

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 15, 2001.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, February 21, 2001
5:30 p.m.

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

A G E N D A

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Lauritsen _____ Melnick _____ Wylie _____ Bennett _____
Gaydos _____ Hocken _____ Kleger _____

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

III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA 05

V. WORK SESSION

A. Fare Policy and Pricing 06

B. Begin Comprehensive Service Redesign Discussion (if time allows) 32

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

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – MARCH 2001 13

VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Consent Calendar | 15 |
| | 1. Minutes of January 17, 2001, Regular Board Meeting
(Page 16) | |
| | 2. Minutes of January 19-20, 2001, Board Strategic Planning Work
Session (Page 30) | |
| B. | Public Hearing on FY 2001-02 Fare Recommendation | 06 |
| | 1. Staff Presentation | |
| | 2. Opening of Public Hearing by Board President | |
| | 3. Public Testimony | |
| | ◆ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes | |
| | 4. Closure of Public Hearing | |
| | 5. Board Discussion | |
| C. | Comprehensive Service Redesign | 32 |
| | 1. Staff Presentation | |
| | 2. Opening of Public Hearing by Board President | |
| | 3. Public Testimony | |
| | ◆ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes | |
| | 4. Closing of Public Hearing | |
| | 5. Board Deliberation and Decision | |

IX. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Current Activities | |
| | 1. Board Member Reports | 35 |
| | (a) Metropolitan Policy Committee | |
| | (b) BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops /
Walkabout Input | |

	(c) Statewide Livability Forum	
	(d) Board Finance Committee	
2.	General Manager's Report	37
3.	Monthly Financial Report – January 2001 Financial Statements	39
4.	TransPlan Update	50
5.	Bus Rapid Transit Update	59
6.	Administration of Special Transportation Services	63
7.	Employee Appreciation Banquet	65
B.	Monthly Staff Report	66
C.	Monthly Performance Reports (November and December, 2000)	72
X.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	81
A.	Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Fare Ordinance	
B.	Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Capital Improvements Plan	
C.	Long-range Financial Plan	
D.	LTD Board Work Session on TransPlan	
E.	Briefing on Train Station by City of Eugene Staff	
F.	Willamette Valley Futures Study Presentation	
G.	Springfield Station Site Selection	
H.	Budget Committee Meetings	
I.	Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 1 Decision	
J.	Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Budget Adoption	
K.	TransPlan Draft Approval	
L.	BRT Updates	
XI.	ADJOURNMENT	

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

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2001\02\Regular Meeting\bdagenda.doc

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

2

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: JANUARY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Financial results for the first seven months of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Total General Fund revenue was \$432,583 over budget through January, due to continued strong interest earnings (\$309,682) and the recovery of payroll tax receipts (\$185,003).

Although ridership gains have been promising in recent months, passenger fares continue to lag expectations, but have been partially offset by the strength of group pass revenue. Year-to-date receipts are below those of the same seven-month period in the last fiscal year. Total fare revenue is likely to be about \$175,000 below budget for the fiscal year. The shortfall will be more than covered by interest income, which will show a surplus of more than \$400,000 by fiscal year-end, even with an expected reduction in rates of return. (Interest income was budgeted low deliberately to provide a hedge against the uncertainties of a local economy in transition.)

Advertising revenue is nearly back on track versus budget year-to-date, and should exceed budget by fiscal year-end due to the implementation of a new contract that will result in increased revenue. As was previously reported, Obie Media was the successful bidder in the recent competitive award process.

While payroll tax revenue is now ahead of budget for the first seven months, staff are still cautious about year-end and FY 2001-02 predictions. Revenue is budgeted according to historical collection patterns, but history has not been a good predictor. Payroll taxes that include assessments for holiday seasonal employees are not due to LTD until February, so it will be March or April before it can be determined if this important resource will meet budget expectations for the fiscal year. The evidence is inconclusive at this time. Local economic forecasts suggest growth over the next year in the 0 to 1 percent range.

Self-employment tax receipts are ahead of both current budget and the same period last year, but no conclusion can be drawn from this result. Most of the funds from this resource are received in May. State-in-lieu revenue was budgeted in equal quarterly installments, but the actual receipt pattern may vary, with the second half of the year receiving more funds than the first. The April financial report will include the third-quarter payment, and a forecast of total annual receipts from this source.

Administration personnel costs are slightly below budget for the first seven months of the fiscal year. Amalgamated Transit Union employee costs are still projected to be over budget for the year by \$200,000 to \$300,000.

Fuel prices have continued to fall in recent weeks. Most recently, diesel was purchased at \$.96 per gallon. In January, the price briefly dipped to \$.83, which matched the rate included in this year's budget. Earlier in the year, it appeared that fuel would report an annual budget deficit of \$200,000. Given the favorable price trend since, it now appears that the negative variance will be half the original prediction. Savings in other materials and services areas will mitigate this negative variance.

The Special Transportation Fund and Capital Fund are as expected through January. It should be noted again that federal grant funding for bus rapid transit (BRT) project planning has now been exhausted. Future BRT planning was included in last year's federal discretionary funding request that was not successful. In accordance with the contingency plan included in this year's Capital Improvements Program (CIP), BRT planning will be covered by local capital for the remainder of this year, and for the foreseeable future.

The FY 2001-02 budget development process is underway. Following the discussions at the January two-day Board work session, staff reviewed the General Fund forecast and capital project funding options. The Finance Committee has been informed of and involved in these discussions, which will lead to the update of both the CIP and the Long-range Financial Plan (LRFP), as well as completion of next fiscal year's proposed budget. The Finance Committee met on February 15th, and will meet again in early March. The full Board is scheduled to review the revised CIP and LRFP at the regular March Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attached are the following financial reports for Board review:

1. Operating Financial Report - comparison to prior year
2. Monthly Financial Report Comments

3. Comparative Balance Sheets
 - a. General Fund
 - b. Special Transportation Fund
 - c. Capital Fund

4. Income Statements
 - a. General Fund
 - b. Special Transportation Fund
 - c. Capital Fund

PROPOSED MOTION: None

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, January 17, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on January 11, 2001, 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, January 17, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: None

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Wylie said that she would hold her remarks until later in the meeting, and there were no announcements or additions to the agenda. The Board would discuss the draft agenda for the two-day strategic planning work session during the regular portion of the meeting.

WORK SESSION – METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN: Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner reminded the Board that the unresolved TransPlan issues had been referred by the TransPlan adopting officials to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) for resolution. MPC had appointed two subcommittees to address the unresolved issues. The subcommittee that addressed the alternative measures issue had completed its task of developing a set of alternative performance measures to be used to demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Each adopting agency would be asked to approve the proposed alternative measures.

The other subcommittee that had been appointed to address the remaining unresolved issues had not completed its work, and the remaining issues would be referred back to MPC for resolution. The recommendations on the remaining unresolved issues would be considered by the adopting officials in February.

Ms. Gardner introduced Tom Schwetz and Paul Thompson of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), who were present to discuss the proposed alternative measures.

Ms. Hocken said that she had participated on the alternative measures subcommittee. The subcommittee was comprised of an LTD representative, Springfield City Councilor Lyle Hatfield, Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer, and a representative from the Eugene City Council. Councilor Betty Taylor was present for some of the meetings and Councilor Scott Meisner for others. The subcommittee basically had started from scratch on the alternative performance measures. Some measures were proposed by staff, but the subcommittee was interested in finding some measures that clearly would indicate that progress was being made in a certain area. Included in the agenda packet were six proposed alternative measures, and MPC had approved sending those measures to the adopting officials for approval.

The transit measure proposed was transit mode share on congested corridors during p.m. peak times. Ms. Hocken said that she had a handout that would show some of the material that the subcommittee used to make its proposal.

Mr. Schwetz said that the adopting agencies needed to come together as a region to establish the alternative performance measures, which represented a commitment to achieving the TPR. The approved alternative measures would be presented for approval to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). The proposed measures were alternatives to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Per Capita, which was the primary target set forth in the TPR. None of the metropolitan planning organizations in the state reached the VMT targets in the TPR, and all were seeking approval of alternative measures.

The subcommittee thoroughly reviewed adopting official comments and what had been proposed by staff. Mr. Schwetz thought that the process went well. The approved alternative measures were to be presented formally to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) by March 14. An extensive public review by the DLCD would follow. It was expected that the final public hearing and decision by the LCDC would be made in early May 2001.

Ms. Gardner noted that the Board would be asked later during the meeting to approve the proposed alternative measures. She added that staff were supporting the proposed alternative measures as presented.

Mr. Kleger said that under the "percentage of transit mode share on congested corridors" measure, no mention was made of Franklin and Glenwood Boulevard corridor, which in his estimation was one of the more congested corridors in the area.

Ms. Hocken said that some targets for the year 2015 were targeted during the modeling that was done for TransPlan. Benchmarks were set as well. The subcommittee decided to be more aggressive on the year 2015 percentages than the computer modeling had indicated. For example, the computer modeling had indicated that the percentage of non-auto trips in 2015 would be 14 percent, and the subcommittee was proposing, through the use of alternative performance measures, to reduce the auto trips by 17 percent. She noted that Franklin Boulevard in both directions east of Agate Street was on the list of selected

major corridors. Mr. Schwetz added that staff inadvertently had left the Franklin Boulevard corridor off the staff memo that was included in the Board packet.

Mr. Bennett asked what would happen if those alternative performance measures did not meet the objectives. Mr. Schwetz said that the interim benchmarks were set as indicators to determine if the goals were being met. If they were determined not to be meeting the goals, they would become part of the periodic TransPlan updates.

Ms. Hocken added that both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield believed that the proposed alternative measure for number of acres to be zoned for nodal development was attainable.

Mr. Bennett asked what the LCOG staff sense was of the West Eugene Parkway issue. Mr. Schwetz said that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) would send a letter to the City outlining what stage the project currently was in, and asking for consistency between the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the long-range plan in TransPlan. The EIS assumed that all four phases would be built by 2015. TransPlan, on the other hand, assumed that only the first phase of the Parkway would be built by 2015.

Mr. Bennett asked if anything had changed in terms of the fundamental analysis for the West Eugene Parkway during the ten years since that analysis had been done that would cause the same or a comparable analysis done today to be vastly different. Mr. Schwetz said that he was more familiar with the first phase of the project than he was with the other three phases that were included in the EIS. The first phase would do a lot to ease some of the congestion on West 11th Avenue. The remaining phases tied into Highway 126, and resulted in an inter-regional facility. The projections for growth both in the area and throughout Lane County had not changed, so the merits of the project remained.

Mr. Bennett asked what the staff response was to the argument that the effect on West 11th would not be as significant as previously projected. Mr. Schwetz said that it was unfortunate in the way some of the projections were presented, such as an 8-percent decrease in congestion. That 8 percent on a facility that already was congested would be a large decrease, and without the facility, the increased congestion would be very noticeable.

Ms. Hocken asked how the West Eugene Parkway project would impact the adoption of TransPlan. Mr. Schwetz said that the Surface Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) had the first phase of the Parkway programmed for 2001. MPC would need to discuss taking the Parkway off the list of regional priorities for STIP funding. If it were dropped from the list, there was no guarantee that the \$17 million slated for this project could be used for other projects. However, Mr. Schwetz thought an argument could be made for the fact that even though that particular project was dropped, the need for some alleviation of congestion on West 11th Avenue would not go away.

Mr. Kleger said that at the State of the City address, he had an opportunity to speak with Mayor Torrey about a fallback plan for addressing some of the traffic issues on West 11th Avenue, and had reiterated that the need would not go away by doing nothing. Mr. Schwetz said that a segment of West 11th belonged to the City of Eugene and improvements to that segment would require city funding.

Ms. Wylie asked how dropping the Parkway project would affect the proposed bus rapid transit (BRT) project. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that dropping the Parkway project would have no direct impact on BRT, but could have an indirect impact on the BRT project, since the more congested 11th Avenue became, the more difficult it would be for LTD to find and acquire bus priority along the corridor. Mr. Viggiano also suggested that BRT in West Eugene might be able to use some of the Parkway funding.

Ms. Wylie said that she had been appointed to the MPC subcommittee that was reviewing the remaining unresolved TransPlan issues. Mr. Gaydos had participated in that subcommittee in Ms. Wylie's absence. At this time, the subcommittee was not planning to meet again, and there were two issues that remained unresolved. Ms. Gardner added that MPC as a whole would be addressing the remaining two unresolved issues.

