

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 14, 2000

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

**Wednesday, December 20, 2000  
5:30 p.m.**

**LTD BOARD ROOM  
3500 E. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene  
(off Glenwood Blvd. in Glenwood)**

**AGENDA**

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Hocken \_\_\_\_\_ Kleger \_\_\_\_\_ Lauritsen \_\_\_\_\_ Melnick \_\_\_\_\_  
Wylie \_\_\_\_\_ Bennett \_\_\_\_\_ Gaydos \_\_\_\_\_

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

- |      |  |   |
|------|--|---|
| III. | PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT | 4 |
| IV.  | ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA  |   |
| V.   | ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING  |   |
| A.   | Employee Of The Month – January 2001   | 5 |
| B.   | Board Committee Assignments            | 6 |
| C.   | Board Member Reports                   | 8 |
|      | 1. Metropolitan Policy Committee       |   |
|      | 2. MPC Subcommittees on TransPlan      |   |
|      | 3. BRT Steering Committee              |   |

D.	Gm Report To The Board	9
E.	Monthly Financial Report – November Financial Statements	11
F.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	22
G.	Board Correspondence	24
H.	Monthly Staff Report	37

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

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A.	Consent Calendar	43
1.	Minutes of November 15, 2000 regular Board meeting (pg. 44)	
2.	Budget Committee Reappointment (pg. 57)	
B.	Public Hearing on Comprehensive Service Redesign	58
1.	Staff Presentation	
2.	Opening of Public Hearing by Board President	
3.	Closing of Public Hearing	
4.	Board Deliberation	
C.	Federal Section 5307 Grant Application / Federal Section 5309 Grant Application / Federal Section 5309 Grant Amendment	60
1.	Staff Presentation	
2.	Opening of Public Hearing by Board President	
3.	Closing of Public Hearing	
4.	Board Deliberation and Decision	
F.	BRT: Franklin/UO Alignment	66

G. Executive Session – Review and Evaluation of General Manager 73

Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(l), to review and evaluate, pursuant to standards, criteria, and policy directives adopted by the governing body, the employment-related performance of the chief executive officer (general manager) of LTD.

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING 74

- A. FY 2001-2002 Service Recommendations
- B. Springfield Station Site Selection
- C. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 1 Decision
- D. Board Strategic Planning Work Session
- E. TransPlan Draft Plan Approval
- F. FY 2001-2002 Pricing Plan and Fare Ordinance
- G. BRT Updates
- H. Quarterly Performance Reporting/Year-end Performance Report

IX. ADJOURNMENT

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

## MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, November 15, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on November 9, 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, November 15, 2000, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Rob Bennett, Vice President, presiding  
Gerry Gaydos  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Pat Hocken  
Virginia Lauritsen  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Hillary Wylie, President  
Vacancy (Subdistrict 3)

**CALL TO ORDER:** Board Vice President Rob Bennett called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m. Ms. Lauritsen was not yet present.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Mr. Bennett said that he had no preliminary remarks to make. Ms. Hocken commented that Mr. Robert Melnick was present. Mr. Melnick had been appointed by the Governor to fill the vacant Board position and was awaiting Senate confirmation of the appointment.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** There were none.

**WORK SESSION – PARATRANSIT, FACILITIES, AND RIDESHARING DISCUSSION:**  
Mr. Hamm said that he had three issues to discuss that could result in a better stewardship of public funds.

**Paratransit:** Mr. Hamm said that there had been staff discussions about the role that the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) had in the administration of the RideSource program. Currently, LTD had a staff person who coordinated the paratransit services with LCOG staff, and LTD paid for a staffed position (Terry Parker) at LCOG to coordinate and oversee the private contracting of the RideSource services. In addition, LTD paid an administrative overhead fee to LCOG. There could be opportunities to improve the efficiency of the paratransit administration, paratransit services, and the allocation of funds.

Mr. Hamm distributed a matrix that showed the estimated RideSource administrative cost savings of bringing in-house the management of the RideSource program. As currently budgeted in Fiscal Year 2000-01, the cost to the District was \$100,250. Mr. Hamm presented preliminary estimates for two options to bring the program in-house, either of which would save the District between \$11,750 and \$12,250 per year. He also noted that it was possible that the Transit Operations Department could absorb the clerical requirements of the program manager with the two staff currently assigned there, which could create a total savings of between \$22,250 and \$36,750 per year. He noted that these estimated costs did not include office space, or new equipment costs.

Mr. Hamm said that there also could be some political opportunities with this proposal. Ms. Parker also aided other rural communities with their elderly and disabled transportation issues, and Mr. Hamm thought her involvement in those areas should continue. LTD was the transportation agency for Lane County and could provide in-kind assistance to those communities.

Staff would be meeting with LCOG staff to discuss the possibilities of bringing the paratransit oversight services in-house. Staff also were asking for Board support in pursuing this effort and for continuing to seek opportunities to be more efficient.

Mr. Kleger asked staff to thoroughly check into possible issues that might affect the relationship with the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) before any decision was made. He said that he supported the idea of making the management of the program more cost effective. There always would be some difficulty in matching the resources with the demand for the service, and this proposal could help in that area.

Ms. Lauritsen arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was an operational advantage to bringing the management of the program in-house. Mr. Kleger said there would be an advantage in terms of closer coordination between the fixed-route service and the paratransit service.

Mr. Hamm said that at this time, there were no plans to bring the operational aspects of RideSource in-house. The Board members supported proceeding with this effort to a position where staff could make a formal proposal. Mr. Bennett asked for a further breakdown of the costs that would be associated with this proposal, including office space and equipment costs.

Facilities: Mr. Hamm said that staff had been working on a solution for the need to move RideSource out of its current location and focusing some resources on a joint relationship with the State Motor Pool to be located in the Glenwood area. Staff were seeking the Board's approval to delay the motor pool option in order to seek additional opportunities that might address LTD's facility and operational efficiency needs.

Mr. Hamm reported that there was a significant operating expense for “deadhead” buses operating to the southwest, west, and northwest parts of Eugene. In addition, LTD was experiencing lack of space issues in Fleet Services, Operations, and the Administration departments. He believed that there was financial and operational merit in seeking a satellite facility to address those needs.

Mr. Hamm said that a phased approach to a satellite development could save LTD significant money. Phase One might be to secure a piece of property with buildings already on it that, with limited investment, might serve as a RideSource facility. Phase Two might add LTD’s west-side buses, with an investment in a preventive maintenance building, above-ground fueling station, and a bus washer. Phase Three could look at additional needs as LTD’s and RideSource’s needs changed; including facilities that provided fleet restoration capabilities.

Ms. Lauritsen said that if there was no urgency to making a commitment to the motor pool, she did not have an objection to staff further investigating a satellite facility option.

Ms. Hocken said that one of the reasons the motor pool location was being considered for the RideSource operation was that the operation would be more centrally located to the Eugene and Springfield area. Currently, RideSource operated out of the west end of Eugene. She did not want to rule out the possibility of locating RideSource in the Glenwood area.

Mr. Kleger said that the current lease for the RideSource property was about to expire without being renewed. The landlord had other plans for the property. He thought there was some urgency in seeking out the new RideSource location.

Ms. Hocken asked if the research would be performed by staff or by outside assistance. Mr. Hamm said that if a particular opportunity stood out, there could be the possibility of hiring a consultant and/or an architect.

Mr. Gaydos thought there could be a potential for collaboration with other government agencies, similar to the facility in the Thurston area that was shared by several Springfield agencies.

The Board indicated its support for the request to delay the motor pool option in order to seek out other facility opportunities.

Ridesharing: Mr. Hamm said that he was seeking ways to better accommodate the major employers that were located outside the urban core that had transportation needs that were not being met. LTD had an opportunity not only to better serve those employers, but also to make a real difference in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) by offering ridesharing applications to those employers.

Fixed-route applications had not been the answer, and staff believed that the Commuter Solutions program could be the answer, if a commitment of resources and a spirit of

partnership could be orchestrated. Carpools, vanpools, and, in some cases, buspools had generated significant success for reverse commute applications in other metropolitan areas.

Currently, staff had conducted surveys at the large employers, such as Hyundai, to determine where each employee lived. Staff could further research to determine which shift those employees who were clustered together worked, and vanpools could be designed to accommodate those employees.

Using LTD's current vanpool from Eugene to Corvallis as an example, Mr. Hamm said that the vanpool traveled 100 miles round trip per day and carried an average of 16 passengers. This resulted in 16 one-way single occupant car trips being removed from the road each day, which equated to an annual VMT reduction of 350,000.

Staff were seeking support from the Board to research the commitment of a sizeable portion of the group pass dollars that were collected from those employers to the Commuter Solutions program. Mr. Hamm said that those ridesharing applications could make a difference, but would require a financial shift from traditional ways of viewing transit.

