff also believe that opening the station as a public forum would create a safety hazard for customers and staff.

2. Allow for signature gathering at specific areas of the station that LTD has determined to be safe areas for this activity. There are open spaces within the station that are out of the way of the main

flow of customers and are away from the boarding platform. These areas could be designated as public forums, and free speech activity could be allowed in these areas without impeding the flow of passengers and creating a safety hazard.

Pro

This is staff's recommended solution. It would provide more access than Ordinance 36 currently allows and protect the safety of our customers. Enforcement would be clearer and more convenient because the space to collect signatures is easily delineated. (See shaded areas on the attached map.) Signature gatherers would operate in an area that is out of the main flow of foot traffic and therefore would not pose a safety hazard to customers.

Con

Adoption of this alternative may result in a legal challenge asserting that the revised ordinance unreasonably restrains speech and petition signature gathering activities. As indicated above, while the District's legal counsel believes such a challenge would not be successful, there is no legal precedent directly on point.

3. Adopt a customers-only policy. This policy would state that only customers are allowed at the Eugene Station, rather than prohibit specific activities at the station. If people were at the station to catch a bus or transfer, then they would have the right to be there. While they were waiting for their bus, they could participate in free speech activities, such as signature gathering. Anyone collecting signatures or engaging in any other form of constitutionally-protected activity would be required to catch the next bus out of the station or LTD would assume that he or she was not a passenger.

Pro

This would limit the time that someone would be on the platform collecting signatures, soliciting, etc., so that they would not be there the entire day blocking the platform and creating a safety hazard.

Con

It is difficult to predict how many people would attempt to use the platform for non-passenger type activities under this option, but we must assume that additional persons would be on the platform, potentially creating a safety hazard. A greater problem likely would exist with enforcement. Fair enforcement of this kind of policy is difficult. A number of questions would have to be resolved, such as: ♦When would free speech activities be deemed a person's primary purpose for being at the station, rather than to catch the bus? ♦After each pulse of buses left, would LTD staff patrol the platform to ensure that everyone on the platform prior to the buses

leaving had left? ♦Would signature gathers ride the bus for a block and then come back to the platform to start anew?

Other transit districts use this method for controlling activity at their stations and have mixed results. This approach would limit people from wandering into the station for the sole purpose of participating in non-bus-riding activities, which would help LTD control the activity to some extent.

This is not a preferred option by LTD or the ACLU, but does have some merit, and in staff's opinion is better than opening the entire station at will. The ACLU views this approach as too restrictive.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Following direction from the Board, staff will continue to work with District Counsel to prepare an amendment to LTD Ordinance 36. It is hoped that the ordinance can be read for a first reading at the May 17 Board meeting and the second reading and adoption at the June 21 meeting.

ATTACHMENT:

Eugene Station Map

PROPOSED MOTION:

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: April 19, 2000

ITEM TITLE: WORK SESSION: DEVELOPMENT OF NEW RIDE*SOURCE* OPERATIONS/ MAINTENANCE FACILITY

PREPARED BY: Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion and direction to staff regarding development concept

BACKGROUND: Ride*Source* is LTD's demand-response transportation service for citizens who are unable to use LTD's fixed-route system because of a disability. LTD does not provide Ride*Source* service. Rather, the District contracts with the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) to manage demand-response services within the metro area. LCOG also is responsible for the coordination of demand-response services in the balance of Lane County outside the metro area. LCOG contracts with Special Mobility Services (SMS), a private, non-profit company, for the actual delivery of the service. The most significant relationship among all of the participants is that LTD is legally mandated and financially responsible by requirement of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide this type of service.

More than five years ago, LCOG initiated a planning process to identify and develop a new maintenance and administrative facility. SMS currently operates out of a leased facility that is much too small for the size of the program. The Ride*Source* program always has operated on a very small overhead margin in order to minimize expense. The current situation is that the owner of the facility wishes to sell it, which will force SMS out. The need for an alternative operating facility suddenly has become urgent.

This fiscal year LCOG, working in conjunction with LTD, programmed \$40,000 in State grant funds to develop a plan for an alternative facility. As the plan development progressed, a unique opportunity arose that staff believe could address the need for a new facility. In order to take advantage of this opportunity, LTD must respond fairly rapidly.

