

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 15, 2000

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

June 21, 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

Lauritsen _____ Wylie _____ Bennett _____ Gaydos _____

Hocken _____ Kleger _____ Kortge _____

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

III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

04

V. WORK SESSION--TRANSPLAN

05

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

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH--July 2000

41

VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A. Consent Calendar

42

1. Minutes of the May 15, 2000, Board Work Session

2. Minutes of the May 17, 2000, Regular Board Meeting

3.	Supplemental Facsimile Signature Policy Update	
4.	Resolution Reaffirming District Boundaries	
B.	Adoption of Fiscal Year 2000-2001 LTD Budget	75
1.	Staff Presentation	
2.	Opening of Public Hearing by Board President	
3.	Public Testimony on Proposed Fiscal Year 2000-2001 Budget	
	□ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes.	
4.	Closure of Public Hearing	
5.	Board Discussion and Decision	
C.	Executive Session Pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to discuss current litigation or litigation likely to be filed	94
D.	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Transit Priority List	95
E.	Election of Board Officers	97
IX.	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING	
A.	Current Activities	
1.	Board Member Reports	98
	a. Metropolitan Policy Committee	
	b. Statewide Livability Forum	
	c. BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input	
	d. Springfield Station Steering Committee	
2.	General Manager's Report	100
3.	Monthly Financial Report—May Financial Statements	101
4.	Eugene Downtown Shuttle Vehicles	111
5.	Customer Service Operating Hours	115
6.	Appeal of Springfield Wal-Mart Site Plan	117

7.	Triennial Review Update	119
8.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	122
9.	Springfield Station Update	123
10.	Clean Air Campaign 2000	124
11.	Summer Board Meeting Schedule	129
12.	APTA Transit Board Members Seminar	130
13.	2000 Pacific Program	131
14.	LTD Bus Roadeo	132
15.	LTD Employee Picnic	133
16.	Correspondence	134
B.	Monthly Staff Report	143
X.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	149
A.	Springfield Station Site Selection	
B.	Joint Meeting on TransPlan	
C.	Bus Purchase Approval	
D.	Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 1 Decision	
E.	Board Strategic Planning Work Session	
F.	Comprehensive Service Redesign Public Hearings	
G.	TransPlan Draft Plan Approval	
H.	BRT Updates	
I.	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: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: MAY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Financial results for the first eleven 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 more than 7 percent ahead of the comparable period last year, which exceeds the 6 percent increase assumed by the current budget. Passenger fare revenue is expected to exceed annual budget by fiscal year-end, a positive indicator.

As expected, payroll tax revenue will exceed current-year appropriations by more than \$900,000 by fiscal year-end. The data required to analyze the impact of Cottage Grove's addition to the District is not yet available from Oregon Department of Revenue. As soon as it becomes available, a report will be prepared. (Cottage Grove officials also have expressed an interest in this information.)

Self-employment tax revenue is as anticipated by the current-year plan. The eleven-month total decreased from last year, however, due to the administrative charges assessed proportionately to LTD and Tri-Met for the cost of a two-year Y2K conversion project that brought revenue processing into compliance with year 2000 requirements, and modernized payment processing.

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. This revenue source is expected to carry the positive budget variance through to year-end.

Total General Fund expenses (before transfers) are \$925,801 less than budgeted through May. Non-payroll expenses (including transfers) are 7.4 percent less than those of the previous year, primarily due to a nearly 60 percent decrease in transfers to the capital fund. Lower than budgeted grant-funded project activity has meant that only \$506,000 of the total \$2,900,000 has been required as capital match year-to-date. 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.

Diesel fuel prices remain at \$.83 per gallon, the same as reported last month, which indicates that prices have stabilized. This line item will show a negative variance at year-end, but will be offset by savings in other materials and services line items. No other adverse financial circumstances exist at this time.

Special Transportation Fund expenses are as anticipated through eleven 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. 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. However, the amount of difference between total revenue and expense has diminished, because another grant has since been delayed. (Staff changes at the FTA regional office in Seattle have created inefficiencies in contract processing.) As a result, approximately \$800,000 of project expenses will be charged in this fiscal year and reimbursed in FY 2000-01. Last year's carry forward will about offset this year's delayed funds, and push the disparity into FY 2000-01.

On-site work began on the FY 1999-2000 independent audit on June 20 and continued through June 21. The remainder of the on-site work will be completed in September. A preliminary FY 1999-2000 financial report will be distributed to the Board by the end of July, as required by ORS. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, including auditors' statements, will be distributed before the November Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attached are the following financial reports for Board review:

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

PROPOSED MOTION:

None

Q:\reference:\Board Packet\2000\06\Regular Mtg\00fin11.doc

**DRAFT MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

Monday, May 15, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 11, 2000, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a Special Board meeting/Work Session on Monday, May 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
Gerry Gaydos
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Dean Kortge, Secretary
Pat Hocken
Virginia Lauritsen
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: None

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: Ms. Wylie said that she and Mr. Hamm had discussed the calling of roll each time a vote was taken. It was decided that roll call will be taken at the beginning of the meeting, and votes would be taken by voice. If the vote were not unanimous, then a roll call would be taken.

WORK SESSION ON TRANSPLAN: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano introduced Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Transportation Program Manager Tom Schwetz and LCOG Senior Planner Paul Thompson, who were present to continue TransPlan issue area discussions with the Board.

Mr. Viggiano said reminded the Board that staff were reviewing with the jurisdictions the ten "Issue Areas" of TransPlan. Each of the jurisdictions were holding work sessions to review the Issue Areas in preparation for a joint work session. To date, the LTD Board had reviewed issue areas 1, 2, 3, and 5, which were general, Land Use/Nodal Development, Transportation Demand Management, and Transportation System Improvements: Transit.

Staff planned to review the remaining Issue Areas, which included Transportation System Improvements: Road System; Transportation System Improvements: Bicycle System; Transportation System Improvements: Pedestrian System; and Finance. Mr. Viggiano said that Issue Area 9, Plan Performance and Assumptions, would not be reviewed at this time as it was still being prepared for review. In addition, Issue Area 10, Air Quality, would not be reviewed as part of this series of work sessions because it had no suggested changes.

The joint meeting of the officials of all four TransPlan adopting agencies had been scheduled for the evening of July 12, 2000.

Mr. Viggiano then reviewed the TransPlan Adoption Process Work Session Tracking Summary that staff had prepared to summarize the positions taken by the four adopting agencies on the various issues. He said that the summary for Issue Area 2, Land Use/Nodal Development was incomplete. Lane County and the City of Springfield had discussed Issue Area 2, but their positions had not yet been entered into the matrix. The other summaries were up to date. The tracking system would allow the adopting officials to easily identify where there were differences of opinion. Eventually, if it were a difference of opinion that should be discussed in the joint work session, there would be comments in the far right column. Ideally differences would be resolved at the joint work session.

Staff were not suggesting that the jurisdictions vote on the various issues at this time. Instead, staff were seeking general consensus among the members. The Board also could defer its position to other jurisdictions on issues that did not impact transit.

Issue Area 4: Transportation System Improvements: System-wide and Road System. Mr. Schwetz reviewed Issue Area 4. He said that he would first review the general comments or testimony received on the policy statements and then we would review general project topics, some of which were controversial.

System-wide Policy #5 TransPlan Project List. Mr. Schwetz said that System-wide Policy #5 TransPlan Project List was added to make it clear that the project lists in TransPlan, along with the policies in TransPlan, were adopted by ordinance as part of Metro Plan. An adopted project list was a requirement of the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The comments and testimony received raised a concern that adoption of the project list into Metro Plan circumvented proper notice to affected property owners and consideration of the relative priority of projects. Staff were recommending three options: No change; modify the policy definition/intent statement, to include a reference to the project development phase and explain the TPR requirements for project development; and deletion of the policy. Mr. Schwetz said that The City of Springfield and Lane County preferred not to change the policy while the City of Eugene had preferred modifying the policy.

Ms. Wylie asked how the plan would be impacted if a project was approved in the plan but stopped at the public hearing process level. Mr. Schwetz said that the plan would be reviewed every three years, and at the three-year update, if the project were dropped, it would be evaluated.

Mr. Bennett thought that it was understood that there would be public process for each particular project, and he asked why the City of Eugene (Eugene) believed it needed to be called out in the policy. Mr. Schwetz said that Eugene most likely was erring on the side of providing more information than, strictly speaking, was needed. Mr. Bennett asked if there had been any comment from the City of Springfield (Springfield) and/or Lane County (the County) with respect to Eugene's position. Mr. Schwetz said that Eugene was the latest agency to discuss the issue, so Springfield and the County had not had an opportunity to comment. He added that this would be a potential issue for the joint work session.

Mr. Kleger asked if there had been a legal review regarding whether or not there would be a transgression of the requirement of notice to property owners. Mr. Schwetz said that there had not been. Staff believed it was not an issue. Mr. Kleger said that it was his impression that it applied when decisions to spend money and a commitment to acquire were being made. He suggested that staff have a legal review of the issue prior to the adoption of TransPlan.

Ms. Wylie thought that there would be a legal review of the entire plan at some point. Mr. Schwetz said that there was a legal review of the policies before they were submitted for public comment.

Ms. Wylie asked for member positions. Ms. Hocken said that this policy was not one that would generate much controversy, and she was comfortable with not changing the policy or with modifying the policy. Mr. Kleger said that if TransPlan were intended to serve as a guide for various governments and as public information, the modification option would be useful; however, if not for public information, he would favor no change to the policy. Mr. Viggiano said that it was not intended as a public information document, but people

would use it as public information for better understanding. Mr. Schwetz said that there were other mechanisms and avenues to provide the same information that actually could be more effective. Mr. Kleger said that in that case, he would favor no change. Other Board members agreed to the no-change option.

Roadway Policy #1: Mobility and Safety for all Modes. Mr. Schwetz said that the policy was very broad and was intended to give importance to all modes in designing roads. Staff had prepared no options, as it was believed that the proposed policy language addressed the issues that were raised during public testimony. Mr. Viggiano added that all three other jurisdictions agreed to no change. LTD Board members agreed. Mr. Viggiano also introduced Nick Arnis from Oregon Department of Transportation, who also was present and available to answer questions.

Roadway Policy #2: Motor Vehicle Level of Service. Service levels were ranked from A to F, with F being the worst. Public testimony received recommended reducing the level of service standard from level D to level E, based on the idea that level of service (LOS) is for peak-hour conditions and this distorted the problem and called for added capacity for a short time of the day. A proposal also was made for a LOS for all modes of travel.

Staff believed that reducing the LOS standard would allow roadways to function closer to their theoretical capacity and with more congestion. This had the potential to reduce the need for major projects that had been proposed in response to congestion. Two options were proposed. One was to make no change to the policy, and the other was to modify the policy to use LOS E in all areas of the community except state highway facilities.

Mr. Schwetz said that both the City of Springfield and Lane County had preferred the no change option, although Springfield had expressed some concern about what the level

should be, and the City of Eugene had preferred the modification option. He said that this issue would need to be discussed at the joint work session.

Mr. Kleger said that this issue was capable of controversy no matter what decision was made. If LOS E were accepted, air pollution would be increased. If a lower LOS were accepted, people would be more likely to seek out alternative modes of for travel. If there were a difference between the acceptable LOS between high density areas and low density areas, some kind of cost benefit incentive would be provided to developers who would not have to pay for quite as large a systems cost in the areas they develop at high density in, for instance, a newly developing node. If one standard LOS E were accepted, those incentives to go for higher density would be lost, which theoretically would enhance the use of alternative modes. There were trade-offs in either scenario, and Mr. Kleger said that it would be hard to determine which way it would happen in a given instance in a general policy statement.

Mr. Schwetz said that for many of the same reasons Mr. Kleger gave, the general feeling among staff was that LOS D might be an option for areas outside of the higher-density areas, and within those higher-density areas, such as proposed nodal developments and downtown Eugene, it would be recommended to accept a higher level of congestion for the benefits that would be realized from the mixed-use, higher density development.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Schwetz to review LOS E. Mr. Schwetz said that basically, LOS E meant that automobiles might have to waiting through two stop light cycles. Mr. Bennett said that in his discussions of LTD and its initiatives, the question had been raised about how LTD would affect the LOS. It often helped LTD to have some flexibility, in the sense that the projections were that the community would reach LOS E or worse

sometime in the near future. Most of the routes being proposed were in fairly high density areas along major arterials. He asked what position LTD could take on the Motor Vehicle Level of Service policy to further its initiatives.

Mr. Viggiano said that strictly from LTD's needs, it would be better to have a lower standard LOS in the policy because in the BRT engineering work, which calculated the projected LOS at an intersection over a 20-year period. To date, in those projections, the Level of Service had not been degraded below LOS D. So, if a lower standard was in the policy statement, that standard would not be violated, which possibly would result in some sort of mitigation that would have to occur.

Ms. Hocken said that the policy statement would not change anything on State highways, which included the Franklin Corridor. Mr. Schwetz said that was correct. The State set the standards for its facilities, which included Beltline Highway and the Franklin corridor. Mr. Viggiano said that there was a new provision in the Oregon Highway Plan that provided for a lower standard LOS on State facilities that were designated as special transportation areas.

Mr. Schwetz, in response to Mr. Bennett's desire for flexibility, said that the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) also had a provision that allowed for a redefining of LOS in areas of special concern, so in some respects, there already was some flexibility.

Ms. Hocken said that in addition to BRT, LTD also had regular bus service to consider, and a lower standard could impact the regular bus service. Mr. Viggiano thought that LTD could seek to get priorities at those lower level intersections that were not part of BRT.

Mr. Kleger said that any time the LOS dropped, it was likely to have more of an impact on LTD operations, which in turn caused more of an impact on other users of the roadway. Mr. Kleger was concerned about the increasing congestion on the LTD routes on major corridors that would be in existence until the transition to BRT was complete, which would take some time.

Mr. Bennett said that to the extent that traffic congestion increased over time, LTD's competitive position would be decreased. He asked if the decrease in LOS would impact LTD more than it would the automobile. Mr. Schwetz said that research suggested that with the increase in congestion, automobile users would do several things before changing modes, such as seeking out other routes. Because of this, transit suffered more than the automobile.

Ms. Hocken asked if a standard of LOS D could be met with the amount of money that was available for road projects. Mr. Schwetz said that most of the roadway projects in the constrained project list were addressing issues or congestion problems that were estimated to be above LOS E already, so there were not many projects planned to bring the LOS up from E to D, but were planned to maintain the balance between LOS D and LOS E. The Springfield Council had expressed similar concern. Due to financial constraints for projects in the region, a higher level of congestion might need to be acceptable.

Ms. Hocken asked if it were possible that Eugene and Springfield could take different approaches to approving development. Mr. Schwetz said that they would not be able to accept different Levels of Service. Both Cities would need to refer to the regional plan.

