

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 12, 2001.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, April 18, 2001  
5:30 p.m.

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

### A G E N D A

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

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

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

III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA 04

V. WORK SESSION

A. Status Report on Eugene Train Station Project (20 minutes) 05

B. Springfield Station Land Acquisition (20 minutes) 07

C. Board Position on Reopening Broadway Street (20 minutes) 08

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

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – MAY 2001 09

VII. EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 2000 10

VIII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

IX. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Consent Calendar  | 12 |
| 1. | Minutes of March 21, 2001, Regular Board Meeting (Page 13)  |    |
| B. | FY 2001-02 Fare Policy  | 31 |
| C. | Second Reading and Adoption of Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, Setting Fares for Use of District Services | 44 |
| D. | Mission Statement and Vision  | 50 |
| E. | Board Position on Reopening Broadway Street   | 52 |

X. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

- |     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| A.  | Current Activities   |    |
| 1.  | Board Member Reports   | 53 |
| (a) | Metropolitan Policy Committee                                      |    |
| (b) | BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input |    |
| (c) | Statewide Livability Forum   |    |
| (d) | United Front Trip to Washington, D.C.                              |    |
| (e) | Eugene City Council  |    |
| (f) | Springfield City Council   |    |
| 2.  | General Manager's Report   | 55 |
| 3.  | Monthly Financial Report – March 2001 Financial Statements         | 57 |
| 4.  | Bus Rapid Transit Update   | 68 |
| 5.  | Correspondence   | 69 |
| B.  | Monthly Performance Group Reports                                  | 74 |
| C.  | Monthly Performance Report (March 2001)                            | 79 |

XI. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING

84

- A. Budget Committee Meetings
- B. Approval of LTD Debt Policy
- C. Springfield Station Site Selection
- D. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Phase 1 Decision
- E. Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Budget Adoption
- F. Resolution Reaffirming District Boundaries
- G. TransPlan Draft Approval
- H. BRT Updates

XII. 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).**

# LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

## Pricing Proposal Summary

Effective 7/1/01

### TYPE OF FARE:

#### Cash Fare

	Current:	Proposed:
Adult	\$1.00	<b>\$1.25</b>
Youth*	\$0.50	<b>\$0.60</b>
Child	\$0.50	<b>\$0.60</b>
Reduced	\$0.50	<b>\$0.60</b>
Senior	\$0.50	<b>\$0.60</b>

#### Passes

	Current:	Proposed:
<b>Adult</b>		
1-Month:	\$28.00	\$28.00
3-Month:	\$65.00	\$65.00
<b>Youth*</b>		
1-Month:	\$14.00	\$14.00
3-Month:	\$32.50	\$32.50

#### **Child, Senior, Reduced**

1-Month:	\$14.00	\$14.00
3-Month:	\$32.50	\$32.50

#### **Day Pass**

Adult	\$2.00	<b>\$2.50</b>
Other	\$1.00	<b>\$1.20</b>

#### **Tokens**

Adult	\$0.85	\$0.85
Other	\$0.42	\$0.42

**Freedom Pass**      Discontinued

**Group Pass**                      3.2%      **4.1%\*\***

#### RideSource (Staff Proposal)

	Current:	Proposed:
Regular	\$1.75	<b>\$2.00</b>
Escort	\$1.75	<b>\$2.00</b>
Shopper	\$2.00	\$2.00
10 Tickets	\$15.00	\$15.00

#### RideSource (STFAC Proposal)

Regular	\$1.75	<b>\$2.00</b>
Escort	\$1.75	<b>\$2.00</b>
Shopper	\$2.00	\$2.00
10 Tickets	\$15.00	\$15.00

#### Sales Outlets

##### **Passes**

All Quantities      10.0%      10.0%

##### **Token**

##### **Packets**

All Quantities      10.0%      10.0%

**Discount                      Discount**

\* Price effective 6/1/2000. Pilot program.

\*\* Does not include base rate adjustments.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** MARCH FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Financial results for the first nine months of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Although concern remains about the effect of an economic slowdown on future revenue growth, and the projected growth of expenses in the next two to three fiscal years, there are no immediate financial concerns to report at this time.

Total General Fund revenue was \$169,730 over budget through March, primarily due to continued strong interest earnings (\$372,582). Payroll tax receipts, the primary subsidy for fixed-route operations, has slipped slightly below plan after posting strong months in January and February. It is likely that this resource will finish the fiscal year at or near budget expectations.

Passenger fares continue to lag expectations. Year-to-date receipts are below those of the same period in the last fiscal year for the third consecutive month, and already are \$225,008 below budget. If the current trend continues, total fare revenue likely will be as much as \$300,000 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.

Advertising revenue is 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 last fall's competitive award process.

Self-employment tax receipts continue to be 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-of revenue is back on budget through the three-quarters of the fiscal year, and is expected to meet annual budget expectations.

Administration personnel costs continue to be below budget for the first nine months of the fiscal year. Amalgamated Transit Union employee costs still are projected to be over budget for the year by approximately \$100,000. Savings in the administrative wage category should offset the shortfall in total.

Fuel prices have remained below \$1.00 per gallon. The negative variance in this line item should be in the \$100,000 or less range by fiscal year-end. Savings in other materials and services areas will mitigate this negative variance.

The Special Transportation Fund is slightly over budget through March, but it still is expected to require \$165,000 less support this year from the General Fund than was anticipated by the budget. It also should be noted that the General Fund transferred \$119,209 in appropriated but unused expense money to the Special Transportation Fund at the end of last year. This amount remains on the balance sheet as unappropriated cash in the current year, and is available to pay down the effect of future cost increases in demand-response transportation services.

The Capital Fund will expend significantly fewer funds than were appropriated in the current fiscal year due to the timing of the bus rapid transit (BRT) project and delays in other projects. For example, the six shuttle buses that were expected to be delivered in April now are expected in July or August, which means that the outlay will occur in next fiscal year. As previously reported, federal grant funding for BRT project planning has 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.

One capital project that was completed in the current fiscal year but has not been expensed is the new Lane Community College transfer station. LTD's share of the project, per agreement, is \$380,000. The current year appropriation for this project is \$400,000, so the project came in under budget. LTD is working with LCC to assure that the paperwork is completed for payment before June 30, 2001.

The FY 2001-02 budget development process is underway. A briefing for non-Board members of the Budget Committee was held on April 4, 2001. The full Budget Committee is scheduled to meet on April 25 and 26. (Additional meetings will be scheduled, if necessary.) Budget notebooks will be delivered to committee members on April 20.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attached are the following financial reports for Board review:

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

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** FARE POLICY

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approval of Revised Fare Policy

**BACKGROUND:** At the February 21 work session, staff reviewed a revised fare policy with Board members. While the material presented was correct, it was later learned that the policy document included in the Board packet materials was incomplete.

In order to make sure that the public record is accurate and complete, the entire fare policy document is attached to this memorandum. At the April 18 meeting, the Board will be asked to approve this policy.

Additionally, at the March 21 meeting, the Board asked for a review of the day pass/transfer program. That staff report is attached for the Board's review before adoption of the fare policy.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- (1) Staff Report: Review of Day Pass/Transfer Program
- (2) Fare Policy

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move approval of the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2001-013: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adopts the Fare Policy as presented.



**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
TENTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35**

**AN ORDINANCE SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES**

The Board of Directors of Lane Transit District does hereby ordain that Ordinance No. 35 of said District is hereby amended to read as follows:

1.01 Definitions. As used in this ordinance, unless the context requires otherwise:

- (1) "District" means Lane Transit District.
- (2) "Service Area" means the area designated in Ordinance No. 24 of Lane Transit District entitled "An Ordinance Altering the Territorial Boundaries for Lane Transit District," adopted November 17, 1999, as such area is now constituted and as it may be altered from time to time hereafter by ordinance of this District.

1.02 Fares.

- (1) Fares on the District transit system shall vary according to the status of the rider and method of payment and shall be in accordance with the following schedule:

(a) Cash Fare (Effective 7/01/01).

**Monday-Sunday**

Adult (ages 19 – 61)	\$1.25
Youth (ages 5 – 18)*	\$ .60
Reduced Fare**	\$ .60
Senior (ages 62 and older)	\$ .60

(b) Monthly or 3-Month Passes (Effective 9/01/00, except as noted).

<u>Pass Type</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>3-Month</u>
Adult (19-61)	\$28.00	\$65.00
Youth (5-18)	\$14.00	\$32.50
Senior, Reduced	\$14.00	\$32.50

(c) Day Pass (Effective 9/01/00).

The Day Pass rate is 2 times the cash fare.

(d) Tokens (Effective 7/01/01).

Regular (large) tokens are worth \$1.25 toward any LTD ride. Tokens are sold in lots of 5 for \$4.25. Small tokens are worth 60¢ toward any LTD ride. Small tokens are sold in lots of 5 for \$2.10.

- \* Youth pass fare rates are effective 6/01/00. Youth fare applies to ages 5-18. Up to two children under age five ride free with parent or guardian. All additional children pay youth fare.
- \*\* Reduced fare applies to all persons who meet the Federal Transit Administration-approved definition of persons with disabilities.

(2) Group Pass Program. The General Manager, or his designated representative, is authorized to sign contracts on behalf of the District to provide transit service to groups of riders at reduced rates pursuant to policies established by the Board at its May 2, 1990, meeting, as amended, or pursuant to such policies as the Board may hereafter adopt by resolution or ordinance.

Deleted: ¶

(3) Special Event Discounts. The promotional distribution of free tickets from time to time is necessary or convenient for the provision of a public transit system. The General Manager, or his designated representative, is authorized to reduce or eliminate fares, or to approve the distribution of free tickets for use of District facilities during special events, or at specified times, on a finding by the General Manager or his designated representative that the fare reduction or elimination will promote increased use of the District's public transit system or will otherwise further the provision of a public transit system.

(4) Reduced Fares for Low-Income Persons. The General Manager, or his designated representative, is authorized to sign contracts with local nonprofit agencies whereunder the District may agree to provide transit fare instruments at reduced prices to such agencies, for distribution to low-income persons within the service area who need transportation assistance. Definitions of those who are "low-income persons" and "who need transportation assistance" shall be part of such contracts, verbatim or by reference.

(5) Paratransit. Fare structure (Effective 7/01/01):

<b>RideSource</b>	\$ 2.00 one way
Escort*	\$ 2.00 one way
<b>RideSource</b> Shopper**	\$ 2.00 round trip
Social Service Agencies***	100 percent
Book of Ten Tickets	\$15.00

- \* Escort is limited door-to-door transportation for medical rides.
- \*\* **RideSource** Shopper is specialized transportation service for grocery shopping. **RideSource** Shopper fares are based on round-trip rides. All other fares are one-way rides.
- \*\*\* Social service agencies will contract for service and pay 100 percent of the marginal cost of service.

2.01 Large-quantity Token and Pass Purchases. The District will provide a discount of 10 percent to individuals or organizations who have been authorized by the District to sell tokens and passes to the general public. Tokens are sold in packages of five.

3.01 Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect 30 days after adoption, at which time this Tenth Amended Ordinance will stand in the stead of Ordinance No. 35 in all particulars and all previous amendments, and will govern all fares charged by the District.

ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President and Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

Q:\ATEAMBOARD\ORDINANC\10THORD35.doc

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**Operating Financial Report**  
For the Fiscal Period Ending 03/31/01 With Comparisons To Prior Year-To-Date  
Current year: 2000-2001

	Prior YTD 99-00	Adopted Budget	YTD Actual	% budget	% over last year
<b>Revenues &amp; Other Sources:</b>					
Passenger fares	\$ 2,436,848	\$ 3,393,000	\$ 2,376,615	70.0%	-2.5%
Group pass	566,778	750,000	636,719	84.9%	12.3%
Advertising	262,103	375,000	282,523	75.3%	7.8%
Special service	130,343	131,250	124,867	95.1%	-4.2%
Miscellaneous	249,680	248,000	151,263	61.0%	-39.4%
Total operating	3,645,753	4,897,250	3,571,986	72.9%	-2.0%
Payroll tax	12,194,438	16,590,000	12,425,843	74.9%	1.9%
Self-employment tax	142,492	1,000,000	153,691	15.4%	7.9%
State-in-lieu	804,118	1,000,000	763,535	76.4%	-5.0%
FTA operating grant	216,499	448,100	255,627	57.0%	18.1%
Total taxes & grants	13,357,548	19,038,100	13,598,697	71.4%	1.8%
Interest income	803,644	892,500	1,039,332	116.5%	29.3%
Sale of assets	-	5,000	3,618	72.4%	0.0%
Total revenues and other sources	17,806,944	24,832,850	18,213,633	73.3%	2.3%
<b>Expenditures &amp; Other Uses:</b>					
<b>Personnel Costs</b>					
Administration	3,924,478	5,680,990	4,102,392	72.2%	4.5%
Administration - Funded by Capital Projects	(524,140)	(748,820)	(503,039)	67.2%	-4.0%
Administration - Net	3,400,338	4,932,170	3,599,353	73.0%	5.9%
Contract	8,021,196	11,602,060	8,772,813	75.6%	9.4%
Total personnel	11,421,534	16,534,230	12,372,166	74.8%	8.3%
<b>Materials &amp; Services</b>					
General Administration	156,962	318,072	143,369	45.1%	-8.7%
Public Affairs	16,127	155,300	125,987	81.1%	681.2%
Commuter Solutions Program	39,388	109,000	111,956	102.7%	184.2%
Finance	40,498	54,900	43,940	80.0%	8.5%
Information Services	107,969	177,849	91,464	51.4%	-15.3%
Human Resources	173,374	199,460	97,536	48.9%	-43.7%
Planning & Development	8,162	7,700	4,921	63.9%	-39.7%
Service Planning & Marketing	520,320	432,900	256,472	59.2%	-50.7%
Guest Service Center	18,338	28,505	13,526	47.5%	-26.2%
Transit Operations	164,180	265,860	199,977	75.2%	21.8%
Fleet Services	1,404,557	2,143,100	1,710,854	79.8%	21.8%
Facilities Services	362,621	568,255	354,472	62.4%	-2.2%
Insurance / Liability Costs	462,962	587,000	472,917	80.6%	2.2%
STF Transfer	530,138	789,000	543,188	68.8%	2.5%
Capital Transfer - Operating	491,150	3,000,000	561,407	18.7%	14.3%
Capital Transfer - Reserves	-	4,254,817	4,254,817	100.0%	0.0%
Total materials & services	4,496,745	13,091,718	8,986,803	68.6%	99.9%
Total expenditures and other uses	15,918,279	29,625,948	21,358,969	72.1%	34.2%
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures	1,888,665	(4,793,098)	(3,145,336)		-266.5%
<b>Net to fund</b>	<b>\$ 1,888,665</b>	<b>\$ (4,793,098)</b>	<b>\$ (3,145,336)</b>		<b>-266.5%</b>

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**General Fund**  
**Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance**  
**For the period 03/01/01 - 03/31/01**

	Annual	Current Month			Year To Date		
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual	Budget	Variance
<b>Revenues &amp; Other Sources:</b>							
Passenger Fares	\$ 3,393,000	\$ 273,786	\$ 310,071	\$ (36,285)	\$ 2,376,615	\$ 2,601,623	\$ (225,008)
Group Pass Payments	750,000	73,433	55,984	17,449	636,719	535,759	100,960
Advertising	375,000	33,750	31,634	2,116	282,523	281,018	1,505
Special Services	131,250	8,019	10,938	(2,919)	124,867	98,436	26,431
Miscellaneous Income	248,000	1,498	1,102	396	151,263	187,988	(36,725)
Payroll Tax Revenue	16,590,000	61,053	165,900	(104,847)	12,425,843	12,442,500	(16,657)
Self-employment Tax	1,000,000	-	50,000	(50,000)	153,691	140,000	13,691
State In-Lieu-of Tax	1,000,000	280,895	250,000	30,895	763,535	750,000	13,535
Operating Grants	448,100	24,054	37,341	(13,287)	255,627	336,077	(80,450)
Interest Income	892,500	105,404	75,250	30,154	1,039,332	666,750	372,582
Proceeds From Sale of Assets	5,000	-	416	(416)	3,618	3,752	(135)
<b>Total General Fund Revenues</b>	<b>24,832,850</b>	<b>861,891</b>	<b>988,636</b>	<b>(126,745)</b>	<b>18,213,633</b>	<b>18,043,903</b>	<b>169,730</b>
<b>Expenditures &amp; Other Uses:</b>							
General Administration	949,917	72,642	82,065	9,423	600,362	719,631	119,269
Public Affairs	176,390	2,245	14,699	12,454	142,197	132,291	(9,906)
Commuter Solutions Program	212,510	30,698	38,626	7,928	198,835	156,634	(42,201)
Finance	594,980	45,533	46,857	1,324	415,230	451,411	36,181
Information Services	552,289	47,985	48,272	287	335,358	397,996	62,638
Human Resources	524,950	54,001	63,846	9,845	350,499	400,719	50,220
Planning & Development	7,700	82	634	552	15,766	5,770	(9,996)
Service Planning & Marketing	1,172,555	70,342	68,577	(1,765)	780,960	958,934	177,974
Guest Service Center	500,075	32,543	41,557	9,014	317,617	375,297	57,679
Transit Operations	10,825,660	899,198	900,026	828	8,266,477	8,126,382	(140,095)
Fleet Services	4,576,270	362,116	377,839	15,723	3,490,015	3,454,895	(35,120)
Facilities Services	901,835	74,482	73,050	(1,432)	613,324	686,775	73,451
Insurance/ Liability Costs	587,000	12,248	11,750	(498)	472,917	551,750	78,833
<b>Total before transfers</b>	<b>21,582,131</b>	<b>1,704,114</b>	<b>1,767,798</b>	<b>63,683</b>	<b>15,999,557</b>	<b>16,418,484</b>	<b>418,927</b>
STF Transfer	789,000	-	-	-	543,188	591,750	48,563
Capital Transfer	7,254,817	68,555	250,000	181,445	4,816,224	6,504,817	1,688,593
<b>Total General Fund Expenditures</b>	<b>29,625,948</b>	<b>1,772,669</b>	<b>2,017,798</b>	<b>245,128</b>	<b>21,358,969</b>	<b>23,515,051</b>	<b>2,156,083</b>
<b>Unreserved Fund Balance</b>							
Change to fund balance					(3,145,336)	(5,471,148)	
Beginning balance					7,746,013	7,793,098	
Ending balance					<u>\$ 4,600,677</u>	<u>\$ 2,321,950</u>	

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**Special Transportation Fund**  
**Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance**  
**For the period 03/01/01 - 03/31/01**

	Adopted Budget	Y-T-D Actual	Current Month Actual	Percent of year Balance	75% YTD% Budget
<b>Revenues &amp; Other Sources:</b>					
State Special Transp Funds	\$ 637,910	\$ 640,005	\$ -	\$ 2,095	100.3%
STF - Capital	380,280	111,899	-	(268,381)	29.4%
STF - Interest Income	-	-	-	-	0.0%
Transfer from general fund	789,000	543,188	-	(245,813)	68.8%
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<u>1,807,190</u>	<u>1,295,091</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>(512,099)</u>	<u>71.7%</u>
<b>Expenditures &amp; Other Uses:</b>					
STF - flow-through transfer	1,018,190	754,355	-	263,835	74.1%
Direct support - Ridesource	659,000	468,000	-	191,000	71.0%
LTD - Capital match	29,750	-	-	29,750	0.0%
Direct support - LCOG admin	100,250	75,188	-	25,063	75.0%
<b>Total STF Expenditures</b>	<u>1,807,190</u>	<u>1,297,542</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>509,648</u>	<u>71.8%</u>
<b>Unreserved Fund Balance</b>					
Change to fund balance	-	(2,451)			
Beginning balance	119,209	121,660			
<b>Ending balance</b>	<u>\$ 119,209</u>	<u>\$ 119,209</u>			

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**Capital Projects Fund**  
**Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance**  
**For the period 03/01/01 - 03/31/01**

	Adopted Budget	Y-T-D Actual	Current Month Actual	Percent of year Balance	67% Y-T-D % Budget
<b>Revenues &amp; Other Sources:</b>					
Grant income	\$ 16,038,606	\$ 1,460,538	\$ 36,220	\$ (14,578,068)	9.1%
Transfer from General Fund					
For Current Projects	3,000,000	561,407	68,555	(2,438,593)	18.7%
For Capital Reserves	4,254,817	4,254,817	-	-	100.0%
<b>Total resources</b>	<u>23,293,423</u>	<u>6,276,762</u>	<u>104,775</u>	<u>(17,016,661)</u>	<u>26.9%</u>
<b>Expenditures:</b>					
Grant Paid Capital					
Miscellaneous equipment	185,600	66,208	573	119,392	35.7%
ADP software & hardware	818,700	236,429	18,433	582,271	28.9%
Shop equipment	14,400	9,307	-	5,093	64.6%
Bus stations, stops, & terminals	445,000	196,030	21,561	248,970	44.1%
Bus rapid transit	11,700,000	684,573	54,341	11,015,427	5.9%
Springfield station relocation	700,000	3,285	-	696,715	0.5%
Facilities	275,000	64,815	15,863	210,185	23.6%
Signal & communication projects	2,225,000	139,863	3,760	2,085,137	6.3%
Revenue rolling stock	2,500,000	7,727	-	2,492,273	0.3%
Support vehicles	140,000	117,336	18,388	22,664	83.8%
Budgeted for capital contingency	200,000	-	-	200,000	0.0%
<b>Total Federal Funded Capital</b>	<u>19,203,700</u>	<u>1,525,574</u>	<u>132,918</u>	<u>17,678,126</u>	<u>7.9%</u>
Locally Funded Capital					
Communications infrastructure	-	1,316	-		
LCC Station	400,000	-	-	400,000	0.0%
RideSource Facility	425,000	6,090	4,500	418,910	1.4%
<b>Total Locally Funded Capital</b>	<u>825,000</u>	<u>7,406</u>	<u>4,500</u>	<u>817,594</u>	<u>0.9%</u>
<b>Total Capital Projects Fund Expenditures</b>	<u>20,028,700</u>	<u>1,532,980</u>	<u>137,418</u>	<u>18,495,720</u>	<u>7.7%</u>
<b>Unreserved Fund Balance</b>					
Change to fund balance	4,089,723	4,743,782			
Beginning fund balance	13,290,361	11,073,760			
<b>Ending Fund Balance</b>	<u>\$ 17,380,084</u>	<u>\$ 15,817,542</u>			

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**General Fund**  
**Comparative Balance Sheet**  
**March 31, 2001 and June 30, 2000**

	Current Balances	Balance 06/30/00 (Unaudited)
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Cash & equivalents	\$6,591,973	\$9,799,678
Receivables	470,425	440,517
Inventory of parts and supplies	628,200	611,933
Prepaid expenses	99,268	127,315
VRC lease	58,333	58,333
Property, plant, and equipment net of accumulated depreciation	39,443,644	39,443,644
<b>Total Assets</b>	<b><u><u>\$47,291,844</u></u></b>	<b><u><u>\$50,481,420</u></u></b>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable	\$0	\$298,988
Payroll payable	556,168	228,861
Unearned revenue	43,036	49,479
Liability claims/other payable	113,419	162,248
CAL/sick accrual	1,797,619	1,797,619
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	<b><u><u>2,510,242</u></u></b>	<b><u><u>2,537,195</u></u></b>
<b>FUND BALANCE</b>		
Investment in fixed assets	5,486,318	5,546,738
Reserved for long-term lease	58,333	58,333
Contributed Capital	34,576,607	34,593,141
 Fund Balance restricted to assets	 <u>40,121,258</u>	 <u>40,198,212</u>
 Fund balance	 7,805,679	 10,173,996
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures	<u>(3,145,336)</u>	<u>(2,427,983)</u>
Ending fund balance	<u>4,660,344</u>	<u>7,746,013</u>
 Total Reserves and Fund Balances	 <u>44,781,602</u>	 <u>47,944,225</u>
<b>Total Liabilities &amp; Fund Balance</b>	<b><u><u>\$47,291,844</u></u></b>	<b><u><u>\$50,481,420</u></u></b>



**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**Special Transportation Fund**  
**Comparative Balance Sheet**  
**March 31, 2001 and June 30, 2000**

	Current Balances	Balance 6/30/2000 (Unaudited)
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Cash & equivalents	\$119,209	\$289,927
Receivables	-	-
Prepaid expenses	-	-
	-	-
<b>Total Assets</b>	<b>\$119,209</b>	<b>\$289,927</b>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable	\$ -	\$ 50,791
FY00-01 STF Pass thru	-	119,927
	-	119,927
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	-	170,718
<b>RESERVES &amp; BALANCES</b>		
Fund balance	121,660	-
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures	(2,451)	119,209
	119,209	119,209
<b>Total Liabilities &amp; Fund Balances</b>	<b>\$ 119,209</b>	<b>\$ 289,927</b>

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**Capital Projects Fund**  
**Comparative Balance Sheet**  
**March 31, 2001 and June 30, 2000**

	Current Balances	Balance 6/30/2000
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Cash & equivalents	\$15,740,212	\$11,156,522
Receivables	77,330	104,349
Prepaid expenses	0	0
<b>Total Assets</b>	<b><u>\$15,817,542</u></b>	<b><u>\$11,260,871</u></b>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable	\$0	\$187,111
Retainage payable	0	0
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	<b><u>0</u></b>	<b><u>187,111</u></b>
<b>RESERVES &amp; BALANCES</b>		
Fund balance	11,073,760	8,584,832
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures	4,743,782	2,488,928
Ending fund balance	15,817,542	11,073,760
<b>Total Liabilities &amp; Fund Balances</b>	<b><u>\$15,817,542</u></b>	<b><u>\$11,260,871</u></b>

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 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

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** MARCH FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Financial results for the first nine months of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Although concern remains about the effect of an economic slowdown on future revenue growth, and the projected growth of expenses in the next two to three fiscal years, there are no immediate financial concerns to report at this time.