The Oregon State Motor Pool has acquired undeveloped property on Franklin Boulevard just west of Brooks Auto Parts to build a new motor pool facility. The State is building the facility so that it can service more than just State vehicles and is interested in contracting for the servicing of the SMS vehicles, as well as providing a compressed natural gas fueling station and

a bus wash facility. The size of this project has just been reduced because the Oregon Department of Motor Vehicles, which had intended to build a new facility on the site immediately west of the Motor Pool property, has withdrawn from the project, leaving a parcel of land available for another use. Staff believe that the opportunity to build a RideSource facility that would not require the expensive infrastructure that comes with a vehicle maintenance and fueling facility should be examined thoroughly. The Motor Pool facility will have ample capacity to serve SMS needs.

There are two other opportunities with this property that make it especially attractive. This particular site is one that is being considered for a BRT station, as well as a Park & Ride facility. This property will be needed to design these facilities into this location.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None. The Board is asked to provide direction to staff regarding moving forward with formulating a plan and budget to address the needs of BRT, RideSource, and a Park & Ride at the subject site on Franklin Boulevard.



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

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

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT

April 19, 2000

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager

FEDERAL

Members of Congress have completed their appropriations requests for FY 01. In this process they are required to name projects and to submit them to the Appropriations Committee. Lane Transit District has been part of the effort to secure a statewide earmark for transit in addition to the District's other federal funding needs, including bus rapid transit (BRT) vehicles, BRT planning, and Springfield Station. This strategy – as predicted – turned out to be difficult to execute, but at the March 31 deadline, the Oregon House delegation had agreed to a letter identifying both the statewide request and the full amount of LTD's request, in addition to other transportation projects around the state. On the Senate side, we have been told that LTD is included in the joint letter from Senators Wyden and Smith.

House appropriations bills may be marked up by the Memorial Day recess, and Senate appropriations bills may be marked up by the July 4th recess. If this schedule is followed, conference committee work will occur during September, with a hoped-for adjournment of October 6. This schedule is not required and is subject to any number of pressures. The issue for Oregon is the degree to which its Congressional delegation can be successful. If the delegation can meet with success, transit is well positioned.

In addition to the work the delegation has done, the District submitted written testimony to the House Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee. The testimony is a modified version of the material in the local Eugene-Springfield "united front" federal priorities book. Tom Dawson, of Smith Dawson and Andrews, the District's Washington representatives, is expected to work with committee staff to advance the testimony.

The hot topic at the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Legislative Conference last month and still of interest is the proposed repeal of 4.3 cents of the federal gasoline tax. Sen. Trent Lott (R-Mississippi) has proposed repealing 4.3 cents of the gasoline tax immediately, and repealing the entire 18-cent tax if the price of gasoline reaches \$2 per gallon. He also proposes to keep the transportation trust funds whole,

thereby making the issue part of the debate on the overall budget resolution. Even if the proposal passes the Senate, which is not certain, it is unlikely to survive in the House.

STATE

The Oregon Transit Association met with Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Director Grace Crunican to discuss future state commitments to transit. She reviewed a white paper association members have developed and made suggestions. Tri-Met and LTD officials also met with the Governor's Transportation Policy Advisor, Greg Wolf, to discuss transit-related proposals the governor could consider in constructing his proposed 2001-03 biennial budget.

Measure 82 – enacting a five-cent gas tax and a diesel fuel tax, and repealing the heavy vehicle weight-mile tax – appears headed for defeat, despite no campaign against the measure. Polling data shows public sentiment against the tax, even while the state is facing serious financial difficulty in meeting road construction obligations. Planned preservation and maintenance projects are being delayed; no new construction or increased-capacity projects are being funded. Transportation funding advocates still hope that the next legislature will work on a simpler measure, but enacting a gas tax increase in the face of voter opposition seems unlikely.

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch has been appointed to the ODOT Public Transportation Advisory Committee, which held its first meeting March 27 in Salem. The purpose of the committee is “to provide a forum for public and special-needs transportation providers and stakeholders in the State of Oregon.” The Committee is advisory to the Oregon Transportation Commission. It is expected that the committee will meet once a month, recommend legislative proposals for the Commission's consideration, review public transportation benchmarks, and recommend appropriate measures and milestones.

SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING

Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

SPECIAL EVENT SERVICES

Discussions regarding the Autzen Stadium expansion are continuing with City of Eugene and University of Oregon staff. While it is a complicated issue, the simple version involves a number of changes to the shuttle program in the short term. First, it appears that the likely site for a temporary boarding area will be the WISTEC parking area. While this site is farther from the stadium, it provides opportunities for customer queuing and bus circulation.