Mr. Kleger asked what the interrelationship was between the Level of Service and safety. Mr. Schwetz said that the higher the congestion, the more safety problems.

Accepting higher levels of congestion would provide more exposure to conflicts in the relationship between LOS and safety.

Mr. Bennett said that his experience was that the general public did not speak out until they were directly affected by proposed projects. They typically did not attend the public planning meetings to learn or provide input. It also was his experience that people would not give up their cars unless there were a highly competitive alternative. When he was a member of the Ferry Street Bridge Committee, the Committee had taken a survey and found that people generally favored alternatives and a different balance of transportation. However, respondents were not willing to change their particular transportation mode habits. From LTD's perspective, the dilemma was how to change the balance carefully so that there was an opportunity to educate and successfully promote new ideas and alternatives. There were many other communities that were experiencing gridlock, and they were because they continued to build roads until they ran out of room. Mr. Schwetz said that those communities that experienced gridlock got there not only by building roads, but also by not restricting land uses around those roads. He added that TransPlan was a 20-year plan, and more than any specific project or policy, what staff saw was a need for trying new and different things, for which there was no specific historical base line for, such as BRT and nodal development. All of those different ideas would need to be pursued together, and LOS was just one way to look at the transportation system.

Mr. Kleger asked what the general result of different levels of service on particular routes that intersected with each other, such as the Barger intersection with the State-owned Beltline Highway. Mr. Schwetz said that lower LOS standard on Beltline would make Beltline an easier route to travel than using Coburg Road or River Road, etc. Mr. Arnis

added that anytime a higher-speed corridor intersected with a lower-speed corridor, the accident rate would be higher.

Ms. Hocken asked how the LOS decision related to maintaining the urban growth boundary, and if maintaining a higher LOS would put pressure on the Urban Growth Boundary. Mr. Schwetz said that an investment could be made at the edge of the Urban Growth Boundary to maintain a Level of Service, which might put pressure on the boundary if development were allowed to occur just beyond the boundary. Mr. Viggiano added that LOS E already was allowed in nodal development areas.

Mr. Viggiano stated that this issue would be discussed as part of the joint work session, and the Board could choose to take a position now or wait for more discussion. Mr. Kleger and Ms. Hocken said that they favored the option to modify the policy to use LOS E in all areas of the community except state highway facilities. Ms. Lauritsen and Mr. Bennett said they favored the no-change option.

Mr. Bennett said that he believed that transit did not fare better when a lower standard was achieved, and it had been indicated that more flexibility might be available with the higher standard. Mr. Viggiano said that if priority were given to transit through intersections, the competitive advantage would be greater if there were more congestion. Mr. Schwetz added that the flexibility in the TPR primarily was aimed at making development decisions in certain areas.

Ms. Wylie suggested that the LTD Board wait for more discussion before taking a position on Roadway Policy #2: Motor Vehicle Level of Service. Other members agreed.

Roadway Policy #3: Coordinated Roadway Network: Mr. Schwetz said that it had been suggested that the term “roadway system” be changed to “transportation system.” The policy was specific to roadways because it was a roadway policy. The policy referred to connecting with other roadways that carried traffic beyond the boundaries of the urban area.

Staff had prepared three options to be considered. The first option was for no change to the policy; the second option was to make the change as requested; and the third option was to add a phrase referencing other modes. The City of Springfield had preferred the first option, while the City of Eugene and Lane County had preferred the third option.

There was no discussion, and the LTD Board members agreed to the third option.

Suggestion to add an Access Management Policy: Mr. Schwetz said that public testimony had been received to create a policy that stated that access management was a Land Use and transportation provision that reduced congestion and increased capacity with additional road or intersection costs. Access management enhanced the safety of pedestrians, autos, and bicyclists by reducing conflicts among modes.

Mr. Schwetz said that staff had responded that access management was discussed in several locations within TransPlan. It was discussed in the implementation sections of Transit Demand Management (TDM) Policy #3: Congestion Management and in Transportation Systems Improvements (TSI) Policy #1: Transportation Infrastructure Protection and Management. Staff believed that the existing policies provided a basis for access management to be addressed; however, an additional policy would make it more explicit.

Two options were presented. The first option was for no change, and the second option added a new policy: TSI Roadway Policy #4: Access Management. Mr. Schwetz said that Springfield and Lane County had preferred the first option, while Eugene had preferred the second option with safety listed first.

The LTD Board members agreed to the first option for no change.

General Project Topics: Mr. Schwetz said that no options had been developed for changes to the draft TransPlan in response to several projects, including projects near the urban growth boundary; one-way streets in downtown Eugene; project ranking and priorities; funding of traffic calming; and seismic upgrade of bridges instead of modernization. He did mention; however, that Springfield had preferred that Project Ranking and Priorities not require an amendment to TransPlan.

Specific Projects Proposed in the Draft TransPlan: Valley River Bridge: Mr. Schwetz said that most of the testimony received opposed a new bridge across the Willamette River in the vicinity of Valley River Center. Four options were presented. The Springfield City Council had deferred a decision until there was more discussion. The City of Eugene preferred option b, which deleted the Valley River Bridge from the TransPlan project list. No further study would be conducted on a new river crossing. However, Eugene modified language in the memorandum to: no further study would be conducted on a new river crossing in the area between the Beltline Bridge and the Ferry Street Bridge. Lane County preferred option d, which removed the Valley River Bridge from the TransPlan project list, and replaced it with a study to evaluate a regional system of Willamette River crossing alternatives. There was no formal staff recommendation.

Mr. Viggiano said that a new binder had been prepared with testimony and staff responses to testimony that had been received since the extension of the public input process. The binder was available to the Board at any time.

Ms. Hocken said that this was an issue for LTD because at some point for BRT, an option for another river crossing would be needed. Ms. Wylie asked if there was any wording in the options that included a study of an alternative modes bridge. Ms. Hocken said that she did not think it was specifically addressed. Ms. Wylie thought that wording could be added to option c.

Mr. Bennett said that there had been consensus among the Ferry Street Bridge Committee that there needed to be a bridge somewhere near Valley River Center that would shorten a significant number of trips. It had wide support and had been an important deliberation. From the transit point of view, it would be helpful, and Mr. Bennett would not support a policy that would not allow further consideration of the issue.

Mr. Viggiano said that option d included the further study of all Willamette River crossings.

Mr. Kleger said that Valley River Center was a trip generator, and LTD would be able to better compete without improvements to river crossings. He would not be able to accept an option that would eliminate further consideration of a bridge, at the very least for alternative modes. He could support option d.

Mr. Schwetz said the issue of the Ferry Street Bridge Committee deliberations had been acknowledged by the Eugene City Council. Councilor Kelly had said that the Council

in reviewing the Committee's recommendations had moved the bridge crossing lower on the priority list and moved other TDM proposals up.

All river crossings in town were State facilities, except the Ferry Street Bridge, and primarily were limited-access facilities. The issue of local trips crossing the river using those limited-access facilities was of some concern. From that perspective, opportunities needed to be found, particularly with the increasing congestion on those facilities, to siphon off more local-oriented trips. Mr. Arnis added that ODOT liked the idea of further study and particularly to adding information about an alternative mode crossing. State roads would not be improved to accommodate local trips. He encouraged the community to continue to study the options before deciding what could or could not be done.

Ms. Lauritsen supported option d. Mr. Bennett said that he was not in favor of establishing a policy that would remove the Valley River Bridge as an option. The Ferry Street Bridge Committee had spent a great deal of time studying that option. However, given the options available, he thought that option d was the best.

Ms. Wylie said that in addition to the deliberations and reasoning of the Ferry Street Bridge Committee, the BRT Steering Committee's deliberations needed to go forward. The case had been made that additional crossing(s) were needed.

Mr. Bennett asked if once a policy was established that deleted the Valley River Bridge from further discussion, even if a provision were made that further study of river crossings would be conducted, did that mean that any bridge that might be suggested in the future anywhere around the Valley River area would not be eligible for consideration. Mr. Schwetz said that there was much discussion of that issue at the Eugene City Council. The Council determined that its decision to delete the Valley River Bridge option did not mean

that a future Council could not reconsider the issue. Mr. Schwetz said that LTD as a Board might want to ensure that the policy included a study of an alternative modes bridge in the area that the Valley River Bridge had been proposed.

Ms. Hocken said that she wanted the LTD Board position to specifically include a reference to an alternative modes bridge. She supported option d. Other Board members agreed.

Division Avenue Bridge: This was a proposed new crossing connecting Division Avenue with Green Acres. It was meant as a type of crossing that would reroute local trips off of Beltline Highway. Mr. Schwetz said that the County had the Division Avenue Bridge programmed in its Capital Improvements Project List. All the testimony received was in opposition to this project.

Three options were presented. Option 1 called for no change to the project. Option 2 called for deleting the project from Table 1a, Financially Constrained Project List, by either moving to the Future List or deletion entirely from the plan. Option 3 called for the addition of language to the project description.

Mr. Schwetz said that the County had preferred option 2, which would move the project to the Future List and would add language that changed the project description in TransPlan to reconstruct and preserve Division Avenue ramps. The Eugene City Council agreed to move the project to the Future List, but were not supportive of specific language changes. The Springfield City Council deferred its position to the County.

Mr. Viggiano said that if the connection existed, LTD would use it, but it was not part of a future BRT route. The LTD Board agreed to defer its position to the affected jurisdictions.

Beaver Street: This project was in conjunction with the Division Avenue Bridge project. Mr. Schwetz said that the County and Eugene had made the same preferences as with the Division Avenue Bridge project. Springfield had deferred its position. The LTD Board agreed to defer its position as well.

Ms. Hocken asked what the difference was between deleting a project entirely, such as the Valley River Bridge, and moving a project to the Future List. Mr. Schwetz said that in the case of the Valley River Bridge, all references to that specifically named bridge would be deleted from the Plan; however, language referring to a Willamette River crossing would remain in the Plan.

Beltline Highway: This project would widen to six lanes the Beltline Highway from the River Road interchange to the Delta interchange. This project would be discussed at the joint work session. Mr. Schwetz reported that the County had preferred to retain the project on the Future List and to modify the description. The City of Eugene preferred to move the project from the Future List to the 20-year Constrained List and favored modifying the project description according to the County's recommendation. Ms. Hocken said that she supported the County position because it left options open for transit crossings.

Mr. Arnis said that ODOT was not in favor of widening a limited-access facility for local trips. ODOT was in favor of the County's position.

The LTD Board agreed to support the County's position regarding the Beltline Highway.

Additional Projects: Mr. Schwetz provided a brief overview of the remaining projects that had received public comment, including the West Eugene Parkway, the Beltline/I-5 Interchange, the Delta/Beltline Interchange, the Washington/Jefferson Bridge/Couplet, the 30th Avenue/I-5 Interchange, Pioneer Parkway improvements, the Jasper Road Extension, South Willamette Street improvements, Crest/Lorane/Friendly/Storey/McLean improvements, and Bethel Drive improvements.

The Springfield City Council had supported the inclusion or retention of all of the above-mentioned projects. Mr. Schwetz said that both Eugene and Springfield wanted to add specific local projects to the Roads Projects List that were related to their restructuring of their development plans. The LTD Board supported the Springfield Council position.

Transportation System Improvements: Issue Area 5, Transit: Mr. Viggiano said that the LTD Board already had reviewed Issue Area 5. Lane County and Springfield had agreed with the LTD Board's position on the transit issues, and the City of Eugene had not yet reviewed Issue Area 5.

Transportation System Improvements: Issue Area 6, Bicycle System and Issue Area 7, Pedestrian System: Mr. Viggiano said that Springfield was the only other jurisdiction to have reviewed this issue area. Staff were not recommending any changes to the Bicycle and Pedestrian System Policies.

Ms. Wylie asked if the bicycle policies would affect LTD's option of including or not including bikeways along the BRT corridors. Mr. Viggiano said that Bicycle Policy #1 would

not, but that Bicycle Policy #2, which required bikeways along new and reconstructed arterial and major collector streets, could impact LTD's option. This policy came from the TPR, which mandated that the policy be in the Plan. Mr. Viggiano said there were some questions about how this policy would be applied, and within the rule, there was an option to not put in bikeways along some arterials if there were safety or operational reasons and if alternate routes were available. It was an important policy for LTD because if BRT would cause the reconstruction of any streets, the issue of bike lanes was raised. It was an issue on Franklin Boulevard and on 11th and 13th Avenues, for example.

Ms. Hocken said that she realized the policy needed to be included in TransPlan, but as stated, bikeways were required. It did not appear to anticipate mitigating circumstances. Mr. Viggiano said that the definition and intent of the policy in TransPlan stated that "in special cases, circumstances of safety issues or physical limitations may prevent the provision of on-street bike lanes. In these cases, alternate parallel routes shall be provided as part of the same project to ensure access to residents and services found on along the collector or arterial streets." Ms. Hocken then asked if the jurisdictions were adopting the policies only or if the policy's definition and intent also would be adopted. Mr. Viggiano said that the definition and intent was used to further explain the policy, but it could be used in litigation, for example.

Ms. Hocken said that she would like to adopt the existing policies without any changes. Other Board members agreed. Ms. Wylie said that unless so noted, the Board would go forward with the recommendation for no change to the existing policies in Issue Areas #6 and #7.

Mr. Viggiano then reviewed the remaining bicycle and pedestrian policies.

Mr. Kleger noted that when the language was being developed for the pedestrian policies, it had been mentioned in the Transportation System Improvements Task Force that the provisions in other parts of the Plan with regard to access for all citizens, also addressed the issue of access for people with disabilities within the pedestrian and bicycle policies.

Ms. Hocken asked that the LTD Board be recorded as supporting Pedestrian Policy #3 regarding the provision of sidewalks. Other Board members agreed.

Mr. Viggiano said that with regard to the specific bicycle projects in TransPlan, staff were concerned about the deletion of the proposed bicycle lanes on 11th and 13th Avenue between Chambers and Lincoln Streets, and three options were prepared to address the issue. Option 1 kept the proposed bicycle lane projects on 11th and 13th Avenues in TransPlan as listed. Option 2 assigned 11th and 13th bikeways to the Future List and suggested working with the neighborhood on a refinement of public process. Option 3 removed the proposed 11th and 13th Avenue bikeways from TransPlan.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were recommending option 1. With BRT planning under way along the corridor, the near future may be the best time to find methods to accommodate the competing transportation needs in the neighborhood. Currently, 12th Avenue was a designated bike route, and for some it was a preferable route for bicycling because there was not too much traffic; however, there were numerous stop signs and other features that slowed the commute time. Bicycle planners recommended both options as well. The serious bicycle commuter could travel faster on the 11th and 13th Avenue arterials, while the less serious or leisurely bicycle rider could use the 12th Avenue bike route.