Mr. Hamm said that staff would provide more information about this proposal at the strategic planning work session in January.

Ms. Hocken said that the group pass was a revenue neutral item, and she thought the rates for group pass might need to be calculated in a different way. The Metropolitan Policy Subcommittee (MPC) on TransPlan had discussed TDM in relation to alternative measures. The subcommittee was interested in what type of TDM data was available and how willing people were to commute by carpool relative to their willingness to commute by bus or by private car.

Mr. Hamm said that typically, with the 12-hour shift structure, carpools and vanpools had a better chance to be successful than fixed-route service. The employers had to be willing to commit to supporting the car/vanpool, possibly by allowing the driver an extra few minutes before and after his/her shift and/or providing premium nearby parking spaces for the vanpools. The two vanpools currently operating between Corvallis and Eugene were leased and were operated by a member of the pool. The driver was responsible for picking up and dropping off the other members, typically from a centrally located park and ride. The lease was in the name of the driver, and the driver rode for free. The cost to the other members covered all costs of the lease, maintenance, and fueling of the van. Insurance costs also were rolled into the lease and covered personal liability insurance and maintenance. The cost of a vanpool would be subsidized until it was full.

The Commuter Solutions program would organize the vanpool(s) and provide a minimum subsidy to get it started and to give it time to grow. If a vanpool were unsuccessful, it would be discontinued. The ideal would be to have each of them reach 100 percent or better in return and become self-sufficient.

Mr. Bennett thought it was interesting that an employee would be willing to individually handle the lease. Commuter Solutions Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams said that the leases were 30-day leases from Vanpool Services, Inc., (VSPI), so if a vanpool was not working, it could be discontinued at any time. There was not much of a liability for the leasing employee.

Ms. Hocken said that it would be interesting to see if the in-town vanpool would have the same appeal as the longer-trip out-of-town vanpools.

Mr. Gaydos said that he appreciated Mr. Hamm and the staff for thinking about ways to be good stewards of public funds and for looking at ways to provide better service. He was supportive of all three proposals.

Mr. Hamm said that staff would continue to work on the issues and prepare a more formal proposal to the Board that would include more detailed information at the January Board meeting.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** General Service Worker Rodney Johnson was selected as the December 2000 Employee of the Month. Mr. Johnson originally was hired by the District in August, 1977, for the position of bus cleaner. He was promoted to the position of shop helper/luber in May 1978, and in June 1978 was reclassified to the position of general service worker. In 1999, Mr. Johnson earned a 20 Year Safe Worker award.

Mr. Johnson was nominated as Employee of the Month by his co-workers in the Fleet Services Department for his willingness to help his fellow employees and for being a hard worker who always had a smile and who put others before himself. They said that Mr. Johnson was respectful, honest, and kind hearted.

Fleet Services Supervisor Don Swearingen introduced Mr. Johnson to the Board. Mr. Swearingen said that Mr. Johnson was a team player whose cooperation, pleasantness, and work ethics made him a valuable part of the Fleet Services Department.

Mr. Bennett presented Mr. Johnson with a letter of congratulations, a certificate of achievement, a lapel pin, and a monetary reward.

Mr. Johnson thanked the Board and said that he enjoyed working at LTD.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** 1) Mary Ellen Rochester of Eugene and representing the residents of Landsby Place, a senior and disabled residential apartment community, said that the elimination of routes #42a and #43a would cause the residents to have to walk more than four blocks to access businesses and buses along Highway 99. Bus service was needed at Landsby Place. She presented the Board with a petition that had been signed by 400 people in support of keeping the routing in place that currently served the Landsby Place apartments. There were many senior and disabled centers within the vicinity of Landsby Place, and most of the residents relied on buses for their only transportation as the RideSource service was more expensive.



2) Debbie Houghton of Eugene said that she also lived at Landsby Place and used the bus daily to travel to and from her employment. Many others used the bus as well from the stop on Jacobs. There were several senior and disabled centers as well as many low-income families in the area who would be left with hard options if bus service were eliminated.

3) Kai Wa Philips read a letter that had been written by her husband, Chris Philips, regarding the proposed elimination of bus service to the City View area. Mr. Philips stated in his letter that he had moved to Eugene nine years ago, and purposely had purchased a home located on a bus route that directly served the University of Oregon campus. Since then, he had used the bus almost exclusively for his daily commute to the University except on weekends when there had been no convenient service. With regard to the proposed elimination of service to the 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue and City View area, he stated that he would be left with a 15-minute walk to the nearest bus stop, which was 300 feet higher on the hill. As a homeowner, it was unrealistic to think he could move to follow the bus service; it was cheaper to purchase another car. Even if he could move, he was afraid that LTD would again cancel the service to his new location. By completely deleting services, LTD was, in particular, showing that it could not be relied on, except on some main streets, and he could not reliably purchase a home with the intent of using bus services. The main advantage of using the bus was that it reduced by one the number of automobiles he would need to purchase. If he had to purchase another car, he might as well drive all the way to the UO and purchase a parking permit. He would be left paying taxes to support a bus system that was useless to him. Currently, he used the bus for commuting to and from work as well as for errands, such as to medical appointments and for shopping. Those trips were on other routes, and LTD would lose those trips as well, if he had to begin relying on his car. He urged the Board to not discontinue the City View area service.

4) Kathleen Brandt of Eugene also spoke in favor of the City View bus service. Her family purchased their home more than eight years ago with the consideration that it was on a direct bus route to Sacred Heart Hospital where she worked. She had taken the last year off to be with her child, so she had not been using the bus as much. She was very proud that she and her husband had figured out a way to get three children to two places and to their two jobs all without a car. Their travel involved the bus, the school bus, and her husband's bicycle. Without the bus, she would have to give in and use her car. She wondered if there was an acuity factor considered on the hill. Maybe there were not the number of riders that was needed, but the hill was a challenge, which she believed meant that some level of service needed to be there. There were several people with disabilities who regularly depended on the bus. She was encouraged since she had returned to work in October to see more people using the #35 route, at least in the morning. She believed there were more people riding in the morning, and she thought LTD ought to leave some level of service in that area rather than just eliminating all of it. Ms. Brandt's young daughter, Genevieve, also asked the Board to please not stop the bus because she wanted to ride it when she grew up. Ms. Brandt really wanted to make the point that she was teaching her children to use the bus and was looking forward to purchasing the Freedom Pass for them and having them make the choice not to rely so heavily on the automobile.

5) Dave Andrews of Eugene, who also lived in the City View area and spoke in support of continuing the #35 route. He had lived well out of town for 35 years, but had moved into town the previous year, and part of the consideration for purchasing his home was the fact that it was on a bus route. He rode the bus part time to his office in order to conserve gasoline usage and to reduce pollution, and it was very pleasant to ride the bus. It appeared to Mr. Andrews as though ridership had been increasing. He recognized the difficult choice the Board had to make with discontinuing routes, but he hoped the Board would continue to operate route #35 City View. When considering the aging of the population, the route #35 would become more critical. He said that in Portland, 28 percent of the population was age 55 or older, and as the life expectancy continued to expand, there would be more older people who would need to ride the bus.

No one else wished to address the Board, and Mr. Bennett thanked those who had testified. Mr. Bennett mentioned that LTD would hold an open house at the Eugene Station on Thursday, November 16, for the public to review and comment on the route proposals that were being considered as part of the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) that would result in service changes in September 2001. The open house would occur between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. In addition, the Board would hold two consecutive public hearings at its regular meetings in December 2000 and January 2001 before a decision would be made.

**MOTION**  
**VOTE**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Ms. Hocken moved the adoption of the following resolution, "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for November 15, 2000, is approved as presented. Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous acclamation. The Consent Calendar for November 15, 2000, consisted of the minutes of the October 16, 2000, Special Board meeting; the repeal of obsolete or superseded procedures; and a revision of the LTD Investment Policy.

**ACCEPTANCE OF INDEPENDENT AUDIT REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2000:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson introduced Charles Swank of the independent auditors group, Grove, Mueller & Swank P.C., to present the independent auditor's report.

Mr. Swank said that the audit included examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The audit also included assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation.

The Auditor's report was found on page 17 of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), which had been distributed to Board members. Typically, the auditing firm would report any exceptions in a management report; however, this year, the firm found no exceptions, so there was no management letter. It was the firm's opinion that LTD's financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of LTD as of June 30, 2000, and 1999, and the results of its operations and its cash flows were in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Mr. Swank said that while there were no exceptions found during the audit, the firm had made some suggestions to management. Ms. Hocken said that it was not unusual to not issue a management letter, but to provide oral suggestions.

Mr. Swank said that LTD was a good financial organization that prepared its own financial statements. The transition of key finance staff had been smooth. The financial report consistently had won awards.