Mr. Thompson said that the subcommittee had made recommendations for six of the eight unresolved issues. Those six recommendations were presented to and agreed upon by MPC for further recommendation to the adopting agencies. The six issues included the addition of a new Roadway Policy #4; the addition of an I-5 Interchange Study; moving the Division Avenue Bridge item to the future list; a revision of the Definition and Intent of Finance Policy #3; a recommendation to not add a New Finance Policy #1; and to add a new Finance Policy #2. The remaining unresolved issues included the wording related to the study of new river crossings and a proposed new Finance Policy related to setting priorities for investment actions by local agencies.

MPC was asking the individual adopting agencies to review the remaining two issues and to take a position so that MPC could further address the issues at its February meeting.

There were three options proposed in regard to the river crossing study. The City of Eugene had asked that any river crossing study include an exclusion zone between the Ferry Street Bridge and the Beltline Highway; another option was to have no mention of a river-crossing study in TransPlan; and a third option would be to mention the study, but without a definition of the study at this time.

The other unresolved issue was the proposed finance policy on investment priorities. Five options were being proposed for this issue. One option was to add no new policy; the second was to leave the policy as originally proposed by the Eugene City Council; the third was to include the original policy proposal with a revised Definition/Intent hierarchy; the fourth was to modify the policy statement; and the fifth option was to address potential land-use problems.

Mr. Gaydos said that he had attended one of the subcommittee meetings. Neither Ms. Wylie nor Mr. Gaydos were able to attend the meeting that was scheduled for November 20. Mr. Gaydos thought it was very important that LTD be represented and more of an effort should be made to ensure representation at all meetings regarding TransPlan. At the meeting attended by Mr. Gaydos, Mayor Torrey, in reference to the river crossing study, said that he felt that in order to get something through the Eugene Council, it would be necessary to exclude the area between the Ferry Street Bridge and the Beltline Highway. He did not know if that had changed, but Mr. Gaydos asked the Board to consider that request. Everyone at the subcommittee agreed that it was important to create a buffer zone

along each of the existing crossings for pedestrians, bicycles, and/or transit, so there would be a potential for a transit addition. Mr. Gaydos thought that it would be better to have a study in the project list than not.

With regard to the Finance Policy issue, Mr. Gaydos said that the subcommittee participants were concerned about whether the policy would be mandatory or something to which the jurisdictions could apply their own decision-making processes. Most of the participants agreed that it should not be mandatory; however, the City of Eugene tended to believe that setting priorities for investment actions by local agencies should be mandatory. The issue was to try to maintain some flexibility for the jurisdictions, and Mr. Gaydos did not have a recommended course of action for the Board.

Ms. Wylie asked if Mr. Gaydos had agreed to the option of adding no new policy. Mr. Gaydos said that, personally, he would choose the first option of adding no new policy; however, he did not believe that would be successful in achieving consensus among the jurisdictions. He thought it was important to look at an option that would allow some flexibility.

Mr. Thompson said that two of the options provided for more flexibility. Option 4 modified the policy statement by adding an introductory phrase to the original proposed policy statement to recognize the "fixed intent" nature of some transportation funding sources. Option 5 addressed potential land-use problems by modifying the definition/intent language and making minor changes to the second priority statement in an attempt to address potential land-use problems with the original proposed policy. He added that option 5 would require additional legal review prior to moving forward.

Mr. Kleger said that he was concerned that the proposed policy could be interpreted to block any LTD initiatives, but he suggested option 5 as the least restrictive option.

Ms. Wylie noted that she and Ms. Hocken would be taking the Board recommendation back to MPC.

Ms. Hocken said that her concern was that there was not enough support for the original proposed policy, and it was important to compromise. She did not have a sense that any of the options met the objectives of the Eugene City Council. Based on the conversation so far, option 2 would not be in the best interest of LTD as there were too many restrictions and too much ambiguity.

Ms. Lauritsen agreed that option 5 appeared to be the most flexible.

Ms. Wylie asked Board members to provide input to her or Ms. Hocken before the next MPC meeting. She would seek staff input as well. Mr. Thompson thought it would be a good idea to have Mr. Gaydos attend the MPC meeting, since he had been the one to attend the subcommittee meeting.

With regard to the river crossing study, Ms Wylie reiterated that the Board had favored option 1, to include the study in TransPlan, but with an exclusion of the area between the Ferry Street Bridge northwest to the Beltline Highway and with the allowance of a buffer zone on either side of existing crossings to allow for expansion for alternative-mode use.

Mr. Thompson said that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had indicated that the exclusion of an area in a crossing study could be at cross-purposes with the requirements of a future EIS where all options would need to be looked at.

Mr. Bennett said that he had participated on a north Ferry Street Bridge committee several years earlier. With regard to the Valley River Bridge, the committee never arrived at a point of recommending a particular position, but had agreed on how to fund it. One of the main points in favor of a new Valley River Bridge was the number of vehicle miles traveled that would be cut. Mr. Bennett wondered if those fundamental principles would still hold true with regard to a Valley River Crossing. Mr. Schwetz said that it would depend on the location of the crossing, but from a purely systems perspective, a situation where a crossing actually would reduce VMTs would be to use the desired lines that existed, particularly east/west, that currently were satisfied by traveling north on River Road to Beltline then east to Delta Highway and west to the Washington/Jefferson bridge to 7th Avenue. By having a crossing located between those facilities, which was in the proposed exclusion area, it would be a more efficient routing of the traffic.

Mr. Thompson said that ODOT was interested in a crossing that would be identified to serve more of the local traffic to ease the regional facilities. The VMT measure would be one consideration that would go into the determination of an independent utility under an EIS. Mr. Bennett said that would be an argument to be very careful before ruling out an area for a study.

Mr. Gaydos asked what the ramifications would be for not recommending that a river crossing study be included in the TransPlan projects list. Mr. Schwetz said that there was no requirement to have studies listed in TransPlan, but the jurisdictions had elected to do that as a recognition of a problem. Leaving it out would not prohibit a study at some future time.

Mr. Melnick said that he shared the concern about excluding an area from the study largely due to the process question that was raised. One of the values of an EIS was to show extremes on any project, which then could be rejected. If the jurisdictions excluded an extreme beforehand, it would preclude a successful EIS many years in the future.

Mr. Kleger said that specifically excluding any study to the west of Valley River Center was discriminatory against his part of town (West Eugene). He thought that anything that specifically included the possibility of a study going into crossing from Valley River to any location other than where the current crossing was would be blocked. He preferred that the study not be included in TransPlan rather than to include it with exclusions at this time, which would preclude any new thinking on the issue.

Ms. Wylie said that the Board would be taking action on the alternative measures later in the meeting.

WORK SESSION: UNITED WAY PRESENTATION: Bus Operator Carl Faddis presented the Board with the United Way Helping Hands Award, which was awarded to companies whose employees raised \$20,000 or more in campaign pledges. Mr. Faddis was the LTD Loaned Executive to the United Way 2001 fundraising campaign. He thanked the Board for its support of the LTD United Way 2001 fundraising campaign. This year's campaign put LTD on the map once again as an organization that cared about and was

committed to the quality of life in the Eugene/Springfield area, not only because of the way it moved people from one place to another, but also because its employees raised more than \$26,000 through payroll deduction pledges and other means to support the United Way of Lane County.

Mr. Faddis also thanked the Board for giving him the opportunity to work as a Loaned Executive during the last three months of 2000. The experience had enriched his life, both professionally and personally. He then presented Ms. Wylie with the Helping Hands Plaque from the United Way.

WORK SESSION: AWARD-WINNING VIDEO FOR YOUTH: Due to lack of time during this work session, it was determined that the video would be shown at the two-day strategic planning work session to be held later in January.

FEBRUARY 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced the February 2001 Employee of the Month, bus operator Jim Saville. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Saville had been with the District for nearly 24 years. He was an employee who made Mr. Johnson's job easy because he was dependable and reliable and did his job well. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Saville was a pleasurable person to be around, which was made evident by the nominations he had received for Employee of the Month.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Saville with a letter of congratulations, a certificate, a lapel pin, and a monetary award. Ms. Wylie thanked Mr. Saville for the hard work and said the Board appreciated the employees. Mr. Saville thanked the Board for the honor.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No one in the audience wished to address the Board at this time.

MOTION
VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for January 17, 2001, is approved as presented." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by acclamation. The Consent Calendar for 2001 consisted of the minutes of the December 20, 2000, regular Board meeting.

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN: Transit Planning Manager Andy Vobora said that this was the second of three public hearings that would be heard prior to adoption of the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) at the February 21, 2001, regular Board meeting. Mr. Vobora said that he would review both a 5 percent increase option and a 2 percent increase option for Board consideration. Mr. Vobora then reviewed the proposed service packages by sector.

Ms. Hocken asked what would happen to Saturday service in the Ferry Street Bridge area under the 2 percent package proposal. Mr. Vobora said that the downtown shuttle service would be cut back to no service on the weekends. Other service would replace the shuttle connection to Valley River Center.

The highlights of the 2 percent package proposal included increasing the number of peak hour trips along the 8th Avenue and Highway 99 corridors to four trips per hour on

weekdays provided by the addition of a new #41S Barger route; maintaining the current level of service on Saturdays and Sundays on the #41 Barger route; and increasing the number of trips on Saturdays between 10:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. to two times per hour on the #51 route. Increasing the service package from 2 percent to 5 percent would include all of the above service enhancements, plus adding Saturday service to the new Downtown Shuttle; improvements to the #17 route on weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays; maintaining weekday service on route #25 and #27; and increasing the number of trips on Sundays on route #43. Service increases above 5 percent would include Sunday service on the Downtown Shuttle; weekday, Saturday, and Sunday service improvements to route #33; additional early weekday evening service on route #42; Saturday service enhancements to routes #82 and #85; and an extension of route #17 to the Jasper Road area for commuter and school trips.

Mr. Vobora said that the 2 percent package would result in an annual cost increase of \$265,530, while a 5 percent package would result in an annual cost increase of \$643,695.

Mr. Hamm said that staff previously had not presented a 2 percent proposal, but he had asked staff to prepare the model in order to give the Board another option, in light of the flattening of revenues and other priorities that were being proposed. He commended staff for their work on the 2 percent proposal.

Mr. Kleger asked about the types of requests staff had received for increases in service. Mr. Vobora said that the same requests were received each year, such as service to Marcola, Mt. Pisgah, and to the airport.

Ms. Lauritsen commented that more service was better, but the question was how much service LTD could afford, and she asked Finance Manager Diane Hellekson to provide some advice in this area. Ms. Wylie noted that the financial discussion would come later, but for now she wanted to get through the Board members' questions about the proposed service packages.

Ms. Wylie asked what the normal rate of growth was for other systems of the same size. Mr. Vobora said that the average was 2 to 3 percent annual increases based on population growth and other factors, such as traffic congestion and ridership growth. The LTD pattern had averaged about 2 percent per year. Last year, service was cut, so a 5 percent increase this year would average out to a lesser percent. If the District had unlimited resources, service increases could continue; but without that, at some point, some decisions would need to be made about efficiency. In the 5 percent model, staff had not yet calculated what percentage of that was productivity and what percentage was coverage. The Board had decided on a 75 percent productivity, 25 percent coverage model during its strategic planning work session last year. Mr. Vobora said that the 2 percent model would cut into the more productive service.

Mr. Bennett asked if the proposed service packages complied with the 75 percent productivity / 25 percent coverage goals that the Board previously had set. Mr. Vobora stated that the changes contained within the current package most likely would not have changed the ratio, but that staff would do the calculations and report back to the Board in February.

Ms. Hocken noted that since the downtown shuttle was new service, she was reluctant to operate it only on the weekdays. She thought there would be a lot of usage of that route on Saturdays. In addition, she was concerned about cutting midday service on route #25. Mr. Bennett said that the shuttle had both a downtown component and a Valley River Center component. He asked what the expected ridership was on the weekdays versus Saturdays. Mr. Vobora said that the higher ridership was expected on the weekdays, and the weekends would experience a different kind of ridership. Mr. Bennett asked if the frequency could be reduced on Saturdays. Mr. Vobora said 30-minute frequency was being proposed for Saturdays.

Mr. Bennett also was concerned about cutting service on route #25, which was a high-productivity route. He had lost his perspective a bit because he had not heard from the finance side of the package. Ms. Hocken said that the Finance Committee had not yet reviewed the long-range financial plan, but would do so in February.