Mr. Bennett said that he would defer on this issue, as it was a City of Eugene issue. Mr. Viggiano said that the staff recommended position was consistent with the BRT message to the community. The BRT design on 13th Avenue included a bike lane, because it tentatively was part of the plan. However, if the decision was made not to put a bike lane along the BRT route, LTD most likely would add more landscaping. LTD had said that the BRT project would work either way, which was consistent with what Mr. Bennett had said.

Mr. Kleger noted that anything that improved the climate for people who used alternate modes was beneficial to LTD. He agreed that the Board should defer this issue and be prepared to work with whatever decision the City made.

Ms. Hocken asked if there were operational issues if the proposed bikeways were implemented, such as the Washington and Jefferson bikeways. If the proposal were to remove parking, she did not think it would impact LTD operations. Mr. Viggiano thought that in these cases, the parking would be exchanged for the bike lanes. Buses always had coexisted with bicycles, which was not the best situation, since the bike lanes usually were on the right-hand side, and the bus picked up and dropped off passengers on the right-hand side.

Ms. Hocken said she would support deferring the bikeway issues to the City of Eugene. Other Board members agreed.

Ms. Hocken asked about the proposed Glenwood Boulevard bike lane, and if the Board should be concerned about the proposal in conjunction with BRT. Mr. Viggiano said that there already were bike facilities along Glenwood Boulevard, but that staff would research the issue to provide more information.

Review and Recommendations: TransPlan Provisions for Financial Policies:

Mr. Thompson said that there were five Finance Policies within TransPlan for review as well as three new suggested Policies. Staff were recommending no change to all five Policies, but there were options prepared for Policies 1 through 3.

With regard to Finance Policy #1: Adequate Funding, two options were presented. Option 1 called for no change to the Policy, and option 2 added a clause to the Policy that referenced the need for funding related to nodal development and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs. Mr. Kleger asked if there was a substantive difference between the two options. Mr. Thompson said that the added language under option 2 was covered in the Policy Definition and Intent. The LTD Board preferred the no change option.

Finance Policy #2: Operations, Maintenance, and Preservation (OM&P): Mr. Thompson said that staff were recommending no change, but had prepared two options. One option was for no change, and the other option was to add a clarification to the Policy Definition and Intent statement that supported the development and application of a process for prioritizing regional system improvements funded by state and federal revenues.

Mr. Kleger said that he recalled that strings attached to funds coming from outside the jurisdiction required that some funds be directed to new construction or capacity advances and not be applied to OM&P. In the event that the Board accepted the second option, the jurisdictions would be prevented from receiving and using funds with that string attached. Mr. Kleger said that he favored the no change option. Other Board members agreed.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff had any new knowledge or had changed its position about what worked and what did not work in terms of TDM in this particular environment, or if any new TDM strategies were being used, particularly in the mandatory versus voluntary TDM strategies. Mr. Schwetz said that there were many strategies that had not been attempted in the voluntary area, such as those things in TransPlan that were being proposed in the problem areas.

Mr. Bennett said he would be interested to know if there were any effective mandatory TDM strategies in other cities of similar size. Mr. Schwetz said that larger cities were more able to implement TDM strategies that were successful, and that for cities of similar size to Eugene/Springfield, there were some mandatory TDM strategies that were stronger than voluntary measures that could have a focused effect, such as on a downtown. Typically, mandatory TDM measures were implemented along with enhanced transit services.

Mr. Bennett said that he thought there was a big difference between what could happen in terms of handling the cost of a major capital improvement, such as a river crossing, versus arbitrarily raising parking rates in publicly owned property. He had seen efforts in Eugene to arbitrarily assign costs, which had been unsuccessful. He was continually interested in where the thinking was in the conceptual and technical aspects of TDM strategies. Mr. Schwetz said that in general, the ability to affect regional travel behavior with TDM was nearly impossible. Rather, TDM strategies should be used that were focused on such things as problem areas or specific types of trips.

Finance Policy #3: Prioritization of State and Federal Revenue. Mr. Thompson reviewed the Policy and public testimony that had been received. He said that one option

was for no change and the other was to add a clarification in the Policy Definition and Intent statement for the policy. Mr. Thompson said that staff were recommending no change to the policy.

Mr. Kleger said he was reluctant to support option 2 because the word 'major' in the context of capacity issues was controversial. If option 2 were selected, he wanted to see some linking between major capacity and safety. Most of the time when a project required a National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) process at the state level, it was done because there was a safety problem of real significance. Other Board members agreed to support the no change option.

With regard to Finance Policies #4 and #5, Mr. Thompson said that there had been little testimony received, and staff were recommending no change. Mr. Kleger said that he fully supported Policy #4, and another reason he had not supported amending Policy #2, was that the amendment restricted the use of system development money. Other Board members agreed to no change to Finance Policies #4 and #5.

Mr. Thompson said that there were three new policy suggestions. The first suggested policy would commit the jurisdictions to rescinding gas tax restrictions. Mr. Kleger said that he was not in favor of this suggested policy. Although something needed to be done about the gas tax restrictions, he was not sure that establishing a local government policy in contradiction of a state constitutional provision that was passed by 75 percent of the voters was the way to do it. However, Mr. Kleger would support making a statement that the applicability of those funds should be broadened.

Ms. Wylie said that there was a clause in the staff response that the money could be made available for transit. She asked Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch if she had an opinion on the subject.

Ms. Lynch said that there was one issue on the May ballot that opened the gas tax trust fund for increased funding for state police. Independently appointed Board members could work on an initiative to make the gas tax funds more flexible; however, not in the context of TransPlan.

Policy suggestion #2 established criteria for prioritization. Ms. Lauritson said that it restricted the ability of staff to be able to assess and make recommendations on each project.

Mr. Thompson said that Policy suggestion #3 committed funding to bicycle infrastructure based on bike ridership as a percentage of total trips. If bike ridership were equal to 12 percent of total trips, the Plan should commit 12 percent of expenditures to the bicycle system. Auto trips generated 80 to 85 percent of the total revenues in TransPlan, but auto-related needs received about 60 percent of the funding. Staff did not recommend that modal shares be used as the determinant of equitable funding in TransPlan. Staff were recommending that this suggested policy not be added to TransPlan.

Mr. Kleger said that the discrepancy was related to the federal flexible funds that were generated from the gas tax, and almost all of that category was devoted to alternatives to the automobile. He had no philosophical problem with the suggested policy, and he said he wished there were a local revenue that came from bicycle users that could be spent on bicycle related projects.

Mr. Viggiano said that people tended to treat the TransPlan funding as a budget that could be divided out equally. The funding in TransPlan varied by mode, such as the fact that all LTD operating costs were included in with the transit budget , when, in fact, those same operating costs for automobiles and other modes were not included.

Staff Clarification on Transportation Utility Fee (TUF) Recommendation: Mr. Thompson said that the current draft TransPlan referred to the use of a TUF to address several of the financial shortfalls, specifically in street and bicycle OM&P needs. The intent of the use of this new revenue source in the development of the financially constrained TransPlan was as a specific example of a new local revenue source that should be developed to address OM&P shortfalls. Staff had recommended two options for modifying the language in TransPlan related to the TUF. One option was for no change. The second option was to modify the language to delete the reference to the development of a TUF, and replace it with language to develop a locally controlled source of revenue equitably tied to the users of the transportation system that could be used to address OM&P needs. The City of Springfield had recommended added 'all users of the transportation system.'

Mr. Schwetz said that LTD was being looked at as one of the main users of the transportation system for OM&P dedicated resources as were school buses. Mr. Viggiano added that in terms of costs, this could be a very significant issue for LTD.

Ms. Hocken asked if LTD needed to take a position. Mr. Schwetz said that the changes that were recommended in the text would not be adopted as policy. Mr. Thompson said that this specific language in TransPlan was addressing the OM&P shortfall of approximately \$238 million over the 20-year period. The shortfall was addressed in TransPlan by reducing the OM&P standards to reduce expenditures by 50 percent, and the

other 50 percent by raising the revenue. This was the specific language that would allow the jurisdictions to financially constrain the Plan. Increased revenues were assumed at about \$119 million by implementing a new revenue source.

Ms. Hocken said that the way the Plan currently was written, there was no shortfall in transit operations and maintenance, which made it awkward to compare LTD's operations and maintenance with the City's OM&P. One could look at a street and see a pothole that needed filling, while there were numerous requests for service that LTD could not fund because money was not available. It was a much broader debate than who would pay to fix the potholes in the streets. Ms. Wylie said that people were being encouraged to use mass transit, and it would be detrimental to turn around at tax that use. It was contrary to purpose.

Mr. Bennett said that roads were made for cars, not buses. If the system provided an even position for LTD in terms of actual viable transportation partner, then it would make more sense. Now, LTD was a small part of the decision process in terms of the use of the streets. LTD was given a purpose that it had no chance to meet, but LTD was not close to being in a position to pay its way.

Ms. Hocken suggested that LTD be allowed to put in exclusive lanes and to provide the maintenance for those lanes.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

Board Secretary

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, May 17, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 11, 2000, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, May 17, 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
Dean Kortge, Secretary
Pat Hocken
Virginia Lauritsen
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Hillary Wylie, President
Gerry Gaydos

CALL TO ORDER: Board Vice President Rob Bennett called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. Ms. Wylie was not yet present.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD VICE PRESIDENT: Mr. Bennett said he had no preliminary remarks.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: Mr. Kleger said that it might be useful to find out at this time when the Board might discuss the advertising program that was set over from Monday night. Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Bergeron for his comments; Mr. Bergeron said the discussion could occur at the end of the work session. Mr. Hamm made the announcement on Mr. Vobora's behalf that all Board members were invited to attend the Comprehensive Service Redesign open house scheduled for June 24 and 25, 2000, from 10:00 a.m. until 7:00 p.m. both days at the Eugene Station's Customer Service Center.

WORK SESSION – LTD Security Program: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson said that the reason the security program was being presented outside of the budget process was because of recent discussions around security in general. Mr. Johnson explained that the different elements of the security program and the various ways that security was provided at the Eugene Station and LTD service areas. The mission of the security program was to create a safe and secure environment, which provided a feeling of wellbeing for employees, customers, and citizens of the community. Mr. Johnson listed and discussed the goals of the program, such as reduction of crime and the fear of crime throughout LTD's system, so customers unfamiliar with the system were not afraid to use the bus. Another goal was to increase community involvement and create ownership in the LTD system by developing a sense of a transit community. This goal was accomplished through partnerships, such as with the Eugene Police Department and within the Eugene/Springfield business community.

Ms. Lauritsen asked what LTD's partnership was with the Eugene Police Department. Mr. Johnson said that an example of a non-contractual benefit was the police presence at the Eugene Station by way of the substation location and police activity there. Mr. Johnson said that the bigger question was what LTD was doing to work with the Springfield Police Department, as developing that partnership recently had presented LTD with challenges. In recent weeks, Transit Security Administrator Rick Bailor and some of the supervisors had good meetings with the Springfield Police Department to discuss issues at the Springfield Station, which was exciting. Mr. Johnson said other goals included increasing and maintaining internal organizational awareness and responsibility for system security; developing planning and physical support for system security; and training and empowering LTD staff to respond

appropriately to security incidents. Mr. Johnson discussed the various LTD prevention programs, including video surveillance.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if the cameras on the buses fed directly to supervisor's screens. Mr. Johnson said the cameras on the buses were digital, and images were transferred to a disk. Those images were kept for approximately four days on a continuous loop system. Operators had push-button activation to save a specific segment of tape for review at a later time, or could notify supervisory staff the same day to do the same.

Mr. Johnson said other prevention programs included environmental design of facilities; patrols; denial program for use in correcting the behavior of unruly customers; police substation presence; and Ordinance 36. Mr. Johnson explained the current times of day and locations of supervisory security coverage, as well as that of contract security staff. Supervisors responded by vehicle to all accidents and other area service needs, including supervision by assignment of 28 operators per supervisor. Because supervisors were managing so many duties and areas, incident response times were concerns, as was response time by the police department, which also was short on coverage.

Current and future needs included the need to provide security at the remote transit stations, such as Thurston Station. As LTD continued to grow and expand; those needs would continue to grow as well. BRT stations would create an interesting security need for LTD, and it would be important that the BRT system be a safe system in order to succeed. LTD needed to position itself to meet the increased demand for security.

Mr. Johnson reported that a Request for Proposals (RFP) for an expanded security service had been sent out to potential bidders. This proposal would expand security services to 28 hours per day in total contracted security. Currently, there was 17 hours of contracted security service, which would be reduced by half. An additional 20 hours then would be added as a result of the RFP. The RFP also would result in a much more formal response to security needs. The selected security service would provide experienced, uniformed security officers. The security officers would not, however, be armed. Staff believed this service would better help LTD respond to incidents and provide flexibility to target services to areas where problems existed.

Mr. Kortge asked about reducing the coverage of the current contractor. Mr. Johnson said that currently, LTD contracted with Downtown Eugene, Inc., to provide Mall Guides to patrol the Eugene Station area. Some Mall Guides would continue to patrol the station; however, staff believed a more formal approach to security would enhance security on the entire system.

Ms. Hocken asked about LTD's contribution to the Eugene Police Officer at the Eugene Station. Mr. Johnson said that LTD paid for one-third of a patrol officer who patrols an 18 square block area of downtown and provided some limited dedicated service to LTD. LTD had no authority to schedule the officer's time and/or location. Also, there was an agreement to pay one-third of the benefits and wages for the Eugene Police Substation Manager. Mr. Hamm added that because LTD had provided a significant presence in downtown Eugene, LTD needed to partner with the downtown business community. The business community had agreed to partner with the City of Eugene and with LTD in the downtown security effort, and

while LTD may, in some cases, not get the direct benefit of the security services; there was a definite benefit in partnering with those neighbors.

Mr. Kleger asked what LTD's relationship was with the Cahoots Van that was provided by Whitebird Clinic. Mr. Bailor said that Cahoots was a community response agency that provided a Whitebird Clinic staff member and a paramedic on board. The Cahoots van worked directly through the Eugene Police Department dispatch to respond to people who were in need of a social-type agency, such as intoxicated people. The Police Department made the decision to have Cahoots respond to certain incidents. Mr. Kleger said there also were people who were having psychotic episodes, which could be very scary to the customers. Cahoots was a good response to those people, and most people thought well of Cahoots. Social services work well with behavioral problems.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if LTD ever just called a taxi for those people. Mr. Bailor said that LTD had called for a Taxi, and sometimes, even the field supervisor transported those people.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Johnson to elaborate on the Springfield Station issues. Mr. Johnson said there was a problem with some young people at the station, but LTD did not own the property, so it had little jurisdiction to deal with those problems. On occasion, LTD had a difficult time getting adequate response from the Springfield Police. Staff met with the Springfield Police, and the two jurisdictions were working together cooperatively to research a lease for the station in order to provide jurisdictional authority to LTD.