Total General Fund revenue was \$169,730 over budget through March, primarily due to continued strong interest earnings (\$372,582). Payroll tax receipts, the primary subsidy for fixed route operations, has slipped slightly below plan after posting strong months in January and February. It is likely that this resource will finish the fiscal year at or near budget expectations.

Passenger fares continue to lag expectations. Year-to-date receipts are below those of the same period in the last fiscal year for the third consecutive month, and already are \$225,008 below budget. If the current trend continues, total fare revenue likely is to be as much as \$300,000 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.

Advertising revenue is 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 last fall's competitive award process.

Self-employment tax receipts continue to be 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-of revenue is back on budget through the three-quarters of the fiscal year, and is expected to meet annual budget expectations.

Administration personnel costs continue to be below budget for the first nine months of the fiscal year. Amalgamated Transit Union employee costs still are projected to be over budget for the year by approximately \$100,000. Savings in the administrative wage category should offset the shortfall in total.

Fuel prices have remained below \$1.00. The negative variance in this line item should be in the \$100,000 or less range by fiscal year end. Savings in other materials and services areas will mitigate this negative variance.

The Special Transportation Fund is slightly over budget through March, but it still is expected that it will require \$165,000 less support this year from the General Fund than was anticipated by the budget. It also should be noted that the General Fund transferred \$119,209 in appropriated but unused expense money to the Special Transportation Fund at the end of last year. This amount remains on the balance sheet as unappropriated cash in the current year, and is available to pay down the effect of future cost increases in demand response transportation services.

The capital fund will expend significantly fewer funds than were appropriated in the current fiscal year due to the timing of the bus rapid transit (BRT) project and delays in other projects. For example, the six shuttle buses that were expected to be delivered in April now are expected in July or August, which means that the outlay will occur in next fiscal year. As previously reported, federal grant funding for the BRT project planning has 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.

One capital project that was completed in the current fiscal year but has not been expensed is the new Lane Community College transfer station. LTD's share of the project, per agreement, is \$380,000. The current year appropriation for this project is \$400,000, so the project came in under budget. LTD is working with LCC to assure that the paperwork is completed for payment before June 30, 2001.

The FY 2001-02 budget development process is underway. A briefing for citizen members of the Budget Committee was held on April 4, 2001. The full Budget Committee is scheduled to meet on April 25 and 26. (Additional meetings will be scheduled, if necessary.) Budget notebooks will be delivered to committee members on April 20.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Attached are the following financial reports for Board review:

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

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** March 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:

1. **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 April 12, 2001, MPC meeting. The next MPC meeting is scheduled for May 10, 2001.
2. **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 Committee last met on March 6. The next BRT Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for April 3, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. At the March 21 Board meeting, Committee Chair Rob Bennett and the other LTD Board representatives can provide a brief update on the March 6 meeting and respond to any questions the Board may have about this committee's activities.
3. **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.
4. **Board Finance Committee:** The Board Finance Committee (Chair Pat Hocken and members Gerry Gaydos and Virginia Lauritsen) last met on

March 7. At the March 21 Board meeting, Ms. Hocken can provide a brief summary of the committee's activities to date.

5. **Board Human Resources Committee**: The Board Human Resources Committee (Chair Gerry Gaydos and members Dave Kleger and Robert Melnick) met on March 12. An agenda item summary and recommendation for action is included in the Items for Action at the March 21 Board meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



## MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

April 18, 2001

### Revenue:

- **Passenger fares** are below budget for the first nine months, and also below the same period in the last fiscal year. Year-end shortfalls versus budget are likely to be in the \$300,000 range. 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 since. 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 February. 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 below budget year-to-date, and efforts have been made to maintain the savings through the remainder of the current fiscal year.
- **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 \$100,000 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 months, 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:** March 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:

1. **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 April 12, 2001, MPC meeting. The next MPC meeting is scheduled for May 10, 2001.
2. **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 Committee last met on March 6. The April 3, 2001, meeting was cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for May 1, 2001.
3. **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 was scheduled to meet again in April 2001. Ms. Lauritsen will provide updates on Forum activities as they occur.

4. **United Front**: Ms. Wylie and Mr. Gaydos participated in the annual lobbying trip to Washington, D.C., in March 2001. At the April 18, 2001, Board meeting, Mr. Gaydos and Ms. Wylie can provide a report and answer questions.
5. **Eugene City Council**: The BRT project was discussed by the Eugene City Council at its April 9, 2001, meeting. Ms. Hocken and Mr. Melnick attended the Council meeting and can provide a report and answer questions during the April 18, 2001, Board meeting.
6. **Springfield City Council**: The Springfield City Council discussed the BRT project during its work session on April 16, 2001. Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen attended the session and can provide a report and answer questions during the April 18, 2001, Board meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** CORRESPONDENCE

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

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

- March 25, 2001, letter to Hillary Wylie from Terry C. Miller, Associate Director, Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, White House, following meeting in Washington, D.C.
- April 5, 2001, letter from Hazel L. Shintani to the Lane Council of Governments, complimenting **RideSource** employees and services
- April 9, 2001, letter from Mindy Wekselblatt, complimenting **RideSource** employees and services
- April 10, 2001, letter from Jean Dalberg, complimenting **RideSource** employees and services

At the April 18, 2001, meeting, staff will respond to any questions the Board members may have about this correspondence.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, March 21, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 15, 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, March 21, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Rob Bennett, Vice President, Chair Pro Tempore, presiding  
Patricia Hocken  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary  
Robert Melnick  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Gerry Gaydos  
Hillary Wylie, President

**WORK SESSION/CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Chair Pro Tempore Rob Bennett.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:** Ms. Hocken stated how great the employee appreciation banquet was. She thought that the entertainment provided by employee singers and musicians had been especially wonderful. Ms. Lauritsen agreed, and said that the employees who attended had been wonderful, as well.

Ms. Lauritsen asked for a preliminary report on the United Front lobbying trip to Washington, D.C. Mr. Hamm said that Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch had reported that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) would like to see LTD and the Eugene/Springfield area be one of the model BRT projects. The FTA offered to fund some work by Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., a consulting firm that worked with a number of transit properties on different projects, to help LTD position itself for New Start funding. She also had reported that there were good conversations with the Congressional membership, and that the Oregon delegation staff people who bring requests together for the Congressional members were just beginning to work on those requests, so the United Front trip timing was very well planned.

**CHOICES VIDEO:** Connie Bloom Williams, the Commuter Solutions program manager, explained that Commuter Solutions had been LTD's alternative transportation program since 1994. One of its primary elements was the education of different target markets, such as employers, employees, the general public, and the school and youth market. She introduced Robert Lewis, the manager of Metro TV, and explained that the

"Choices" video was a joint project between Metro TV and LTD, with some funding assistance from the City of Eugene. They had produced a video, entitled, "Choices," that focused on transportation choices for local middle and high school audiences. Mr. Lewis had been submitting the video to various awards programs and it had been winning awards. The Oregon Department of Transportation had written a press release about the video, so LTD was beginning to receive more requests for copies.

Mr. Lewis said that about 500 high school students had been interviewed to find out what they would like to see in the video. Hundreds of 4J students had been auditioned and 45 were selected for the music video. School District 4J Superintendent George Russell and others in the school district were so enthusiastic about the project that now the video was being used in a 25-minute curriculum in every 4J middle school, in multiple classes, such as social studies and environmental sciences. Mr. Lewis stated that the Telly award was equivalent to an academy award for video production. The 2000 Telly competition had 11,033 entries, with approximately 7 percent receiving awards. Competition for the awards came from businesses such as Dick Clark Productions, IBM, and Coca-Cola USA. The video also was submitted for competition for the 2000 Communicator Crystal Award and the Aegis Award of Excellence, and won awards in both of these competitions. Mr. Lewis and Ms. Williams showed the video for the Board.

**WORK SESSION ON METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE TRANSPLAN RECOMMENDATIONS:** LTD Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner introduced the topic and gave some background information. She introduced Tom Schwetz and Paul Thompson of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). She said that she would present the remaining issues that MPC had considered as the resolution body for TransPlan unresolved issues. Later in the meeting, the Board would be asked to take action on the issues as a set, rather than one by one. The LTD Board had seen all of these issues before, either in a TransPlan joint work session or at LTD Board work sessions.

Ms. Hocken had attended the MPC meeting where these issues were discussed. She said that except for one issue that was still unresolved, MPC had come to a place that the LTD Board supported the last time they reviewed these various issues. One issue, #14.2, the new finance policy, had been sent back to the City of Eugene for further discussion. MPC had voted to not add the new policy to TransPlan. The feeling was that it was now up to the Eugene City Council to see if they felt strongly enough about it to pursue an amendment. All others were at a place the LTD Board had agreed with during the Board's last discussion.

Ms. Gardner clarified that as currently proposed, all the issues were resolved and the plan was financially constrained. Depending on what the City of Eugene did with the West Eugene Parkway (WEP), it could become unconstrained. If no changers were made, it was possible that this would be the final plan that the Board would be asked to adopt. The Board would have an opportunity to discuss future proposed changes and take action as needed.

Ms. Hocken added that MPC had discussed the new construction piece of financial constraints, but had not really talked about the operations and maintenance piece. There was still some interest in being able to put more money in operations, maintenance, and

preservation, not necessarily among the members of MPC, but in a lot of testimony from the public.

Mr. Thompson further explained that TransPlan was constrained under the federal requirements. Currently, TransPlan specified that for the shortfall in OM&P funding in Eugene and Springfield, a new locally-controlled source of revenue would be identified. Both city councils had directed their staffs to work on those issues. In Eugene, a staff and citizen committee had been working on new revenue sources since September, and would be bringing recommendations for those to the Council's budget committee in April. They were quite far along in that process, which satisfied the federal requirement for fiscal constraint. He said that if the Eugene City Council, under the direction of MPC or their own initiative, brought back a change in the project list because of the West Eugene Parkway (WEP), or chose to pursue the new finance policy further, that could cause some change in the priorities for expenditures, and there could be action that would move the Plan out of constraint. The Eugene Council also could pursue nodal development financing further, following the March 8 MPC addition of \$5 million for nodal development planning. If Eugene chose to pursue further funding for nodal development infrastructure, there might be a need to identify or move funding for that element.

Ms. Gardner said that there appeared to be momentum by MPC to adopt the Plan, and that any further unresolved issues could be dealt with in triennial updates. That was LCOG's staff recommendation. This Plan met the federal requirement for a plan, and there were some issues that were pushing the need to adopt it soon, such as air quality performance, and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the local Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) no longer being current.

Ms. Hocken asked if the plan could be adopted without knowing about the West Eugene Parkway process, or if that would hold up adoption. Mr. Schwetz replied that the issue of the WEP was associated with project development, and a detailed discussion about what parts would be built should be differentiated from what would be done in the course of developing a regional transportation plan. The TransPlan could be adopted without knowing what final process would result from that project. There had been a change in the original project list of a couple of years ago, but staff believed that TransPlan did not have to be held up by not knowing the final configuration of the West Eugene Parkway. It could be specified that a refinement plan would be done, some investment would be made, and those would be worked on during the triennial update. Staff's recommendation was to move forward with TransPlan adoption.

Mr. Bennett asked if, in the absence of anything happening with WEP, something would happen with the W. 11<sup>th</sup> and Beltline intersection. Mr. Schwetz said that there was no doubt that not having something in place would have a tremendous impact on West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It was hoped that the decision-making could be done on that project without holding up TransPlan. He described Plan adoption as a snapshot in time as to what the regional bodies could agree to, and said that the federal process envisioned that discussions on the projects would continue. It was important to talk now about the triennial update. He added that a lot of new issues had arisen during the time it had taken to prepare TransPlan for adoption. He thought it was only fair to the process that the community look for ways to

adopt the Plan so that everything else in the Plan could get underway. Mr. Thompson said that it was discussed at MPC that TransPlan could be adopted in June and then MPC could embark on the triennial update. The reconfiguration of the WEP project and changes to the project list could be amended to TransPlan anytime after this adoption.