Mr. Bennett noted that the final CSR decision did not have to be 2 percent or 5 percent, but could be some number between those two. At some point in the future, LTD would need more revenue, and now could be the time to begin making the case for an increase in the payroll tax. The context of such a case would be that LTD was doing everything it could to show that it was reasonably productive. The Board needed to make it an important part of its agenda on a continual basis in order to convince the community not only about the need for additional revenues, but also the importance of LTD's initiatives, such as the downtown shuttle and bus rapid transit. He looked forward to further conversations with the Board at the strategic planning work session.

Public Hearing: (1) Mr. Fred Simmons of Springfield, an LTD bus operator, said that staff had done an excellent job of balancing the needs of the budget versus the needs of LTD's guests. One of the things that concerned him was that in TransPlan, the frequency of service that was illustrated would appear to cause approximately a 300 percent increase in the operating budget. He did not believe those funds were readily available, and he agreed with Mr. Bennett about seeking additional funding for LTD and the transit system.

One of the issues in Springfield was that the connectivity between north and south is underserved. The alterations to route #13 would change the flow of the way things worked. The staff had responded very effectively to the proposed Wal-Mart site at Olympic and 28th Streets. There were many other things happening in the development dynamics in Springfield, particularly with the issue of the Jasper extension as well as the ability to serve the components north and south of Main Street. The Board had talked about route #27 and its connectivity between the neighborhoods it served and the University and downtown, and Mr. Simmons thought the staff had done a wonderful job with the limited resources. In Springfield, one of the connectivity problems was between Eugene and Springfield. Crescent extended to Old Game Farm Road and looped around to Gateway. With Symantec taking the 14 acres west of Sony, it would add another mix. The Pioneer Parkway extension would throw in another dynamic, as would the closure of Laura Street at Harlow Road.

The Springfield City Council had authorized the purchase of a house located at the end of Pioneer Parkway, and it was hoped that the unnecessary portion of the right-of-way would be something LTD could use as a transfer point on the north side of Springfield. The

Council also had discussed the possibility of the guideway process on the Pioneer Parkway extension. He hoped, as a citizen of Springfield, that LTD could make some connections between the Delta-Oaks/Gateway area and points south as well as the connections between Olympic, 42nd Street South, and out into the rapidly growing Jasper-Natron area south of Main Street.

While it may not be the time in the current budget, he asked that the Board look at those possibilities in the future to provide the connectivity. As people continued to build in that area and the 3,500 new structures that were planned in the area south of Main Street, it was important to realize that there was a tremendous transit base there. The opportunity to create that involvement in transit was on the near horizon. If transit was cut out of that area because those people who lived in that area were vehicular oriented at the present time, LTD would lose a portion of the customer base that ought to be looked to.

He asked the Board, as a governing body, to seek connections in those other areas that would facilitate people beginning to develop a more friendly and accessible component of the process to use transit. He thought LTD had stepped forward a bit, and he thanked the Board for maintaining the frequency on route #11. He was thankful for what had been done, and he encouraged the Board to look at trying to facilitate that north-south movement and connectivity.

Mr. Simmons said that LTD had somewhat failed at dealing with Hyundai and other areas that were thought would be more productive in terms of ridership, but he thought there was a way to get those people involved. The planning staff had begun to engage with Springfield City planning staff, unsuccessfully so far, at the time that the Wal-Mart development occurred, and he hoped in the future, LTD would be closer to being out in front of the growth rather than behind it. He hoped another Gateway or Valley River Center would never be built without having it designed in a more transit-friendly way.

Ms. Hocken asked about the timeline for the Jasper-Natron development and the Pioneer Parkway extension. Mr. Simmons said that the Pioneer Parkway extension was being planned for 2003. As soon as the wetland mitigation was resolved in the Jasper area, the development would come together. Storm drainage already was being installed.

Mr. Simmons added that, as was experienced in the past, when large developments were built, if transit was not in the plan, then those folks did not have the concept that they could use transit to get to and from their places of business.

Ms. Hocken understood that one of the sites that was being zoned for nodal development was the Jasper-Natron site, and one of the key elements of TransPlan was to get appropriate transit services to the nodal developments.

(2) Charles Berg of Eugene asked why staff were proposing changing route #40 from 30-minute frequency back to 60-minute frequency. Mr. Vobora said that the decision was made simply to save money to meet the lower percentage goals. That proposed change was in the 2 percent model.

Mr. Bennett asked if the 30-minute route #40 was a productive route. Mr. Vobora said that it was, but in order to achieve the 2 percent increase model, and in

order to maintain some of the coverage in some neighborhoods, staff had proposed cuts to some of the productive routes.

Mr. Berg asked about route #42 and if it would be cut from Terry Street. Mr. Vobora said that all of the routes in that area would be shortlined and would be connected by route #43, which would circulate among the neighborhoods.

Board Discussion: Ms. Wylie said that the Board would hold further discussions during the two-day strategic planning work session to be held on January 19 and 20.

APPROVAL OF MPC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN ALTERNATIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURES: Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: **MOTION** “Resolved, that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves the proposed alternative measures for TransPlan, as proposed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee subcommittee on alternative measures.” Mr. Melnick seconded the motion.

Mr. Kleger said that he was concerned that Franklin Boulevard not be overlooked as a high-impact corridor where performance would be closely monitored and measured.

VOTE Ms. Wylie called for a vote by acclamation, and the motion carried unanimously. Ms. Gardner noted that the recommendations on the unresolved issues would be brought back to the Board for approval as well.

BUS RAPID TRASIT (BRT): GLENWOOD ALIGNMENT: Mr. Viggiano said that the agenda packet included the information that was provided to the BRT Steering Committee at its last meeting. He provided a brief history of the planning process that had occurred to date.

Staff and the BRT Steering Committee were proposing a “fast lane” approach through Glenwood, with future BRT development to be coordinated with the City of Springfield’s planning efforts for Glenwood, most notably the Transportation Growth Management (TGM) study that was underway. The City of Springfield had encouraged LTD to not deviate from Franklin as plans were to further develop the area between Franklin Boulevard and the river. Mr. Viggiano then described the elements of the “fast lane” alternative, which included median stations, movement that would occur in mixed traffic with stoplight priority, and some exclusive lanes in the more congested areas.

Mr. Viggiano introduced Susanna Julber from the City of Springfield planning department, who was managing the TGM study. How that study proceeded and the direction that came from the study would help dictate what was done with BRT, such as where stations would be located. The study also would provide information about what Franklin Boulevard through Glenwood might look like in the future. Currently, Franklin Boulevard had no sidewalks, no bike lanes, and an inadequate storm drainage system. There were significant improvements that could be made to Franklin Boulevard apart from putting in BRT, and it was expected that BRT would be part of the study and that an implementation plan for BRT and Franklin Boulevard would be developed as part of that study.

The commitment would be to start out with the "fast lane" approach and continue to work with the City of Springfield and ODOT to design the future BRT system and an implementation plan. That was the proposal that the Steering Committee was recommending to the Board, that the "fast lane" approach be designated as the preferred alternative for Glenwood. The Steering Committee vote had one dissenting vote, which was from Eugene City Councilor Scott Meisner. Councilor Meisner's concern was that there was no guarantee that the future BRT development would occur. Ms. Wylie added that in talking with Councilor Meisner, she had learned that he thought the vote was for no further future build-out of the BRT through Glenwood.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was very discouraged that a stronger case could not be made with the City of Springfield today in terms of the Glenwood alignment. The question he had asked himself was whether the BRT route should end in east Eugene and not travel into Springfield or whether it was important enough to get something in place to show what it could look like and what it could do. Mr. Bennett agreed to support the proposal because efficiency would not be a major issue, at least for the first 10 years, in terms of travel time; because the stations would be in place; because LTD could position itself for the future in terms of obtaining additional right-of-way as the area developed; and because of the new Springfield Station.

Ms. Wylie said that LTD had been criticized for moving away from the original objective. She thought LTD had been in an extremely difficult position while attempting to work cooperatively with the Glenwood business association and the Springfield City Council, while still attempting to please those who were the critics. She believed that LTD was very committed to the project and was determined to get the first layer down. It was disappointing that the "fast lane" approach was not the desired BRT system, but she was not willing to give up the concept. It was difficult to get the approval of the two Cities to get the project going, and that was why she had voted to approve the option.

Mr. Kleger said that he also was not willing to give up the concept, but thought it important to take the steps now. He truly believed that if nothing was done to facilitate faster bus service, LTD would become part of the increased congestion problem by the necessity to continue to stop in the right-hand lane to pick up and drop off passengers.

Mr. Melnick said that he was a supporter of BRT, and he thought that good planning occurred when integrated with other planning efforts, such as with the TGM study being conducted by Springfield. What was being proposed did not preclude future design, but actually prepared LTD for the future. The cost of the components would be integrated into future plans. Mr. Melnick asked about the concerns of the Glenwood business association. Mr. Viggiano said that the "fast lane" approach was a compromise, but the Glenwood business owners continued to oppose anything but a "no-build" option because they were very concerned about the impact on their businesses. He added that staff had a good working relationship with Springfield staff.

MOTION There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors designates the "fast lane" option as the preferred alignment for the Glenwood segment of the BRT pilot corridor." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken asked for clarity that what the Board would vote on was what was described as the "fast lane," which was an interim solution to get to a more BRT-like solution

VOTE

as the planning progressed. Ms. Wylie said that was correct. The roll was called, and the motion carried unanimously, with Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, Wylie, Bennett, Gaydos, and Hocken voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Viggiano to reiterate what the last action was that the Board had taken regarding the preferred alignment on Franklin through the UO area. Mr. Viggiano said the Board had endorsed a two-lane guideway as the preferred alternative. One of the agenda items for the Board's strategic planning work session was to look at options for the implementation of that alignment.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: (1) MPC. Previously discussed during work session. (2) BRT Steering Committee. Previously discussed. (3) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Lauritsen said that the next meeting would be held in April 2001. (4) Board Finance Committee. Ms. Hocken said that the Committee had met in early January and would meet again in February and March. Some time had been spent discussing the feasibility and process of debt financing, but no recommendations were being made at this time. The Committee also discussed proposed fare increases, which would be discussed further, resulting in a recommendation to the Board in February.

LTD GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Hamm asked the Board to review the draft strategic planning work session agenda, which was handed out, and to provide feedback to Executive Assistant Jo Sullivan.

DECEMBER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson reminded the Board that the new union contract was over budget and would continue to be over budget for each of the four years of the contract. Payroll tax revenue was below budget for the first six months, but February was the key month to determine whether or not it would make budget because assessments for holiday seasonal wages were not due until February. It was not a good combination of things to report for the midyear, and more discussions would take place during the strategic planning work session.

EMPLOYEE APPRECIATION BANQUET: Board members and their guests were invited to the annual LTD Employee Appreciation Banquet that would be held on Sunday, March 18, 2001, at the Valley River Inn. Invitations would be mailed, and Board members were being asked to hold the date open and to let staff know if they were able to attend.

CORRESPONDENCE: There was no discussion about correspondence that was included in the agenda packet.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that she had nothing to add to her written report, except to announce that ODOT Director Grace Crunican had announced her resignation.

MOTION

EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(I): Ms. Hocken moved 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)

VOTE

of LTD. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by acclamation. The Board adjourned to Executive Session at 8:15 p.m.

VOTE

By unanimous vote, the Board returned to regular session at 8:35 p.m. Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Hamm upon his successful first eight months with LTD. The Board was pleased with the job he had done and was looking forward to continuing to work together in the future.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussions, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

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

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, January 17, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on January 11, 2001, 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, January 17, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: None

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Wylie said that she would hold her remarks until later in the meeting, and there were no announcements or additions to the agenda. The Board would discuss the draft agenda for the two-day strategic planning work session during the regular portion of the meeting.

WORK SESSION – METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN: Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner reminded the Board that the unresolved TransPlan issues had been referred by the TransPlan adopting officials to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) for resolution. MPC had appointed two subcommittees to address the unresolved issues. The subcommittee that addressed the alternative measures issue had completed its task of developing a set of alternative performance measures to be used to demonstrate compliance with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). Each adopting agency would be asked to approve the proposed alternative measures.

The other subcommittee that had been appointed to address the remaining unresolved issues had not completed its work, and the remaining issues would be referred back to MPC for resolution. The recommendations on the remaining unresolved issues would be considered by the adopting officials in February.

Ms. Gardner introduced Tom Schwetz and Paul Thompson of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), who were present to discuss the proposed alternative measures.