WORK SESSION: BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) UPDATE: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano provided an update on the design process for Phase 2 of the BRT

project. Phase 2 had been split into two segments, the first being from the Eugene Station west to Garfield Street, and the second being from Garfield west to the Seneca Station. The workshop process had been completed for the first segment of Phase 2. There were two alignments options being considered. One was an option to use 13th Avenue for both directions of travel between Jefferson and Chambers. The other alternative would use 6th Avenue for westbound travel and 7th Avenue for eastbound travel. Mr. Viggiano displayed several maps of the design features of both options.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff hoped to hold workshops on the second segment of Phase 2 beginning in the fall. Staff would spend the summer months developing alternatives. A decision by the Steering Committee would be delayed until the entire Phase 2 was completed.

Mr. Kortge asked if the 6th and 7th Avenue option had come up in opposition to 13th Avenue or because it would better serve bus riders. Mr. Viggiano said it had been proposed for both reasons. Mr. Kortge asked how the fairgrounds would be served if BRT operated on 6th and 7th Avenues. Mr. Viggiano said that other transit service would have to be designed to serve the Fairgrounds.

Ms. Hocken said early on in the BRT process, it had been determined that BRT should remain out of the residential areas as much as possible and operate on major streets. One of the alternatives being considered for west of Garfield Street would be a residential alternative. She did not believe there was a neighborhood association that represented that neighborhood, and she wondered if staff had talked with people who lived in that neighborhood. Mr. Viggiano said that staff had not yet talked with those people, but doing so would be part of the process. Typically, staff have gone door-to-door along the proposed corridors to ensure that each person

had an opportunity to be heard. It might be difficult in that particular neighborhood, so staff were considering a mailing to invite people to meetings to try to make people aware of what was being proposed.

Mr. Kleger believed that if BRT operated on 6th and 7th Avenue, there would be a loss of running time. Mr. Viggiano said that the running time difference was extremely significant between 6th and 7th Avenues versus the 13th Avenue option. Staff believed that the 6th/7th corridor ought to be served by BRT in the future, but it was different than the 11th/13th corridor.

During the last workshop, the groups voted on the two proposed alignments. The vote was split, and a slight majority favored the 13th Avenue alignment. Mr. Viggiano said that he also attended a fairly well attended neighborhood meeting, in which the group was split 2 to 1 in favor of the 6th/7th Avenue alignment.

Ms. Wylie arrived at the meeting at 6:14 p.m.

With regard to Phase 1 of the BRT project, Mr. Viggiano reported that the Environmental Assessment (EA) was expected to be released in June. There was a required 30-day review process, during which public comment would be received. It was hoped that workshops would be held with other jurisdictions in early summer to review the EA, and in September, staff would present the EA to the jurisdictions for a decision.

Ms. Hocken asked if the County Commissioners were expected to approve the EA as well, or to provide an opinion. Mr. Viggiano said that the County's role was unclear, as the County did not have any jurisdiction over the roads that were planned to be used. Staff would inquire with the County about what role it wished to have.

WORK SESSION: ADVERTISING REVENUE EXPANSION STRATEGIES: Public Affairs

Manager Ed Bergeron said that staff were seeking direction from the Board regarding the Board's interest in pursuing various advertising expansion strategies.

There had been a successful program of advertising on the bus during the past 20 years, and it had grown to a healthy revenue source for LTD, and it had established numerous partnerships within the community between LTD and individual businesses. As new sources of revenue were being sought, there were five areas that staff believed could be possible. Staff were interested in finding the right level of the advantages of creating additional revenue while keeping in mind what the community would find acceptable in terms of commercializing LTD.

Expanding the existing on-bus revenue program was one option, perhaps by using more square footage of inside and outside the bus for advertising to generate more revenues. LTD had been careful about that up to this point. There were some buses that carried no advertising and some that carried a limited amount, and from time to time, LTD had experimented with full-wrap coverage.

Another option was to place advertising in bus shelters, particularly those along major corridors. Those could generate revenue as well as to offer the advantage of lighting opportunities within the shelters. Other options included outdoor billboards placed at LTD facilities; advertisements within the transit stations, such as kiosk-type posters; and possibilities for revenues from advertising in LTD printed materials, banners on the web page, or on the answering machine for people to hear while waiting for trip-planning assistance.

Staff hoped to get direction from the Board before spending a lot of time and money researching possibilities that the Board was not interested in.

Mr. Kleger said that the full-wrap was a customer service, comfort issue. The screen acted as a mirror back on sunny days, and water collected in the screen on wet days. The Board needed to consider this issue very carefully. The current *Click Oregon* black wrap seemed to make the bus hotter. He noted that on the 300-series buses, there was space above the window that resembled letterboard space that could be used.

Ms. Hocken said that she owned stock in Obie Media, Inc., which was the contractor that handled all the on-board advertising for LTD. She wanted to ensure that there was not a conflict of interest in her participation in this discussion. She observed that on the bus, there was space available on the inside that could be more utilized for advertising, so she thought an expansion there could be researched. She said that she had no problem with placing ads in the shelters and at stations. She was not sure about the billboard idea, but she thought advertising revenue from printed materials was acceptable. She also said that she was not sure about the answering machine advertising issue.

Mr. Kortge thought that advertising in the shelters made sense.

Ms. Wylie thought that it was important to continue with advertising revenues by expanding the advertising inside the bus and to shelters and stations. However, it was important to maintain good taste. People were attracted to or repelled by advertisements. She asked staff to research the additional advertising revenues, while maintaining good taste and taking Mr. Kleger's comments about the bus riders' concerns into consideration.

Mr. Bergeron said that the University of Michigan had researched the effect of covering the bus windows. The research had shown that when the windows were covered, people did not feel as safe on the inside because they could not be seen and could not see out quite as easily. Part of the appeal of the concept vehicle for BRT was the big windows.

Staff would conduct a market viability research process, research sign codes and other legal issues, and would bring its recommendations back to the Board for a decision.

Mr. Bennett said that the comments were good. He stated that he did not want to see advertising on the outside of the BRT vehicle. Everyone agreed that more income was needed, and LTD appreciated the revenue, but the BRT system should be presented as a sleek, clean system that would be free of advertising. Ms. Lauritsen agreed, and said that she thought that the new buses that only had the LTD logo on the side looked real good. Mr. Bergeron said that staff agreed about the BRT vehicle – that it should be clean without the advertisements.

JUNE 2000 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Senior Systems Analyst Gery Sorg had been selected as the June 2000 Employee of the Month. Ms. Wylie introduced Information Systems Manager Steve Parrott, who would provide the background information about the selection of Mr. Sorg.

Mr. Parrott said that Mr. Sorg had been nominated by a co-worker who was very appreciative of Mr. Sorg's cheerful assistance. She wanted to thank him for the cheerful way he came to her rescue when she had computer problems or when she tried to fix something herself, and he had to figure out what she did wrong in order to make it work again. In addition,

the Employee of the Month Selection Committee also considered Mr. Sorg's leadership in the Employee Association and his role as Chair of the Employee Council.

Mr. Parrott said that Mr. Sorg was the bridge between the technology that LTD had and the users of that technology. He helped users establish what their business needs were and translated those needs into tools that they could use to get their work done. Mr. Sorg had a serving heart and wonderful people skills. The Information Services Department was very proud to have learned of Mr. Sorg's nomination for Employee of the Month. Mr. Parrott congratulated Mr. Sorg for the nomination and introduced him to the Board.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Sorg and presented him with a letter of congratulations, a certificate, and monetary award.

Mr. Sorg said that he appreciated and was honored to be selected as Employee of the Month. He said that he worked with so many dedicated and hard-working people at LTD, and to have been recognized as Employee of the Month from such an outstanding group was an honor. Mr. Sorg said that years ago, he had worked as a consultant to LTD's Information Services Department, and during that time, he had been impressed with the widespread commitment of the employees at LTD to provide excellent service to the community. Now, as an employee, he said that he was equally impressed. The commitment at LTD was incredible. At LTD, one could feel the shared vision among the employees of making the Eugene/Springfield area and all of Lane County a better place to live. Being able to work with the team at a time when LTD was experiencing many changes was truly a privilege, and he appreciated being a part of the entire effort.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: 1) David Hinkley of Eugene addressed the subject of the BRT in the Jefferson neighborhood. He said that the BRT concept appeared to be an intriguing system; a solution to the modern transit dilemma of more need than money, combining the best aspects of bus and light rail, the system was expected to provide enhanced light-rail like service at a bus-line cost.

If the Board was serious about going forward with BRT, it would be worthwhile and crucial to discuss with the Board how to put it through the Jefferson neighborhood. However, it was clear that it was not serious. When one examined the 2015 build-out of the BRT system, it became absolutely clear that the segment of 6th and 7th Avenues between Chambers and Charnelton was essential to the system. Without it, there would be no access to northwest Eugene. It was the fastest growing section of the community, and was about one-quarter of the town. If LTD was not going to go out there, it was not serious about a system. To put it bluntly, Mr. Hinkley said that if LTD were not serious about the system, he did not want LTD bringing a half-baked experiment that was going to fail into his neighborhood and tearing it up.

When LTD wanted to become serious, Mr. Hinkley urged that a route be planned that had a system that would work. He reiterated that the argument was that if 6th and 7th Avenues were not secured now for BRT, LTD would not get it. LTD already would have to fight the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for it, but every day that went by, one or more cars were added to the congestion, and it would become that much harder to get. Mr. Hinkley's argument was that now was the time to fight for it, and if LTD was not willing to do the fight, then it was not willing to put the system in, and there would be no point in tearing up his neighborhood.

2) Mr. Tom Lester of Eugene said that he had a correction to the April 2000 Board minutes. On page 7 of the minutes, with regard to petition gathering at the Eugene Station, Mr. Lester was paraphrased as having said, "LTD could take a friendlier approach and identify areas that were not high traffic areas that were under cover and out of the way." He said that he believed he had said to identify areas that were high traffic areas. Petitioners liked high-traffic areas in order to get more signatures per hour.

Mr. Lester then said that he also wanted to again address the issue of petition gathering at the Eugene Station. He said that it would be valuable to look to the Erb Memorial Union (EMU) at the University of Oregon campus as a model of how to deal with petitioners on a public facility. The EMU provided tables right in the front lobby, one of the most congested areas. It did not cause conflicts for people moving through, and it worked very well for them. The EMU had a scheduling system, and he encouraged LTD to take a look at their system for allowing petition gatherers.

**MOTION
VOTE**

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution:
"It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 17, 2000, is approved as corrected.
Ms. Hocken seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken said that on page 11 of the May 17, 2000, minutes, there had been a conversation with Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora about the 5 percent Board discretionary service that was being proposed in the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR). Mr. Kortge had been paraphrased as saying that his concept of the 5 percent allocation was that of the 100 percent service plan, 95 percent of which would be dedicated to productivity service, while the other 5 percent would be used to address coverage and lifeline services. Ms.

Hocken said that the Board was not committing 95 percent of service to productivity. She asked staff to correct that paragraph to reflect the correct percentages and allocations for the CSR.

There was no further discussion, and the motion carried by acclamation. The May 17, 2000, Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the April 19, 2000, regular Board meeting.

EMERGENCY ORDINANCE: AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 36, GOVERNING CONDUCT

ON DISTRICT PROPERTY: Mr. Johnson said that District Counsel was present to answer any questions. At the April 19, 2000, Board meeting, the Board had discussed and held a public hearing around changes to Ordinance 36, specifically about signature gathering. The direction of the Board was to proceed with the staff recommendation to allow areas at the Eugene Station where signature gathering could take place. In addition, clarification was made in some areas that had been brought up by ACLU counsel Ed Gerdes and complainant Steve Lepponen. Staff believed Ordinance 36 was legally defensible as written; however, there were some issues that it was agreed could be better clarified.

Since that meeting, LTD had been taken to court for a temporary restraining order to restrict LTD from enforcing Ordinance 36. The judge denied the order, and a hearing would be held in June, which was why staff were presenting an emergency Ordinance at this time. The amended Ordinance then would be in place in time for the June hearing.

The specific changes pertained to definitions of boarding platform areas that were not limited to the Eugene Station, such as Park & Rides and remote stations. In addition, a definition of shelters and stops was added. There also was an addition of emergency language

clause that was required to adopt the amended Ordinance at this meeting. It would take a unanimous vote of the Board to adopt the Emergency Ordinance.

**MOTION
VOTE**

Ms. Hocken moved that Ordinance 36, 2000 Revision, be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none opposed.

**MOTION
VOTE**

Ms. Wylie then read the Ordinance by title: "Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, 2000 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property."

Mr. Kortge then moved the following resolution: "It is resolved that Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, 2000 Revision, is hereby adopted as an emergency ordinance and will take effect upon adoption." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none opposed.

PROPOSED 2002-2005 STIP REQUESTS FOR COMMUTER SOLUTIONS

PROGRAM/TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS: Mr. Bergeron said that the agenda item summary from Commuter Resources Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams outlined the current thinking among the partner jurisdictions with regard to how the program might change in the years 2002 through 2006. Staff were presenting the issue to the Board so the members could have as much time to think about it and to review with staff to determine how it fit with the Board's concept of the future of the program. This was in preparation for the adoption of the request by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC).

The current timeline for the process was that staff would begin discussions with the Board, and the Board would have a month to consider the request, or if it liked the direction immediately, it would endorse the program at this meeting. Later in May, staff would present the same information to the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), which was made up of senior planning staff of the partner jurisdictions. TPC would be prioritizing the projects for presentation to the MPC for adoption in July.

Ms. Williams had briefed the Board during the past two months about the Commuter Solutions Program, but as part of the State Transportation Improvement (STIP) process, projections were made two years in advance about how the program might evolve. The program had achieved a great deal of success. The program flowed from the LTD Strategic Plan and had evolved from a commuter-based program to a community-based program.

Mr. Bergeron then highlighted the project proposals for 2002 – 2005.

Ms. Wylie asked if some of the proposed projects were currently occurring or if they all were projected to occur in the future. Mr. Bergeron said that most of the proposed projects were continuations of existing programs. Those that he highlighted were new additions and represented growth in the program. Ms. Wylie asked if there were a regional coordinator. Mr. Bergeron said that was Ms. William's current position.

Mr. Kortge asked about the \$487,500 expense for the year 2002, and if it were continuation money or new funding. Mr. Bergeron said it was the proposal that the partner jurisdictions would forward to ODOT for new funding for the year 2002. Currently, the program was funded at approximately \$250,000, and there was about \$200,000 in additional requests that would go

to ODOT for the 2002 – 2005 year. LTD matched the grant funding at 10 percent in addition to the housing of the program.