The long-term plan will include a new bus boarding area nearer the stadium and will have expanded bus parking and customer queuing areas to reach a modal split of 21 percent.

Oregon Country Fair (OCF) service will change this year in response to the loss of the Autzen Stadium staging facility. Discussions with OCF and School District 4J staff have resulted in a plan to use Civic Stadium and South Eugene High School parking areas to operate a Park & Ride facility. Additionally, buses will operate from the Eugene Station. It is hoped that many local fairgoers will take a bus downtown or park downtown and use the Eugene Station location. The logistics of operating from two locations will require a greater effort from the OCF staff and LTD, but we are confident that a quality level of service can be maintained. Other sites were considered for staging the Park & Ride, but no suitable location was identified.

BASKETBALL SHUTTLES

WOMEN'S YEARLY SUMMARY

Season (Number of Home Games)	Total Rides for Season	Avg Rides per Game	% Chg. from prev. year	Avg Attendance per Game	% Chg. from prev. year	Modal Split
98-99 (16 games)	12,056	754	136.9%	4,960	27.3%	7.6%
99-00 (16 games)	12,756	797	5.8%	5,512	11.1%	7.2%

MEN'S YEARLY SUMMARY

Season (Number of Home Games)	Total Rides for Season	Avg Rides per Game	% Chg. from prev. year	Avg Attendance per Game	% Chg. from prev. year	Modal Split
98-99 (17games)	16,714	983	21.3%	7,868	-2.2%	6.2%
99-00 (16 games)	14,898	931	-10.9%	7,607	-3.3%	6.1%

EARTH DAY

April 2000 marks the 30th anniversary of Earth Day. To recognize the role transit plays in reducing air pollution and traffic congestion, LTD will offer free service on Saturday, April 22. The District is encouraging local residents to leave their cars at home and take part in local Earth Day activities. These activities include displays and presentations at events occurring in Downtown Eugene, at the University of Oregon, and in Cottage Grove.

SCHEDULING SYSTEM INSTALLATION

Senior Service Planner Paul Zvonkovic and Service Planner Ken Augustson spent several days at the Giro offices in Montreal learning advanced scheduling techniques. Staff are on schedule to use the new system in parallel with the existing system when fall bid work is completed later this spring. A number of cost savings already have been identified in the limited use of the system to date, which gives staff confidence that projected cost savings will materialize as the system comes to full implementation.

YOUTH FARE PROGRAM

Plans are moving ahead quickly to introduce the reduced fare youth program. A marketing campaign is being developed to tell youth and their parents about the new opportunities to use the bus. In addition to an advertising program, the campaign will include partnerships with City of Eugene Recreation and Cultural Services, and staff are hoping for a renewed partnership with former Freedom Pass partner Burger King. Staff are developing an incentive program that will offer weekly and monthly prizes to pass buyers, as well as discount offers at recreation sites throughout Eugene-Springfield.

EUGENE STATION "TRANSIT GUIDE" PROGRAM

On March 14, 2000, Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) sent out a Request for Proposals for a new "Transit Guide" program to numerous local agencies. The Transit Guide program will provide individual travel training (e.g., transitioning individual riders from RideSource onto LTD), route transfer assistance at the Eugene Station, and staff support for LTD's Bus Buddy Program. The program will be funded for one year through new State Transportation Funds approved by the State Legislature. A proposer's conference was held on March 27, and representatives from Alternative Work Concepts and Goodwill Industries attended the meeting. Goodwill has since indicated that it will not be submitting a proposal at this time. Alternative Work Concepts is the current provider of training and provides the transfer oversight. AWC has submitted a proposal for this new program. The deadline for the submission of written proposals is April 10. The goal is to have the contract in place and the position(s) staffed by mid- to late May, 2000.

DAY PASS/TRANSFER DESIGN TEAM

An internal staff committee has begun work on the design and implementation of the new daylong transfer to be implemented in September 2000. The team will develop design issues, inventory, and an educational strategy.