Mr. Bennett asked if any of the proposals being discussed with respect to the amendments to the WEP plan or alternatives were expected to have a major impact on West 11<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues, from a transportation technical analysis point of view. Mr. Schwetz said that a number of the options that had been discussed, which came close to the equivalent of Phases 1A and 1B, which basically were a full connection between Highway 99 and Beltline, would have an impact on the stretch of West 11<sup>th</sup> between Garfield and Beltline. Building just that link would cause problems on West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, particularly between Danebo or Willow Creek and Beltline, where a lot of people coming out of the Hyundai area were making a right turn and then a left turn onto Beltline, making that a highly-congested segment. The issue was finding a way to help that traffic move without congesting that segment. A lot depended on the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) figuring out a way to continue its financial commitment.

Mr. Thompson added that ODOT was interested in the project—some form of the WEP—relieving congestion on the state system and providing an additional component to the state system. West 11<sup>th</sup> east of Beltline, between Garfield and Beltline, was not part of the state system. To the extent that the eastern portion of WEP relieved congestion on the eastern portion of West 11<sup>th</sup>, that was not in ODOT's interest as much as addressing the western portion of West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Schwetz summarized by saying that in addition to that linkage between Highway 99 and Beltline, some of the proposals that were "non-WEP" would involve making that connection and then making improvements to Beltline and then 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue west of Beltline. There actually was a project in TransPlan to do parts of that.

Ms. Gardner asked Mr. Schwetz to talk about alternative performance measures that LTD reviewed. Mr. Schwetz said that materials prepared for the Lane Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) meeting on May 3-4 were available for public review from March 21 through April 9. Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff would prepare recommendations and on May 3 or May 4 would go to LCDC with a request to approve the use of these alternative measures. He thought it was in LCDC's interest to approve the measures and let the local area proceed with some of the things LCDC was interested in.

Mr. Kleger said that there were several major intersection revision projects that had been moved from "constrained" to the "future" list. He wanted to confirm his impression that these could come back onto the constrained list and would have to be dealt with. Mr. Thompson said that those (such as the Franklin/I-5, 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue/I-5, and Main Street/Highway 126 interchanges) could come back to the constrained list; the requirement was that funding be reasonably expected. MPC voted to move them to the future list pending studies that were ongoing or planned, to determine where investments should be made. The TransPlan future projects list was made up of projects waiting for need and/or funding.



Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Schwetz to comment on proposed bylaws changes to MPC. Mr. Schwetz said that LCOG staff were responding to a request from one of MPC's members. Procedurally, there probably was an opportunity at the meeting for someone to ask to vote on that request, rather than having LCOG respond to one member's request. As background, he explained that Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer had requested that LCOG develop amendments to the MPC bylaws to limit LTD's participation on MPC to "mass transit" issues, rather than "transportation" issues. Mr. Schwetz said that from staff's perspective, mass transit was synonymous with transportation. Ms. Gardner added that the federal requirement was that coordination came under the broader umbrella of transportation issues and was not broken out by mode. Mr. Schwetz said that while the federal government clearly stated that transit needed to be part of the discussion, it did not comment on bylaws and voting privileges as long as the bylaws met federal requirements. Ms. Hocken commented on the process, stating that it had not been her sense that this would happen as a result of only one person's request. MPC would have an opportunity to discuss this issue at its next meeting; however, she thought it was unfortunate that staff work was undertaken before there was any conversation about it.

**WORK SESSION ON WILLAMETTE VALLEY FUTURES STUDY:** LTD Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano introduced Hillary Deerborn of LCOG, who was working on the Willamette Valley Futures Study. Ms. Deerborn said that the project was very interested in feedback, and asked the Board members to mail or fax comments on a survey sheet she handed out. She explained that the project looked 50 years into the future for transportation issues in a valley-wide, regional approach to transportation. It was anticipated that the population of the valley would almost double in the next 50 years, equivalent to adding three more cities with Portland's current population or 12 or 13 more cities the size of Eugene. She explained the project, which looked at how population growth would affect the livability, mobility, and goals of the area. The purpose of the project was to take a long-range look and identify policy choices that could minimize the impact of population growth on transportation. The study involved intercity transportation and population issues throughout the valley, not local traffic congestion issues. The policy choices that were considered were the urban land available for development, investments in highway and transit, and cost of driving. Ms. Deerborn discussed the seven scenarios that were evaluated for highway and transit development, looking out to the year 2050. The "no action" scenario showed that traffic congestion on the major highways throughout the valley would increase by 81 percent. The "transit only" scenario showed a reduction in congestion levels of 16 percent. A major investment in highways showed a 12 percent reduction. The mileage tax, or the "disincentive" scenario would reduce congestion by 10 percent. However, she said, the hybrid scenarios were much better than any of the single-factor scenarios in reducing congestion. The most effective scenario was the one that was most aggressive about expanding transit as well as highways, and included some form of the mileage tax.

Ms. Deerborn said that there was no magic answer to solve all problems, and the best results for all categories considered, such as travel time and truck freight travel time, were from a hybrid solution that included more transit and more highways. Expansion of public transit tended to concentrate jobs in major urban centers, while pulling population to outlying cities. Expanding highways drew both people and jobs to outlying cities.

Ms. Deerborn said that the study had been completed, although it was still under review. Continuing examination of the data was providing additional information. An important aspect for the Forum was to identify policy choices and be clear about finding policies that would help minimize the future impacts of growth on transportation, and to make public recommendations about those. One of the questions was whether an increase in travel time by a little bit, by a little bit more, or by a lot, would result in respondents making different travel choices. Ms. Deerborn referred the Board to more information available on the Livability Forum Web site, and said that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was one of the partners in the study and would be publishing a large report.

Ms. Hocken asked why the funding source that was chosen was cents per mile rather than a gas tax or some other source. Ms. Deerborn said that was done to avoid a gasoline tax, to try to get the issue out of the political arena. It became more of a mileage/usage kind of test. Mr. Melnick commented that a toll road could collect by the mile. Ms. Deerborn added that the study was not focused on finding the right mechanism; it was more about what happened if the cost of driving increased.

Mr. Bennett called a five-minute break, from 6:35 to 6:40 p.m.

**REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING** Mr. Bennett called to order the regular business meeting of the District at 6:40 p.m.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced the April 2001 Employee of the Month, Bus Operator George Day, who was hired in May 1995 and had earned awards for four years of safe driving and three years of correct schedule operation. He also recently received an Accessible Service Award as a result of providing excellent accessible bus service to guests with disabilities. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Day was nominated for this award mainly by his passengers, which showed his ongoing service to LTD's guests. Mr. Johnson said that one of the measures of bus operators was how they handled situations on the bus, and that even when things were not going well, Mr. Day handled them very well, made the ride safe and comfortable, and helped his guests feel good about riding.

Mr. Bennett presented Mr. Day with an Employee of the Month pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award, and thanked him for his excellent service. Mr. Day thanked the Board. He described himself as a people person and said that if he could help someone, it made him feel good to do so. He said he liked to drive and that LTD was a good company to work for.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Mr. Bennett opened the meeting for audience participation.

- (1) Rich Coolman, of 335 Storey Blvd in Eugene, said he was a pediatrician and a Eugene Bicycle Coalition board member who was speaking on behalf of the Crest Drive Citizens Neighborhood Group. He said that he appreciated the difficulty of balancing coverage and productivity in the face of increasing congestion and limited budgets. He also recognized that the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR)

process begun last May had offered many opportunities for people to track what LTD was doing. However, he said, he had been aghast to hear on March 1 that LTD was planning to substitute a high school bus for what had been limited commuter service to the Crest Drive neighborhood. He said he had found nothing in writing on the buses or stops, and only a blank area on the maps at the Eugene Station and on the Web site. He had talked several times with LTD staff members and was told that there would be four trips daily—two to downtown and two to South Eugene High School, compared with the six buses that currently ran downtown. The Crest Drive Citizens urged LTD to further address four important issues: (1) Reexamine the policy that decreased neighborhood coverage in order to maintain corridor frequency. If neighborhoods lost access to the corridors, ridership would decline, auto dependence would rise, and alternative mode share would decrease. He said that TransPlan required that LTD do better, and that the balance should favor neighborhood coverage and efforts to increase ridership. (2) Develop a process to ensure that neighborhoods had input, particularly when their only commuter bus service was being terminated. The buses and stops needed to be posted, and neighborhood groups needed to invite affected households to discuss the issues with LTD. He asked LTD to challenge the neighborhood to reasonably increase their ridership, and questioned why LTD would just abandon service without seeing what the neighborhood might accomplish in partnership. He said that riders who had made location decisions based in part on LTD's service and had demonstrated the ability to reduce their vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) deserved better. (3) Keep the school bus route accessible to adults. He asked why the current plan for 22C excluded commuters and shoppers from half their options by not connecting the school route the extra mile to the Eugene Station. He stated that the mile not traveled could increase LTD's productivity significantly, but might make the difference for whether his neighbors rode the bus or drove. (4) Poll current 22C riders regarding the best transit times. Given the severe cuts in the service currently planned, Crest Drive citizens were requesting that LTD planners try to determine what route times would best meet riders' needs. He thought that a business reply postcard handed out by drivers for a week could accomplish this.

Mr. Bennett asked the other two people who had signed up to speak to wait for the public hearing for their issue. He then closed the public comment period.

**MOTION**            **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the Consent  
**VOTE**            Calendar for March 21, 2001. After seconding, the Consent Calendar was approved unanimously by voice vote, 5 to 0. The Consent Calendar for this meeting consisted of the minutes of the February 21, 2001, regular Board meeting, the March 7, 2001, special Board meeting, and the March 7, 2001, canceled special Board meeting.

**FISCAL YEAR 2001-02 PRICING PLAN AND FIRST READING OF AMENDED FARE ORDINANCE:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson corrected some errors in the agenda materials, including an error on the second page of the draft amended fare ordinance, which listed the current cost for a book of ten RideSource tickets as \$17.50, with a proposed reduction to \$15. She explained that this form of fare had not previously been included in the ordinance, and in an attempt to include it, it was added at the original staff

recommendation of \$17.50. When the staff recommendation was changed to \$15, a strikethrough occurred, making it look like it was reduced. Mr. Kleger called Ms. Hellekson's attention to an error at the top of that same page, where the third sentence referred to a child fare, which should have been changed to "youth." Ms. Hellekson agreed, saying that the intent was to show that there no longer is a difference between a child fare and a youth fare. Those corrections were called to the Board's attention so that the first reading of the ordinance, with these minor changes, could occur that evening.

She stated that another error had occurred the previous month, when only half of the revised Fare Policy had been given to the Board. She offered to bring the entire Fare Policy back to the Board in April and have the Board vote to adopt it at that time.

Ms. Hellekson then discussed the recommended fare changes shown on page 51 of the agenda packet, which also were discussed with the Board the previous month.

Service Planning Manager Andy Vobora presented a related item on the Lane Community College (LCC) term pass, a handout numbered page 54-A. He said this issue was taken to the LTD Finance Committee, and did not appear in the fare ordinance because it was a special fare promotion between LCC and LTD. He explained that LTD had met with LCC student government representatives to discuss the program, and a proposal for next year had resulted. LCC had budgeted the \$135,000 subsidy for next year, and LTD had tried to increase its revenues somewhat to recover the small loss from this year that resulted from how the passes were priced and the number that were made available, while still trying to maximize the number of passes available for students. Staff expected to sell all 7,500 passes during the current year and all 7,200 the following year, and LCC was considering how to make more passes available long-term, especially as summer pass use increased.

Mr. Melnick asked Mr. Vobora to clarify that the student organization at LCC supported this proposal. Mr. Vobora said that it did. He also called the Board's attention to the resolution related to the LCC Term Pass agenda item, requiring separate action.

Mr. Kleger asked to clarify that staff were not proposing changes to the individual pass fares at this time, just the cash fares. Ms. Hellekson said that was correct; however, the Board could make changes to that recommendation. She added that LTD had had good success alternating fare increases, so that the impact was not delivered all at once, without other options for some of the lower-income riders. She explained that LTD had alternated cash fares with pass fares and tokens, so that in each of a three-year cycle, all of them would be addressed. The policy had been revised so that would not necessarily be what LTD would do in the future, but this proposal continued that method of raising fares one more year.

Mr. Melnick asked staff to talk about the discontinuation of the Freedom Pass and how successful that program had been. Mr. Vobora explained that the Freedom Pass had been a very successful program, as a four-month summer pass for youth, during a traditionally low-ridership period for college students. It was a program to add ridership during those months, with the hope of keeping those youth on the buses during the school year. When the Board took action the previous year to reduce the youth fares overall, the

Freedom Pass was discontinued because youth now had the option to buy the discounted monthly pass or a three-month discounted youth pass. Although it was not quite as good a deal for the youth, more youth ridership had carried over into the school year.