Ms. Hocken asked if the grant recipient would be LTD. Mr. Bergeron said that was correct. Ms. Hocken then asked if priorities had been set as to what would be eliminated if the funding were reduced. Mr. Bergeron said that the partner jurisdictions would be reconvened to decide the priorities. The school program likely would be very high on the priority list even without funding.

Ms. Hocken then asked about the past issue of ODOT putting Park & Ride funding in the same pot as TDM funding, which created some problems for LTD as an agency. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that the answer was somewhat elusive. LTD looked at the issue as two separate categories, but state funds put allowable uses together because of the federal funding categories. Mr. Hamm added that when one program was expanding and there was only so much money going into the pot, the potential was for that program to siphon off from another part that was just as essential. Maybe Park & Rides were being partially diminished at the expense of another program. Staff would provide more information at the June Board meeting.

Mr. Kortge asked how a four-year budget request could be turned in that kept salaries level for four years. Mr. Bergeron said that the answer was that the salaries included benefits and the specific amounts were worked out with the LTD match. The requests that were forwarded to ODOT were not required to include that level of detail.

Mr. Kortge then asked where new money would go if the funding were increased. He said that he could not determine by looking at the project proposal list, which programs would receive new money, with the exception of the new staff member request. Mr. Bergeron said that the new programs included Education and Awareness research, the administrative assistant, the establishment of a Transportation Management Associations (TMA) program, and the Youth and Parent School Programs/Activities/Special Events program.

Ms. Hocken said that she would like to wait until the June meeting to learn more about the other projects before taking action on the STIP request. She was concerned about the issue about other projects that LTD had and whether those would affect the ODOT funding for TDM. Mr. Bergeron said it would be fine for the Board to wait until June.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: 1) MPC. No MPC meeting had been held since the April Board meeting. 2) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken said that she wanted to be replaced as the Board representative. The next meeting was scheduled for June 6. Ms. Lauritsen and Mr. Gaydos had expressed interest. Ms. Wylie appointed Ms. Lauritsen as the Board representative with Mr. Gaydos as an alternate. Ms. Hocken said the Forum met three times each year. 3) BRT Steering Committee. The Committee had not recently met, and staff had nothing to add to the update that had been provided on May 15, 2000. 4) Springfield Station Steering Committee. The Committee would meet on June 1, 2000, to make a site selection. Mr. Viggiano reported that the Environmental Assessment (EA) was not yet completed, pending approval by the State Historical Preservation Board. There were no historic issues, but it was required for the EA. Staff would ask the Committee to make a recommendation on a site, and if for some reason, an issue was raised with regard to the

historic issues, which was unlikely, the Committee would be reconvened. Once the Committee recommended a site, it would be presented to the Springfield City Council and then to the LTD Board for approval.

Ms. Wylie asked staff also to review the traffic mitigation issues with the Committee. Mr. Bennett asked if there was additional information on the parking mitigation. Mr. Viggiano said staff were pursuing the issue, but had no answers to date.

APRIL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson reported that LTD was in good shape for the first 10 months of the year, and staff were looking to finish the year on budget.

There was some uncertainty contained in the Agenda Item Summary about the Self-Employment tax, and Ms. Hellekson provided an update. She said that the State of Oregon was more than one month behind in processing returns. To date, fewer than 15 percent of the returns were processed. Some additional money was received at the end of the previous week, which put the total close to right on budget.

Two years ago, the Oregon Department of Revenue (DOR) reported both to Tri-Met and LTD that the Self-Employment Tax program was not Y2K compliant, and it would be expensive to bring it into compliance. The DOR suggested that LTD and Tri-Met split the expense. The agreement was that DOR would charge the expense out over the two-year life of the project. As it turned out, the DOR did not do that, and the charges were made during the last two months. LTD's share was only 13 percent of the total expense. So, while staff believed the

Self-Employment Tax would be on budget, it would be artificially low due to the administrative cost for compliance work.

Ms. Hellekson also reported that fuel prices were beginning to stabilize, and it appeared that staff had budgeted appropriately for next year.

GENERAL MANAGER REPORT ON APTA CONFERENCE: Mr. Hamm requested that the Board allow him to have a regular spot on the informational portion of the monthly agenda for a General Manager report. Board members agreed to the request.

Mr. Hamm had attended the recent American Public Transportation Association's (APTA) Operations and Paratransit Conference in Houston along with two other staff members. While there, he met with Edward Thomas from the Federal Transits Administration (FTA). Mr. Thomas continued to campaign for BRT in two particular areas. One area was how to make BRT more competitive by improving the criteria that was used in the new start option. Because new start funding was slanted toward rail projects, BRT projects were not rating well in that process. The other area was his concern that the BRT properties were not pushing hard enough on the vehicle end to try to get manufacturers to move forward with the type of vehicle that he agreed ought to represent BRT applications.

Mr. Hamm also met with Ron Tober, who was the Director of the Cleveland Regional Transit Association (CRTA), and who now was with the Charleston Transit District. Both of the properties were part of the consortium for BRT. Mr. Hamm had gained more information from another General Manager's perspective on the consortium and on BRT in general.

Another meeting that Mr. Hamm had was with Larry Miller of Gannut Fleming, which was a firm that potentially could assist staff and the Board with the development of specifications for the Design/Build process of the BRT.

Mr. Hamm said that at the Product Show, one of the bus manufacturers displayed a small, propane, turban, electric bus application, and Mr. Johnson was able to learn more about the real-time informational software that the Transit Operations staff were considering.

In addition, Transit Planner Will Mueller attended to present information about LTD's BRT project and to present the BRT Video. People were impressed with the project and LTD's approach. Overall, it was an impressive, beneficial opportunity.

Mr. Hamm reported that staff were involved in ongoing discussions with Jeff Geiger, the manager of the McDonald Building, and with Chez Ray regarding moving tables outside onto the Eugene Station Plaza for eating space. It was agreed that it would make the area more inviting. It appeared that a lease would be generated to remove LTD from liability. Mr. Hamm asked if the Board had any concerns about the process. Mr. Hamm thought it would be an asset to the people place that LTD had created to have other things created that adjoined it and would make it a friendlier people environment.

Mr. Bennett asked Facilities Services Manager Charlie Simmons for his thoughts on the project. Mr. Simmons said that the intent when developing the Eugene Station was to develop adjoining areas. Staff had concerns about how that area was controlled, and after consulting with legal counsel, it appeared that language would be included in the lease that would spell out LTD's expectations for such things as cleanliness and table bussing. Mr. Simmons also hoped

to be involved with the design of the area, and it was hoped that with Architect Eric Gunderson's assistance, a design charette would be held with all parties involved.

Mr. Hamm said that Mr. Geiger was very supportive. There already was a mural designed for the wall of the building that faced the Station. The Board indicated its consensus to Mr. Hamm to proceed with the plans for the area between the Station and the McDonald Building.

Mr. Hamm also said that he would provide a regular report to the Board via memorandum regarding what he was doing, who he was meeting with, etc. It would serve as a communication tool for the Board to evaluate and provide feedback to him about the direction he was taking. He believed this was an important communication tool, particularly during the first six months to one year of his employment.

Ms. Hocken asked him to report on his meeting with LCC President Jerry Moskus. Mr. Hamm said that he would include a report in his first memorandum to the Board.

Ms. Lauritsen suggested that Mr. Hamm stagger his memorandum so that it did not coincide with the Board meeting week.

APTA BOARD MEMBERS SEMINAR: Ms. Wylie said that the seminar would be held on July 23 through 27, and she recommended that at least two of the members go. She and Ms. Lauritsen had attended the seminar last year, and found it to be very informative and valuable. She thought it also was valuable for people who supported the Board as well.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Mr. Kleger asked about the Youth Pass slogan, "License to Ride," and if it implied a right in spite of Ordinance 36. He thought 'license' had a limited meaning, and he asked staff to check into it.

Mr. Kortge asked about the Bus Rodeo. Mr. Johnson said that Board members were welcome to participate in the novice competition, or to participate as judges for the bus operator competition, or to just come for the fun and food. The event would be held on July 16, 2000, with the winner of the operator competition going to San Francisco to compete in the national rodeo at the APTA Annual Conference.

Ms. Wylie noted that LTD's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report again had been awarded the Government Finance Officer's Association (GFAO) Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting. She congratulated Ms. Hellekson and staff for a job well done. Ms. Hocken added that many agencies that received this award had their reports prepared by an outside auditor. LTD prepared its report internally, and so it really was LTD's award.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Board Secretary

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Lane Transit District hereby adopts the budget for the Fiscal Year 2000-2001 in the total combined fund sum of \$71,016,922 now on file at Lane Transit District offices.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the amounts for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 2000, and for the purposes shown below are hereby appropriated as follows:

GENERAL FUND - OPERATING BUDGET

Personnel Services	\$ 16,534,230
Materials & Services	5,047,901
Total Operating	<u>21,582,131</u>

GENERAL FUND - NON-OPERATING

Transfer to Special Transportation	789,000
Transfer to Capital Fund	7,254,817
Self-Insurance Contingency	1,000,000
Operating Contingency	1,000,000
Working Capital Contingency	<u>1,000,000</u>
Total Non-operating	<u>11,043,817</u>
Total General Fund	<u>\$ 32,625,948</u>

SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION FUND

Total Subcontracting Costs	\$ <u>1,807,190</u>
Fund Total	\$ <u>1,807,190</u>

CAPITAL FUND

Capital Outlay	\$ 20,028,700
Capital Reserve	<u>16,555,084</u>
Total Capital Fund	<u>\$ 36,583,784</u>

Date

Board President

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 BUDGET

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: (1) Hold public hearing on Fiscal Year 2000-2001 budget
(2) Adopt Fiscal Year 2000-2001 budget by resolution

BACKGROUND: The Budget Committee approved the budget for Fiscal Year 2000-2001 on April 27, 2000. The operating budget is \$21,582,131. The grand legal total of all combined funds plus reserves and transfers is \$71,016,922. A public hearing on the budget must be held, and a final budget must be adopted by the Board of Directors before July 1, 2000.

The attached total budget for the General Fund is exactly the same as the authorized spending in the approved budget for FY 2000-2001. The Special Transportation Fund also has no change from the fund budget that was proposed to and approved by the Budget Committee. The same is true for the Capital Fund.

A copy of the final budget document will be provided to each non-Board member of the Budget Committee as soon as a FY 2000-2001 budget is adopted.

ATTACHMENTS: Resolution
General Fund Budget
Special Transportation Fund Budget
Capital Fund Budget

PROPOSED MOTION: I move approval of the Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2000-2001 budget and appropriating \$71,016,922 as represented in the Resolution.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: LTD EMPLOYEE PICNIC

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: The Annual LTD employee picnic will be held on August 6, 2000, at Jasper Park. Board members and their families are invited to attend. This is a good day to mix with LTD's employees and enjoy an assortment of delicious food and fun events. Please mark this day on your calendars, and staff will provide additional details as they are available.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 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

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: APTA TRANSIT BOARD MEMBERS SEMINAR

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: As noted at the May Board meeting, the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) will hold its Transit Board Members Seminar in Minneapolis, Minnesota, on July 23-27, 2000. This is an annual conference for public transportation agency board members and policy makers, as well as board support personnel. The program will include sessions on the role and responsibilities of public transportation agency board members/policy makers and board support personnel; current issues in public transportation; orientation for new board members; and skill-building for policy development.

The preliminary program has now been received and is enclosed separately for your review.

Any LTD Board members who are interested in attending this seminar should let Ken Hamm or Jo Sullivan know as soon as possible.

ATTACHMENT: Preliminary Program (enclosed as separate document for Board members)

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 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 Hillary Wylie can provide a brief report on the June 8 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. In May, Ms. Hocken asked to be replaced on the committee, and Board member Ginny Lauritsen was named as her replacement. This committee has been meeting once every six months, and was scheduled to meet again on June 6. At the June 21 Board meeting, Ms. Lauritsen will report to the Board on Forum activities.
- c **BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input:** ®Board members Pat Hocken, Rob Bennett, and Hillary Wylie are participating on LTD's BRT Steering Committee with members of local units of government and community representatives. The Steering Committee last met on June 6 and generally meets on the first Tuesday of the month; however, no meeting is scheduled for July. The next BRT Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for August 1, 2000, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. ®A third open house for the Downtown Eugene-West segment was held at the Eugene Station on May 19-23. ®There have been three 10th Avenue design workshops this month, on June 1, June 5, and June 13. ®At the June 21 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:** 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, to consider sites for a new Springfield Station. Former Board member Mary Murphy chairs the committee. The Committee held its final meeting on June 1. The committee's site recommendation may be forwarded to the LTD Board in July, following discussion by the Springfield City Council. At the June 21 Board meeting, the LTD representatives can provide an update on this committee's activities.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: CORRESPONDENCE

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

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

1. May 17, 2000, letter regarding BRT from David Hinkley to Board President Hillary Wylie, with District response
2. April 25, 2000, letter to Jay Pearson and May 30, 2000, letter to John Meerscheidt, both from Board President Hillary Wylie regarding the location of the federal courthouse

At the June 21, 2000, meeting, staff will respond to any questions the Board members may have about this correspondence.

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: EUGENE DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE VEHICLES

PREPARED BY: Ron Berkshire, Fleet Services Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Direction to staff regarding type of vehicles preferred for the shuttle service.

BACKGROUND: A proposed downtown shuttle service that will connect Eugene station with the U of O campus, Fifth Street Market area and Valley River Center is part of the comprehensive service redesign to be implemented in the fall of 2001. The service is designed to provide ten-minute service during peak hours and twenty-minute service the remainder of the time. A total of six buses will be needed to provide the service, five in regular service and one spare. Based on ridership projections the buses should have a minimum capacity of thirty-three passengers.

The distinct characteristics of this service operating the majority of the time in the downtown core on a circulatory route with buses thirty feet or less in length, provide a unique opportunity: the introduction of alternative-powered, low-emissions technology. The community has and continues to encourage the District to use low-emission technology on its buses. Staff have been monitoring alternative-powered technology for a number of years, seeking a viable technology that is affordable and could be implemented into service with minimal impact on current operations. Currently hybrid-electric technology is the most promising and has been successfully implemented into transit service. Staff feel that this is an opportune time to introduce low-emission buses to the community, and the District should consider hybrid-electric powered buses for the shuttle service.

Beside propulsion systems there are two other factors to be considered in basic bus design: floor height and seating configuration. To facilitate fast, easy ingress and egress, and provide maximum seating and space for passengers, staff are recommending that only low-floor buses with perimeter seating be considered. However, standard-floor buses with forward facing seats remain an option.

Staff believe that there are four viable alternatives in selecting a bus for this service. Since the bus selection is ultimately a Board decision, staff have prepared the following options to assist the Board.