FALL SERVICE MARKETING MATERIALS

LTD graphics staff have developed three potential designs for this year's Rider's Digest cover. The Board may view these at the meeting on the April 19. A decision not to print a new system map was made because there were few changes to the current map and the expense could be saved for this transitional CSR year. A foldout schematic map will be included in the Rider's Digest and will include all the updated route information. Another change will involve the distribution of the Commuter Pack. To save money, the Commuter Pack will not be mailed this fall. A recent study has shown recall and retention rates have fallen slightly; therefore, staff have decided that this would be a good year to test a new distribution method. Rider's Digests will be distributed through the LTD sales outlet system and through additional sites to be determined. An advertising campaign will continue to be used during the fall and will direct people to pick up the new Rider's Digest at a location near their home or work. Staff will evaluate mailing the Commuter Pack in its evaluation of the CSR marketing strategy for fall 2001.

YIELD LAW PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENT (PSA)

In an effort to continue the education of community residents regarding the Yield Law, LTD has developed a video public service announcement. This thirty-second commercial gives residents a good visual representation of when it is necessary to yield and when passing the bus is appropriate. The video was produced by LCOG staff at Metro Television who used footage developed for a training video produced previously. Tapes will be distributed to the local network affiliates and cable providers.

COTTAGE GROVE

LTD was officially welcomed by the Cottage Grove Chamber Greeters in a ceremony on March 13, 2000. LTD Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn was photographed cutting the ceremonial blue ribbon and was featured in the local paper the same week.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEWS

Staff participated in discussions with City of Springfield staff regarding the development of the new Wal-Mart on Olympic Street. Staff have developed a set of concerns and have asked for the siting of bus facilities to accommodate transit users. The biggest issue with this development is the proposed orientation of the building. The front door of the store is more than two blocks from Olympic Street, which makes transit use difficult. LTD has requested an evaluation involving a change in the building orientation that would place the doors closer to Olympic and the proposed transit stop.

WELCOME WAGON NEW RESIDENT PROGRAM

LTD has signed a one-year contract with Welcome Wagon to distribute LTD information to new residents. The package includes an LTD listing in an attractive address book and two coupons in a package of free coupons given to the new residents. Two hundred and sixty packets will be delivered monthly. Additionally, LTD will receive mailing labels, which will allow staff to send a letter to each new resident. The coupons allow four free rides and an opportunity to receive a free gift by stopping at the CSC. Distribution of these packets began this month.

TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

1999 STATISTICS SHOW IMPROVEMENT

LTD bus operators did a terrific job in 1999. Total accidents were reduced by 8.3 percent from 1998 and total customer complaints were reduced by 9 percent. This is an indication that LTD's bus operators are taking to heart the District's focus on safety and customer service. Transit Operations will continue to develop and implement programs to further reduce accidents and improve customer service, but the operators deserve the credit for making those programs work in the system. It is no surprise that overall LTD's operators are top-notch professionals and that they have a record we can all be proud of.

BID AND DISPATCH SOFTWARE

The Bid and Dispatch software for the Transit Operations department is on track. Staff met with the contractor and are confident that the specifications will be worked out to everyone's satisfaction. This is the second phase of the scheduling and run-cutting software being implemented by Service Planning and Marketing.

NTI CONFERENCE IN PORTLAND

Training Coordinator Vern Rogers and Instructor Frank Roberson attended the National Transit Institute Trainers Conference in Portland in late March. This is a national conference dedicated to transit-specific training. The conference highlights the presentation of new programs and the building of training skills. It was a rare opportunity for LTD to be able to send two trainers because of the close proximity of this year's conference. They reported that it was an excellent conference and that they look forward to building on what they have learned.

HUMAN RESOURCES

David Dickman, Human Resources Manager

There is no Human Resources report.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** May 17, 2000
- ITEM TITLE:** Proposed 2002-2005 STIP Requests for Commuter Solutions Program/Transportation Demand Management Projects
- PREPARED BY:** Connie Bloom Williams
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Endorse Proposed 2002-2005 STIP Requests for Commuter Solutions Program/Transportation Demand Management Projects.
- BACKGROUND:**
- The State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) is a document developed by the State that includes all transportation projects funded with state money or state-administered federal money. The STIP is a four-year plan that is updated every two years. Work has now started on the STIP update that is to include projects and programs slated for 2002-2005.
- As a part of this update, the State requests that local areas submit requested projects in order of priority. The Transportation Planning Committee will be prioritizing projects for presentation to the MPC in July.
- Staff has worked with representatives of the local jurisdictions to prepare the attached list of proposed projects.
- RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Proposed 2002-2005 STIP projects would proceed to TPC for review and discussion before presentation to MPC in July.
- ATTACHMENT:** Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Project Proposals for 2002-2005 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the LTD Board endorse the STIP priority list for TDM projects as presented.