**Public Hearing on Fare Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2001-02:** Mr. Bennett opened the public hearing.

- (1) Ed Necker of 173 E. Hatton, Eugene, stated that he was on the Special Transportation Fund (STF) Advisory Committee that had hashed out the recommended RideSource fare increase during three meetings. He said he was thankful that LTD staff had respected the committee's wishes and opinions. He pointed out that the fare had increased on September 1 every year since 1997. This increase would go into effect on July 1, an even shorter period. He said that the term "trying to reach the ADA maximum" was like shooting at a moving target, because as the LTD cash fare increased, so did the maximum. Mr. Necker said that he no longer used the service, but when he first began using it, it cost \$.80. He understood the Board's concerns about revenue and with the service paying for itself in some respects, but he did really appreciate the staff and Board taking the committee's recommendation seriously.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was strong support among the committee members for this recommendation. Mr. Necker said that the recommendation made by staff came second to the committee's decision. The committee made its decision about its recommendation a couple of months before, and then it was brought to their attention that the Board wanted a little higher recovery because it was financially strapped other places, so it was brought up that perhaps one or the other fare could be increased. However, after a long discussion, the committee decided to stay with its original recommendation. He said that somewhere between 60 percent and 80 percent of the current RideSource clientele were over the age of 80. Being on a fixed income and financially limited was an issue for a lot of the RideSource clients. He said that he had been a RideSource volunteer for four years and on the STF committee for five years, ever since he realized that the need was increasing and the funding was decreasing. He repeated that he primarily was there to say thank you.

- (2) Christina Drumm of 3319 Coralee, Eugene, said she was a science teacher at South Eugene High School and a long-time, enthusiastic supporter of public transportation, and would like to continue to be an active supporter, not just a philosophical supporter. She said she rode the bus regularly, although infrequently. She and her husband had made a conscious decision not to purchase a second car because they could make the bus their second form of transportation. She said that they carpoled except for two or three times a week when she took the bus home, which was a one-way trip for her, and also used the bus sometimes as weekend transportation. This had worked out very well, with minor inconveniences now and then. In September, the elimination of the transfer program effectively doubled her fare. It took her two buses to get home from the high school, and she now had to pay twice to get home. Using a day pass did not work for her because she did not ride the bus to get to work. She said that she may be in a minority in using the bus one way only, but she

thought that people in her situation disproportionately took the burden of solving the transfer problem. The rate increase, so soon after that, had concerned her, because people who used the bus by choice rather than as a necessity, who would like to reduce their dependence on a car and the number of miles they have a car on the road, would be pushed back to getting a car. She said she tried to keep a supply of tokens on hand, so she realized that her fare would not increase this year, but knew that it would increase eventually. She said she wanted to keep supporting public transportation and that she liked to be a good model for other people in the community and her students by riding the bus. She asked the Board to consider people in her situation who used the bus by choice, maybe infrequently, and asked that LTD come up with some alternatives for those riders, and perhaps even consider bringing back the transfer.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Vobora to respond. Mr. Vobora said that the information staff had last year was that the number of people who rode round trips who would be penalized by the new day pass system, or who made one-way trips with a transfer, were in the range of 2 percent to 3 percent of the daily rides. It was a small percentage, but when talking about thousands of riders, this number became hundreds of people who could be affected on a daily basis. He said that there were alternatives that staff could look at, such as single-ride transfers. There were some hybrid systems where LTD would not have to go back to the old time-based transfer system, because to rectify this problem, it could be a question of a transfer for the next bus only. Staff would just need to weigh the cost of administration and the benefits of such a change; for instance, whether it would be another instrument the driver would have to issue, or whether it could be the same one modified in some way. He said that there were some districts that did both on one ticket. For the most part, the new system had benefited the District with positive results in increased ridership and the positive response to the use of the day pass.

Mr. Kleger wondered if there currently were arguments about when a day pass expired, compared with the former arguments about when a transfer expired. Mr. Vobora said that there were not. Mr. Kleger said he had noticed the old system being a terrible time-eater for drivers.

Mr. Bennett and other members of the Board asked staff to review this issue and come back to the Board with a recommendation.

- (3) A gentleman in the audience said he would agree with Mr. Necker about how good the bus is. He said about 85 percent to 95 percent of his transportation was by bus. He had two ways of getting places, by foot or by bus, and the bus was a lot better for him than walking.
- (4) Al Good of Jasper said that he received the Board agenda mailings each month. Jasper did not have bus service, but one day he had business in River Road and Eugene, so he decided to try the bus. He drove to the Thurston Station, and thought it was a really good deal to ride all day for a dollar for seniors. An added benefit was that Mr. Day had been one of his drivers.

There was no further comment, so Mr. Bennett closed the public hearing on fares.

**Board Discussion and Decision:** Mr. Kleger observed that there had been a significant increase in operating costs for several different reasons, and LTD needed to find a way to pay for those. The District was at the maximum tax level and could not increase taxes without changing the law at the state level.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger then moved that Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only.  
**VOTE** Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 5 to 0. Mr. Bennett then read the title: "Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services." Extra copies of the ordinance were available for members of the audience.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-011: It is hereby resolved that the Lane Community College Term Bus Pass be priced at \$43 for the 2001-02 school year and that a total of 7,200 passes be made available for sale to students, faculty, and staff." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the  
**VOTE** resolution was adopted unanimously, 5 to 0.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Vobora to respond to the public input regarding route No. 22C. Mr. Vobora replied that the 22C was a commuter route running in the Crest Drive neighborhood, with three commuter trips in the morning and three in the afternoon. It was a coverage-type route with fairly low usage. A couple of the trips had been timed for meets at South Eugene High School, so staff decided to trim back the service to meet high school times plus two commuter trips going to downtown. He thought that the suggestion about running all the trips in and out of the Eugene Station was possible, so staff would review that. Mr. Vobora added that Mr. Coolman's comments about notification were correct in some respects. In some areas, staff did place postings on bus stops and sent direct mail, but this was not comprehensive in all neighborhoods, so he thought the Crest area was something that staff missed. LTD did send information to all neighborhood association presidents so they could be updated on the process throughout, and they were invited to the public open houses. However, because the Crest Drive route was changing, this segment did not show up on the map, so the information was not very clear. Mr. Vobora said that staff could have done a better job of notifying this neighborhood.

Ms. Hocken thought that Mr. Coolman's suggestion to survey the neighborhood or the bus riders seemed like a reasonable suggestion. Mr. Vobora agreed that staff could do this, and said that he would be speaking to the neighborhood association in May about current and future service. He said it was staff's intent to find out which trips were most useful for the neighborhood and try to time that correctly.

Mr. Bennett asked how low the ridership was. Mr. Vobora said that there probably were eight to ten riders on Mr. Coolman's trip. Mr. Coolman said that he rode his bike to work and caught the bus intermittently on the way home. However, his sons both rode to South, and one of his big concerns about the South bus was if it just took them home after school, it might mean that he would have to drive to work in order to pick them up after activities after school. The 5:20 p.m. bus that he rode intermittently usually had at least eight

to ten, if not 15, people on that bus. His sons' buses to school were quite full. Mr. Vobora stated that the high school trips were well used. The commuter routes, on a rides per revenue hour basis, looked pretty good, but that was because they were in service only for a short period while they were taking people home. However, after adding in deadhead time and the fact that these were peak buses, the costs became fairly high, and that is what staff were concerned about, in trying to balance the whole mix.

Mr. Melnick said he was intrigued by the positive challenge to LTD to say what level of ridership would make the route acceptable to LTD's needs, and whether the neighborhood could get to that level within a certain period, such as three or six months. He liked the idea of cooperating with the neighborhood, as well as making it clear that it was not just LTD acting in a certain way, but also the neighborhood's responsibility. Mr. Vobora said that this had been done with routes before, such as the Laurel Hill Valley, which had been very active in door-to-door contact about keeping the ridership at a certain level. He said he felt bad because in some instances, such as the 22C, where staff were trying to provide some skeleton level of coverage, such a low level of service almost doomed the service before it started. He said there had to be some level of frequency to give people the flexibility to stay after school or stay after work, etc., to make it a viable route. That was why staff decided to maintain the school routes, which were the best-used pieces of this service, but it was a difficult decision.

Mr. Hamm added that this was an historical struggle for transit, especially on the outskirts of the urban area. There initially would be big excitement about a route, but when considering what the density of the area could support and the diversity of needs, it became a marginal service application that typically dropped below productivity levels. It became a struggle of how to keep those areas in the mix. By spreading service out, more of the neighborhood may be able to ride, but it still was a poor performer in terms of the investment. It was a difficult decision because staff knew that the need was there, but also had to consider the budget.

Mr. Melnick said he understood this struggle but was wondering if there was any way to revisit this issue. Ms. Hocken said she would support extending the routes to downtown.

**APPROVAL OF MPC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN:** Ms. Gardner called the Board's attention to page 55 of the agenda packet, for the action item relating to the Board's discussion earlier that evening.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-07: Resolved, that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves policy changes for TransPlan as proposed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, and the resolution passed by unanimous vote, 5 to 0.

**VOTE**

Ms. Lauritsen noted that the number of minutes that were allotted to the work session agenda items were listed on the agenda packet, and suggested adding timelines for the regular business portion of the minutes. Mr. Hamm said that staff would take this suggestion under advisement for future meetings.



**LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLAN:** Ms. Hellekson said that this material, found on page 56 of the agenda packet, had been reviewed by the Board Finance Committee on March 7. Essentially, the committee agreed with the approach taken in the agenda materials. A lot of this material was covered in the Board's strategic planning work session in January. The purpose of the Long-range Financial Plan (LRFP) was to identify funding for short- and long-term District plans, to identify circumstances and trends that affect funding, and to affirm the financial goals that support the strategic plan. Ms. Hellekson emphasized that the LRFP focused on the big picture and was subject to change. The Board was being asked to approve a plan as a direction to staff in preparation for adopting a budget for the next fiscal year.

Ms. Hellekson discussed the goals of the LRFP and the assumptions regarding bus rapid transit. The biggest assumption was that of improved, cost-effective, attractive, and productive fixed-route service. As part of this effort, LTD was very involved in the TransPlan update process.

Ms. Hellekson explained that for state planning purposes and for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations, the LRFP had to be a 20-year plan. However, she said she never got into the details after about year 3.5, and because LTD reviewed the LRFP each year, it was pro-forma after five years, and the Finance Committee only looked at the five-year rolling window.

Ms. Hellekson said that staff were assuming that service requirements and capital projects would continue to form the plan framework, that population growth and ridership increases would result in fare revenue increases, and that the preservation of assets would continue to be a high priority for LTD. Staff also were assuming that TEA-21 would be reauthorized and funded. With the most recent census data, LTD would be changing categories from under 200,000 to over 200,000 in population. Staff assumed that this would mean at least \$1 million more in LTD's formula funds. Another assumption was that tax revenue would be stable, but growth would be slow.

Ms. Hellekson said that for the first half of the rolling five-year window, LTD was locked into a labor agreement, with expenses that would be increasing faster than the major source of subsidy. The local capital set-aside would continue one more year, and then would have to be discontinued for awhile in order to avoid damaging the District's core operations. Debt financing was discussed by the Finance Committee, and the Board would be discussing this issue at the April Board meeting. As LTD spent down its reserves in the future, the District's ability to prepay for projects that ultimately would be grant funded could be reduced. Ms. Hellekson briefly listed the projects in the plan, as well as the sources of funding, and stated that it was certain that LTD would be looking at debt.

The most important BRT assumption was that BRT would not increase operating costs, even though there were a lot of unknowns that would be reviewed carefully as the project progressed. Staff also were assuming that BRT would increase ridership. Those two assumptions meant that staff were assuming that BRT would increase productivity and efficiency and decrease the cost per ride, which was an essential part of positioning LTD for the future.

Ms. Hellekson next discussed the history of operating fund revenues and total revenue and expense. She explained that \$3 million had been appropriated in the current operating fund budget to transfer to the capital fund, but only \$1.3 would be transferred, to help reduce the impact of a slowdown in revenues and an increase in personnel expenses. Ms. Hellekson handed out a chart showing operating and capital five-year projections, showing that the transfer to the capital fund disappeared after the following year. She said she was presenting the plan this way to show the Board what the problems and challenges were and where the District would have to look to find solutions, as well as to show that the District was fine for the current and following year. The plan showed that the District would run out of money in year five, but staff would be working hard to ensure that the District did not run out of money.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she knew the reasons for concern, but when she looked for things to cut, she did not find anything. She said she did not want to get into micromanaging, and thought that LTD should charge forward with this plan and stay very optimistic. She said she had a lot of confidence in the debt service that the Finance Committee had discussed, especially when keeping that under tight control and always having repayment financing sources. She thought that the most important thing LTD could do was keep a positive attitude, because she thought BRT would have a positive impact.