Option One: Use existing buses--no new bus purchase.

Pros:

- >This option would require no capital expenditures, assuming bus availability.

Cons:

- >There is a potential risk of not having enough buses to cover the new CSR.
- >There would be a shortage of thirty-foot buses requiring larger buses to be used in areas that require shorter buses.
- >Standard-floor buses would be used on the shuttle service, slowing down passenger ingress and egress.
- >Passenger space would be reduced due to forward facing seats and narrow aisles.
- >Fleet emissions would not be reduced.

Option Two: Purchase six low-floor diesel-powered buses.

Pros:

- >Low-floor design would provide fast, easy passenger ingress and egress.
- >Perimeter seating would increase passenger space.
- >Latest diesel technology would have the potential to reduce fleet emissions.
- >Diesel technology is well established and very reliable.

Cons:

- >District and Community would not benefit from alternative low-emissions technology.

Option Three: Purchase six low-floor, hybrid-electric powered buses.

Pros:

- >Low-floor design would provide fast, easy passenger ingress and egress.
- >Perimeter seating would increase passenger space.
- >Community and environment would benefit from maximum low emissions technology.
- >This would be an opportunity for the District to receive positive publicity.
- >A quieter operating bus is possible.

Cons:

- >There is a greater risk of failure.
- >Entire shuttle service is at risk if technology becomes unreliable or fails completely.
- >There is a premium price of 15 to 20 percent for this technology, when compared to diesel technology.

Option Four: Purchase a combination of both diesel and hybrid-electric powered buses.

Pros:

- >Low-floor design would provide fast, easy passenger ingress and egress.
- >Perimeter seating would increase passenger space.
- >Community and environment would benefit from low emissions technology.
- >This would be an opportunity for the District to receive positive publicity.
- >Two buses would have quieter operating characteristics.
- >The reliability of diesel technology would minimize exposure of the shuttle service to potential unreliability of new technology.

Cost Comparisons:

All costs are estimated capital expenditures.

- Option One – No Cost
- Option Two – \$ 235,000 each x 6 = \$1,410,000
- Option Three – \$ 278,000 each x 6 = \$1,668,000
- Option Four – 2-hybrid & 4-diesel = \$1,496,000

Staff Recommendation:

Staff are recommending Option Four. It facilitates the introduction of cleaner, quieter, hybrid-electric technology into our service while minimizing exposure of the shuttle service to potential unreliability or complete failure of the new technology. Although the technology is proven and is working in transit operations, there is always the potential for problems with this technology, which is still evolving. Although this option does not provide maximum benefit from an all hybrid-electric shuttle bus fleet, it does provide the District with valuable experience that will assist in the decision process for future purchases, such as the neighborhood buses for BRT.

Staff recommend the purchase of two hybrid-electric powered buses and four diesel-powered buses to be used for the downtown shuttle.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff will prepare a proposal for procurement of buses based on Board direction and bring the proposal to the Board for review and approval.

ATTACHMENT:

None

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move that the LTD Board direct staff to prepare a proposal to purchase (number) hybrid-electric and (number) diesel-powered buses to be used for the downtown shuttle service.

H:\Board Packet\agendasum.doc

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora, Service Planning and Marketing Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of resolution reaffirming District boundaries

BACKGROUND: Oregon Revised Statutes 167.207(3)(a) mandates that the boards of directors of transit districts annually determine the territory in which the system will operate. No changes are recommended to the LTD boundary for FY 2000-2001.

CONSEQUENCES OF REQUESTED ACTION: The District will operate within the boundaries set forth in ordinance No. 24 (2000 Revision).

ATTACHMENT: Resolution reaffirming LTD's boundaries

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board adopt the resolution reaffirming that Lane Transit District will continue to operate service within the boundaries specified in Lane Transit District Ordinance No. 24 (2000 Revision).

RESOLUTION

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

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

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

THEREFORE, HEREBY BE IT RESOLVED, that for Fiscal Year 2000 - 2001, the Lane Transit District will continue to operate service within the boundaries specified in Lane Transit District Ordinance Number 24 (2000 Revision).

June 21, 2000
Date Adopted

Board President



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

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

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM:

RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

Prepared by Andy Vobora, Service Planning and Marketing Manager
June 21, 2000

ACTION REQUESTED

Approval of resolution reaffirming District boundaries

BACKGROUND

Oregon Revised Statutes 167.207(3)(a) mandates that the boards of directors of transit districts annually determine the territory in which the system will operate. No changes are recommended to the LTD boundary for FY 2000-2001. Attached for the Board's approval as part of the Consent Calendar for June 21, 2000, is a Resolution reaffirming LTD's boundaries for the coming fiscal year.

CONSEQUENCES OF REQUESTED ACTION

The District will operate within the boundaries set forth in Ordinance No. 24 (2000 Revision).

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2000\06\Regular Mtg\boundary consent cal.doc

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE

PREPARED BY: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND: The Springfield Station Steering Committee met on June 1, 2000, to recommend a site for the new station. As you know, the following three sites are under consideration:

- Site G: This site, which currently houses the US Bank, is located between Main Street and South "A" and between 4th and 5th Streets.
- Site I-East: This site is located at the southwest corner of 5th and South "A."
- Site I-West: This site is located just west of Site I-East.

By a vote of 8 to 3, the Committee voted to recommend Site I-West. The Springfield City Council will consider this recommendation before it is brought to the LTD Board. It is anticipated that the Board will consider the issue at the July Board meeting.

Staff have been waiting for final environmental review of Site I-West, which still has not been granted. However, given that no significant environmental issues have been identified, staff have begun the site selection process with the anticipation that final sign-off of the environmental issues will occur very soon. Staff will wait for final environmental clearance before taking the issue to the Springfield City Council.

ATTACHMENT: None

MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: LTD BUS ROADEO

PREPARED BY: Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: The LTD Bus Roadeo is an opportunity for operators to show off their skills in a competition to see not only who earns the right to be called the best at LTD, but also to compete at the international level. The LTD Roadeo will be held on Sunday, July 16, at the District's Glenwood facility, beginning at 9 a.m. It is a family event, with employees and their families helping throughout the day, and also is open to other employees who want to try their driving skills. This year there are four divisions: the Masters division, for bus operators who have met the criteria to qualify; the Maverick division, for operators who do not meet the criteria for the Masters division; a Supervisor division, for those who have driven a bus before but are now an administrative employee; and a Greenhorn division, for those who have never driven a bus before. All Greenhorn participants must attend practice day to receive some basic instruction on the safe operation of a bus.

This year the International Bus Roadeo is in San Francisco. The winning operator from the LTD Masters division will receive a trip to San Francisco to compete against the best operators in the world. It is a fun event at both the local and international level and an opportunity for LTD operators to meet operators from other transit districts around the world.

Board members are encouraged to participate in some way. You are welcome to drop by and watch the activities, or to participate in the Greenhorn division (please sign up with staff ahead of time in order to receive prior instruction).

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

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

1. Approval of minutes: May 15, 2000, Board work session
2. Approval of minutes: May 17, 2000, regular Board meeting
3. Approval: Supplemental Facsimile Signature Policy Update
4. Adoption: Resolution Reaffirming District Boundaries

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Minutes of the May 15, 2000, Board work session
2. Minutes of the May 17, 2000, regular Board meeting
3. Supplemental Facsimile Signature Policy
4. Resolution Reaffirming the Territory in the District Within Which the Transit System Will Operate in Accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes 267.207(3)(a)

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for June 21, 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: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: CUSTOMER SERVICE OPERATING HOURS

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Staff request Board feedback regarding the hours of operation in Customer Services.

BACKGROUND: Lane Transit District has operated a customer service function on or adjacent to the Eugene Station since the 1970s. The facilities and staffing levels were small to begin with, but have grown as the District and its customer base have grown.

In 1983, the 10th Avenue Eugene Station was upgraded with wider sidewalks and new passenger shelters, and the telephone and sales functions were consolidated into leased space at the corner of 10th Avenue and Willamette Street. Hours of operation were roughly 7 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Throughout the mid-1980s, ridership grew steadily, placing more demands on the customer service staff. To meet the growing demands, Saturday and Sunday service was added, along with an expansion of weekday evening service. These added hours provided more opportunities for customers to access route and schedule information, make fare instrument purchases, and wait for their buses in a dry, safe place.

Following the comprehensive service redesign of 1992, the service span offered on LTD routes was expanded to include an 11:40 p.m. departure. At the same time, the District extended operating hours in customer services to offer a fuller span of service. Weekday evening coverage was expanded from a closing time of 7:30 p.m. to 11:30 p.m.

Since moving into the new Eugene Station in 1998, the budgeted level of customer service staffing has remained unchanged. However, due to turnover, actual staffing to accommodate this span of service has yet to reach full strength. This has resulted in overtime costs. Currently, only eight of the ten positions are filled, which has provided an opportunity to discuss the concept of reducing service center staffing and hours of operation.

Staff have discussed many different options for staffing customer services. The discussions have narrowed the options to two scenarios:

1. Hire staff to fill the two open positions and maintain the service center hours that currently exist.
2. Hire one staff person and reduced the operating hours to 6:00 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends.

Scenario One is consistent with the operational plan for the Eugene Station. Before construction, the Eugene Station Advisory Committee discussed issues related to customer convenience and safety, as well as facility safety. The customer service hours directly reflect the Committee’s study of the concept of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.

Scenario Two was developed using an analysis of sales and telephone activity on an hour-by-hour basis. These activities drop quickly in the evening; therefore, there is an argument that these sales and information calls could be accommodated by shifting the demand. Staff recognize that there are many customers who use the waiting area and restrooms during their evening and weekend transfers. These customers would not have this option under Scenario Two. Under Scenario Two, staffing of the station platform would occur through the use of LTD supervisory staff or contract security staff. Additional accommodations, such as waiving the ‘closed-door’ policy, would need to be considered.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

If the Board prefers Scenario One, staff will begin the hiring process to fill the two vacant positions. If the Board prefers Scenario Two, staff will fill one additional staff position and begin the communication process with the customers regarding the changes in customer service hours.

Implementation of changes to hours of operation would most likely be coordinated with the fall bid. This timing allows adequate time to educate the customers and to change printed information pieces.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Board elect a President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer to fill two-year terms beginning July 1, 2000.

BACKGROUND: In accordance with ORS 267.120(1), the Board of Directors must elect from among its members, by majority vote, a president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer, to serve two-year terms. Elections were held in June 1998 for two-year terms ending July 1, 2000. Following Kirk Bailey's resignation from the Board during the summer of 1999, Hillary Wylie was elected president to fill the last year of his two-year term. Elections were then held to fill the second year of Ms. Wylie's vacated position as secretary. The current officers are Hillary Wylie, president; Rob Bennett, vice president; Dean Kortge, secretary; and Dave Kleger, treasurer.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: I nominate _____ as the LTD Board ____ (office) ____, for a two-year term beginning July 1, 2000.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: JULY 2000 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Secretary

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: **JULY 2000 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Bus Operator Walt Boynton has been selected as the July 2000 Employee of the Month. Walt began his employment with LTD on May 11, 1974, and has earned an award for 24 years of Safe Driving. He is a union officer and a member of the current negotiations committee. Walt was nominated for this award by a customer after helping her on and off the bus with her suitcase and bag. The customer thought that Walt was very kind, even making others wait until he helped her off the bus.

When asked what makes Walt a good employee, Field Supervisor Shawn Mercer said that Walt is well liked and respected by his fellow operators and is one of the "go to guys" for the system supervisors managing the extra board. His willingness to provide great all-around service for the customers of LTD, his friendly and positive attitude, and his work ethic are important components of his nomination and selection as Employee of the Month. Walt has earned a reputation as an operator who can be depended on to deal with issues quickly and efficiently. He has an excellent safety and attendance record. Our congratulations to Walt on his selection!

AWARD: Walt will attend the June 21 meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h)

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to discuss current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to discuss current litigation or litigation likely to be filed.



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

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

Consent Calendar Item:

Lane Transit District SUPPLMENTAL FACSIMILE SIGNATURE POLCY UPDATE

Prepared by Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

Since December 1994, Lane Transit District has used facsimile signatures to sign the majority of District checks. There has always been a Board-approved policy governing the use of facsimile signatures, which has been revised periodically to reflect changes in titles, responsibilities and other routine matters. Security always has been of utmost importance, and remains the focus of the policy.

The revision recommended at this time is to make the following changes, all of which are of a "housekeeping nature":

- Correct a title that has been changed since the policy was last revised in June 1996.

The assistant finance manager position has been reclassified to accounting supervisor, but still has the same responsibilities for backing up check processing as the previous position.

- Eliminate from the policy the department managers who previously were authorized to review checks in the absence of the general manager, assistant general manager, finance manager, and executive secretary.

During the last four years, there has never been a situation in which the services of the additional department managers were necessary. In addition, work schedules and new office assignments downtown have made several of those managers unavailable, so it would be impractical to rely on them for process backup. The four primary reviewers (with the finance manager performing more than 90 percent of the reviews), plus the two reserve reviewers (accounting supervisor and purchasing administrator) who are generally available and familiar with the work, are sufficient to meet the needs of the review process.

- Update the description of facsimile signature options.

When the policy was first written, all facsimiles were generated by a piece of electronic equipment attached to a dot matrix printer that was secured by a key. That system is still in operation for vendor check printing, but is scheduled to be replaced by facsimile

signatures embedded in software applications. The payroll system already uses software signatures for the approximately 70 paychecks that are printed every two weeks. It is appropriate to add this alternative to the policy's description of the facsimile process.

The vendor system also will be offering electronic funds transfer (EFT) as a payment alternative to checks in the near future, as is utilized for the majority of the employee payroll transactions. (Separate security procedures exist for EFT transactions.) It is possible that within the next two years, the majority of LTD's payments will be electronic.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
SUPPLEMENTAL FACSIMILE SIGNATURE POLICY**

OBJECTIVE

To amend District policy regarding the usage of facsimile signatures for the signing of the District's payroll and vendor checks adopted by the Board of Directors on December 13, 1994, and modified on May 17, 1995, and June 19, 1996. The goal of this policy is to establish internal control procedures that will help safeguard the District's assets.

APPLICATION

This policy refers to the signing of District General Account checks and Payroll Account checks using facsimile signatures. All necessary internal control procedures governing facsimile check signing have been included.

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

The signature of the general manager, assistant general manager, and/or the finance manager may be affixed to General or Payroll Account checks of the District by facsimile signature.

Physical check stock for each of the two accounts used by the District will be pre-printed with sequential check numbers. A check log will be maintained for each set of checks. The General Account check log will be maintained by the accounts payable accounting technician. The Payroll Account log will be maintained by the payroll technician. Both logs will be reviewed and signed during the bank statement reconciliation process by separate staff. All check stock will be stored in a secure location.