Mr. Swank said that there were new accounting and reporting requirements that the District management would be subject to in the future. He said that the new reporting requirements did not change the way the District budgeted or accounted for operations, but they did incorporate information into the annual financial report that would assist the users of the document. He presented a letter to the Board that outlined the new requirements.

**MOTION**

Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors accepts the Independent Audit Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett said that LTD had a fine record, and he was proud to be a member of the Board. It was important to know that Grove, Mueller & Swank P.C., was an independent firm, and even though it worked with staff throughout the year, LTD received the best independent judgment, which was critical in trying to act in an oversight manner. Ms. Lauritsen agreed.

**VOTE**

Mr. Bennett called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously by acclamation.

**STATE LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES:** Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch was present to discuss the state legislative priorities for LTD and to gain Board direction about the relative importance of state issues.

The Oregon Legislature would convene on January 8, 2001, for its next regular session. The primary focus would be to balance the budget, determine the effect of ballot measures on the budget and on any laws, and to engage once again in trying to determine the appropriate level of funding for schools.

Oregon transit agencies met on November 14, 2000, to determine a final legislative agenda, which, as proposed, included seeking increased funding for elderly and disabled transportation services and the establishment of state responsibility for all or a portion of the maintenance and preservation of the urban bus fleet. In addition, transit agencies would continue to seek other state funding for transit and continued funding for Willamette Valley passenger rail. Other issues that would be of interest to transit were modifications to the Business Energy Tax Credit, clarification that workers' compensation did not extend to van and carpool drivers, development of incentives for shared-use park and ride facilities, and restoration of transit agencies' right to regulate firearms on their vehicles and property.

In addition, Ms. Lynch said that it was staff's intent to monitor all legislation pertaining to the administration of a municipal corporation as well as the budget process.

Ms. Lynch said that implementation language would be needed for Measure 7, which had implications for burden of proof and how government regulation would affect the value of property. She reported that there were 25 new members of the Oregon House of Representatives.

Mr. Bennett asked if Ms. Lynch anticipated asking Board members to be directly involved in lobbying activities as had been done in the past. Ms. Lynch said that she would call on Board members occasionally, as needed, to testify or provide input about particular bills. The first event that she was asking the Board to participate in would be a December dinner with the local representatives to discuss maintaining funding for elderly and disabled transportation services while pointing out that the money that was appropriated still did not meet the statewide need.

Statewide, the transit agencies would argue for transit's role in the preservation of the road system. Carrying passengers on a bus meant that many fewer cars on the road. Mr. Bennett asked if the issue of bus weight causing deterioration of the roads was brought up at the legislature. Ms. Lynch said that she had not heard it, but was prepared to address it if it came up.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Ms. Lauritsen then moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the legislative priorities as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by acclamation.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:** a) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken reported that MPC had appointed two subcommittees to resolve the TransPlan issues. Ms. Hocken was assigned to the subcommittee that would review and make recommendations on the alternative measures that were proposed in the draft TransPlan, and Ms. Wylie had been assigned to the other subcommittee would review finance policies and other unresolved issues. Both subcommittees would report back at the December MPC meeting.

Ms. Hocken said that if the alternative measures were selected instead of the state mandated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction, the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) would need to approve those alternative measures before local adoption of TransPlan could take place.

Ms. Hocken said that the first subcommittee meeting had been very productive.

2) Statewide Livability Forum: Ms. Lauritsen said the meeting on November 2 had been very informative. Governor Kitzhaber spoke to the Forum, and an economist discussed the growth patterns for Oregon. Mr. Gaydos added that a video had been produced that included part of the BRT proposal. He asked staff to get a copy of the video to show at the strategic planning work session in January. Mr. Bennett asked about the expected growth

patterns for Oregon. Mr. Gaydos said that a 75 percent increase in the population of Oregon was expected over the next 20 years, and Salem now was the second largest metropolitan area in Oregon.

3) BRT Steering Committee. Ms. Hocken reported that the last meeting had been very interesting. The agenda items included the trees on Franklin issue and the Glenwood routing proposal. The committee ended up talking about BRT as a concept. The question came up about how much time would be saved as a result of the exclusive rights-of-way and how much time saving came from other components of BRT. Other philosophical issues of BRT were discussed as well. Eugene City Councilor Scott Meisner had raised the question that if LTD were willing to back off of the exclusive right-of-way issue in Glenwood, why then should exclusive right-of-way be supported anywhere else along the pilot corridor. Mr. Bennett had discussed his philosophy that in some areas, congestion was worse now and was expected to continue to deteriorate, such as along the Franklin Boulevard/UO segment. In Glenwood, the traffic currently was not as bad, and while it also was projected to deteriorate over time, the thought was that if LTD could get a foothold in Glenwood using other BRT elements, over time, the need for the exclusive right-of-way would become more apparent, and it would be better achieved.

Mr. Bennett said that the success of BRT would be based on a package approach. There was a certain expectation and feeling that people would have when they rode BRT. The entire package was more complicated than what could be immediately accomplished, and some compromises would be necessary, but it was important to be on record with what the future plans would be if the congestion reached a certain level.

Mr. Bennett said that he thought BRT was worth working very hard for. He thought that it was a unique opportunity in the evolution of a transit system in Eugene and Springfield and the County. He was not sure what all the answers were today, and he had heard from the Glenwood Business Association that there was more support for a mixed plan than there was for the immediate exclusive right-of-way. It was an ongoing and interesting discussion.

Ms. Hocken added that when analyzing the no-build and build options in some of the corridors, figures had not been included about what travel times were today. One of the known factors in the annual route adjustment was that each year, minutes had to be added to certain routes along busy corridors, but that information had not been captured in the materials that had been put together for BRT. She thought that the no-build alternative would look substantially worse than it looked today, and that was why BRT needed to be accomplished. It was not so much that it would make it better in 2015 or 2020, but it would be at least as good as it was today. It was an argument that had not yet been used.

The City of Springfield had received a grant to do some planning in the area of Glenwood between Franklin Boulevard and the river. LTD staff would work to have the future design of BRT incorporated into that plan.

Mr. Kleger said that he supported the position of the travel time issues, and it was important to keep the goal in mind. He agreed with what Ms. Hocken said about the no-build

option. If LTD did not build BRT, then LTD would own the right hand lane of traffic, and traffic would not move any faster than the buses could move.

Mr. Gaydos said that he appreciated what the other Board members had said, and he also thought it was important to secure the right-of-way now, but maybe not to use it immediately. He thought people could deal with things in the future easier than they could deal with things today. He noted that people on the Downtown Eugene, Inc., Executive Committee were asking those same types of questions. Although LTD may believe that it was at a certain stage in the development of the BRT, Mr. Gaydos thought there were many who were still at the questioning stage.

4) Springfield Station Steering Committee. Ms. Lauritsen said that the last meeting was held in June, and another meeting was not expected in the near future.

5) Eugene Downtown Visioning. Mr. Bennett reported that the committee had completed the first phase of the committee work. Some action priorities would be presented to the City Council or the Planning Commission. A second committee would be formed that would work more with the detail of the specific projects. The difficulty with this committee was trying to match the financial resources to projects, when, essentially, there were none. The Urban Renewal money was being spent on the library, and Mr. Bennett was very much an urban renewal advocate both from a private standpoint and from a community point of view. To the extent that a community should be involved in its downtown, in addition to those who participated downtown everyday, then a consideration needed to be made for what objectives the community had and how to fund those objectives.

An example of how difficult it was to come up with a plan with no resources to fund the plan was the issue of what to do with the West Broadway area. Enhancing West Broadway or opening it to vehicular traffic would require financial resources, of which there were none. He had worked on the opening of Willamette Street, which had been seen as a community project and not as a private business improvement project, yet some of the funding for that project came directly from concerned businesses.

Mr. Bennett distributed a copy of the downtown visioning report. He said that if there was interest in the list of priorities, he could be contacted for a copy. Also, he appreciated the staff support of Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner, who also would be able to provide more information to anyone who was interested.

6) Lane County Board of Commissioners Meeting. Ms. Hocken said that LTD had asked the Commissioners how they would like to be involved in the approval of Phase 1 of the BRT pilot corridor. The two cities had decided to have their planning commissions review the BRT proposal first, and it was not clear if the County wanted to take an active role in the BRT approval process because there only was a very small segment of the BRT pilot corridor that was not in the domain of either of the two cities. The Commissioners decided to have the County Planning Commission in conjunction with the County Roads Advisory Committee review the proposal before it went to the Commissioners.

7) Board Finance Committee. Ms. Hocken said that the Committee had met on November 8, to hear the RideSource facility, LTD satellite facility, and rideshare concepts that Mr. Hamm had discussed earlier, and to review and approve amendments to the investment policy, which the Board adopted earlier in the meeting.

8) Board General Manager Evaluation Committee. Ms. Hocken reported that an evaluation tool had been developed that would be used by both Board members and as a self-evaluation tool by Mr. Hamm. The blank forms would be distributed to the Board members, and the evaluation would be conducted at the December meeting in executive session.

**GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT:** There was no discussion on this agenda item.

**PRESENTATION OF COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000:** Ms. Hellekson presented the CAFR to the Board and directed their attention to Page 7, the Summary of Revenues. She reviewed each of the revenue items, which resulted in a 6.9 percent increase over the prior year.

On page 8, the Summary of Expenses, Ms. Hellekson explained that the operating expenses (not including depreciation) totaled \$21.5 million, a 7.0 percent increase from the prior year. Expenses including depreciation increased by 7.4 percent. Ms. Hellekson explained that the expenses were artificially low in some areas, primarily because the Planning and Development staff costs were being capitalized into the BRT grant during the duration of the BRT project, but those costs eventually would be brought back into LTD's budget.

Ms. Hellekson noted that the revenue and expenses were nearly even, and staff would be looking at ways to improve productivity to ensure that expenses did not go over revenues.

Mr. Bennett said he would appreciate receiving summary comments from Ms. Hellekson, much like what she provided with the monthly financial report that would highlight the areas that she thought were important and would summarize the information contained in the various charts. Mr. Gaydos agreed. He said that the Strategic Plan work session in January would be a good time for Ms. Hellekson to provide more information about how LTD was doing and to ensure that the Board understood what factors were used to measure LTD's success. Ms. Hellekson said that she would prepare an executive summary of the CAFR.

**MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – OCTOBER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:** Ms. Hellekson said that fuel prices had remained high, well above the \$.83 per gallon that had been included in the Fiscal Year 2000-01 budget. However, staff were encouraged by a fairly significant dip in fuel prices that had occurred during the past 10 days. In addition, Ms. Hellekson noted that it was apparent that personnel services would not be on budget for the end of the Fiscal Year. This was due to prospective costs that had been incorporated in the new ATU contract. Ms. Hellekson would provide more detailed information during the December Board meeting, as more information would be available by then.

**FIRST-QUARTER RIDERSHIP REPORT:** Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora reported that ridership had shown solid growth in each of the three months of the first quarter and had increased by eight percent for the year-to-date. Staff believed that this was due to increased fuel prices, the lowered youth fare and youth promotions, and the Sacred Heart Shuttle. In addition, Mr. Vobora reported that 2,200 LCC term passes had been sold for the fall term, and trips serving LCC and UO were experiencing overloads.

Mr. Kleger asked if the District had any figures on the day pass use since the introduction of day passes being issued instead of transfers. Mr. Vobora said that customer response and bus operator response to the day pass had been good. A special count had indicated that nearly 2,300 day passes were issued on the weekday sampled. This number was consistent with origin and destination information relating to the number of customers paying cash or token fares. Mr. Kleger observed that customer response to the day pass had been good, with the exception of the occasional rider. Mr. Kleger also observed that this was the first year in about five years, that he had not had to join with a bus operator to persuade young people to curb their language. He was not sure who should get the credit for this, but it was a relief to see the better behaviors of riders on the buses.

Mr. Bennett said that the year-to-date ridership figures were fairly positive, and he asked how that related to farebox recovery. Ms. Hellekson said that it was not unusual to have a growth in ridership and still see farebox revenues decrease, typically due to the upsurge of riders being group pass holders or other pre-paid fare holders.

Mr. Vobora noted that staff were including a special Services category in the performance report to capture such things as UO football ridership.

**BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE:** There was nothing to add to previous information that had been provided.

**BOARD CORRESPONDENCE:** Board correspondence included a letter regarding LCC service from Charlotte Behm to Board President Hillary Wylie. Ms. Wylie's response also was included in the packet.

**BOARD ACTIVITY CALENDARS:** Calendars were included in the packet to highlight Board activities for the next several months.

**MONTHLY STAFF REPORT:** Mr. Hamm highlighted the safety report contained in the Transit Operations report. September and October were exceptionally safe months, which had an impact on the bottom line in terms of savings.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further discussions, Mr. Bennett adjourned the meeting at 8:21 p.m.



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

2

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** NOVEMBER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Financial results for the first five months of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Total General Fund revenue was \$391,727 over budget through November, due to strong interest earnings and the strength of payroll tax receipts. Passenger fares are below expectations, but have been offset partially by the strength of group pass revenue. Special services revenue included the fall football shuttle service booked in November.

Advertising revenue is down versus budget year-to-date, but will recover by year-end due to the implementation of a new contract that will result in increased revenue. Obie Media was the successful bidder in the recent competitive award process.

Although other revenue line items show negative year-to-date variances, none represents a source of concern at this time. Miscellaneous revenue was budgeted in even monthly increments, but generally is received in lump sums. Revenues from all three tax programs are expected to meet budget expectations for the fiscal year.

Administration personnel costs are according to plan for the first five months of the fiscal year. Amalgamated Transit Union employee costs are now over budget year-to-date due to the implementation of a change in retirement plan. The new contract changes the ATU retirement plan from the previous defined contribution to a defined benefit plan. The cost of this change was not made available to Finance until November, at which time the contributions were made retroactive to July 1. Also, as previously reported, many of the new ATU contract provisions are phased in throughout the year (e.g., another wage adjustment on January 1, 2001), and the new contract assumed some changes in the way that work is assigned in Transit Operations, but that have not yet been implemented. The new contract also contains a provision to add five minutes to paid driver preparation time, but has yet to be implemented. Current year ATU personnel services now appears it will exceed budget by approximately \$200,000. An overage of this magnitude would not violate State budget law, but would be a departure from LTD's past performance.

Fuel prices remain higher than anticipated by the current year budget, but have fallen from the previously reported highs. Most recently, diesel was purchased at \$1.15 per gallon, still well above the \$.83 per gallon included in this year's budget. Year-to-date diesel fuel expenditures are more than \$76,000 over budget. If there is no significant downward trend in the coming months, the General Fund could see a negative year-end variance in the range of \$200,000. Savings in other materials and services areas will mitigate this negative variance.

It was reported in last month that insurance premiums/costs had been overpaid due to a billing error. That error was corrected, resulting in a negative expense. Year-to-year comparisons of insurance/liability expenses now are valid. Public Affairs' materials and services has increased dramatically because it absorbed the cost of the youth advertising campaign. The Commuter Solutions program is more active this year than last and received significantly more Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding, which has resulted in more spending this year. Other than fuel, no material expenditure budget issues are of concern at this time.

The Special Transportation Fund and Capital Fund are as expected through November.

The FY 2001-02 budget development process is underway. First steps are the establishment of capital priorities and the identification of funding, the update of the Long-Range Financial Plan assumptions, and the definition of outcomes by which operating fund activities will be defined and against which they will be measured. The Finance Committee will be informed of and involved in these discussions, which will lead to the update of both the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and the Long-Range Financial Plan, as well as completion of next fiscal year's proposed budget. The Finance Committee is next scheduled to meet on January 8, 2001.

**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\12\reg mtg\01fin05rev.doc

**FY 2001 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS AND BUDGET**  
**SECTION 5309 – Bus Purchase**

GRANTEE: Lane Transit District  
Eugene, Oregon

GRANT NO.: FY 2001

	FEDERAL AMOUNT	TOTAL AMOUNT
<u>SCOPE</u>		
111-01 REVENUE ROLLING STOCK PURCHASE BUSES SECTION 5309 FUNDS (80% / 20%)	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,250,000
<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
11.12.01 PURCHASE BUSES	1,000,000	1,250,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 1,000,000</b>	<b>\$1,250,000</b>

SOURCES OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

FUNDING UZA: 411440  
FUNDING UZA NAME: EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD, OREGON

FY 2000, SEC. 5309 CAPITAL 1,000,000  
**TOTAL FY2000, SECTION 5309 \$ 1,000,000**

**FY 2000 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS AND BUDGET  
 SECTION 5307 – Capital Improvement Program**

GRANTEE: Lane Transit District  
 Eugene, Oregon

GRANT NO.: FY 2000

	FEDERAL AMOUNT	TOTAL AMOUNT
<u>SCOPE</u>		
111-01 REVENUE ROLLING STOCK.....\$	1,008,400	\$1,260,500
PURCHASE BUSES/BUS RELATED		
<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
11.12.40 BUS RELATED	368,400	460,500
SECTION 5307 (80% / 20%)		
11.12.01 BUS PURCHASE	640,000	800,000
SECTION 5307 (80% / 20%)		
<u>SCOPE</u>		
114-01 BUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT / FACILITIES.....	690,640	863,300
<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
11.42.07 COMPUTER HARDWARE	219,200	274,000
SECTION 5307 (80% / 20%)		
11.42.08 COMPUTER SOFTWARE	93,440	116,800
SECTION 5307 (80% / 20%)		
11.42.11 SUPPORT VEHICLES	109,840	137,300
SECTION 5307 (80% / 20%)		
11.42.20 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	148,160	185,200
SECTION 5307 (80% / 20%)		
11.62.03 SIGNAL & COMMUNICATION	120,000	150,000
SECTION 5307 (80% / 20%)		