Ms. Hocken stated that this plan was a little more optimistic than the one the Finance Committee saw the previous month. She thought that part of the optimism was that the Board knew that staff were looking hard for anyplace where operating costs could be cut, as well as at some new strategies in terms of operating procedures. She thought LTD was in a good enough position for the next two or three years, and at the end of three years would still have \$7.5 million. Ms. Hellekson said that this plan was staff's best attempt to take the Board's message to not cut either capital or operations, and to explain how they were integrated and how they would be expected to be integrated over the next few years. The LRFP maintained the capital list as it was discussed with the Board in January, which meant that it did not compromise any of those priorities.

Ms. Hellekson added that if LTD found alternative funding for Phase 2 of BRT, there would be no budgetary problem. The current scenario assumed that LTD would be paying 50 percent of the cost of Phase 2. If LTD received New Start money or some kind of full-funding agreement, that would make several million dollars available for other local capital projects, or to retain in operations to support expansion of service or other projects. Ms. Lauritsen said it was important to keep looking for ways to tighten the budget, but she thought it already was very good. The real breakthroughs would be in achieving another grant or developing another source of funding.

Mr. Hamm said that every member of the leadership council had spent a significant amount of time looking at every detail of the budget, to justify the expense on every line item and to define the outcome for each investment. Ms. Hellekson added that staff had pared \$800,000 from the budget through this process. Mr. Hamm continued by saying that staff had not just considered this to be this year's walk; it was a long-term walk and staff's responsibility to be good stewards of the public's trust. There were some things occurring

with the implementation of new software that had the potential to improve how work schedules were developed and assigned, with a potential positive impact of several hundred thousand dollars. Staff planned to keep working with the Board to continue to achieve those higher standards.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-008: It is hereby resolved that the proposed Long-range Financial Plan for fiscal years 2001-02 through 2020-21 is approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Melnick said he was impressed by a couple of things. One was the understanding that this was a multi-faceted set of issues and would not be addressed in only one way, and that this was, in the life of LTD, a relatively short-term set of issues that could be overcome. He said he was struck by Ms. Hellekson's comment about BRT, and assumed that the pursuit of funding for Phase 2 was actively underway, because that would allow LTD to not only resolve some serious budget issues, but also to move ahead with BRT in a significant way. Mr. Bennett said that these points were well taken.

**VOTE** There was no further discussion. The resolution was approved unanimously, 5 to 0. Mr. Melnick thanked Ms. Hellekson and the rest of the staff for the clarity of the information.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Ms. Hellekson said that that Board had spent quite a bit of time on this topic at its January strategic planning work session and the list had not changed substantially since that time. She said that more information would be coming about the possible land acquisition for a RideSource facility. The Finance Committee had requested that staff prepare a detailed investment return analysis and distribute that to the committee before the April meeting. The land had been appraised, including demolition of the buildings that were unacceptable for future use, at \$1.3 million. The \$2 million included in this plan would cover both the land acquisition and a facility or the remodeling of the existing office facilities for RideSource. The Special Transportation service at LCOG was applying for an \$800,000 grant from the State of Oregon for the facility. If that grant were successful, LTD's investment could be substantially less than budgeted. LTD also already had \$144,000 in state matching funds, so she thought there was a very good case for the grant. That information would go back to the Finance Committee and would be shared with the full Board after that. Again, she said, the Board would not be adopting anything that evening; rather, it would be approving a plan that would roll into the capital portion of the budget.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-009: It is hereby resolved that the proposed Capital Improvements Program for fiscal years 2001-2001 through 2005-2006 is approved as presented." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unanimously,

**VOTE** 5 to 0. Mr. Bennett thanked Ms. Hellekson for a very good job.

**BOARD HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Bennett called the Board's attention to page 68 of the agenda packet. Mr. Kleger said that the committee reviewed the matter of an increase to the general manager's salary in some

detail, and their proposal was in the agenda packet. He observed that the general manager was the Board's one employee, and that the committee thought that Mr. Hamm had done an outstanding job during the past year, as the Board concluded in its recent evaluation. The committee believed that the positive evaluation needed to be responded to in the conventional way. Mr. Bennett thought that the recommendation was a strong one that should have the Board's support, and asked if it was unanimous among the committee. Mr. Kleger said that it was.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-010: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves a 4 percent merit increase to the general manager's base pay, effective March 27, 2001." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. Mr. Melnick stated that the committee also spent a considerable amount of time on other issues, and urged the Board to read the agenda item. The committee also wanted to look generally at comparative salaries for the District's leadership and other issues that the Committee could help with.

**VOTE** The resolution was then adopted by unanimous vote, 5 to 0.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Board Member Reports:** The Board already had discussed the topics in this report.

**General Manager's Report:** Mr. Hamm informed the Board that Bus Operator Marcie Pope had been accorded the honor of the Year 2000 Employee of the Year at the Employee Appreciation Banquet on March 18. She was overwhelmed with the support from her fellow employees and the pats on the back. He also commented that the banquet was an exceptional team activity and very well received.

**February Financial Statements:** Ms. Hellekson said that staff were slightly more optimistic about the District's year-end position. It appeared that the District would be on budget for payroll tax receipts for the current year, which was very good news. The drop in gas prices also was good news. There was a delay in the implementation of utility cost increases, which could mean a short-term smaller increase and then a much larger increase. She said that staff still were concerned about fares, but were seeing some savings opportunities from the transfer to special transportation services that would help position the District better at year-end, as well. She reminded the Board that the budget meetings would be held in April.

**Bus Rapid Transit Update:** Mr. Viggiano stated that the Springfield Planning Commission had met to discuss BRT the previous evening, and had recommended approval of the Springfield portions of BRT, which included Glenwood, to the Springfield City Council. This meant that the project was one step farther along. BRT was scheduled to be discussed by the Eugene Planning Commission on April 3.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Eugene Planning Commission's public hearing already had occurred. Mr. Viggiano said that it occurred on March 13. He was not present, but he understood that 14 people had testified, providing mixed testimony. Some of the concerns

were about compromising too much and not providing enough exclusive treatment throughout, and that the Phase 1 corridor was not long enough. There was a desire by those people to move ahead with future phases quickly. Four of the seven planning commissioners were present, and they heard the testimony without discussion.

**Springfield Station Update:** Mr. Viggiano said that it appeared that this project was close enough to environmental approval to go ahead with the steps for approval. The FTA had told LTD staff that it had all the information it needed, and staff basically were waiting for a letter giving permission to go ahead with the project. Because of that, staff were suggesting that when discussing BRT Phase 1 with the Springfield City Council, the Council also be asked to approve the Springfield Station site. The Springfield Station Steering Committee had approved the site on the south side of South A between what would be extensions of Pioneer Parkway East and 4<sup>th</sup> Street. After approval by the Springfield City Council, it would come back to the LTD Board for final approval, possibly in May. LTD had some funding but did not have complete funding for the station. The Board would have to decide whether to proceed with land acquisition and design with the funding it had, or to wait until money for the entire project had been allocated.

Mr. Melnick asked about the source of that funding. Mr. Viggiano said that federal funds had been requested, and this had been the highest-priority request on LTD's United Front list of requests. There was strong support from Springfield for this funding.

**Correspondence:** Mr. Hamm pointed out the Downtown Eugene, Inc. (DEI) letter that commended staff for their effort on the BRT project and talked about DEI's support for a BRT project that contributed to the vitality of downtown. The letter made five points that DEI would like to see as part of the objectives: private property should be enhanced and not negatively impacted to the extent possible; pedestrian and vehicle access should be improved by the project; streetscape, landscape, and lighting improvements should be a major part of the project; two-way streets should be encouraged and access to the parking structures on 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue should be improved; and the High Street station should remain on the east side of High Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Hamm said that staff had worked significantly with the 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue group and had an understanding of their interests. He did not think there were any major problems, but had wanted to bring this to the Board's attention and enter it into the record for DEI.

**Monthly Performance Reports:** Mr. Hamm reported that person trips on the bus had increased 7.5 percent from the same year-to-date figures the previous year. There was some improvement in the football and basketball service. Total passenger revenues were just about even, while farebox revenue had increased 12.6 percent. The average passenger fare was down 6.7 percent, so staff were reviewing those issues. Special Transportation Service rides were about even, although the split between providers, SMS and RideSource, was a little different. Another important factor was that fuel costs were up 36 percent. That was a volatile part of the budget that had a huge impact on the bottom line. Staff were looking forward to decreasing some of the District's vulnerability with the possibility of other alternative-powered vehicles in the future.

Ms. Lauritsen thanked staff for the performance report. She asked about ridership for basketball service. Mr. Vobora said that football ridership was different because of the sheer number of spectators. The modal split was higher because of the lack of parking at Autzen Stadium, the cost of parking, the priority lane to exit the stadium, etc. Staff were pleased that basketball ridership was growing, with a significant increase in ridership to women's basketball games, where the modal split was higher than for men's games. He said that staff would have a full report on basketball service following the end of the season.

**Monthly Performance Group Reports:** Mr. Vobora said that there was a shuttle stakeholder meeting the following day. Issues such as the name and color scheme would be determined within the next month. Staff were looking at shelter design and placement, as well. A new business on Country Club Road that probably would be a group pass participant by fall planned to have 300 employees by fall, but only 150 parking spaces. They asked if a Park & Ride could be set up at Valley River Center so their employees could catch the shuttle. Staff were working with the UO regarding the opportunity to run the shuttle through the campus in the evenings, to take people from one side to the other, as well as have better access to the dorm area. The request to make Pearl Street two-way was taking some time. Staff had requested that the State allow a stop on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if commuters would be using the Valley River Center parking spaces on a daily basis, and how VRC felt about that. Mr. Vobora said that the benefit to the shopping center was that there was a great likelihood that people would go into the center to make purchases or get something to eat. Mr. Vobora planned to meet with VRC's new general manager about this in the near future.

Mr. Bennett asked Facilities Services Manager Charlie Simmons if he had anything to report. Mr. Simmons said that his group was focusing on the shuttle project and the shelters. They also were looking at the Thurston Station as part of the capital plan for the next year, so were working with the City of Springfield, ODOT, and Lane County on changes at the Thurston Station.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion. Mr. Bennett adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

---

Board Secretary

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** BOARD POSITION ON REOPENING BROADWAY STREET

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Board member Gerry Gaydos may ask the Board to take a position on the reopening of Broadway Street

**BACKGROUND:** Board member Gerry Gaydos has requested that the Board discuss the reopening of Broadway Street and its impact on LTD and the community. At the April 18 meeting, Mr. Gaydos will provide a written summary of the issues that he would like the Board to consider.

Time has been scheduled during the work session portion of this meeting for this discussion. If the Board chooses to take a position on the reopening of Broadway Street, that should be done during the Items for Action portion of the meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** None at this time

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2001-016: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors \_\_\_\_\_ .

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2001\04\Regular Meeting\Broadway action.doc

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DRAFT – TO GERRY GAYDOS FOR REVIEW 4/09, a.m.**

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** WORK SESSION: BOARD POSITION ON REOPENING OF BROADWAY STREET

**PREPARED BY:** Gerry Gaydos, Board Member

**ACTION REQUESTED:** I request that the Board discuss taking a position on the reopening of Broadway Street in downtown Eugene

**BACKGROUND:** Broadway Street was closed in the early 1970s as part of a movement to create a pedestrian mall in the heart of the city. In 1985 a portion of Willamette Street was reopened to traffic and subsequently the remaining portions of Willamette Street and Olive Street have been reopened. Broadway Street, between Oak and Charnelton Streets, remains the final remnant of the pedestrian mall.

In order to address a problem of building vacancies and continue an effort to increase vitality in downtown, the City of Eugene is examining the re-opening of Broadway Street to vehicular traffic. In their effort to seek input from a variety of perspectives, they have asked for feedback from LTD.

LTD service planning staff have reviewed the opening and have offered the following comments:



1. Opening Broadway Street to vehicular traffic should not affect transit operations if the northbound and southbound movements continue to be unimpeded. Signal or stop delays of one minute or more will have an effect on our ability to maintain transfers during peak travel periods; therefore, the buses need direct and unimpeded travel to the station.
2. The new street should be designed and constructed in a way that accommodates bus travel. This should not be a problem because the streets must meet the operating specifications for fire trucks. LTD does not anticipate operating buses along Broadway at this time; however, there may be possibilities for adding a shuttle to the new federal courthouse and operating on Broadway needs to be an option.
3. The opening would introduce new traffic elements at three intersections where vehicles do not currently operate. In many ways, this creates a safer situation because the intersection activities become more predictable. Currently, these intersections provide for free-flowing pedestrian traffic, which introduces very unpredictable behavior. Standard intersections allow for more predictable behavior.