A checklist, prior to printing, will be reviewed and approved by the finance manager or her/his designee. Each General Account check will be individually reviewed and the check copy initialed prior to the check's release. All supporting documentation will be attached for review. The reviewer will be one of the following: the general manager, assistant general manager, finance manager, or executive secretary. In the absence of the previous four reviewers, the accounting supervisor or purchasing administrator may review and initial checks before distribution.

Facsimile signatures shall be secured at all times, either by restricted access to a key that is required to operate older facsimile equipment, or by password and access restrictions for facsimiles embedded in software applications. Facsimile security shall be reviewed annually by independent auditors as part of the comprehensive audit process.

Legal Reference: ORS 294.120

Adopted _____, 2000, by the Lane Transit District Board of Directors.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

June 21, 2000

Revenue:

- **Special service revenue** is slightly lower than for the first eleven 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 receipts are more than \$112,000 ahead of plan due to the adjustment.
- **Payroll tax receipts** were incorrectly anticipated by the monthly budget. This resource already exceeds budget for the fiscal year by \$900,000. Cottage Grove receipts have contributed to this positive variance, but it is not yet known to what extent. An analysis is pending the receipt of data from the Oregon Department of Revenue.

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 Public Affairs 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 will 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 be carried through most of the current fiscal year. However, another grant contract delay will offset the current-year surplus, and create a similar surplus in next year's capital revenue. BRT project expenses are overstated in the current-year budget, which contributed to a year-long positive variance.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** June 21, 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. **Springfield Station Site Selection:** The Board will be asked to make a decision regarding the site for the new Springfield Station, possibly at a special meeting on July 12, 2000, or later during the summer.
 - B. **Joint Meeting on TransPlan:** A discussion of TransPlan by the Eugene and Springfield City Councils, the Lane County Board of Commissioners, and the LTD Board of Directors has been scheduled for Wednesday, July 12, 2000, at the Springfield DoubleTree Hotel. Dinner will be provided at 5 p.m., and the hearing will begin at 6 p.m.
 - C. **Bus Purchase Approval:** The Board will be asked to approve the purchase of buses for the Eugene downtown shuttle, possibly on July 12, 2000, or later during the summer or early fall.
 - D. **Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 Decision:** It is anticipated that a Board decision regarding Phase 1 of the bus rapid transit project will need to be made during the fall of 2000.
 - E. **Board Strategic Planning Work Session:** Staff will work with the Board to schedule a two-day strategic planning work session for the fall of 2000.
 - F. **Comprehensive Service Redesign Public Hearings:** The Board will be asked to hold public hearings on service recommendations that result from the 2000 comprehensive service redesign.
 - G. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval:** It is anticipated that approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur in December 2000.
 - H. **BRT Updates:** Various action and information items will be placed on Board meeting agendas during the design and implementation phases of the bus rapid transit project.
 - I. **Quarterly Performance Reporting:** Staff will provide quarterly performance reports for the Board's information in February, May, August, and November each year.

LTD GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

**Prepared by Ken Hamm, General Manager
June 21, 2000, Board Meeting**

G.M. Evaluation

The letter of agreement between the Board and the general manager does not identify the timing and format for the general manager's evaluation. Since we are coming up on three months together, it would be appropriate to identify a tool or format and determine the intervals of evaluations. From the general manager's perspective, it would be good in the first year to have a three-month, six-month, and annual evaluation. Staff could present Board members with some format options. A committee that includes the Board President, Vice President, and Past President might oversee the process of collecting input and sitting down with the general manager. Another idea might be for the entire Board to hold an executive session at one of the study sessions or Board meetings.

Customer Service Center Hours

A review of the productivity of hours expended in the Customer Service Center shows a considerable drop-off after the p.m. peak. It is my recommendation that the CSC hours be changed to focus resources on the periods of demand. Board input would be appreciated.

Current hours at the CSC are: Monday through Friday - 6 a.m. to 11:30 p.m.; Saturday – 7:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m.; and Sunday – 8:30 a.m. to 8 p.m. This coverage has required nine employees as a minimum. The recommended hours are: Monday through Friday – 6 a.m. to 8 p.m.; Saturday and Sunday – 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. We can increase our service quality with the eight employees we currently have, eliminating the two positions that currently are vacant as a result of attrition. This is an estimated annual savings to the District of \$30,000.

Workshops

The Management Team will hold a workshop later this summer or in early fall to look at a number of interests and to focus on our future. Some of the discussion will relate to our internal workings (culture, structure, interest, issues) and some to our external focuses (projects, partnerships, image).

Out of this workshop could potentially come some recommendations to the Board. It is anticipated that a Board workshop would occur sometime in October or November. LTD has a need to update our strategic plan. Included in that exercise would be bus rapid transit, Eugene downtown shuttle, Comprehensive Service Redesign, UO shuttles, intermodal considerations, and much more. This is just a heads-up for future scheduling.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: 2000 PACIFIC PROGRAM

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

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

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

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

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

ATTACHMENT: 2000 Pacific Program Brochure (enclosed separately for Board members)

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: EUGENE DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE VEHICLES

PREPARED BY: Ron Berkshire, Fleet Services Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Direction to staff regarding type of vehicles preferred for the shuttle service.

BACKGROUND: A proposed downtown shuttle service that will connect Eugene station with the U of O campus, Fifth Street Market area and Valley River Center is part of the comprehensive service redesign to be implemented in the fall of 2001. The service is designed to provide ten-minute service during peak hours and twenty-minute service the remainder of the time. A total of six buses will be needed to provide the service, five in regular service and one spare. Based on ridership projections the buses should have a minimum capacity of thirty-three passengers.

The distinct characteristics of this service operating the majority of the time in the downtown core on a circulatory route with buses thirty feet or less in length, provide a unique opportunity: the introduction of alternative-powered, low-emissions technology. The community has and continues to encourage the District to use low-emission technology on its buses. Staff have been monitoring alternative-powered technology for a number of years, seeking a viable technology that is affordable and could be implemented into service with minimal impact on current operations. Currently hybrid-electric technology is the most promising and has been successfully implemented into transit service. Staff feel that this is an opportune time to introduce low-emission buses to the community, and the District should consider hybrid-electric powered buses for the shuttle service.

Beside propulsion systems there are two other factors to be considered in basic bus design: floor height and seating configuration. To facilitate fast, easy ingress and egress, and provide maximum seating and space for passengers, staff are recommending that only low-floor buses with perimeter seating be considered. However, standard-floor buses with forward facing seats remain an option.

Staff believe that there are four viable alternatives in selecting a bus for this service. Since the bus selection is ultimately a Board decision, staff have prepared the following options to assist the Board.

Option One: Use existing buses--no new bus purchase.

Pros:

- >This option would require no capital expenditures, assuming bus availability.

Cons:

- >There is a potential risk of not having enough buses to cover the new CSR.
- >There would be a shortage of thirty-foot buses requiring larger buses to be used in areas that require shorter buses.
- >Standard-floor buses would be used on the shuttle service, slowing down passenger ingress and egress.
- >Passenger space would be reduced due to forward facing seats and narrow aisles.
- >Fleet emissions would not be reduced.

Option Two: Purchase six low-floor diesel-powered buses.

Pros:

- >Low-floor design would provide fast, easy passenger ingress and egress.
- >Perimeter seating would increase passenger space.
- >Latest diesel technology would have the potential to reduce fleet emissions.
- >Diesel technology is well established and very reliable.

Cons:

- >District and Community would not benefit from alternative low-emissions technology.

Option Three: Purchase six low-floor, hybrid-electric powered buses.

Pros:

- >Low-floor design would provide fast, easy passenger ingress and egress.
- >Perimeter seating would increase passenger space.
- >Community and environment would benefit from maximum low emissions technology.
- >This would be an opportunity for the District to receive positive publicity.
- >A quieter operating bus is possible.

Cons:

- >There is a greater risk of failure.
- >Entire shuttle service is at risk if technology becomes unreliable or fails completely.
- >There is a premium price of 15 to 20 percent for this technology, when compared to diesel technology.

Option Four: Purchase a combination of both diesel and hybrid-electric powered buses.

Pros:

- >Low-floor design would provide fast, easy passenger ingress and egress.
- >Perimeter seating would increase passenger space.
- >Community and environment would benefit from low emissions technology.
- >This would be an opportunity for the District to receive positive publicity.
- >Two buses would have quieter operating characteristics.
- >The reliability of diesel technology would minimize exposure of the shuttle service to potential unreliability of new technology.

Cost Comparisons:

All costs are estimated capital expenditures.

- Option One – No Cost
- Option Two – \$ 235,000 each x 6 = \$1,410,000
- Option Three – \$ 278,000 each x 6 = \$1,668,000
- Option Four – 2-hybrid & 4-diesel = \$1,496,000

Staff Recommendation:

Staff are recommending Option Four. It facilitates the introduction of cleaner, quieter, hybrid-electric technology into our service while minimizing exposure of the shuttle service to potential unreliability or complete failure of the new technology. Although the technology is proven and is working in transit operations, there is always the potential for problems with this technology, which is still evolving. Although this option does not provide maximum benefit from an all hybrid-electric shuttle bus fleet, it does provide the District with valuable experience that will assist in the decision process for future purchases, such as the neighborhood buses for BRT.

Staff recommend the purchase of two hybrid-electric powered buses and four diesel-powered buses to be used for the downtown shuttle.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff will prepare a proposal for procurement of buses based on Board direction and bring the proposal to the Board for review and approval.

ATTACHMENT:

None

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move that the LTD Board direct staff to prepare a proposal to purchase (number) hybrid-electric and (number) diesel-powered buses to be used for the downtown shuttle service.

H:\Board Packet\agendasum.doc



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

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

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT

June 21, 2000

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager

The Congress has entered its annual appropriations debate, and as expected this year it has taken on a very partisan tone, delaying consideration of most of the 13 appropriations measures. One exception is the Transportation Appropriations measure. The House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee marked up its version of the bill in 20 minutes, and there were no changes in full committee. It passed the full House with little debate, 395 to 13.

The House version of the bill contains absolutely no mention of Lane Transit District and provides a mere \$5 million to Tri-Met for interstate light rail, an amount obviously insufficient to move forward with the project. In response to Oregon's request for a \$16 million state-wide earmark for transit projects, the House included only \$4 million. Again, there is a high correlation between significant earmarks and the home states of Appropriations Committee members.

The Senate has named recipients but not indicated or recommended any funding levels. LTD is included in the Senate version, as are other Oregon transit agencies, but the state-wide earmark is not. Negotiating a path between Oregon transit agencies and the work needed in Washington to reconcile the House and Senate versions is the next task. At this writing, the full Senate has not yet voted on the measure, and no date has been set for conference work.

Board members Rob Bennett, Gerry Gaydos, and Pat Hocken had the opportunity to meet with U.S. Congressman Peter DeFazio on June 1, to discuss the status of BRT Phase I, to answer any questions he might have, and to forecast issues related to Phase II. In a conversation with KEZI-TV following the meeting, he discussed BRT. The evening news was transcribed as follows:

NEWSCASTER RICK DANCER: An Oregon congressman is backing a plan for a new bus rapid transit system. Peter DeFazio met with the LTD Board today. He says he will back the plan to link Downtown Eugene with

Downtown Springfield, but he hasn't decided which plan he likes for West Eugene. One would go along 13th Avenue, the other would run along 6th and 7th Avenues. Either way, DeFazio says it's a project that he thinks needs to be done.

REP. PETER DeFAZIO, (D) OREGON: Today, you can look at Eugene-Springfield and say, well, we can limp along with what we've got. But we're already looking and trying to look 20 or 30 years into the future, as the area continues to grow is what will mitigate the problems of growth and congestion.

At the State level, staff have met most recently with state Senator Susan Castillo and state Rep. Floyd Prozanski, to discuss BRT and funding for the proposed RideSource facility.

While decisions are being made about Eugene-Springfield local priorities for the State Transportation Improvement Plan, the Oregon Transportation Commission is facing the reality of insufficient funding to maintain current pavement conditions. It is believed that an additional \$141 million is needed in the next two years to maintain the current ratings for both pavement and bridges, or close to the amount available in all STIP programs combined.

The Commission is devoting parts of its June and July meetings to the issue, and holding a special meeting on the STIP June 21. At those meetings the Commission is hearing from the various programs within ODOT, the affected interest groups, as well as the individual regions. The Commission faces a major dilemma in that the voters have—in some ways—voted for bad roads, while the Commission feels its responsibility is to maintain a certain standard. All programs are underfunded and everything is a high priority.

SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING

Andy Vobora, Service Planning & Marketing Manager

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN (CSR) OUTREACH

The May 24 and 25 CSR open houses went well. Customer traffic by the display and discussions with staff were steady throughout the day. A summary of the input received will be available at the Board meeting. Additional input is being received through letters, petitions, and e-mail. All input will be reviewed by staff and considered for inclusion in the route changes as refinements are made during the process. Staff are working on the next step in the process, which is to further research the cycle times of the routes and to begin determining the pulse times for each route. It is staff's plan to have these details worked out by the next open house dates of July 24 and 25. This additional information will allow riders to better analyze how the routes will work for them. Further review of the service has

occurred through an internal employee committee, information posted in the operators' lounge, and Customer Service staff meetings. On June 22, the staff will meet with Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) members and other planning staff to review the routes. This is needed to ensure that the planners are on board with the changes early in the process. A similar review will occur with TPC in early fall.

YOUTH PASS

Sales data are still being compiled for the first couple of weeks of Youth Pass sales. The major push of paid advertising has begun and informational materials continue to be distributed through the schools and sales outlets. June 12 marks the date when prize contests begin. Staff look forward to a busy summer with our partners: KDUK radio, Pepsi, and Burger King. Our long-time partnership with the City of Eugene Parks Department is also back in swing with their summer kick-off event that occurred on June 9. More advertising will begin when bottle hangers start appearing on Pepsi products sold throughout Eugene-Springfield. The new youth pass radio advertisement features Madeline Puckett, a seventeen year-old Corvallis high school student who wrote the music and lyrics and recorded the ad. She also appears, along with LTD employees' children, in the print ads. Madeline's CDs will be given away with prize packages throughout the summer, and staff hope to introduce her to local event organizers to arrange performances later this summer.

An associated youth activity involves LTD's partnership with the Oregon Bach Festival. The Bach Festival is sponsoring 600 (so far!) low-income youth to attend free concerts. LTD is contributing day passes to ensure that these young people can get to the event.