Ms. Hocken said that she had participated on the alternative measures subcommittee. The subcommittee was comprised of an LTD representative, Springfield City Councilor Lyle Hatfield, Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer, and a representative from the Eugene City Council. Councilor Betty Taylor was present for some of the meetings and Councilor Scott Meisner for others. The subcommittee basically had started from scratch on the alternative performance measures. Some measures were proposed by staff, but the subcommittee was interested in finding some measures that clearly would indicate that progress was being made in a certain area. Included in the agenda packet were six proposed alternative measures, and MPC had approved sending those measures to the adopting officials for approval.

The transit measure proposed was transit mode share on congested corridors during p.m. peak times. Ms. Hocken said that she had a handout that would show some of the material that the subcommittee used to make its proposal.

Mr. Schwetz said that the adopting agencies needed to come together as a region to establish the alternative performance measures, which represented a commitment to achieving the TPR. The approved alternative measures would be presented for approval to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). The proposed measures were alternatives to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Per Capita, which was the primary target set forth in the TPR. None of the metropolitan planning organizations in the state reached the VMT targets in the TPR, and all were seeking approval of alternative measures.

The subcommittee thoroughly reviewed adopting official comments and what had been proposed by staff. Mr. Schwetz thought that the process went well. The approved alternative measures were to be presented formally to the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) by March 14. An extensive public review by the DLCD would follow. It was expected that the final public hearing and decision by the LCDC would be made in early May 2001.

Ms. Gardner noted that the Board would be asked later during the meeting to approve the proposed alternative measures. She added that staff were supporting the proposed alternative measures as presented.

Mr. Kleger said that under the "percentage of transit mode share on congested corridors" measure, no mention was made of Franklin and Glenwood Boulevard corridor, which in his estimation was one of the more congested corridors in the area.

Ms. Hocken said that some targets for the year 2015 were targeted during the modeling that was done for TransPlan. Benchmarks were set as well. The subcommittee decided to be more aggressive on the year 2015 percentages than the computer modeling had indicated. For example, the computer modeling had indicated that the percentage of non-auto trips in 2015 would be 14 percent, and the subcommittee was proposing, through the use of alternative

performance measures, to reduce the auto trips by 17 percent. She noted that Franklin Boulevard in both directions east of Agate Street was on the list of selected major corridors. Mr. Schwetz added that staff inadvertently had left the Franklin Boulevard corridor off the staff memo that was included in the Board packet.

Mr. Bennett asked what would happen if those alternative performance measures did not meet the objectives. Mr. Schwetz said that the interim benchmarks were set as indicators to determine if the goals were being met. If they were determined not to be meeting the goals, they would become part of the periodic TransPlan updates.

Ms. Hocken added that both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield believed that the proposed alternative measure for number of acres to be zoned for nodal development was attainable.

Mr. Bennett asked what the LCOG staff sense was of the West Eugene Parkway issue. Mr. Schwetz said that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) would send a letter to the City outlining what stage the project currently was in, and asking for consistency between the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the long-range plan in TransPlan. The EIS assumed that all four phases would be built by 2015. TransPlan, on the other hand, assumed that only the first phase of the Parkway would be built by 2015.

Mr. Bennett asked if anything had changed in terms of the fundamental analysis for the West Eugene Parkway during the ten years since that analysis had been done that would cause the same or a comparable analysis done today to be vastly different. Mr. Schwetz said that he was more familiar with the first phase of the project than he was with the other three phases that were included in the EIS. The first phase would do a lot to ease some of the congestion on West 11th Avenue. The remaining phases tied into Highway 126, and resulted in an inter-regional facility. The projections for growth both in the area and throughout Lane County had not changed, so the merits of the project remained.

Mr. Bennett asked what the staff response was to the argument that the effect on West 11th would not be as significant as previously projected. Mr. Schwetz said that it was unfortunate in the way some of the projections were presented, such as an 8-percent decrease in congestion. That 8 percent on a facility that already was congested would be a large decrease, and without the facility, the increased congestion would be very noticeable.

Ms. Hocken asked how the West Eugene Parkway project would impact the adoption of TransPlan. Mr. Schwetz said that the Surface Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) had the first phase of the Parkway programmed for 2001. MPC would need to discuss taking the Parkway off the list of regional priorities for STIP funding. If it were dropped from the list, there was no guarantee that the \$17 million slated for this project could be used for other projects. However, Mr. Schwetz thought an argument could be made for the fact that even though that particular project was dropped, the need for some alleviation of congestion on West 11th Avenue would not go away.

Mr. Kleger said that at the State of the City address, he had an opportunity to speak with Mayor Torrey about a fallback plan for addressing some of the traffic issues on West 11th Avenue, and had reiterated that the need would not go away by doing nothing. Mr. Schwetz said that a segment of West 11th belonged to the City of Eugene and improvements to that segment would require city funding.

Ms. Wylie asked how dropping the Parkway project would affect the proposed bus rapid transit (BRT) project. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that dropping the Parkway project would have no direct impact on BRT, but could have an indirect impact on the BRT project, since the more congested 11th Avenue became, the more difficult it would be for LTD to find and acquire bus priority along the corridor. Mr. Viggiano also suggested that BRT in West Eugene might be able to use some of the Parkway funding.

Ms. Wylie said that she had been appointed to the MPC subcommittee that was reviewing the remaining unresolved TransPlan issues. Mr. Gaydos had participated in that subcommittee in Ms. Wylie's absence. At this time, the subcommittee was not planning to meet again, and there were two issues that remained unresolved. Ms. Gardner added that MPC as a whole would be addressing the remaining two unresolved issues.

Mr. Thompson said that the subcommittee had made recommendations for six of the eight unresolved issues. Those six recommendations were presented to and agreed upon by MPC for further recommendation to the adopting agencies. The six issues included the addition of a new Roadway Policy #4; the addition of an I-5 Interchange Study; moving the Division Avenue Bridge item to the future list; a revision of the Definition and Intent of Finance Policy #3; a recommendation to not add a New Finance Policy #1; and to add a new Finance Policy #2. The remaining unresolved issues included the wording related to the study of new river crossings and a proposed new Finance Policy related to setting priorities for investment actions by local agencies.

MPC was asking the individual adopting agencies to review the remaining two issues and to take a position so that MPC could further address the issues at its February meeting.

There were three options proposed in regard to the river crossing study. The City of Eugene had asked that any river crossing study include an exclusion zone between the Ferry Street Bridge and the Beltline Highway; another option was to have no mention of a river-crossing study in TransPlan; and a third option would be to mention the study, but without a definition of the study at this time.

The other unresolved issue was the proposed finance policy on investment priorities. Five options were being proposed for this issue. One option was to add no new policy; the second was to leave the policy as originally proposed by the Eugene City Council; the third was to include the original policy proposal with a revised Definition/Intent hierarchy; the fourth was to modify the policy statement; and the fifth option was to address potential land-use problems.

Mr. Gaydos said that he had attended one of the subcommittee meetings. Neither Ms. Wylie nor Mr. Gaydos were able to attend the meeting that was scheduled for

November 20. Mr. Gaydos thought it was very important that LTD be represented and more of an effort should be made to ensure representation at all meetings regarding TransPlan. At the meeting attended by Mr. Gaydos, Mayor Torrey, in reference to the river crossing study, said that he felt that in order to get something through the Eugene Council, it would be necessary to exclude the area between the Ferry Street Bridge and the Beltline Highway. He did not know if that had changed, but Mr. Gaydos asked the Board to consider that request. Everyone at the subcommittee agreed that it was important to create a buffer zone along each of the existing crossings for pedestrians, bicycles, and/or transit, so there would be a potential for a transit addition. Mr. Gaydos thought that it would be better to have a study in the project list than not.

With regard to the Finance Policy issue, Mr. Gaydos said that the subcommittee participants were concerned about whether the policy would be mandatory or something to which the jurisdictions could apply their own decision-making processes. Most of the participants agreed that it should not be mandatory; however, the City of Eugene tended to believe that setting priorities for investment actions by local agencies should be mandatory. The issue was to try to maintain some flexibility for the jurisdictions, and Mr. Gaydos did not have a recommended course of action for the Board.

Ms. Wylie asked if Mr. Gaydos had agreed to the option of adding no new policy. Mr. Gaydos said that, personally, he would choose the first option of adding no new policy; however, he did not believe that would be successful in achieving consensus among the jurisdictions. He thought it was important to look at an option that would allow some flexibility.

Mr. Thompson said that two of the options provided for more flexibility. Option 4 modified the policy statement by adding an introductory phrase to the original proposed policy statement to recognize the "fixed intent" nature of some transportation funding sources. Option 5 addressed potential land-use problems by modifying the definition/intent language and making minor changes to the second priority statement in an attempt to address potential land-use problems with the original proposed policy. He added that option 5 would require additional legal review prior to moving forward.

Mr. Kleger said that he was concerned that the proposed policy could be interpreted to block any LTD initiatives, but he suggested option 5 as the least restrictive option.

Ms. Wylie noted that she and Ms. Hocken would be taking the Board recommendation back to MPC.

Ms. Hocken said that her concern was that there was not enough support for the original proposed policy, and it was important to compromise. She did not have a sense that any of the options met the objectives of the Eugene City Council. Based on the conversation so far, option 2 would not be in the best interest of LTD as there were too many restrictions and too much ambiguity.

Ms. Lauritsen agreed that option 5 appeared to be the most flexible.

Ms. Wylie asked Board members to provide input to her or Ms. Hocken before the next MPC meeting. She would seek staff input as well. Mr. Thompson thought it would be a good idea to have Mr. Gaydos attend the MPC meeting, since he had been the one to attend the subcommittee meeting.

With regard to the river crossing study, Ms Wylie reiterated that the Board had favored option 1, to include the study in TransPlan, but with an exclusion of the area between the Ferry Street Bridge northwest to the Beltline Highway and with the allowance of a buffer zone on either side of existing crossings to allow for expansion for alternative-mode use.

Mr. Thompson said that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had indicated that the exclusion of an area in a crossing study could be at cross-purposes with the requirements of a future EIS where all options would need to be looked at.

Mr. Bennett said that he had participated on a north Ferry Street Bridge committee several years earlier. With regard to the Valley River Bridge, the committee never arrived at a point of recommending a particular position, but had agreed on how to fund it. One of the main points in favor of a new Valley River Bridge was the number of vehicle miles traveled that would be cut. Mr. Bennett wondered if those fundamental principles would still hold true with regard to a Valley River Crossing. Mr. Schwetz said that it would depend on the location of the crossing, but from a purely systems perspective, a situation where a crossing actually would reduce VMTs would be to use the desired lines that existed, particularly east/west, that currently were satisfied by traveling north on River Road to Beltline then east to Delta Highway and west to the Washington/Jefferson bridge to 7th Avenue. By having a crossing located between those facilities, which was in the proposed exclusion area, it would be a more efficient routing of the traffic.

Mr. Thompson said that ODOT was interested in a crossing that would be identified to serve more of the local traffic to ease the regional facilities. The VMT measure would be one consideration that would go into the determination of an independent utility under an EIS. Mr. Bennett said that would be an argument to be very careful before ruling out an area for a study.

Mr. Gaydos asked what the ramifications would be for not recommending that a river crossing study be included in the TransPlan projects list. Mr. Schwetz said that there was no requirement to have studies listed in TransPlan, but the jurisdictions had elected to do that as a recognition of a problem. Leaving it out would not prohibit a study at some future time.

Mr. Melnick said that he shared the concern about excluding an area from the study largely due to the process question that was raised. One of the values of an EIS was to show extremes on any project, which then could be rejected. If the jurisdictions excluded an extreme beforehand, it would preclude a successful EIS many years in the future.

Mr. Kleger said that specifically excluding any study to the west of Valley River Center was discriminatory against his part of town (West Eugene). He thought that anything that specifically included the possibility of a study going into crossing from Valley River to any location other than where the current crossing was would be blocked. He preferred that the

study not be included in TransPlan rather than to include it with exclusions at this time, which would preclude any new thinking on the issue.

Ms. Wylie said that the Board would be taking action on the alternative measures later in the meeting.

WORK SESSION: UNITED WAY PRESENTATION: Bus Operator Carl Faddis presented the Board with the United Way Helping Hands Award, which was awarded to companies whose employees raised \$20,000 or more in campaign pledges. Mr. Faddis was the LTD Loaned Executive to the United Way 2001 fundraising campaign. He thanked the Board for its support of the LTD United Way 2001 fundraising campaign. This year's campaign put LTD on the map once again as an organization that cared about and was committed to the quality of life in the Eugene/Springfield area, not only because of the way it moved people from one place to another, but also because its employees raised more than \$26,000 through payroll deduction pledges and other means to support the United Way of Lane County.