SCOPE

117-01 BUS - OTHER CAPITAL ITEMS.....	187,536	209,000
---------------------------------------	---------	---------

ACTIVITY

11.72.11 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT (Program & Projects) STP FUNDS (89.73% / 10.27%)	<u>187,536</u>	<u>209,000</u>
--	----------------	----------------

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,886,576</b>	<b>\$2,332,800</b>
--------------	--------------------	--------------------

**SOURCES OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE**

FUNDING UZA: 411440  
 FUNDING UZA NAME: EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD, OREGON

FY 2000, SECTION 5307 CAPITAL (CARRYOVER)	\$ 1,699,040
FY 2000, STP STATE	<u>187,536</u>

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,886,576</b>
--------------	--------------------

**FY 2000 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS AND BUDGET**  
**SECTION 5309 – Bus Rapid Transit**  
**Grant Amendment**

GRANTEE: Lane Transit District  
Eugene, Oregon

GRANT NO.: FY 2000 – BRT Grant Amendment

	<u>FEDERAL AMOUNT</u>	<u>TOTAL AMOUNT</u>
<u>SCOPE</u>		
411-00 BUS RAPID TRANSIT PILOT PROJECT SECTION 5309 FUNDS (80% / 20%)		
<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
41.13.02 FINAL DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION	\$ <u>8,000,000</u>	\$ <u>10,000,000</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 8,000,000</b>	<b>\$10,000,000</b>

SOURCES OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

FUNDING UZA: 411440

FUNDING UZA NAME: EUGENE-SPRINGFIELD, OREGON

FY 2000, SEC. 5309 CAPITAL \$ 8,000,000

**TOTAL FY2000, SECTION 5309** \$ **8,000,000**

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

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

**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:** December 20, 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 representatives Pat Hocken and Hillary Wylie can provide a brief report on the November 9, 2000, MPC meeting, and on the two subcommittees to which they have been assigned. The next MPC meeting is scheduled for December 14, 2000.
  - b **MPC Subcommittees on TransPlan:** Ms. Hocken was assigned to a subcommittee that evaluated and made recommendations about the alternative performance measures that would be proposed to the State to demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule. Mr. Gaydos participated on a subcommittee assigned to evaluate and make recommendations about various issues that were not agreed to by the joint adopting officials.
  - c **BRT Steering Committee:** Board members Pat Hocken, Rob Bennett, and Hillary Wylie are participating on LTD's BRT Steering Committee with members of local units of government and community representatives. The Steering Committee generally meets on the first Tuesday of the month, and last met on November 7. The next BRT Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for December 5, 2000, at 5:30 p.m. At the November 15 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.
- ATTACHMENT:** None
- PROPOSED MOTION:** None

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2000\11\Regular Mtg\BD Report Summary.doc

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** CORRESPONDENCE

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

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

- ❑ December 4, 2000, memorandum regarding Special Transportation Fund (STF) Oregon Administrative Rule Review from Terry Parker to the LTD Board of Directors.
- ❑ November 17, 2000, memorandum from the Oregon State Senate confirming executive appointments made on November 16, 2000.
- ❑ October 9, 2000, letter regarding input from local agencies on transportation issues from Governor John Kitzhaber to Board President Hillary Wylie.
- ❑ November 7, 2000, letter regarding GFOA Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting Program participation from Wayne Lowry, GFOA Representative to Board President Hillary Wylie.

At the December 20, 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:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** Board Committee Assignments

**PREPARED BY:** Hillary Wylie, Board President

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Designate Board members to Board committee assignments

**BACKGROUND:** With the resignation of Dean Kortge and the appointment of a replacement Board member, Board committee assignments will need to be reconsidered.  
At the December Board meeting, Board President Hillary Wylie will complete committee assignments.

**ATTACHMENT:** Current list of Committees and Special Assignments

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** BRT UPDATE

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None. Information only.

**BACKGROUND:** **Environmental Assessment (EA):** The Draft EA has been available for public comment since November 8, 2000. The comment period was originally set to close on December 8, 2000, but has been extended to January 2, 2001, at the request of the BRT Technical Advisory Committee. Open houses to solicit public comment on the EA were held on November 28, 2000, and November 29, 2000. Approximately 30 people attended each open house, although only a few people provided written comments.

**Phase 1 Review and Approval:** The Phase 1 review process has been moving forward, though at a more deliberate pace than originally planned. The current meeting schedule is summarized below (meetings already held are shown in italics):

- *Springfield Planning Commission: November 21, 2000*
- Springfield Planning Commission: December 19, 2000
- Springfield City Council: January 2001 (exact meeting dates to be determined)
  
- *Eugene Planning Commission: November 6, 2000*
- *Eugene Planning Commission: November 27, 2000*
- Eugene Planning Commission: January 10, 2001 (tentative)
- Eugene City Council: February 2001 (dates to be determined)
  
- *Lane County Planning Commission/Roads Advisory Committee: December 5, 2000*
- Lane County Planning Commission/Roads Advisory Committee: January 9, 2000
- Board of County Commissioners: February 2001 (date to be determined)
  
- Oregon Transportation Commission (update only): March 2001

The review process with the City of Eugene has been amended to include a more formal staff working arrangement. In addition to the Technical Advisory Committee, an LTD/Eugene BRT Policy Team and BRT Project Team has been established. These teams will be working through the various BRT issues in preparation for Eugene City Council action. Similar, though less structured, working arrangements are in place with our other partner agencies.

**Glenwood Alignment:** The Glenwood "Fast Lane" option that was shared with the Board last month was recommended by staff to the BRT Steering Committee at their meeting earlier this month. The Committee expressed general support for the alternative but postponed action until more Committee members were present (four of the nine members were absent). The Glenwood alignment will likely be coming to the Board as an action item in January 2001.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** BRT: FRANKLIN/UO ALIGNMENT

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve revised alignment for the Franklin/UO segment.

**BACKGROUND:** Two years ago, the Board selected a preferred alignment for the Franklin/UO segment of the BRT Phase 1 corridor. That alignment was a combination single/double lane guideway in the Franklin Boulevard median. Subsequently, it was determined that the trees on Franklin Boulevard are more than 50 years of age and, thus, designated as "historic trees" by a City of Eugene charter amendment passed by voters in 1985. That charter amendment requires that the public approve, in a citywide vote, the removal of historic trees for a street-widening project. It is not clear at this point whether construction of a transit guideway legally would constitute a "street widening," though the expectation is that the Eugene City Council would choose to put the issue to a vote if there were any question.

The tree issue has caused the BRT Steering Committee to rethink its position on the preferred Franklin/UO alignment. The Committee was presented with three options. The original single/double lane option would require the removal of an estimated seven historic trees. Another option is to primarily use a single-lane guideway, with passing opportunities, that would not require the removal of historic trees, with the possible exception of two trees removed at stations. (Staff do not believe that removing trees for station construction falls within conditions set forth in the charter, though that decision would need to be made by the City of Eugene and its legal counsel). A third option is to develop a two-lane guideway for the entire length of the Franklin/UO segment, which would require the removal of approximately 20 historic trees. There are a total of 49 trees on the Franklin Boulevard median between 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Interstate 5.

The BRT Steering Committee recommends to the Board that the two-lane guideway option be designated as the preferred alignment for the Franklin/UO segment. If that option is subject to public vote and is not approved, then the single-lane option would be recommended for implementation. The Committee believes that the two-lane option eventually will be required for operational reasons and that it is best to put that option in place as part of the initial project. Board members Rob



Bennett, Hillary Wylie, and Pat Hocken are members of the BRT Steering Committee and can provide additional information on the Committee's deliberation on this issue.

It should be mentioned that an additional hurdle might need to be cleared in order to implement the two-lane Franklin/VO option. The Environmental Assessment has identified the Franklin Boulevard median and trees as having potential historic significance. That may mean that an additional study, commonly referred to as a "4F" study, will need to be completed. This study would need to demonstrate that there is no "prudent and feasible" alternative to the option that impacts the historic resource.

Attached is the packet on this issue that was distributed to the BRT Steering Committee. The packet includes responses to questions from the Committee on various related issues that may be of interest to the Board.

**ATTACHMENT:**

Memorandum dated November 7, 2000, to the BRT Steering Committee on the Franklin/VO segment.