UO FOOTBALL SERVICE

Discussions continue with UO and City staff regarding Autzen Stadium expansion and how the LTD service will be affected. Currently, the UO has retained architect Eric Gunderson to produce conceptual drawings for placement of the bus platform. There are pros and cons for each site and much discussion still is needed before a decision can be made. Staff do know that this coming season LTD will operate from the existing location. A decision has been made to eliminate the Shasta Park & Ride in favor of a downtown Eugene Park & Ride. The downtown location offers more parking and faster turnaround time. All other locations will remain the same. The District and the UO have agreed that the fare will remain the same at \$2 per round trip and that a discounted season pass will be sold.

OREGON COUNTRY FAIR

The detailed planning for the Country Fair service is in full swing. This year presents a challenge in that the service will be operated from two locations. Shuttles will depart from Civic Stadium and the Eugene Station. This was necessary due to the uncertainty of Autzen Stadium work. Fastixx will set up shop in the Customer Service lobby to provide ticket sales.

Most fairgoers will have purchased tickets already, but for those who have not, this is a necessity, because only those with tickets will be allowed to ride the shuttle.

BUTTE TO BUTTE SHUTTLES

Plans have been finalized to provide pre-race shuttles for the Butte to Butte race on July 4. Northwest Event Management provides the free rides to racers, who can leave their cars near the finish area and catch a ride to the start. The service provides more than 1,000 rides during a forty-minute period.

NEW FARE PAYMENT SYSTEM

An internal committee has developed the design of the new day pass. The process of selecting a printer is now underway, with a targeted delivery date of August 15. Public information continues to be provided. "Bus Talk" articles are appearing monthly and bus posters were installed in early June. A Spanish version of the poster will be placed in late June. A few complaints have been received; however, most customers are still learning how the system will work.

SCHEDULING SYSTEM TRAINING

An additional week of software training took place this month. This included training in the use of the geographic information system (mapping) module and the bus stop information module. The staff continue to face frustrations working with a company that has never been required to meet the needs of a smaller transit system that integrates its work products. The LTD task team is in constant communication with the vendor to ensure that the final product meets the District's needs. The project is on schedule for parallel testing for the fall bid.

LTD RECEIVES HUD GRANT APPROVAL

LTD was notified of approval of a grant through HUD's Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Program. The goal of the program is to provide services to help senior and disabled residents of the HUD facilities improve their independence and quality of life. Transportation was one of the needs identified. LTD currently offers bus service to all the local HUD locations (except Florence).

The proposal was prepared jointly, then submitted through the local HASCA. Altogether, the group received \$100,000. Other local agencies included in this joint proposal include Food For Lane County, Meals on Wheels, LCC, Campbell Senior Center, Options Counseling, Senior & Disabled Services, and Retired Senior Volunteer Program.

The proposal includes transportation services for the senior & disabled residents in these HUD facilities:

- ◆ McKenzie Village (Springfield)
- ◆ Parkview Terrace (Eugene)
- ◆ Lindeborg Place (Junction City)
- ◆ Cresview Villa (Creswell)
- ◆ Riverview Terrace (Cottage Grove)
- ◆ Veneta Villa (Veneta)

The transportation services include:

- ◆ 12-month bus pass & photo ID for elderly & disabled residents
- ◆ \$10 gift certificate for OASIS programs for elderly residents
- ◆ Semiannual Transportation Fairs (on-site)
- ◆ Initial survey of resident needs
- ◆ Follow-up survey of resident usage and satisfaction

LTD calculated the cost of the program at \$19,596. The District will receive \$9,495 from the grant, and will provide a match of \$10,101.

LANE COUNTY PARKS NEWSLETTER

Lane County Parks expressed to LTD staff their desire to publish a newsletter to be distributed to people using County parks throughout the summer. However, Lane County Parks is without in-house marketing staff.

SP&M staff agreed to work with the Parks staff to edit and design the newsletter and prepare it for printing. In exchange, LTD will have one page inside the newsletter to promote activities, such as the Youth Pass Program, and list LTD routes that serve Lane County Parks. Lane County Parks will put the newsletter on its Web site and distribute it through the parks. LTD staff believe that creating this partnership and sharing resources will be beneficial for both LTD and Lane County Parks.

TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager

GETTING CONNECTED

Transit Services Administrator Rob Montgomery and System Supervisor Dennis Potter attended the Washington State Transit Association (WSTA) operations committee meeting in

Wenatchee, Washington, in May. This was a good opportunity for them to meet with other operations professionals and to discuss what other agencies are doing to maintain high-quality service.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL CERTIFICATION

LTD has been recognized as a Training Agency for the National Safety Council “Driver Improvement Program.” Transit Operations will be conducting a class on June 20. Members of the Accident Review Committee will be attending, and other employees of the District have been invited to attend, as well. The information presented in the “Driver Improvement Program” is valuable for anyone who drives, whether professionally or not.

INTERVIEW WORKSHOP

Training Supervisor Vern Rogers has been working with Human Resources Analyst Joyce Ziemplak to revise the new operator interview process. LTD has begun taking applications for operator positions continuously (rather than only when there are vacant positions), and is beginning to use a video test to help screen applicants. Vern has held a workshop to train the interview team. The new process is intended to give the District better insight into the candidates’ skills and abilities, and ultimately provide LTD with the best operators possible.

HUMAN RESOURCES

David Dickman, Human Resources Manager

There is no Human Resources report this month.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: 2002-2005 STIP PRIORITY SETTING

PREPARED BY: Lisa Gardner, Capital Grants Administrator
Connie B. Williams, Commuter Solutions Coordinator

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval of 2002-2005 STIP Transit/TDM Priority List

BACKGROUND: Every two years, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) updates the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The STIP document programs the expenditure of state and federal transportation funds in the state. The State has begun the process to develop the 2002-2005 STIP, and will be soliciting prioritized project lists from the Eugene-Springfield area. As part of the regional project prioritization, Lane Transit District will forward a list of project priorities to the local Metropolitan Policy Committee. Staff have prepared a recommended project list for Board discussion and action. At the Board meeting, staff will provide an overview of the STIP process and how these priorities were developed.

At the May 17, 2000, regular Board meeting, the Board discussed the proposed TDM projects for funding through STIP. Additional copies of that document will be available at the June 21 meeting.

ATTACHMENT: Transit/TDM priority list recommended by staff

PROPOSED MOTION: I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors recommends to the Metropolitan Policy Committee the proposed transit/TDM project priority list for inclusion in the 2002-2005 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

LTD STIP Requests 2002-2005

Prepared by Lisa Gardner

June 21, 2000

	2002	2003	2004	2005
Springfield Station (BRT Terminus)	800,000	400,000		
Transportation Demand Management	487,000	481,000	478,000	451,000
Ridesource Facility	100,000			

Springfield Station (BRT Terminus)

LTD is seeking federal funds for the Springfield Station as part of the United Front funding request. Since it is unlikely that the project will be fully funded through the federal discretionary grant program, LTD is seeking other funding sources to ensure that the project can move forward. Through the 2000-2003 STIP programming process, LTD has been appropriated \$846,000 in Surface Transportation (STP) funds. Additional STP funds are being requested as part of the 2002-2005 request to piece together the total project funding, in addition to federal funds that may be appropriated. The project is scheduled to be completed in 2002; however, depending on funding availability, it may be necessary to build the project in phases, with final passenger boarding amenities and landscaping being funded in federal FY 2003.

Transportation Demand Management

The four-year funding requests reflect the TDM program as presented to the LTD Board at the May 2000 meeting. The project list and funding priorities were developed as part of a regional prioritization process with the Eugene-Springfield interjurisdictional TDM committee.

RideSource Facility

As discussed at the April Board meeting, RideSource is in need of a new maintenance and administrative facility. LTD is working to develop a funding plan for this project. State funding for this type of facility is extremely limited, and this funding request represents partial project funding, in addition to \$140,000 appropriated to LTD by ODOT. The land acquisition piece of the RideSource project has been included in the FY 2000-01 LTD budget, and will be 100 percent funded with local funds. Additional funds will need to be identified to fully fund the project.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: TRIENNIAL REVIEW UPDATE

PREPARED BY: Jeanette Bailor, Purchasing Administrator

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND: Every three years, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducts a review of Lane Transit District to assess management practices and program implementation, and to evaluate compliance with federal requirements. A triennial review consists of two stages. The first is a desk review of FTA files of documents submitted by LTD that pertain to federal requirements. The desk review for LTD's most recent triennial review was conducted in June 1999. The second stage is a site visit, which was conducted on September 7 through 9, 1999.

A written report was issued by FTA on April 19, 2000, addressing the results of the triennial review and stating that LTD complies with most federal requirements and remains eligible for federal assistance. The report contained three items that required follow-up by staff: procurement, regarding the addition of a written summary of procurement history to contract files; a drug-free workplace program; and the District's Drug and Alcohol Program. Staff have responded to the FTA letter with changes that bring LTD into compliance with the federal regulations. The Drug and Alcohol Program was updated and received Board approval at the February 16 Board of Directors meeting.

Attached to this summary is a copy of staff's May 16, 2000, letter to the FTA, which lists the three areas requiring follow-up and describes the District's responses. Full copies of the Final Report and the staff response, with attachments, will be available at the June 21 meeting for interested Board members.

ATTACHMENTS: LTD Letter of Response to Final Report

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: APPEAL OF SPRINGFIELD WAL-MART SITE PLAN

PREPARED BY: Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None, information only

BACKGROUND: On June 6, 2000, the City of Springfield issued a Site Plan Review for a new Wal-Mart store to be constructed in the Mohawk neighborhood of Springfield. The 33-acre property is to house 330,000 square feet of retail space, 600,000 square feet of parking, and 275,000 square feet of landscaping. While the site review permit is issued by the City of Springfield, LTD is one of the local public agencies that, by law, is solicited for comments on the proposed site plan. LTD's comments are advisory to the City of Springfield. LTD made five requests to the City on this project:

1. **REQUEST:** That Wal-Mart move the location of its main store on the site so that it would be closer to the bus stop. The store location is typical of a shopping mall; i.e., on the far side of the parking lot from the bus stop.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart declined to move the store and the City of Springfield agreed with Wal-Mart.

2. **REQUEST:** That Wal-Mart be required to move a sidewalk to provide for a safer, more direct walk from the bus stop to the store entrance.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart proposed to build another sidewalk that accomplishes the same goal.

3. **REQUEST:** That Wal-Mart be required to build two bus stop pull-outs and shelters, one on either side of Olympic Street. Customers will be using the bus in both directions to access the store.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart agreed to build a shelter on the south side of Olympic but not the north side. It is LTD's experience that the vast majority of the customers who use the bus to shop at Wal-Mart will make round trips on the bus. Shelters will be needed on both sides of the street because customers will be waiting for a bus on both sides of

the street. To agree to build one shelter but not the other does not provide good customer service for Wal-Mart’s bus riding customers.

- 4. REQUEST: That Wal-Mart install a pedestrian light on Olympic Street for the bus passengers traveling to and from the north-side bus stop.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart declined to install a pedestrian light and the City of Springfield agreed with Wal-Mart.

- 5. REQUEST: That Wal-Mart increase the size of the sidewalk from the bus stop to the store entrance from six feet to nine feet. LTD’s experience is that bus passengers use grocery carts to carry their goods to the bus stop. A six-foot sidewalk can be too small when wheelchairs, grocery carts, and strollers all need to occupy the same sidewalk.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart declined to expand the sidewalk and the City concurred with Wal-Mart.

At this point LTD staff intend to appeal three of the City of Springfield rulings: installing a pedestrian crosswalk light on Olympic Street for passenger safety; installing a passenger shelter on the north side of Olympic Street for passenger comfort; and widening the access sidewalk from six feet to nine feet for passenger safety. **Unless the community marries land use and transportation decisions _____.**
When given the opportunity, the District needs to advocate for citizens _____
_____ make it friendly for pedestrian traffic and those who travel to businesses such as Wal-Mart by transit _____

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: June 21, 2000

ITEM TITLE: APPEAL OF SPRINGFIELD WAL-MART SITE PLAN

PREPARED BY: Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None, information only

BACKGROUND: On June 6, 2000, the City of Springfield issued a Site Plan Review for a new Wal-Mart store to be constructed in the Mohawk neighborhood of Springfield. The 33-acre property is to house 330,000 square feet of retail space, 600,000 square feet of parking, and 275,000 square feet of landscaping. While the site review permit is issued by the City of Springfield, LTD is one of the local public agencies that, by law, is solicited for comments on the proposed site plan. LTD's comments are advisory to the City of Springfield. LTD made five requests to the City on this project:

1. **REQUEST:** That Wal-Mart move the location of its main store on the site so that it would be closer to the bus stop. The store location is typical of a shopping mall; i.e., on the far side of the parking lot from the bus stop.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart declined to move the store and the City of Springfield agreed with Wal-Mart.

2. **REQUEST:** That Wal-Mart be required to move a sidewalk to provide for a safer, more direct walk from the bus stop to the store entrance.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart proposed to build another sidewalk that accomplishes the same goal.

3. **REQUEST:** That Wal-Mart be required to build two bus stop pull-outs and shelters, one on either side of Olympic Street. Customers will be using the bus in both directions to access the store.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart agreed to build a shelter on the south side of Olympic but not the north side. It is LTD's experience that the vast majority of the customers who use the bus to shop at Wal-Mart will make round trips on the bus. Shelters will be needed on both sides of the street because customers will be waiting for a bus on both sides of

the street. To agree to build one shelter but not the other does not provide good customer service for Wal-Mart's bus riding customers.

4. REQUEST: That Wal-Mart install a pedestrian light on Olympic Street for the bus passengers traveling to and from the north-side bus stop.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart declined to install a pedestrian light and the City of Springfield agreed with Wal-Mart.

5. REQUEST: That Wal-Mart increase the size of the sidewalk from the bus stop to the store entrance from six feet to nine feet. LTD's experience is that bus passengers use grocery carts to carry their goods to the bus stop. A six-foot sidewalk can be too small when wheelchairs, grocery carts, and strollers all need to occupy the same sidewalk.

RESOLUTION: Wal-Mart declined to expand the sidewalk and the City concurred with Wal-Mart.

At this point, LTD staff intend to appeal three of the City of Springfield rulings: installing a pedestrian crosswalk light on Olympic Street for passenger safety; installing a passenger shelter on the north side of Olympic Street for passenger comfort; and widening the access sidewalk from six feet to nine feet for passenger safety. It is LTD's position that if the bus is to be a viable option in competition with the auto, using the bus to shop at Wal-Mart must be as convenient and safe as possible and that it is the obligation of the development and the permitting authority to make it so. Unless the community truly marries land use and transportation decisions, development and growth and their attendant impact of auto use will continue to degrade the quality of life in our community and decrease the viability of transit as an alternative to auto use.

When given the opportunity, the District needs to advocate for citizens who use transit now, or who would use transit in the future. We must be diligent in making transit safe and convenient, and as we do so, transit will become more competitive with the automobile.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None