Mr. Faddis also thanked the Board for giving him the opportunity to work as a Loaned Executive during the last three months of 2000. The experience had enriched his life, both professionally and personally. He then presented Ms. Wylie with the Helping Hands Plaque from the United Way.

WORK SESSION: AWARD-WINNING VIDEO FOR YOUTH: Due to lack of time during this work session, it was determined that the video would be shown at the two-day strategic planning work session to be held later in January.

FEBRUARY 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced the February 2001 Employee of the Month, bus operator Jim Saville. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Saville had been with the District for nearly 24 years. He was an employee who made Mr. Johnson's job easy because he was dependable and reliable and did his job well. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Saville was a pleasurable person to be around, which was made evident by the nominations he had received for Employee of the Month.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Saville with a letter of congratulations, a certificate, a lapel pin, and a monetary award. Ms. Wylie thanked Mr. Saville for the hard work and said the Board appreciated the employees. Mr. Saville thanked the Board for the honor.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No one in the audience wished to address the Board at this time.

MOTION **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution:
"It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for January 17, 2001, is approved as presented." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by acclamation.
VOTE The Consent Calendar for 2001 consisted of the minutes of the December 20, 2000, regular Board meeting.

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN: Transit Planning Manager Andy Vobora said that this was the second of three public hearings that would be heard prior to adoption of the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) at the February 21, 2001, regular Board meeting. Mr. Vobora said that he would review both a 5 percent increase option and a 2 percent increase option for Board consideration. Mr. Vobora then reviewed the proposed service packages by sector.

Ms. Hocken asked what would happen to Saturday service in the Ferry Street Bridge area under the 2 percent package proposal. Mr. Vobora said that the downtown shuttle service would be cut back to no service on the weekends. Other service would replace the shuttle connection to Valley River Center.

The highlights of the 2 percent package proposal included increasing the number of peak hour trips along the 8th Avenue and Highway 99 corridors to four trips per hour on weekdays provided by the addition of a new #41S Barger route; maintaining the current level of service on Saturdays and Sundays on the #41 Barger route; and increasing the number of trips on Saturdays between 10:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. to two times per hour on the #51 route. Increasing the service package from 2 percent to 5 percent would include all of the above service enhancements, plus adding Saturday service to the new Downtown Shuttle; improvements to the #17 route on weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays; maintaining weekday service on route #25 and #27; and increasing the number of trips on Sundays on route #43. Service increases above 5 percent would include Sunday service on the Downtown Shuttle; weekday, Saturday, and Sunday service improvements to route #33; additional early weekday evening service on route #42; Saturday service enhancements to routes #82 and #85; and an extension of route #17 to the Jasper Road area for commuter and school trips.

Mr. Vobora said that the 2 percent package would result in an annual cost increase of \$265,530, while a 5 percent package would result in an annual cost increase of \$643,695.

Mr. Hamm said that staff previously had not presented a 2 percent proposal, but he had asked staff to prepare the model in order to give the Board another option, in light of the flattening of revenues and other priorities that were being proposed. He commended staff for their work on the 2 percent proposal.

Mr. Kleger asked about the types of requests staff had received for increases in service. Mr. Vobora said that the same requests were received each year, such as service to Marcola, Mt. Pisgah, and to the airport.

Ms. Lauritsen commented that more service was better, but the question was how much service LTD could afford, and she asked Finance Manager Diane Hellekson to provide some advice in this area. Ms. Wylie noted that the financial discussion would come later, but for now she wanted to get through the Board members' questions about the proposed service packages.

Ms. Wylie asked what the normal rate of growth was for other systems of the same size. Mr. Vobora said that the average was 2 to 3 percent annual increases based on population

growth and other factors, such as traffic congestion and ridership growth. The LTD pattern had averaged about 2 percent per year. Last year, service was cut, so a 5 percent increase this year would average out to a lesser percent. If the District had unlimited resources, service increases could continue; but without that, at some point, some decisions would need to be made about efficiency. In the 5 percent model, staff had not yet calculated what percentage of that was productivity and what percentage was coverage. The Board had decided on a 75 percent productivity, 25 percent coverage model during its strategic planning work session last year. Mr. Vobora said that the 2 percent model would cut into the more productive service.

Mr. Bennett asked if the proposed service packages complied with the 75 percent productivity / 25 percent coverage goals that the Board previously had set. Mr. Vobora stated that the changes contained within the current package most likely would not have changed the ratio, but that staff would do the calculations and report back to the Board in February.

Ms. Hocken noted that since the downtown shuttle was new service, she was reluctant to operate it only on the weekdays. She thought there would be a lot of usage of that route on Saturdays. In addition, she was concerned about cutting midday service on route #25. Mr. Bennett said that the shuttle had both a downtown component and a Valley River Center component. He asked what the expected ridership was on the weekdays versus Saturdays. Mr. Vobora said that the higher ridership was expected on the weekdays, and the weekends would experience a different kind of ridership. Mr. Bennett asked if the frequency could be reduced on Saturdays. Mr. Vobora said 30-minute frequency was being proposed for Saturdays.

Mr. Bennett also was concerned about cutting service on route #25, which was a high-productivity route. He had lost his perspective a bit because he had not heard from the finance side of the package. Ms. Hocken said that the Finance Committee had not yet reviewed the long-range financial plan, but would do so in February.

Mr. Bennett noted that the final CSR decision did not have to be 2 percent or 5 percent, but could be some number between those two. At some point in the future, LTD would need more revenue, and now could be the time to begin making the case for an increase in the payroll tax. The context of such a case would be that LTD was doing everything it could to show that it was reasonably productive. The Board needed to make it an important part of its agenda on a continual basis in order to convince the community not only about the need for additional revenues, but also the importance of LTD's initiatives, such as the downtown shuttle and bus rapid transit. He looked forward to further conversations with the Board at the strategic planning work session.

Public Hearing: (1) Mr. Fred Simmons of Springfield, an LTD bus operator, said that staff had done an excellent job of balancing the needs of the budget versus the needs of LTD's guests. One of the things that concerned him was that in TransPlan, the frequency of service that was illustrated would appear to cause approximately a 300 percent increase in the operating budget. He did not believe those funds were readily available, and he agreed with Mr. Bennett about seeking additional funding for LTD and the transit system.

One of the issues in Springfield was that the connectivity between north and south is underserved. The alterations to route #13 would change the flow of the way things worked. The staff had responded very effectively to the proposed Wal-Mart site at Olympic and 28th. There were many other things happening in the development dynamics in Springfield, particularly with the issue of the Jasper extension as well as the ability to serve the components north and south of Main Street. The Board had talked about route #27 and its connectivity between the neighborhoods it served and the University and downtown, and Mr. Simmons thought the staff had done a wonderful job with the limited resources. In Springfield, one of the connectivity problems was between Eugene and Springfield. Crescent extended to Old Game Farm Road and looped around to Gateway. With Symantec taking the 14 acres west of Sony, it would add another mix. The Pioneer Parkway extension would throw in another dynamic, as would the closure of Laura Street at Harlow Road.

The Springfield City Council had authorized the purchase of a house located at the end of Pioneer Parkway, and it was hoped that the unnecessary portion of the right-of-way would be something LTD could use as a transfer point on the north side of Springfield. The Council also had discussed the possibility of the guideway process on the Pioneer Parkway extension. He hoped, as a citizen of Springfield, that LTD could make some connections between the Delta-Oaks/Gateway area and points south as well as the connections between Olympic, 42nd Street South, and out into the rapidly growing Jasper-Natron area south of Main Street.

While it may not be the time in the current budget, he asked that the Board look at those possibilities in the future to provide the connectivity. As people continued to build in that area and the 3,500 new structures that were planned in the area south of Main Street, it was important to realize that there was a tremendous transit base there. The opportunity to create that involvement in transit was on the near horizon. If transit was cut out of that area because those people who lived in that area were vehicular oriented at the present time, LTD would lose a portion of the customer base that ought to be looked to.

He asked the Board, as a governing body, to seek connections in those other areas that would facilitate people beginning to develop a more friendly and accessible component of the process to use transit. He thought LTD had stepped forward a bit, and he thanked the Board for maintaining the frequency on route #11. He was thankful for what had been done, and he encouraged the Board to look at trying to facilitate that north-south movement and connectivity.

Mr. Simmons said that LTD had somewhat failed at dealing with Hyundai and other areas that were thought would be more productive in terms of ridership, but he thought there was a way to get those people involved. The planning staff had begun to engage with Springfield City planning staff, unsuccessfully so far, at the time that the Wal-Mart development occurred, and he hoped in the future, LTD would be closer to being out in front of the growth rather than behind it. He hoped another Gateway or Valley River Center would never be built without having it designed in a more transit-friendly way.

Ms. Hocken asked about the timeline for the Jasper-Natron development and the Pioneer Parkway extension. Mr. Simmons said that the Pioneer Parkway extension was being planned

for 2003. As soon as the wetland mitigation was resolved in the Jasper area, the development would come together. Storm drainage already was being installed.

Mr. Simmons added that, as was experienced in the past, when large developments were built, if transit was not in the plan, then those folks did not have the concept that they could use transit to get to and from their places of business.

Ms. Hocken understood that one of the sites that was being zoned for nodal development was the Jasper-Natron site, and one of the key elements of TransPlan was to get appropriate transit services to the nodal developments.

(2) Charles Berg of Eugene asked why staff were proposing changing route #40 from 30-minute frequency back to 60-minute frequency. Mr. Vobora said that the decision was made simply to save money to meet the lower percentage goals. That proposed change was in the 2 percent model.

Mr. Bennett asked if the 30-minute route #40 was a productive route. Mr. Vobora said that it was, but in order to achieve the 2 percent increase model, and in order to maintain some of the coverage in some neighborhoods, staff had proposed cuts to some of the productive routes.

Mr. Berg asked about route #42 and if it would be cut from Terry Street. Mr. Vobora said that all of the routes in that area would be shortlined and would be connected by route #43, which would circulate among the neighborhoods.

Board Discussion: Ms. Wylie said that the Board would hold further discussions during the two-day strategic planning work session to be held on January 19 and 20.

APPROVAL OF MPC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN ALTERNATIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURES: Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "Resolved, that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves the proposed alternative measures for TransPlan, as proposed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee subcommittee on alternative measures." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger said that he was concerned that Franklin Boulevard not be overlooked as a high-impact corridor where performance would be closely monitored and measured.

VOTE

Ms. Wylie called for a vote by acclamation, and the motion carried unanimously. Ms. Gardner noted that the recommendations on the unresolved issues would be brought back to the Board for approval as well.

BUS RAPID TRASIT (BRT): GLENWOOD ALIGNMENT: Mr. Viggiano said that the agenda packet included the information that was provided to the BRT Steering Committee at its last meeting. He provided a brief history of the planning process that had occurred to date.

Staff and the BRT Steering Committee were proposing a “fast lane” approach through Glenwood, with future BRT development to be coordinated with the City of Springfield’s planning efforts for Glenwood, most notably the Transportation Growth Management (TGM) study that was underway. The City of Springfield had encouraged LTD to not deviate from Franklin as plans were to further develop the area between Franklin Boulevard and the river. Mr. Viggiano then described the elements of the “fast lane” alternative, which included median stations, movement that would occur in mixed traffic with stoplight priority, and some exclusive lanes in the more congested areas.

Mr. Viggiano introduced Susanna Julber from the City of Springfield planning department, who was managing the TGM study. How that study proceeded and the direction that came from the study would help dictate what was done with BRT, such as where stations would be located. The study also would provide information about what Franklin Boulevard through Glenwood might look like in the future. Currently, Franklin Boulevard had no sidewalks, no bike lanes, and an inadequate storm drainage system. There were significant improvements that could be made to Franklin Boulevard apart from putting in BRT, and it was expected that BRT would be part of the study and that an implementation plan for BRT and Franklin Boulevard would be developed as part of that study.

The commitment would be to start out with the “fast lane” approach and continue to work with the City of Springfield and ODOT to design the future BRT system and an implementation plan. That was the proposal that the Steering Committee was recommending to the Board, that the “fast lane” approach be designated as the preferred alternative for Glenwood. The Steering Committee vote had one dissenting vote, which was from Eugene City Councilor Scott Meisner. Councilor Meisner’s concern was that there was no guarantee that the future BRT development would occur. Ms. Wylie added that in talking with Councilor Meisner, she had learned that he thought the vote was for no further future build-out of the BRT through Glenwood.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was very discouraged that a stronger case could not be made with the City of Springfield today in terms of the Glenwood alignment. The question he had asked himself was whether the BRT route should end in east Eugene and not travel into Springfield or whether it was important enough to get something in place to show what it could look like and what it could do. Mr. Bennett agreed to support the proposal because efficiency would not be a major issue, at least for the first 10 years, in terms of travel time; because the stations would be in place; because LTD could position itself for the future in terms of obtaining additional right-of-way as the area developed; and because of the new Springfield Station.