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

I move the following resolution: Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors designates the two-lane guideway option as the preferred alignment for the Franklin/VO segment of the BRT pilot corridor.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 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 December 20, 2000:

1. Approval of minutes: November 15, 2000, regular Board meeting
2. Budget Committee Reappointment

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Minutes of the November 15, 2000, regular Board meeting
2. Budget Committee Reappointment: Betsy Boyd

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for December 20, 2000, is approved as presented.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** December 20 , 2000
- ITEM TITLE:** Comprehensive Service Redesign – Review of Service Package
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Staff requests final direction from the Board in preparation for the service package adoption.
- BACKGROUND:** The staff and Board began the CSR process more than two years ago. This process attempts to address the Board's desire to place more service hours into "productive" versus "coverage" types of applications. Additionally, staff have focused on correcting system problems, which have been driving District costs higher each year.
- The criteria used during the CSR process were:
1. Place 75 percent of service hours in "productive" applications and utilize 25 percent of service hours to ensure "coverage" in the community
  2. Reduce total travel time;
  3. Minimize the inconvenience of transfers;
  4. Match frequency of service to level of density;
  5. Schedule service to meet peak demand;
  6. Make the service simple to understand;
  7. Ensure operational safety and reliability; and
  8. Ensure convertibility to BRT
- Community outreach was conducted at many different levels, including:
1. Four open-houses;
  2. Public displays at community events, such as the Lane County Fair;
  3. Displays posted on the LTD Web site;
  4. Neighborhood and community group meetings;
  5. Meetings with Transportation Planning Committee staff;
  6. A briefing of the Metropolitan Policy Committee;
  7. Employee displays and training;
  8. Communications with LTD group pass organizations;
  9. News media interviews;
  10. Conversations with residents who contacted staff directly; and
  11. Public testimony at Board meetings;

These outreach efforts have resulted in hundreds of written comments, which have assisted staff in evaluating and making changes to the route proposals.

In recent weeks, staff have been refining the running-time information for each of the routes, finalizing a number of routing issues, and summarizing the total costs of the package. This process has been a vigorous one and not without a level of frustration. The most significant issue that has arisen is how to efficiently schedule routes that have widely varying running times. This is not a large issue during weekday service when the District is operating a high level of service, but it becomes an issue in the evenings and on weekends when service levels drop. The result of routes with longer running times operating during off-peak periods is that the transfer connections begin to break down, and schedule efficiency quickly drops. There are limited numbers of options available to handle this situation.

First, the District can implement the routes with longer running times and continue with the greater inefficiency and poor transfer connections in the off-peak periods. Second, routes can operate as weekday routes and have variations for the evenings and weekends. This would allow better scheduling and would improve scheduling efficiency. The downside is that system coverage would be reduced substantially and the system would become much more difficult to understand. Third, routes can be shortened to maintain consistent sixty-minute running times, giving us the ability to maintain the same route structure on weekdays, evenings, and weekends. The downside of this option is that coverage, in some neighborhoods, would be replaced with connector routes. For many customers, this means an additional transfer during their trip.

Considering the magnitude of changes that may result from public testimony and direction from the Board, staff may suggest a change to the adoption timeline. This change would be to hold off on plan adoption until the February Board meeting. This extra time would allow the District an opportunity to notify current customers and potential customers about the final plans, and to solicit feedback about the potential changes to the route structure.

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Staff will modify the service package to reflect the direction provided by the Board.

**ATTACHMENT:**

Public input received following the final open-house held on November 11, 2000.

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

None

H:\Board Packet\2000\12\Regular Mtg\csr public hearing 1.doc

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** JANUARY 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **JANUARY 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Bus Operator Ray McCann has been selected as the January 2001 Employee of the Month. Ray was hired by the District on March 10, 1993. Ray has received numerous compliments from his customers for his "above and beyond" customer service, especially his patience and courtesy toward his customers and pleasant personality. Ray has received awards for six years of Safe Driving, more than seven years of Correct Schedule Operation, Exceptional Attendance, and Accessible Service

When asked what makes Ray a good employee, Transit Services Administrator Rob Montgomery said that he had been on the selection committee for the past several years, and during that time, he reviewed countless EOM nominations from LTD guests, each letting us know what a terrific employee we have. Ray has been selected and has declined the EOM Award at least 3 times. Once, when I told him he had been selected, he told me he did not think he was doing anything special, but was just doing his job; he thanked me for the recognition, but declined. Well, from this supervisors point of view, Ray is an exemplary employee, an Ambassador of LTD, his work ethics are high, and he demonstrates them daily. The staff members, including me, in the Transit Operations Department are very proud to have him on our team!  
Thanks Ray!

Our congratulations to Rod on his selection!

**AWARD:** Rod will attend the December 20 meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

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

**PREPARED BY:** Hillary Wylie, Board President

**ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(i), to review and evaluate, pursuant to standards, criteria, and policy directives adopted by the governing body, the employment-related performance of the chief executive officer (general manager) of LTD.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(i), to review and evaluate, pursuant to standards, criteria, and policy directives adopted by the governing body, the employment-related performance of the chief executive officer (general manager) of LTD.

## MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

December 20, 2000

### Revenue:

- **Passenger fares** are below budget for the first five months, but are offset partially by the strength of the group pass programs. The youth program, aimed at attracting young riders with reduced fares, appears to be meeting revenue goals thus far.
- **Special service** receipts are behind those of last year due to the change in the University of Oregon home football game schedule this year. This category is expected to meet annual budget.
- **Miscellaneous revenue** was anticipated inaccurately by the current budget. This revenue tends to be received in either small, irregular amounts, or large lump sums at unpredictable intervals. However, this category is expected to meet annual budget.

### Expense:

- **Administration personnel** expenses are on budget year-to-date.
- **Contract personnel** expenses are over budget to date due to the retroactive implementation of a new defined benefit retirement plan that replaced the previous defined contribution plan in the new ATU contract. Prospective provisions and their effect will be discussed as they are implemented. This line item may show a negative variance of approximately \$200,000 by fiscal year-end.
- **Materials and services** expenses generally are as anticipated by the budget. A notable exception is diesel fuel expense, which almost certainly will exceed budget for the year. Whether or not this overage will require remedial action will be determined later in the fiscal year.
- **Capital** expenses also are as anticipated by the budget. It should be noted that LTD will receive only \$1 million of the \$6.9 million requested as part of the United Front appeal for federal discretionary funding, and none of the \$5 million requested for a new Springfield Station. The revised Capital Improvement Program and Long-Range Financial Plan will address concerns raised by funding uncertainty. Funds for the BRT pilot corridor already have been identified and/or set aside.



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

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

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

**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. **Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Service Recommendations:** A preliminary public hearing on proposed service adjustments for next fiscal year is scheduled for the December 20, 2000, regular Board meeting. The Board will be asked to hold a second public hearing and approve a final service package at the January 17, 2001, Board meeting.
- B. **Springfield Station Site Selection:** After the environmental assessment is available, the Board will be asked to make a decision regarding the site for the new Springfield Station. Staff hope that this decision can be made at the January 2001, regular meeting.
- C. **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 winter of 2000-2001.
- D. **Board Strategic Planning Work Session:** At the October meeting, the Board scheduled a two-day strategic planning work session for January 19-20, 2001. Staff will work with the Board to set the agenda for this important planning session.
- E. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval:** It is anticipated that approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur in January 2001.
- F. **FY 2001-2002 Pricing Plan and Fare Ordinance:** A public hearing and approval of the recommended FY 2001-2002 pricing plan will be scheduled for the February 21, 2001, regular Board meeting. The first reading of the amended fare ordinance will be scheduled for March 21, 2001, and the second reading and adoption will be scheduled for the April 18, 2001, regular Board meeting.

- G. **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.
- H. **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

December 20, 2000, Board Meeting

## Future Dates to Remember in 2001

January 19-20	LTD Board strategic planning work session
March 11-14	APTA legislative Conference, Washington, DC
May 5-10	APTA Bus & Paratransit Conference, Calgary, Alberta
July 15-19	APTA Board Members Seminar, Denver, CO
September 30- October 4	APTA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia
Unscheduled	Lobbying trip(s) to Washington, D.C.

## City of Eugene/LTD Partnership

Eugene City Manager Jim Johnson and I met regarding continuing issues between the city and LTD. Some issues relate to BRT. My read on the BRT issues hints at a breakdown between city staff who work with LTD staff on the project and the city's upper management group. Other issues surfaced in our discussion regarding the downtown shuttle, Autzen Stadium service, the city's visioning process, and service to the future courthouse.

Jim and I agreed to form two committees: a policy committee and a project committee. The idea is to ensure that the City of Eugene and LTD, both management and staff, are on the same page. The City of Eugene/LTD Policy Committee has met two times. Paul Farmer and Les Lyle are the city representatives. Ken Hamm and Mark Pangborn are LTD's representatives. Agreements are being crafted that will ensure joint understanding, processes, participation, and ownership in projects. With BRT, we are jointly determining cost estimates, alignments, council approval strategies, contracting options, and more.

Stefano Viggiano and Graham Carey from LTD and Tom Larsen and Mike Sullivan for the City of Eugene staff the Project Committee. A joint meeting is scheduled to get all parties coordinated and off on the right foot. I believe this committee structure will create a better partnership and create more positive outcomes. You will be kept informed.