**RESULTS OF RECOM-****MENDED ACTION:**

If the Board chooses to take a position on the reopening of Broadway street, staff will forward the Board's position to the City of Eugene and will continue to work with City staff regarding specific aspects of a possible street opening.

**ATTACHMENT:**

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2001-0\_\_ : It is hereby resolved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors . . .

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** WORK SESSION: BOARD POSITION ON REOPENING BROADWAY STREET

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Work session discussion on the reopening of Broadway Street

**BACKGROUND:** Board member Gerry Gaydos has requested that the Board discuss the reopening of Broadway Street and its impact on LTD and the community. At the April 18 meeting, Mr. Gaydos will provide a written summary of the issues that he would like the Board to consider.

If the Board chooses to take a position on the reopening of Broadway Street, that should be done during the Items for Action portion of the meeting. Time has been scheduled on the agenda for this purpose.

**ATTACHMENT:** None at this time

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None at this time

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** BRT UPDATE

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

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

**BACKGROUND:** **Environmental Assessment (EA):** Work continues on the preparation of the final draft of the EA. We are targeting completion of the final EA and issuance of a "FONSI" (Finding of No Significant Impact) by June 1, 2001.

**Phase 1 Review and Approval:**

Eugene

- Planning Commission recommended approval on April 3, 2001
- City Council scheduled April 9, 2001, and either May 14 or May 30, 2001

Lane County

- Planning Commission/Roads Advisory Committee recommended approval of the Glenwood "Fast Lane" option on February 20, 2001
- Board of County Commissioners: Meeting not yet scheduled

Springfield

- Planning Commission recommended approval on March 20, 2001
- City Council work session scheduled April 16, 2001 and joint meeting with the LTD Board scheduled for May 14, 2001

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 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 April 18, 2001:

- ◆ Approval of minutes: March 21, 2001, regular Board meeting

**ATTACHMENTS:** (1) Minutes of the March 21, 2001, regular Board meeting

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the Board adopt the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2001-012: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 18, 2001, is approved as presented.



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

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

## **STAFF REPORT: REVIEW OF DAY PASS/TRANSFER PROGRAM**

Prepared by Andy Vobora, Service Planning Manager  
April 18, 2001

### **BACKGROUND**

In September 2000, Lane Transit District eliminated the practice of issuing transfers. Transfers allowed customers to pay one fare and complete their trips using as many buses as necessary to reach their destinations. Issues were raised about the transfer system, which included:

1. Transfers were the single biggest point of contention between bus operators and guests. These confrontations were a result of bus operators needing to view date codes and verify that transfer time had not expired. The all-day pass eliminated these issues because the time feature is clearer and the instrument is easily read.
2. Issuing transfers slowed the boarding process. Because transfers had to be used by guests on their first trips and then again on their return trips, boarding processes were slowed in each direction as operators punched new transfers. Day passes eliminated this issue. Pre-dated passes require only one validation punch by the issuing operator. This benefits the afternoon peak operators the most, which is the period when quick boarding by guests is critical to the system running on time.

A committee comprised of representatives from Service Planning, Finance, Guest Services, and Transit Operations met to review this program and consider possible options for changing it to benefit the guests who are required to pay a higher fare as a result of this system. These people include those who ride only one direction and are required to transfer and those who were able to complete a round-trip within the time allowed when using a transfer. Based on information gathered during the 1999 on-board survey, these guests represent between 2 and 3 percent of LTD's daily trips. The total ranges from approximately 150 to 240 guests. The committee considered the following options:

1. Maintain the current system.
2. Return to the transfer system.
3. Create a combined fare instrument to accommodate both groups.
4. Lower the cash fare.

After a lengthy discussion of the pros and cons of each of these options, the committee unanimously recommended maintaining the current system. All other options introduced levels of complexity for the majority of LTD's guests and operators, or re-introduced the issues that have

been overcome by eliminating the time-based transfer. Besides eliminating the negative issues, the day pass system provides a greater benefit to the majority of guests who pay with cash or tokens. These guests now pay the same amount to ride in two directions, but they receive a fare instrument that allows them to ride an unlimited number of times. Therefore, the committee believes that the current system best meets the needs of the District and the vast majority of its guests at this time.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Adoption of the pricing plan and fare policy affirms the existing day pass system. No separate action is required if the Board concurs with the staff recommendation to continue the current day pass system.

### **RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION**

The existing day pass system will be maintained. Use of the day pass is explained in the Rider's Digest.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001
- ITEM TITLE:** DEBT POLICY
- PREPARED BY:** Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve, by resolution, a debt policy that will govern future financing of revenue vehicles and other capital expenditures.
- BACKGROUND:**
- As the Board knows, it has become increasingly difficult to successfully apply for federal discretionary grant funds to finance LTD projects and capital purchases. LTD staff have been encouraged (and urged) by the Federal Transit Administration and by LTD's Washington, D.C., lobbyists to explore other methods for financing capital projects, particularly purchases that do not have special attributes that might make them more attractive for discretionary funding. Fleet vehicles have been specifically mentioned as good candidates for alternative funding, but other projects may also qualify.
- The possibility of using debt financing has been presented to the Board on several occasions in the past, and the Finance Committee of the Board has reviewed successive drafts of the policy that is here proposed. At the Finance Committee's direction, the attached policy has been referred to the full Board for adoption and implementation. LTD's legal counsel also has reviewed the policy. In fact, the policy is a derivation of sample policies that were provided by the Government Finance Officers' Association, all of which had extensive review and are in use in various United States jurisdictions.
- Adoption of the proposed policy is the first step in a series that will position LTD to obtain desirable, low-cost funding for buses and other capital acquisitions, appropriately manage cash resources, and leverage stable funding sources to assure that capital priorities are addressed. The Board, the Finance Committee, and the new committee formed by the debt policy all will be involved in the future steps necessary to complete any debt issuance. When the FY 2001-02 budget is adopted, the intent to finance by debt will be formalized.
- RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** With the debt policy in place, staff will proceed with steps required to utilize debt to finance future capital expenditures.



**ATTACHMENTS:** Draft Debt Policy  
Resolution

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that LTD Resolution No. 2001-0\_\_, adopting the LTD Debt **Management??** Policy for Lane Transit District, be approved as presented.

**(What will the final title of the debt policy be?)**



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

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

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT RESOLUTION NO. 2001-0\_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ADOPTING REVISIONS TO LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT'S FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, DEBT MANAGEMENT, AND INVESTMENT POLICIES, TO BECOME EFFECTIVE UPON PASSAGE AND APPROVAL

WHEREAS, it is the goal of the District to maintain a long-term stable and positive financial condition; and

WHEREAS, well-planned and prudent financial, debt, and investment management is essential to the achievement of the District's goals; and

WHEREAS, revisions to the current Financial Management, Debt Management, and Investment Policies have been considered;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT IN EUGENE, LANE COUNTY, OREGON:

SECTION 1: THAT the Board of Directors hereby adopts the proposed revisions to the District's Financial Management, Debt Management, and Investment Policies.

ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President and Presiding Officer

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
DRAFT DEBT POLICY  
April 2001**

**PURPOSE**

The Debt Policy sets forth comprehensive guidelines for the financing of capital expenditures. It is the objective of the policy that: (1) the District obtain financing only when necessary; (2) the process for identifying the timing and amount of debt or other financing be as efficient as possible; and (3) the most favorable interest and other costs be obtained.

**USE OF DEBT FINANCING**

Debt financing, to include general obligation bonds, revenue bonds, certificates of participation, lease/purchase agreements, and other obligations permitted to be issued or incurred under Oregon law, shall be used only to purchase revenue rolling stock; purchase or construct related operating equipment; and/or purchase or construct real property, facilities, and other improvements. The useful life of the asset or project shall exceed the payout schedule of any debt the District assumes in order to acquire the asset or project.

**RESPONSIBILITY**

The primary responsibility for developing financing recommendations rests with the Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Finance Manager. No less than annually the CFO/Finance Manager shall prepare for the Board Finance Committee a written report on the status of Capital Improvements Program (CIP) financing. The report shall include a projection of near-term financing needs compared with available resources, an analysis of the impact of contemplated financings on the long-range financial plan and the capital improvements program, and financing recommendations.

In developing financing recommendations, the CFO/Finance Manager shall consider the following:

- Timing of sales, length of time proceeds of obligation remain on hand, and the related carrying cost
- Options for interim financing, including short-term and interfund borrowing, taking into consideration federal and state reimbursement regulations
- Trends in interest rates
- Other factors, as appropriate

The CFO/Finance Manager shall prepare a resolution of intent to issue bonds authorizing staff to proceed with preparations for the consideration of the Board of Directors when the capital budget is presented.

**Bond Counsel Involvement**

The Bond Counsel will issue an opinion as to the legality and tax-exempt status of all obligations. The District also may seek the advice of Bond Counsel on other types of financing and on any other questions involving federal tax or arbitrage law. Bond Counsel also is responsible for the preparation of the resolution authorizing issuance of obligations, all of the closing documents to

complete their sale, and performance of other services as defined by contract approved by the District's Board of Directors.

### **Financial Advisor Involvement**

The District will seek the advice of the Financial Advisor when necessary. The Financial Advisor will advise on the structuring of obligations to be issued, inform the District of various options, advise the District as to how choices will impact the marketability of District obligations, and provide other services as defined by contract approved by the District's Board of Directors. To ensure independence, the Financial Advisor neither will bid on nor underwrite any District debt issues. The Financial Advisor will inform the Finance Manager of significant issues.

## **SHORT-TERM DEBT**

### **General**

Short-term obligations may be issued to finance projects or portions of projects for which the District ultimately intends to issue long-term debt; i.e., it will be used to provide interim financing that eventually will be refunded with the proceeds of long-term obligations. Short-term obligations may be backed with a tax or revenue pledge, or a pledge of other available resources.

### **Interim**

Interim financing may be appropriate when long-term interest rates are expected to decline in the future. In addition, some forms of short-term obligations can be obtained more quickly than long-term obligations and, thus, can be used in emergencies until long-term financing can be obtained. In some cases when the amount of financing required in the immediate future is relatively small, it may be more cost effective for the District to issue a small amount of short-term obligations to provide for its immediate needs than to issue a larger amount of long-term obligations to provide financing for both immediate and future needs when the carrying costs of issuing obligations that are not immediately needed are taken into account.

### **Line of Credit**

With the approval of the Board of Directors, the District may establish a tax-exempt line of credit with a financial institution selected through a competitive process. Draws shall be made on the line of credit when (1) the need for financing is so urgent that time does not permit the issuance of long-term debt, or (2) the need for financing is so small that the total cost of issuance of long-term debt, including carrying costs of debt proceeds not needed immediately, is significantly higher. Draws will be made on the line of credit to pay for projects designated for line-of-credit financing by the Board of Directors. Only projects that ultimately will be financed with the proceeds of authorized bonds may be so designated.

Borrowings under the line of credit shall be retired with the proceeds of long-term debt. Interest on borrowings will be repaid from current revenues. A takeout agreement or alternate financing source will be provided for additional security in addition to the tax or revenue pledge.

Additionally, a line of credit may be established to fulfill bond covenant requirements for a reserve fund when permitted under applicable ordinances and when it is cost beneficial to do so.

## **LONG-TERM DEBT**

### **General**

Long-term obligations will not be used for operating purposes, and the life of the obligations will not exceed the useful life of the projects financed. Debt service structure will approximate level debt service unless operational matters dictate otherwise. The District will strive to limit its annual issuance of long-term obligations to either \$5 million or \$10 million to take advantage of small-issuer exemptions in the federal arbitrage laws. Should subsequent changes in the law raise these limits, then the District's policies will be adjusted accordingly.

The cost of issuance of private activity bonds usually is higher than for governmental purpose bonds. Consequently, private activity bonds will be issued only when they will economically benefit the District. The cost of taxable debt is higher than for tax-exempt debt. However, the issuance of taxable debt is mandated in some circumstances and may allow valuable flexibility in subsequent contracts with users or managers of the improvement constructed with the bond proceeds. Therefore, the District usually will issue tax-exempt obligations but occasionally may issue taxable obligations.

### **Bonds**

Long-term general obligation or revenue bonds shall be issued to finance significant capital improvements for purposes set forth by the Board of Directors. Bonds will have an average life of not more than the average useful life of the rolling stock or facility being financed or 20 years, whichever is less. The structure should approximate level debt service for both general obligation and revenue bonds.

Call provisions for bond issues shall be made as short as possible, consistent with the lowest interest cost to the District. When possible, all bonds shall be callable only at par.