Ms. Wylie said that LTD had been criticized for moving away from the original objective. She thought LTD had been in an extremely difficult position while attempting to work cooperatively with the Glenwood business association and the Springfield City Council, while still attempting to please those who were the critics. She believed that LTD was very committed to the project and was determined to get the first layer down. It was disappointing that the “fast lane” approach was not the desired BRT system, but she was not willing to give up the concept. It was difficult to get the approval of the two Cities to get the project going, and that was why she had voted to approve the option.

Mr. Kleger said that he also was not willing to give up the concept, but thought it important to take the steps now. He truly believed that if nothing was done to facilitate faster bus service, LTD would become part of the increased congestion problem by the necessity to continue to stop in the right-hand lane to pick up and drop off passengers.

Mr. Melnick said that he was a supporter of BRT, and he thought that good planning occurred when integrated with other planning efforts, such as with the TGM study being conducted by Springfield. What was being proposed did not preclude future design, but actually prepared LTD for the future. The cost of the components would be integrated into future plans. Mr. Melnick asked about the concerns of the Glenwood business association. Mr. Viggiano said that the "fast lane" approach was a compromise, but the Glenwood business owners continued to oppose anything but a "no-build" option because they were very concerned about the impact on their businesses. He added that staff had a good working relationship with Springfield staff.

MOTION There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors designates the "fast lane" option as the preferred alignment for the Glenwood segment of the BRT pilot corridor." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken asked for clarity that what the Board would vote on was what was described as the "fast lane," which was an interim solution to get to a more BRT-like solution as the planning progressed. Ms. Wylie said that was correct. The roll was called, and the motion carried

VOTE unanimously, with Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, Wylie, Bennett, Gaydos, and Hocken voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Viggiano to reiterate what the last action was that the Board had taken regarding the preferred alignment on Franklin through the UO area. Mr. Viggiano said the Board had endorsed a two-lane guideway as the preferred alternative. One of the agenda items for the Board's strategic planning work session was to look at options for the implementation of that alignment.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: (1) MPC. Previously discussed during work session. (2) BRT Steering Committee. Previously discussed. (3) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Lauritsen said that the next meeting would be held in April 2001. (4) Board Finance Committee. Ms. Hocken said that the Committee had met in early January and would meet again in February and March. Some time had been spent discussing the feasibility and process of debt financing, but no recommendations were being made at this time. The Committee also discussed proposed fare increases, which would be discussed further, resulting in a recommendation to the Board in February.

LTD GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Hamm asked the Board to review the draft strategic planning work session agenda, which was handed out, and to provide feedback to Executive Assistant Jo Sullivan.

DECEMBER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson reminded the Board that the new union contract was over budget and would continue to be over budget for each of the four

years of the contract. Payroll tax revenue was below budget for the first six months, but February was the key month to determine whether or not it would make budget because assessments for holiday seasonal wages were not due until February. It was not a good combination of things to report for the midyear, and more discussions would take place during the strategic planning work session.

EMPLOYEE APPRECIATION BANQUET: Board members and their guests were invited to the annual LTD Employee Appreciation Banquet that would be held on Sunday, March 18, 2001, at the Valley River Inn. Invitations would be mailed, and Board members were being asked to hold the date open and to let staff know if they were able to attend.

CORRESPONDENCE: There was no discussion about correspondence that was included in the agenda packet.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that she had nothing to add to her written report, except to announce that ODOT Director Grace Crunican had announced her resignation.

MOTION **EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(I)**: Ms. Hocken moved 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. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by acclamation. The Board adjourned to Executive Session at 8:15 p.m.

VOTE

VOTE

By unanimous vote, the Board returned to regular session at 8:35 p.m. Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Hamm upon his successful first eight months with LTD. The Board was pleased with the job he had done and was looking forward to continuing to work together in the future.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussions, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: EMPLOYEE APPRECIATION BANQUET

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: The annual LTD Employee Appreciation Banquet will be held on Sunday, March 18, 2001, at the Valley River Inn. The evening will begin with a social hour at 5:30 p.m. Dinner and an awards ceremony will begin at 6:30 p.m. Some very talented LTD employees will provide the evening's musical entertainment. All Board members are invited to attend this evening honoring LTD's employees. Board members will receive mailed invitations in the near future. Please hold this date on your calendar, and call 682-6100 to let staff know whether you and your guest will be able to attend and to make your dinner selection.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: BOARD MEMBER REPORTS

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

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 February 8, 2001, MPC meeting. The next MPC meeting is scheduled for March 8, 2001.
- b **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; however, the February 6 meeting was canceled, so the committee last met on January 9. The next BRT Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for March 6, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. At the February 21 Board meeting, Committee Chair Rob Bennett and the other LTD Board representatives can respond to any questions the Board may have about this committee's activities.
- c **Statewide Livability Forum:** Board member Virginia Lauritsen is participating on a statewide committee called the Livability Forum, as one of 12 participants from the Eugene/Springfield area. The committee has been meeting once every six months, and is scheduled to meet again in April 2001. Ms. Lauritsen will provide updates on Forum activities as they occur.

- d **Board Finance Committee**: The Board Finance Committee (Chair Pat Hocken and members Gerry Gaydos and Virginia Lauritsen) met on February 15 and is scheduled to meet again on March 7. At the February 21 Board meeting, Ms. Hocken can provide a brief summary of the committee's activities to date.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: January 17, 2001

ITEM TITLE: CORRESPONDENCE

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

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

- ◆ December 26, 2000, letter from Springfield Chamber Executive Director Dan Egan regarding the Chamber's Legislative Issues Committee recommendation regarding bus rapid transit

At the January 17, 2001, meeting, staff will respond to any questions the Board members may have about this correspondence.

PROPOSED MOTION: None

LTD BOARD STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION
January 19-20, 2001
Eugene Hilton

Day One

Call to Order 9:15 a.m.

Present: Hillary Wylie, Board President, presiding
Rob Bennett, Vice President
Gerry Gaydos (arrived at 9:25 a.m.)
Pat Hocken
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary
Robert Melnick

Gerry here 9:25

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: CONSENT CALENDAR

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

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 February 21, 2001:

- ◆ Approval of minutes: January 17, 2001, regular Board meeting
- ◆ Approval of minutes: January 19-20, 2001, Board strategic planning work session

ATTACHMENTS:

- (1) Minutes of the January 17, 2001, regular Board meeting
- (2) Minutes of the January 19-20, 2001, Board strategic planning work session

PROPOSED MOTION: I move that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for February 21, 2001, is approved as presented.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora, Service Planning Manager

ACTION REQUESTED:

- (1) Hold a final public hearing on the proposed service package
- (2) Approve service package for FY 2001-02

BACKGROUND: The goals of the CSR included fixing operational problems existing within the current system design and increasing the overall productivity of the system by placing more resources into service frequency. The proposal before the Board accomplishes these goals, while maintaining a balanced distribution of service hours.

The Board's interest in dividing service hours into 75 percent productivity, 20 percent coverage, and 5 percent discretionary has been met through the proposed service design. The 4.68 percent package includes coverage service on routes 17, 25, and 27, bringing the productivity percentage to 75 percent and the coverage percentage to 25 percent. Without these coverage hours the package shifts slightly to 75.4 percent productivity and 24.6 percent coverage.

The Development Services Group (DSG), comprised of Service Planning, Marketing, Planning & Development, and Facilities Services, has reviewed the package and recommends approval at the 4.68 percent level. The DSG believes that this package represents the best opportunity to meet the needs of our growing metro area, but also recognizes that this package does not respond to the continuing growth in both the housing and commercial sectors. As population continues to increase and as additional jobs are created, transit needs to play a part in linking residents and jobs. To accomplish this, an ongoing investment in service hours must be made. While staff do not have a recommendation at this time, they agree that the percentage of service hours projected in the Long-range Financial Plan should reflect a number that includes a service "fix" factor and a population factor. This number could range from 1 percent to 3 percent. Service "fixes" for the period 1996 – 2000 averaged .85 percent, while population growth between 1990 and 2000 averaged 2.4 percent. Setting a service investment percentage allows the Board to plan for future demands and estimate financial impacts on the District's financial resources.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff will complete final scheduling and run cuts to implement the service package on September 2, 2001.

ATTACHMENT:

CSR summary spreadsheet

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the Fiscal Year 2001-2002 service recommendations as presented on February 21, 2001, as shown on the Summary Table for Comprehensive Service Redesign 2001.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: MARCH 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: **MARCH 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Transit Operations Coordinator Michelle Gilles has been selected as the March 2001 Employee of the Month. Michelle was hired by the District on July 25, 1994, and previously was selected as Employee of the Month for August 1996. She was nominated this time by the bus operators who work with her on a daily basis, out of appreciation for the support she provides to all the employees in the Transit Operations department. The operators were especially appreciative of Michelle's efforts with regard to the recent changes in their uniforms.

When asked what makes Michelle a good employee, Transit Operations Office Manager Jill Howard described one segment of Michelle's work at LTD, which resulted in Michelle being nominated by "All of Us" in the driver ranks for her ceaseless efforts in selecting and obtaining approval on the new operator uniform items. This uniform selection process was followed by the laborious undertaking of ordering and distributing hundreds of individual items and dealing with everything that can go wrong when ordering via the mail – from wrong sizes to sloppy logos.

Jill stated that Michelle has put her heart into this project with trips to uniform companies, committee meetings with vendors, and inspecting dozens of samples. She has done battle with vendors over fabric type, garment style, and logo modifications, sometimes with forgiveness and sometimes with determination. She has persevered over the last year going from exasperated to thrilled and back to exasperated again, all the while keeping her caring attitude for all of her "customers."

As further example of Michelle's exceptional guest service, Jill quoted the nomination, which states:

- Pleasing 200 individuals plus the company is an impossible task, but Michelle manages to stay cheerful despite this.
- She is an extreme team player and puts up with all the drivers and their uniform problems.

- She is a pleasant person and is caring and concerned and has been like this from the first day she came here.
- It's good to see her cheerful presence as I come into the building after a hard day.

The nomination was signed by 59 operators, but the sentiment is felt by all 210.

Our congratulations to Michelle on her selection!

AWARD:

Michelle will attend the February 21, 2001, meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive her award.

Fare Policy

The fare policy is used to provide direction in making decisions about changes in the District's fare structure. The policy is composed of objectives and guidelines. The objectives indicate the general goals the District's fare structure should achieve. The guidelines provide more specific direction on the various aspects of a fare structure. The intent of each of the guidelines is further explained in a discussion section that follows each statement.

This Fare Policy applies to both the fixed-route and RideSource systems. Unless otherwise stated, objectives and guidelines apply to both systems.

OBJECTIVES

1. To promote fixed-route ridership by making the fare structure attractive to users
2. To improve the farebox recovery ratio
3. To improve the efficiency of fare collection
4. To promote equity of fare payment among patrons

APPLICATION

This policy applies to all recommendations for changes to the fare structure.

GUIDELINES

1. *Recommendations for changes in the fare will be developed by LTD staff. Decisions on fare changes are made by the LTD Board of Directors, and require an amendment to an ordinance. A public hearing is required for any change in fares. Changes to the RideSource Fare also will include review by the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee.*

Typically, fare change decisions are made over the course of three board meetings. At the first meeting are an informational presentation to the Board, and a public hearing. The first reading of the ordinance is held at the second meeting, and the second reading and approval of the fare ordinance occur at the third meeting.

2. *Staff recommendations for changes to the fare will consider the inflation rate, ridership and revenue trends, local economic trends, trends in automobile-related costs such as gas, service changes, the value of the service to the rider, market conditions and opportunities, the District's financial situation, the District's goals and objectives, and Board policy.*

This policy statement lists the most important factors to be considered in making recommendations for changes to the fare structure. The list of factors to be evaluated is not meant to be exclusive; other factors will need to be considered from year to year. It is further

recommended that staff develop and maintain a ridership model in order to more accurately predict the effects of changes in the fare structure.

- 3. *Increases to the Group Pass rates will be based on guidelines included in the Group Pass section of this policy.*

Deleted: the average increase in operating costs of the preceding three years.