## Re-Authorization of TEA 21

The APTA Legislative Committee met in Washington, D.C., December 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss the coming year and the transit legislative agenda. The second half of the day focused on

developing the priorities for funding to be considered for the next transportation authorizing bill. I made the trip for three specific purposes. First, it is imperative that BRT be clearly identified as a national transit initiative and that funding for it should be included in the proposed re-authorizing package. Second, LTD needs to be at the table at the national level and seen as a player in Congressional efforts. Third, there was a move afoot by some systems who use federal funds to subsidize their operating budgets to move the 200,000 population formula threshold to 250,000. LTD and the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area does not get a fair share of formula funds when the funds flow through the state, which is what happens for urban areas under 200,000 population. We want the funds to come directly to this community so that local decision making controls their application. I strongly voiced that at this meeting, as Linda Lynch had through written communications.

### **Cottage Grove Tax Challenge**

On December 7<sup>th</sup>, LTD was notified by the Oregon Department of Revenue (ODOR) that a Cottage Grove business (unnamed) had filed a challenge to the LTD payroll tax in court. A Magistrate's Hearing has been held and recessed until complete documentation of the Cottage Grove Annexation can be provided to the hearing official. The requested information has been delivered to ODOR to forward to the court. The hearing will be reconvened in the future.

Additional information will be provided to board members, as it becomes available. LTD notified the City of Cottage Grove of the complaint.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 20, 2000

**ITEM TITLE:** FY 2000 SECTION 5307 FEDERAL GRANT APPLICATION  
FY 2001 SECTION 5309 FEDERAL GRANT APPLICATION  
FY 2000 SECTION 5309 FEDERAL GRANT AMENDMENT

**PREPARED BY:** Lisa Gardner, Capital Grants Administrator

**ACTION REQUESTED:** (1) Hold a public hearing on the grant applications  
(2) Approve grant application

**BACKGROUND:** FY 2000 Section 5307 Federal Grant Application: Each year, LTD receives formula funds that are authorized as part of the federal transportation funding appropriations. These funds are referred to as Section 5307 funds and are awarded through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Section 5307 projects are funded at 80 percent, with a 20 percent match provided by LTD. LTD also receives Surface Transportation Program (STP) Flexible funds, which are allocated to LTD on a formula basis through the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). STP projects are funded at 89.73 percent.

This grant request is for \$2,332,800, which includes \$187,536 in FY 2001 State STP funds, and \$1,699,040 in FY 2000 section 5307 funds. The request funds the 2000-2001 Capital Improvements Program, which includes a hybrid-electric bus purchase, spare parts for bus maintenance, computer hardware and software, miscellaneous office equipment, Automatic Vehicle Locator/Automatic Passenger Counter, and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

FY 2001 Section 5309 Federal Grant Application and FY 2000 Section 5309 Federal Grant Amendment: In addition to formula funds, LTD receives federal discretionary 5309 funds, which are appropriated by Congress. This application includes \$1,000,000 for bus purchase, as well as a request to amend the BRT grant to include the balance of the congressional earmark of \$8,000,000 for final design and construction. The BRT funds will be applied for pending FTA approval of the Environmental Assessment, and local jurisdiction approval of the BRT Phase 1 project.

**ATTACHMENT:** Program of Projects and Budgets for Section 5307 Grant  
Program of Projects and Budgets for Section 5309 Bus Grant  
Program of Projects and Budgets for Section 5309 BRT Grant  
Amendment

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed FY 2000 Section 5307 federal grant application for \$1,886,576 in federal funds, the FY 2001 Section 5309 federal grant for \$1,000,000 for bus purchase, and the amendment to the FY 2000 Section 5309 federal grant for bus rapid transit final design and construction and authorizes the General Manager to submit this application to the Federal Transit Administration for approval.

# Legal Notice

**Date:** May 8, 2020  
**To:** Debbie Buzalsky, Legal Publications  
*The Register-Guard*; Fax: 687-6668  
**From:** Susan Hekimoglu, Administrative Office Supervisor  
Lane Transit District; Phone: 682-6108  
**RE:** Notice of Preliminary Public Hearing  
LTD Purchase Order #7585

**Please publish the following legal publication on Thursday,  
December 14, 2000:**

## **NOTICE OF PRELIMINARY PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Notice is hereby given that a public hearing on proposed adjustments to service for Fiscal Year 2001-2002 will be held by Lane Transit District in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue (off Glenwood Blvd.), Eugene, Oregon, at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, December 20, 2000. The proposed adjustments would result in a comprehensive redesign of the LTD system, including changes, additions, and deletions to service, to be implemented on September 2, 2001. For further information, call the LTD Service Planning and Marketing Department at 682-6100 during regular business hours. A second public hearing and approval of the final staff recommendation is scheduled for 6:30 p.m., Wednesday, January 27, 2001.

Alternative formats of printed materials (Braille, cassette tapes, or large print) are available upon request. A sign language interpreter will be made available with 48 hours' notice. The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. For more information, call 682-6100 (voice) or 1-800-735-2900 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2000\09\Regular Mtg\Legal notice to RG.doc



## **Lane Transit District**

*P.O. Box 7070  
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470*

*3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon 97403*

*Phone: 541-682-6100  
Fax: 682-6111  
TTY: 800-735-2900  
E-mail: [ltd@ltd.lane.or.us](mailto:ltd@ltd.lane.or.us)  
Internet: [www.ltd.org](http://www.ltd.org)*

# Legal Notice

**Date:** May 8, 2020  
**To:** Debbie Buzalsky, Legal Publications  
*The Register-Guard*; Fax: 687-6668  
**From:** Susan Hekimoglu, Administrative Office Supervisor  
Lane Transit District; Phone: 682-6108  
**RE:** Notice of Board Meeting  
LTD Purchase Order #7585

**Please publish the following legal publication on Thursday,  
December 14, 2000:**

## NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

Notice is hereby given that a public hearings will be held by Lane Transit District in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue (off Glenwood Blvd.), Eugene, Oregon, at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, December 20, 2000, for the purpose of considering three grant applications for Federal funding as follows: Federal Section 5307 funding for the annual Capital Improvements program in the amount of \$2,332,800.00; Federal Section 5309 funding for a Hybrid-Electric bus purchase in the amount of \$1,250,000; and for a proposed Federal Section 5309 Amendment to OR-03-0079 for the construction of the BRT pilot corridor in the amount of \$10,000,000.00.

Alternative formats of printed materials (Braille, cassette tapes, or large print) are available upon request. A sign language interpreter will be made available with 48 hours' notice. The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. For more information, call 682-6100 (voice) or 1-800-735-2900 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2000\09\Regular Mtg\Legal notice to RG.doc



**Lane Transit District**

*P.O. Box 7070  
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470*

*3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon 97403*

*Phone: 541-682-6100  
Fax: 682-6111  
TTY: 800-735-2900  
E-mail: [ltd@ltd.lane.or.us](mailto:ltd@ltd.lane.or.us)  
Internet: [www.ltd.org](http://www.ltd.org)*



# Legal Notice

**Date:** May 8, 2020  
**To:** Debbie Buzalsky, Legal Publications  
*The Register-Guard*; Fax: 687-6668  
**From:** Susan Hekimoglu, Administrative Office Supervisor  
Lane Transit District; Phone: 682-6108  
**RE:** Notice of Board Meeting  
LTD Purchase Order #7585

**Please publish the following legal publication on Thursday,  
December 14, 2000:**

## NOTICE OF BOARD MEETING

The Lane Transit District Board of Directors will hold its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, December 20, 2000, in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene (in Glenwood). The meeting will begin at 5:30 p.m., with items for information and the following action items: Employee of the Month, Consent Calendar, and Board Committee Assignments. No public testimony will be heard during this portion of the meeting. At 6:30 p.m., the Board will ask for public comment of a general nature and hold the first of two public hearings on the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR), public hearings and approval of three federal grant applications, and approval of a revised BRT Franklin/UO alignment, followed by additional items for information. At the end of the meeting, the Board will meet in Executive (non-public) session (ORS192.660(1)(l)) to review and evaluate the employment-related performance of the general manager.

Alternative formats of printed materials (Braille, cassette tapes, or large print) are available upon request. A sign language interpreter will be made available with 48 hours' notice. The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. For more information, call 682-6100 (voice) or 1-800-735-2900 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).