- 4. *The RideSource fare should exceed the fare of the fixed-route system to reflect the higher cost of a RideSource trip and to encourage use of the fixed-route system.*

RideSource, a demand-responsive, curb-to-curb service, has a much higher cost per trip than LTD's fixed-route service. Establishing a higher cash fare for RideSource than for the fixed-route system will help to compensate for the higher cost and encourage riders who may have a choice between systems to use the fixed-route service. By law, RideSource fares cannot exceed twice the fixed-route fare.

Deleted: The initial group pass rate was based on a formula as dictated by the Group Pass Policy. **Group Pass Policy is undergoing revision to set new base rates for program participation and program eligibility.** Ongoing adjustments to the rate generally are determined by a rolling three-year average of increases in the District's operating costs. Should service be added for a particular group pass program, the marginal costs of that added service also should be included in an increase.

- 5. *Increases in the farebox recovery ratio should be pursued primarily by improving the ridership productivity of the system and by improving internal operating efficiency.*

There are three ways to improve farebox recovery ratio: by increasing the fare (in real terms); by improving internal operating efficiency; and by improving ridership productivity. Attempts on the LTD fixed route to improve the recovery ratio by increasing the fare by an amount substantially greater than the inflation rate have proven unsatisfactory. Ridership decreases have almost offset the increase in the average fare, yielding only small gains in revenue and significant ridership loss. Improvements in internal operating efficiency should be pursued whenever possible. Improvements in ridership productivity are likely to provide the greatest potential for a significant improvement to the farebox recovery ratio. If the average fare remains stable (in real terms), a 10 percent increase in ridership productivity would achieve a 10 percent improvement in the farebox recovery ratio.

Unlike the fixed-route system, significant increases in RideSource rides do not provide significant additional income to offset costs. Encouraging use of the RideSource Shopper and providing incentives for grouping trips may improve productivity but would not have a substantial impact on the farebox recovery ratio. Due to the significant fare subsidy on RideSource, efforts should be made to maintain a minimum farebox recovery ratio and maintain the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) maximum fare, once attained.

- 6. *Prepayment of fares on the fixed-route system shall be encouraged. Accordingly, passes and tokens should be priced below the cash fare.*

Prepayment of fares benefits the District in a number of ways: It improves the cash flow situation; it guarantees ridership and revenue by the customer; it reduces the chance of non-payment or underpayment; and it speeds boarding. Prepayment mechanisms also tend to encourage increased ridership by customers since the cost of the ride is not required at the time the decision to take the ride is made. It is recommended that monthly passes be priced at 25 to 30 times the cash fare, and that tokens be priced at 75 percent to 90 percent of the cash fare. Passes should, on a per-ride basis, be discounted more than tokens, since they are more effective at increasing ridership and are a more efficient fare mechanism from an internal operating standpoint. It should be noted that RideSource does not use either passes

or tokens since there should not be an incentive to ride RideSource more frequently. However, RideSource provides ticket books for riders, at the same per-ride price as the cash fare, to minimize underpayment of fares, to encourage ease of boarding for customers, and to offer a non-cash alternative to riders.

- 7. *Increases to the base fixed-route fare generally should not exceed ~~25 percent~~ within a year. Increases to the RideSource fare should not exceed 50 percent and no more than one increase should be implemented each year until reaching the allowable ADA maximum of twice the LTD adult cash fare.*

Deleted: 20

Deleted: and no more than one increase in each fare type should be implemented

This policy directs that changes in the fare be incremental in nature to avoid large "catch-up" increases. The District's experience has been that large fare increases (even though occurring less often) have a substantially more negative impact on ridership than smaller, more frequent fare increases.

Deleted: However, more than one increase in any one fare instrument in a year would tend to discourage ridership.

Large fare increases on RideSource do not seem to have a significant impact on ridership. However, RideSource has a more "captive" ridership and fare increases should not be unduly burdensome, especially since many of the riders have low incomes. Once the ADA maximum fare of twice the fixed-route adult cash fare is attained, additional fare increases would occur only when the LTD adult cash fare increases.

Deleted: , approximately once every three years

- 8. *Recommendations for fare changes will be developed prior to the budget process each spring for the following fiscal year.*

Given the dynamic nature of ridership, budgets, and other factors that affect fares, it is necessary to consider changes in the fare on a yearly basis. This policy ties the recommendations on fare changes to the budget process, as well as to decisions on major changes in the service that result from the Annual Route Review. This policy does not preclude making unprogrammed changes to the fare in mid-year if unforeseen conditions warrant.

- 9.

Deleted: The District should alternate increases in the cash fare with increases in the cost of tokens and passes.

Deleted: The District has had good success alternating increases in the cash fare with increases in the cost of tokens and passes. This method always gives riders the option of switching to a fare payment mechanism that has not been increased and therefore mitigates some of the negative impacts on fare increases.

- 10. *Changes in the fare structure should be implemented on the first day of a month, preferably in July or September.*

Deleted: ¶

Since LTD ridership changes significantly at the start and end of summer, these are good times to implement changes to fares. Pass price increases during the school year when LTD ridership is highest are more visible and therefore may result in a greater loss of ridership.

- 11. *Fare promotions can be used to attract new riders to the fixed-route system.*

Deleted: ¶

Fare promotions have been shown to be a cost-effective method of attracting new users to the system at a very low cost per trip. Surveys indicate that many of those attracted by free or reduced fares are not regular bus riders. The process to be followed in fare promotions includes an analysis of the proposal, a marketing plan for the promotion, and a post-project

evaluation. The extent of the analysis, marketing plan, and evaluation would be based on the scale of the promotion. RideSource fare promotions shall be designed to switch riders to the LTD fixed route and to increase RideSource productivity.

- 12. *Discounted fares may be used to encourage ridership during traditionally low-demand periods.*

The District has had very good success in generating additional ridership in low-demand times through fare reductions. The cost per trip generated by the fare reductions has been much lower than for other options available to the District.

- 13. *Fare payment options that effectively attract a different market segment or encourage increased use of the bus by current riders shall be developed. The fare payment options should be made conveniently available to customers.*

The District currently offers customers the choice of paying cash or using tokens, monthly passes, or day passes. Each of these fare payment options is attractive to a different segment of the market. Other fare payment options that attract additional riders, increase bus use among current riders, or are more convenient forms of current options should be investigated and, if feasible, implemented. Convenient access to all fare payment options will tend to make the system more attractive to customers and thus will increase ridership.

- 14. *The design and number of fare payment instruments shall consider the ease of enforcement by bus operators and ease of understanding by customers.*

Bus operator enforcement of fares is necessary to ensure adherence by customers to the fare policies. The ease of enforcement is dependent upon the design of the fare payment instrument and the quantity of different fare payment options available. These two factors should be considered when making decisions on the implementation of a new fare option or the redesign of an existing fare instrument. Fare enforcement programs should be evaluated periodically to ensure that they are appropriate.

MAINTENANCE

The Finance Department will monitor application of this policy as it relates to cash fares, tokens, and standard passes, and propose revisions as necessary.

Adopted 2/85
 Revised 6/86
 Revised 6/87
 Revised 2/98
 Revised 2/01

Q:\REFERENCE\BOARD PACKET\...FARE POLICY.DOC
 Q:\REFERENCE\BOARD PACKET\2001\02\REGULAR MEETING\FARE POLICY REVISED.DOC

Deleted: 1

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: FY 2001-2002 PRICING PLAN AND FARE POLICY

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: 5:30 p.m. Discuss pricing plan recommendation
6:30 p.m. Hold public hearing on the proposed changes to the LTD Fare Policy and pricing plan for FY 2001-02, and provide direction to staff

BACKGROUND: During the past three-and-a-half months, a staff committee has been reexamining LTD's formal fare policy. The purpose of this study was:

- To determine if existing fare policy continues to serve LTD and its stakeholders best.
- To identify changes in the policy, should opportunities for improvement become apparent.
- To recommend fare changes for FY 2001-2002 in accordance with whatever policy appears optimal.

This work was reviewed with the Finance Committee on January 8, 2001, and again on February 15, 2001.

As a result of Finance Committee discussion, and also Board discussion at the work session on January 19-20, a pricing plan proposal, which is a departure from the previously published plan, has been prepared. Instead of proposing an increase in the adult cash fare from \$1.00 to \$1.10, staff now propose an increase to \$1.25. Other cash fares and the day pass price would change proportionately. The new proposal is summarized in Attachment II to this document.

There are two reasons for the revised proposal:

- There appears to be Board support for more aggressive fare pricing (and operating cost increases support higher fare prices).

- By raising cash fares by 25 percent and holding all other fare instruments at current prices, LTD will have an opportunity to accurately evaluate the effectiveness of a deep discounting strategy.

Board members also have expressed an interest in increasing the farebox recovery ratio. Staff were asked to provide an analysis of whether a 25 percent farebox recovery is possible by increasing fare prices alone, and to describe what a system would look like with 25 percent or more farebox recovery. This information will be provided to Board members at the February 21 work session.

There is a public hearing on the proposal set for the regular Board meeting on February 21, but the first reading of revised Ordinance 35 (which sets fares and prices) will not occur until the March 21 Board meeting. Therefore, it will be possible for the Board to direct staff to make changes in the proposal before the ordinance is revised, should the Board wish to do so.

ATTACHMENTS:

Fare Policy
Draft FY 2001-2002 Pricing Plan Proposal Summary

PROPOSED MOTION:

None

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

February 21, 2001

Revenue:

- **Passenger fares** are below budget for the first seven months, and also below the same period in the last fiscal year. Fares are offset partially by the strength of the group pass programs. Ridership in recent months has shown healthy increases, but, because growth appears to be due to increased pass usage, revenues have not kept pace.
- **Special service** receipts caught up to budget expectations in December and have improved further in January. This category is expected to meet or exceed annual budget.
- **Miscellaneous revenue** was anticipated inaccurately by the current budget for the first six months, but is on track through January. This revenue tends to be received in either small, irregular amounts, or large lump sums at unpredictable intervals. 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 to \$300,000 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. Since fuel prices have dropped in recent weeks, the projected budget deficit also has come down and is likely to be mitigated within the current budget.
- **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 Improvements 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: February 21, 2001

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. **FY 2001-2002 Fare Ordinance:** A second public hearing and approval of the recommended FY 2001-2002 pricing plan will be scheduled for the March 21, 2001, regular Board meeting. The first reading of the amended fare ordinance tentatively is scheduled for March 21, 2001, and the second reading and adoption the April 18, 2001, regular Board meeting.
- B. **Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Capital Improvements Plan:** The Fiscal Year 2001-02 CIP is scheduled for Board approval at the March 21, 2001, Board meeting.
- C. **Long-range Financial Plan:** Staff will discuss the updated Long-range Financial Plan with the Board at the March 21, 2001, meeting.
- D. **LTD Board Work Session on TransPlan:** A Board work session on TransPlan will be scheduled for either Monday, March 19, or Wednesday, March 21, 2001.
- E. **Briefing on Train Station by City of Eugene Staff:** The City of Eugene has asked to provide a briefing for the LTD Board about the train station and other current transportation issues. This will be scheduled for a March work session.
- F. **Willamette Valley Futures Study Presentation:** A presentation on the Willamette Valley Forum's Alternative Transportation Futures Study may be scheduled for either the Monday work session or the regular Wednesday Board meeting in March.
- G. **Springfield Station Site Selection:** The District is still waiting for FTA approval regarding the site for the new Springfield Station. The

Board will be asked to make a site decision after the environmental assessment is available.

- H. **Budget Committee Meetings:** An informational meeting for the seven non-Board members of the LTD Budget Committee has been scheduled for April 9, 2001. Budget deliberation meetings for the full Budget Committee have been scheduled for Wednesday, April 25; Thursday, April 26; and Wednesday, May 2, 2001.
- I. **Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 Decision:** Final Board approval of Phase 1 of the bus rapid transit project will occur after partner agency action, possibly in April or May of 2001.
- J. **Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Budget Adoption:** Following approval of the proposed budget by the LTD Budget Committee in April or May, the Fiscal Year 2001-2002 budget will be on the agenda for adoption at the June 20, 2001, Board meeting. Budget law requires that the District's budget be adopted before the end of the current fiscal year on June 30, 2001.
- K. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval:** Approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur in June 2001. Specific TransPlan action and information items will be included in Board agenda packets before that time.
- L. **BRT Updates:** Various action and information items will be placed on Board meeting agendas during the design and implementation phases of the bus rapid transit project.