**Lane Transit District**

*P.O. Box 7070  
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470*

*3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Eugene, Oregon 97403*

*Phone: 541-682-6100  
Fax: 682-6111  
TTY: 800-735-2900  
E-mail: [ltd@ltd.lane.or.us](mailto:ltd@ltd.lane.or.us)  
Internet: [www.ltd.org](http://www.ltd.org)*



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

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

## **MONTHLY STAFF REPORT**

December 20, 2000

### **GOVERNMENT RELATIONS**

*Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager*

#### **FEDERAL**

Two of the District's federal lobbyists were in Eugene-Springfield December 11 and 12 to discuss projects with staff from the "united front" local coalition and to review progress from this year's Congressional session. It was unfortunate that the new administration was not determined, because it is difficult to predict how agencies and priorities will change when the next administration is in place. It also makes it difficult to plan the 2001 lobbying trip to Washington, D.C., because many second and third-tier executive appointments will not be complete or confirmed very quickly, and these are positions local delegates have met with in the past.

This situation conflicts with the fact that Congress will be on a schedule that will require appropriations requests to be completed by early March, as in past years. How to manage this conflict still is being considered, but a tentative recommendation is for staff to travel to Washington early in the year to meet with congressional staff. Appointed and elected officials would travel to Washington later in the year when administration officials are in place, most likely (but not definitely) in September. This also would be a good time to discuss policy issues in addition to specific projects in the region.

As you know, Lane Transit District received \$1 million in discretionary funds for bus and bus facilities. Requests for these funds outnumbered the amount available tenfold. This is probably an indication that competition for such funds also will continue to be fierce in future years. In the year 2000, some other accomplishments of the "united front" coalition included:

- Passage of the "Secure Rural Schools and Self Determination Act of 2000" – what has been known locally as the county timber payments bill. This bill will provide about \$5 million per year over six years to Lane County.
- \$1.35 million for west Eugene wetlands land acquisition.
- \$286,000 for the Springfield Millrace feasibility study. This is the second year of funding through the Corps of Engineers for this project.

- Three Eugene projects were authorized in the 2000 Water Resources Development Act, Section 206, Small Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Projects: Central Amazon Creek; Delta Ponds Restoration; and the Eugene Millrace Restoration.
- \$250,000 to Lane County toward replacement of AIRS (law enforcement data system). This is an \$8 – 10 million project that needs an estimated \$2 million in Federal funds.
- Report language directing the National Guard to include funding for a new Lane County armory in Fiscal Year 2002 budget.

While the region had several other requests that were not funded, and without Oregon Members of Congress on appropriations committees, it appears that the local coalition enjoys a productive working relationship with its delegation.

The agenda for 2001 is being refined by all local agencies, but is expected to include:

- The last year of funding for land acquisition in west Eugene wetlands;
- Continue funding for restoration of Springfield Millrace;
- Continue to seek funding for restoration of AIRS; and
- Continue to seek funding for construction of a new Lane County armory.

Lane Transit District will continue to seek funding for Springfield Station (\$4 million federal share) and \$5 million for BRT or other vehicles. Needs are much larger than this amount, but in an effort to present an achievable result, staff recommends keeping the federal discretionary request under \$10 million.

## **STATE**

Lane area legislators were invited to a work session dinner with the Board. Because no House of Representatives members could be present, this work session was cancelled. State senators Susan Castillo, Lee Beyer, and Tony Corcoran will meet more informally with Board President Hillary Wylie, Rob Bennett, and Gerry Gaydos to discuss LTD's legislative priorities.

House members generally are unavailable this month because they have been in a series of training sessions, meetings, retreats, and caucuses. The number of these is larger than usual, as permanent legislative staff adjusts to the large number of new legislators, a result of term limits. There are 25 new members in the House (out of 60 total), with many committees chaired by legislators in their first or second terms. This was unheard of just a few years ago, when seniority meant a legislator would not even get on a preferred committee until his or her second or third term. There will be new chairs for both House and Senate Transportation Committees, and for Ways and Means. Newspaper columnists have written about the expected positive changes in the Oregon legislature due largely to the departure of certain personalities, rather than any changes in partisan numbers. This is not a 100-percent certainty, however, particularly with Senator Gary George chairing Senate Transportation, who has never embraced a transit agenda and is highly critical of the state Department of Transportation.

## **SERVICE PLANNING**

*Andy Vobora, Service Planning Manager*

### **SPECIAL EVENT SERVICES**

Basketball service is rolling along for both men's and women's games. Ridership for the pre-Pac 10 games is always lower; however, the numbers appear consistent with past years. Note that women's service is now at the same level as men's service. While the attendance is lower at women's games, transit use is higher.

Work continues on the Autzen Stadium expansion. LTD staff continue to coordinate with UO and City staff participating in the project. No final decisions have been made with respect to the transit station location.

### **LCC TERM PASS**

Final sales of the discounted term bus pass were 2,279. This represents an increase in sales of 14 percent; however, it falls short of LTD's goal to sell all 2,500 passes available. Staff will continue to pursue efforts to sell more passes during winter term. During the early part of winter term, the staff will begin discussions with LCC staff and determine how the program will be shaped for the 2001-02 school year. It would be my hope that a recommendation would be included in LTD Board discussions of fare policy in February 2001.

### **WINTER BID**

Service planners and marketing staff are working on the service changes for winter bid. This bid will include very few changes to the system. This is being driven by the new scheduling system implementation, which will run in parallel to the current system. Because there are so few changes, the standard printing of the Rider's Digest Update will not occur. Customers will be informed about the changes through the use of Bus Talk, our rider newsletter.

## **TRANSIT OPERATIONS**

*Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager*

### **OPERATIONS STAFF RETREAT**

The Operations team met for two days in November to plan and develop a departmental reorganization. The department is changing significantly. During the next few months, we will be cross training supervisors so that they will be proficient at all supervisory functions. The supervisory staff will be combined to better serve and support the bus operators. Some of the benefits of the new structure include fewer operators reporting to a single supervisor and more flexibility in how supervisors' shifts are structured. Additional benefits include better office efficiency and consistency. It will take a few months to get all of the pieces in place. Full implementation is anticipated by summer 2001.

### **TECHNICAL TOUR**

In November, System Supervisors Jim Coffman and Judy Rose toured the C-Tran operations facility in Vancouver, Washington, and the Tri-Met operations facility in Portland. The purpose of the tour was to evaluate how other agencies assign work and operate control centers, and it resulted in a broader understanding of LTD system supervisor positions. Possibilities for change in some areas were noted, as well as other areas where LTD's current procedures better met the District's needs. It was a valuable tour for both of them.

### **TRAINING**

LTD training staff have been very busy. The fall training for current operators was completed in November. The primary focus of this training was customer sensitivity and stress reduction. The sessions were well received and the operator comments about the classes were largely positive. In addition, the training staff have been training new operators, some of whom recently completed training. Another class of new operators will begin training in late December.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES**

*David Dickman, Human Resources Manager*

### **LABOR RELATIONS**

The Florida Gore/Bush Presidential election was not the only election to experience difficulties this year. During the summer and fall, Local 757 experienced two elections with completely different results. On July 1, 2000, Wally Feist replaced Ron Heintzman as Business Representative of the ATU Local 757. Mr. Feist was the Business Representative for about 60 days, and was the installed leader at the time of our conclusion of our collective bargaining agreement. Ron Heintzman, who claimed that voting irregularities resulted in the election results being in doubt, challenged Feist's scant victory of 21 votes. The International Union investigated the allegations and subsequently ordered a new election. Ron Heintzman won the second election by a substantial margin. Continuing allegations of misconduct are being heard now from Feist (and other dissenters) but to what end is not really apparent or known.

With the election of Ron Heintzman, the District has a known quantity for the coming three years. It is difficult to know whether Mr. Heintzman will continue the new spirit of teamwork and partnership that the District is developing with the Union. He did not negotiate completely the new agreement and may have his own ideas about what needed addressing by the Agreement. Time will tell where we are headed in this important question.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES**

A committee composed of representatives of the Employee Association and the Leadership Council has been reviewing and preparing a comprehensive revision of administrative policies covering personnel and employment. A draft of this revision may be ready in January for the Leadership Council and general manager and then sometime in the following months for review by the LTD Board of Directors' Human Resources Committee and subsequent adoption by the Board.

### **AFFIRMATIVE ACTION**

In accordance with the requirements of the FTA and UMTA Circular 4704.1, LTD has restated its Affirmative Action Plan. Human Resources Specialist Joyce Ziemplak did a masterful job of preparing this complex document. LTD does not have any difficulties in meeting the requirements of law with regard to equal employment and affirmative action. A purpose of this report is to establish goals for the coming years to further enhance LTD's equal opportunity position within the organization. LTD's prior employment practices suggest that our recruitment and hiring of ethnic minorities has met our past goals and likely

will continue into the future. However, the District needs to focus attention on the recruitment and advancement of women, particularly among craft, technical, and official/manager positions and continue in its past strong practice of hiring minorities. The goals in the revised plan are achievable, and the Human Resources Department will continue in its strategic compliance role to further the advancement towards these goals.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2000\12\Regular Mtg\staff report December 2000.doc (jhs)