LTD General Manager's Report

February 2001 Board Meeting

Future Dates to Remember in 2001

March 11-14	APTA Legislative Conference, Washington, D.C.
March 19-21	United Front trip to Washington, D.C.
May 5-10	APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference, Calgary, Alberta, Canada
July 15-19	APTA Board Members Seminar, Denver, Colorado
September 30- October 4	APTA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

External Activities

BRT

LTD Board members have been meeting with Eugene City Council members and Lane County Commissioners about bus rapid transit issues. We appreciate the time and efforts of all who have been involved in these discussions.

Representatives of the company manufacturing the Civis bus may be visiting LTD on March 6-7, 2001. Once this visit is confirmed, staff will provide an agenda for the meeting, in case Board members wish to attend.

APTA

The American Public Transportation Association held its General Manager Seminar two weeks ago in Phoenix. Mark Pangborn and I attended. There were many very enlightening sessions, including presentations and discussion on technology, the new federal administration, funding re-authorization, the changing workforce, visioning, industry labor practices, and more. I have always found this to be an exemplary program and this year was no exception.

ODOT

The state is losing a champion for intermodalism and transit this month. Grace Crunican, Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation, has announced her resignation. She has been very supportive of BRT and other LTD initiatives. The state is losing an effective

administrator, and LTD is losing a friend. Linda Lynch and I will stay connected as a new director is announced and transitioning occurs.

OTHER EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES

- January 23 Rob Bennett and Jim Johnson regarding BRT
- January 26 Springfield/Eugene/Lane County/LTD CEO meeting
- January 26 Springfield Chamber Annual Dinner
- February 13 Metro Partnership Annual Dinner
- February 14 BRT Policy Committee (Ken Hamm, Mark Pangborn, Jim Johnson, Paul Farmer, Les Lyle)
- February 16 LTD and EWEB staff regarding BRT underground construction issues
- February 20 LCC President Jerry Moskus and Vice Presidents Marie Mattson and Mary Spilde
- February 20 Induction into Eugene Downtown Rotary

Internal Activities

Budget

Diane and the Finance staff are working with the Performance Groups and individual departments to produce a budget recommendation. As promised, staff are looking hard at efficiency and productivity in the operating budget.

RideSource

Discussions continue regarding the movement of Terry Parker's position from LCOG to LTD. It is my belief that we will have far more effectiveness with special transportation services and the connectivity to our fixed-route system by having her on our staff. No added cost is forecast. There is much opportunity in the future to look at some innovative uses of both fleets and potentially offer a better service product at a lower or equal cost.

We continue to look at securing a site for RideSource's operation. The property on the west side is being appraised for LTD currently. We will know more in March.



LTD General Manager's Report

March 2001 Board Meeting

Future Dates to Remember in 2001

May 5-10	APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference, Calgary, Alberta, Canada
July 15-19	APTA Board Members Seminar, Denver, Colorado
September 30- October 4	APTA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

External Activities

APTA Legislative Conference

Linda Lynch and I were in Washington, DC for the American Public Transportation Association Legislative Conference March 10-14. APTA's message to Congress is that TEA 21 works. The investment in public transportation has returned 21% growth in ridership over the past 5 years for 20% of the transportation dollars. Roads and highways have received 80% of the funds and grown around 5% during the same time period.

Linda and I met with Oregon's Congressmen and Senators delivering a request for funding support for Springfield Station and bus replacement. I spent Wednesday with the APTA task force for reauthorization. Linda spent Wednesday at the FTA New Starts Workshop.

United Front

The United Front team is back in Washington, DC beginning March 18-21. LTD's request included in that packet is the \$4 million for Springfield Station and the \$5 million for bus replacements. As members of the broader transportation community, LTD also supports reconstruction of the I-5/Beltline Interchange and monies to renovate Eugene's rail station.

BRT Update

The Eugene Planning Commission held a public comment session on BRT March 13th. There was a strong contingent of Friends of Eugene people at the hearing who made their case for LTD not going far enough with the first phase of BRT (too much compromise). Some say this piece is too short. There was support for BRT from the U of O and a number of miscellaneous citizenry. Overall, there were no surprises.

For those that haven't heard, Paul Farmer, City of Eugene Planning Director, has accepted a new position as Executive Director of the American Planning Association. This change comes

at a time that the City and LTD have reached agreements on a phased approach to implementing BRT and to creating a boulevard entrance to the City on Franklin. Hopefully, this will not negatively impact the approval process with the Eugene City Council.

OTHER EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES

- February 23 Met with Mayor and City Manager of Cottage Grove
- February 26 Invited by Don Essig to Oregon Club lunch
Eugene City Council Meeting – BRT discussion
- February 28 In Salem to meet with State Representatives and Senators
Attended Secretary of Transportation Grace Crunnican’s farewell
- March 1 Meeting with State Human Services decision-makers
- March 7 Irisbus (Civis) meetings and dinner

Internal Activities

Budget

Diane, Mark P., and I met with the three performance groups to discuss their budgets. After many hours and some tough discussions with each group, over \$600,000 had been carved from their original requests. Each group was directed to go back to their budgets and sharpen the pencil. They all returned with some efficiencies. Additionally, the oversight group proposed additional savings.

The budget document that gets presented to the Finance Committee and subsequently the Board will reflect efficiencies. Additionally, over the next year with software enhancements and some new management strategies, the Leadership Council expects to demonstrate other performance enhancements that reflect positively on the bottom line. Run cutting and Operator scheduling/dispatching are two areas where performance is already improving.

Staff Evaluations

Six-month evaluations of all employees have been completed. Part of our commitment to our employees is regular feedback and dialogue regarding goals, objectives, performance and growth. Our people are our number one asset. We need them informed and committed to be successful.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORTS

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: In response to a request by the Board for regular reporting on the District's performance in several areas, monthly performance reports will be included in the Board agenda packets. The November 2000 and December 2000 Performance Reports are included this month. Staff will be available at the February 21 meeting to answer any questions the Board may have about this information.

ATTACHMENTS:

- (1) November 2000 Performance Report
- (2) December 2000 Performance Report

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: ADMINISTRATION OF SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

PREPARED BY: Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND: LTD currently is exploring changes in the management of special transportation services mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This includes those fixed-route services provided by LTD as well as the demand-response services that are managed by the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). The current division of responsibilities was established in 1983, before the ADA was ever envisioned. It was a local solution to a local transportation priority. With the federal approval of the ADA, the rest of the nation began to catch up to what LTD already had established, but the ADA also mandated certain responsibilities that LTD initially had not addressed locally.

Over time, LTD and LCOG have managed the changing needs of special transportation in an effective and efficient manner. Over time, a closer working relationship between LTD/LCOG has evolved such that we have arrived at the point of asking ourselves if the overall program needs would be better served by combining the overall management of special transportation under one person working at LTD. A good example of this closer working relationship arose with the comprehensive service redesign (CSR).

The needs of special transportation are growing in size, complexity, and cost. Initial discussions at LTD have highlighted the advantages of combining total program management under one person at LTD. The primary advantages include improved communications, coordination, and program efficiencies.

LTD staff have proposed the concept of combining program management to the Special Transportation Advisory Committee. At its January meeting, the committee recommended that the planning for combining program management proceed. The committee members did voice some concerns that they want the planning process to address. The first concern was assurances that Oakridge and Florence would continue to receive transit

planning staff support. Terry Parker, the LCOG special transportation staff person, currently helps both of these communities with their transit planning. The advisory committee was also concerned that the social service focus of the current RideSource program not be lost in a management transition. LTD staff believe that both of those concerns can be addressed in the planning process, and intend to move that planning process forward.

Staff will return to the Board, as part of the budget process, with a proposal to incorporate special transportation management into LTD's administrative structure.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None



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

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

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORT

March 21, 2001

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

Ken Hamm, General Manager
Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager
Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager
Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES GROUP

Ed Bergeron, Marketing Manager
Charlie Simmons, Facilities Services Manager
Stefano Viggiano, Planning & Development Manager
Andy Vobora, Service Planning Manager

TRANSPORTATION SERVICES GROUP

Ron Berkshire, Fleet Services Manager
Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager
Angie Sifuentez, Guest Services Supervisor

SECURITY PROGRAM PAYS DIVIDENDS

The LTD security program has paid dividends in many ways. The Wackenhut security officers have been a welcome addition to the system. Transit Projects Administrator Rick Bailor has done an outstanding job of overseeing the contract and ensuring that the

officers are trained properly to be professional and positive representatives of the District. They are working in all aspects of the security program. Wackenhut supervisor Ed Fowler is doing a good job of connecting with social service agencies and other resources in the community to solve problems and ensure that problem guests are dealt with appropriately and get help, if necessary, to retain their riding privileges. We have received positive comments from our guests about Wackenhut's presence and professionalism. The addition of the officers has allowed LTD supervisors to focus in on system issues and operator supervision.

The District's surveillance systems are also paying off. There have been several incidents in the past month in which we have been able to identify people who have been breaking the law or harassing guests and they have been arrested. One incident was the result of an operator observing a graffiti vandal at work on the bus. The operator stopped and asked the young man to come and talk to him. The vandal jumped out the emergency window and ran away. The operator saved the incident on the recorder and reported it. Staff were able to take the picture to the police, who identified the person as a notorious graffiti vandal, and he was arrested.

Recently, supervisors Dave Thulstrup, Kay Kinnish, and Rick Bailor received certificates of appreciation from the Eugene Police Department for their help in identifying drug dealers at the Eugene Station. The police were allowed to review the station surveillance system as part of the downtown sting operation that ended in 20 arrests of individuals involved in drug trafficking.

There is a lot of activity in and around the station. The security systems and patrols ensure that we have a safe and secure system for our guests.

REVISED ABANDONED BICYCLE PROGRAM

Each year the District is in possession of a number of abandoned bicycles. Currently, if they are not claimed during a certain period of time, they are donated to The Center for Alternative Transportation, where they are sold. Rick Bailor and Wackenhut supervisor Ed Fowler have developed a different program in partnership with EPD and The Salvation Army. In this new program, The Salvation Army picks up the bikes after 21 days and stores them, making them available to needy children and adults in the community. The police department will identify needy children through its Safer Schools Program and give a voucher to the student's parent or guardian to obtain a bike from The Salvation Army. The Salvation Army, through its programs, also will identify people who need a bike and cannot afford one. This is a good collaborative effort between The Salvation Army, EPD, and LTD. It gives LTD the opportunity to contribute directly to community members who are in need and make a positive impact in their lives.

SOFTWARE PROJECT PROGRESSING

After some delays the operations scheduling, timekeeping, and bid software project is on track. System Supervisor Renee Remior and Systems Analyst Gery Sorg have been working diligently with the vendor during the implementation. Staff training will begin the

week of February 19. The District will operate in a parallel mode for several weeks until any problems are corrected and the new system and its users can be depended upon to provide accurate information. This is an important system that will streamline payroll, operator scheduling, and system management functions.

HUMAN RESOURCES

David Dickman, Human Resources Manager

There is no Human Resources report this month.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2001\02\REGULAR MEETING\staff report February 21, 2001.doc (jhs)

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: February 21, 2001

ITEM TITLE: TRANSPLAN UPDATE

PREPARED BY: Lisa Gardner, Capital Grants Administrator

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND: At the February 8, 2001, Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) meeting, MPC discussed the remaining two unresolved TransPlan issues. The two unresolved issues discussed were: (1) Willamette River Crossing Study; and (2) New Finance Policy on Investment Priorities.

Following discussion on the Willamette River Crossing issue, a motion passed to approve the following option: "Do not include a study in the project list." This motion will be referred from MPC to the individual adopting agencies for approval.

Resolution could not be reached on the New Finance Policy on Investment Priorities, and a motion was approved to table the issue. In summary, the City of Springfield remains opposed to this policy and supports Option 1. The City of Eugene remains supportive of this policy, and was flexible regarding which option could be adopted. LTD expressed a preference for Option 5, but stated a willingness to be flexible in support of reaching agreement. Lane County indicated that it did not support this policy.

At the February meeting, MPC also began a discussion of the letter from Peter Sorensen that was distributed at the October Joint Adopting Officials TransPlan meeting. Discussion of the letter will continue at the March MPC meeting. Also at the March meeting, MPC will begin discussion of TransPlan financial constraint issues.

It is anticipated that the financial constraint issues will require several meetings by the MPC to resolve. Following MPC action on financial constraint issues, the LTD Board will be asked to take action on them and on the entire set of unresolved issues, including those discussed at the January LTD Board work session on TransPlan.

ATTACHMENT: February 8, 2001, MPC TransPlan Materials