When cost-beneficial and when permitted under applicable ordinances, the District may consider the use of surety bonds, lines of credit, or similar instruments to satisfy reserve requirements.

For the District to issue new revenue bonds, revenues, as defined in the resolution authorizing the revenue bonds in question, shall be a minimum of 125 percent of the average annual debt service and 110 percent of the debt service for the year in which requirements are scheduled to be the greatest, but should be maintained at 150 percent of the maximum annual debt service for financial planning purposes. Annual adjustments to the District's rate structure will be made as necessary to maintain a 150 percent coverage factor.

### **Negotiated versus Competitive Sale versus Private Placement**

When feasible and economical, obligations shall be issued by competitive rather than negotiated sale. Whenever the option exists to offer an issue either for competition or for negotiation, analysis of the options shall be performed to aid in the decision-making process. When a sale is not competitively bid, the District publicly will present the reasons and will participate with the Financial Advisor in the selection of the underwriter or direct purchaser.

When cost-beneficial, the District may privately place its debt. Private placement sometimes is an option for small issues. The opportunity may be identified by the Financial Advisor.

### **Bidding Parameters**

The notice of sale will be constructed carefully so as to ensure the best possible bid for the District, in light of existing market conditions and other prevailing factors. Parameters to be examined include the following:

- Limits between lowest and highest coupons
- Coupon requirements relative to the yield curve
- Method of underwriter compensation: discount or premium coupons
- Use of true interest cost (TIC) versus net interest cost (NIC)
- Use of bond insurance
- Deep discount bonds
- Variable rate bonds
- Call provisions

### **REFUNDING**

The District shall consider refunding debt whenever an analysis indicates the potential for present value savings of approximately 5 percent of the principal being refunded or at least \$200,000. The District will not refund less than 5 percent of its outstanding debt at one time except in unusual circumstances such as when it intends to change bond covenants.

Private activity bonds may be refunded in a current refunding only.

### **CAPITAL LEASING**

Capital leasing is an option for the acquisition of a piece or package of equipment costing less than \$500,000.

Whenever a lease is arranged with a private sector entity, a tax-exempt rate shall be sought. Whenever a lease is arranged with a government or other tax-exempt entity, the District shall strive to obtain an explicitly defined taxable rate so that the lease will not be counted in the District's total annual borrowings subject to arbitrage rebate.

The lease agreement shall permit the District to refinance the lease at no more than reasonable cost should the District decide to do so. A lease that can be called at will is preferable to one that merely can be accelerated.

Since the market for lease financings is relatively inefficient, the interest rates available at any one time may vary widely. Therefore, the District shall obtain at least three competitive proposals for any major lease financing. The net present value of competitive bids shall be compared, taking into account whether payments are in advance or in arrears and how frequently payments are made. The purchase price of equipment shall be bid competitively, as well as the financing cost.

The advice of the District's Bond Counsel shall be sought in any leasing arrangement and when federal tax forms 8038 are prepared to ensure that all federal tax laws are obeyed.

The District may consider issuing certificates of participation to finance a very large project. Care should be taken because financing costs may be greater than for other types of financing.

### **OTHER TYPES OF FINANCING**

From time to time, other types of financing may become available. Examples of these options are debt pools with other entities and low-interest loans from state agencies. The Finance Manager will prepare a written analysis of such options. This report will include consideration of the advice of the District's Bond Counsel and Financial Advisor.

### **OFFICIAL STATEMENT**

The Official Statement is the disclosure document prepared by or on behalf of the District for an offering of securities.

#### **Responsibility**

The preparation of the Official Statement is the responsibility of the Finance Manager. Information for the Official Statement is gathered from departments/divisions throughout the District.

#### **Timing**

The Finance Manager or designee will begin assembling the information needed to update the Official Statement in October or as soon as the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the preceding June 30 year-end is complete. Capital budget information from the current-year budget process will be included. After all information has been gathered and assembled, it will be held for the next anticipated bond sale. If the next anticipated bond sale is expected to be more than seven months after fiscal year-end, then the prior year's audited financial statement information must be updated using unaudited figures.

#### **Auditor's Involvement**

The District will include a review of its Official Statement in the contract for services with its external auditor.

### **RATINGS**

The District's goal is to establish and maintain a respectable bond rating. Toward that end, prudent financial management policies will be adhered to in all areas.

Full disclosure of operations shall be made to the bond rating agencies. The District staff, with the assistance of the Financial Advisors and Bond Counsel, will prepare the necessary materials for a presentation to the rating agencies.

The District shall maintain lines of communication with the rating agencies (Moody's, Standard and Poor's, and Fitch), informing them of major financial events in the District as they occur. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report shall be distributed to the rating agencies after it has been accepted by the Board of Directors.

The rating agencies also will be notified either by telephone or through written correspondence when the District begins preparation for a debt issuance. After the initial contact, a formal ratings application will be prepared and sent along with the draft of the Official Statement relating to the bond sale to the rating agencies. This application and related documentation should be sent several weeks prior to the bond sale to give the rating agencies sufficient time to perform their review.

A personal meeting with representatives of the rating agencies will be scheduled as needed upon the recommendations of the Financial Advisor.

### **CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS**

Credit enhancements are mechanisms that guarantee principal and interest payments. They include bond insurance and a line or letter of credit. A credit enhancement, while costly, will usually bring a lower interest rate on debt and a higher rating from the rating agencies, thus lowering overall costs.

During debt issuance planning, the Financial Advisor will advise the District whether or not a credit enhancement is cost effective under the circumstances and what type of credit enhancement, if any, should be purchased. In a negotiated sale, bids will be taken during the period prior to the pricing of the sale. In a competitive sale, bond insurance may be provided by the purchaser if the issue qualifies for bond insurance.

### **CONTINUING DISCLOSURE**

The District is committed to continuing disclosure of financial and pertinent credit information relevant to the District's outstanding securities and will abide by the provisions of Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Rule 15c2-12 concerning primary and secondary market disclosure.

The CFO/Finance Manager will be designated "Compliance Officer" for disclosure requirements.

Copies of CAFR and updated tables from the Official Statement are submitted to nationally recognized municipal information depositories (NRMSIRs) and state information depositories (SIDs) within six months of fiscal year-end.

### **ARBITRAGE LIABILITY MANAGEMENT**

It is the District's policy to minimize the cost of arbitrage rebate and yield restriction while strictly complying with the law.

#### **General**

Federal arbitrage legislation is intended to discourage entities from issuing tax-exempt obligations unnecessarily. In compliance with the spirit of this legislation, the District will not issue obligations except for identifiable projects with very good prospects of timely initiation.



### **Responsibility**

Because of the complexity of arbitrage rebate regulations and the severity of noncompliance penalties, the advice of Bond Counsel and other qualified experts will be sought whenever questions about arbitrage rebate regulations arise.

### **Internal Interim Financing**

In order to defer the issuance of obligations, when sufficient nonrestricted reserve funds are on hand, consideration shall be given to appropriating them to provide interim financing for large construction contracts or parts of contracts. When the appropriations subsequently are refinanced with the proceeds of obligations or other resources, the nonrestricted reserve funds shall be repaid. When expenditures are reimbursed from debt issuances, applicable state law and the Internal Revenue Service rules on reimbursements will be complied with so that the reimbursements may be considered expenditures for arbitrage purposes. Requirements in general are as follows:

- The District shall declare its intention to reimburse an expenditure with debt proceeds before paying the expenditure and will exclude costs such as design and engineering fees or cost of issuance;
- Reimbursement bonds must be issued and the reimbursement made within one year after the expenditure was made or the property financed by the expenditure was placed in service, whichever is later; and
- The expenditure to be reimbursed must be a capital expenditure.

### **MODIFICATION TO POLICIES**

These policies will be reviewed annually by the Debt Management Committee and significant changes may be made with the approval of the Board Finance Committee. Significant policy changes will be presented to the Board of Directors for confirmation.

Date Adopted:

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

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

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **MAY 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Bus Operator Steve Hoisington has been selected as the May 2001 Employee of the Month. Steve was hired on October 18, 1978, and has earned awards for 20 years of safe driving, 22 years of correct schedule operation (CSO), and exceptional attendance. In 2000, he also earned an accessible service award for excellence in service to persons with disabilities. Steve has received many nominations for Employee of the Month, and previously was chosen as the May 1984 Employee of the Month. This time he was nominated by his evaluating supervisor, who said that Steve is a quiet guy who goes out of his way to help his guests, provides a smooth and safe ride, and has excellent safety and attendance records. She added that Steve is an asset to the District and that honoring him a second time as Employee of the Month was way past due.

When asked to provide an additional statement about what makes Steve a good employee, Field Supervisor Marylee Bohrer said:

Steve is a great person, and he really cares about providing service excellence. He has received CSO commendations for 22 consecutive years, and his guests know they can count on him to be at their stops on time. Steve is friendly, dependable, and well liked by all. He likes the changes and growth he has seen at the District, and is looking forward to what the future holds at LTD. Steve is a true professional and proud to be a part of LTD, and we are proud of him. Congratulations for an award long overdue!

Our congratulations to Steve on his selection!

**AWARD:** Steve will attend the April 18, 2001, meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 2000

**PREPARED BY:** Joyce Ziemiak, Human Resources Specialist

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **YEAR 2000 EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR:** The selection of Bus Operator Marcie Pope as LTD's 2000 Employee of the Year was announced at the March 18 Employee Appreciation Banquet. Marcie was selected for this award in recognition of her dedication to providing excellent service to LTD's guests, her team-oriented efforts with her co-workers, and the extra effort she always puts forward to make LTD a very special place to work. She previously was the Employee of the Month in February 1997. She has earned awards for eight years of correct schedule operation and four years of safe driving.

Marcie was selected as the November 2000 Employee of the Month after being nominated by many of her coworkers, who appreciate her wonderful sense of team spirit and the extra effort she always puts forth.

Marcie originally was hired by LTD for the position of coin counter in July 1990. She became a bus operator in July 1992. During her career at LTD she also worked as a temporary supervisor for two years, and for the past five years has volunteered to be a transportation coordinator (TC) for the Oregon Country Fair, Lane County Fair, Joy Ride, men's and women's University of Oregon basketball games, and UO football games.

When asked what makes Marcie a good employee, System Supervisor Gene Shaw mentioned her willingness to help out wherever she can and her service "above and beyond" as a TC for football service. She was given the responsibility for TC assignments and arranging their work schedules, and accomplished everything that was asked of her, and more. In addition, she organizes operator potlucks, decorates the lounge, and is responsible for the cleanup. He offered his congratulations for a job well done.

Field Supervisor Gary Taylor added that Marcie always has volunteered to help with any and all LTD special events, as well as donating her time

to the United Way campaign and assisting with LTD picnics. She takes special pride in decorating the operators' lounge with a different theme for each football game, makes sure the potluck is set up so that all the employees have a wonderful time eating and enjoying the game between pre- and post-game service, and then ensures that the lounge and kitchen are clean afterward. He described her as a real team player with LTD.

When asked about Marcie, Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson responded: "Marcie has unmatched professionalism, a golden attitude and unbelievable energy. Her organizational skills and leadership abilities are incredible. She served LTD well over the past year as the lead transportation coordinator, overseeing football and other special events. I have been impressed with her in all aspects of her work, including the excellent demeanor she has while performing her regular duties as a bus operator. My hat is off to her and her ability to be an outstanding employee and an asset to LTD."

**AWARD:**

Marcie received her award at the March 18 Employee Appreciation Banquet. She will be introduced at the April 18, 2001, Board meeting.

# 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, an informational presentation to the Board and a public hearing are held. 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. *When making recommendations for changes to the fare, staff 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.*

Deleted: ,

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.*
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.

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 a discount that is reviewed annually 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.*

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.

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.

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

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.

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

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.

11. *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.

- 12. *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.

- 13. *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.

- 
- ATTACHMENTS: FARE MEDIA DONATIONS GUIDELINES  
FARE DISCOUNTS (PRIVATE NON-PROFIT AGENCY PROGRAM) GUIDELINES  
SSI RECIPIENT DISCOUNTS GUIDELINES  
WHOLESALE DISCOUNTS GUIDELINES  
GROUP PASS PROGRAM GUIDELINES

REVISED: 4/18/01



## Fare Media Donations

---

### **OBJECTIVE**

The District offers fare discounts for purposes of joint marketing promotions and to support community activities. Donations will occur in the form of fare media and gift certificates. Examples include, gift certificate to local school fundraising events and the donation of bus passes to organizations, such as Mobility International, that host delegates who come to our community to learn about accessibility.

### **APPLICATION**

The following guidelines apply to all fare media donations.

### **PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

Donations of both fare media and gift certificates will be handled through LTD Guest Services. Any community group may request a donation. The LTD Marketing Manager or the Guest Services Supervisor will review the request and determine the benefit to the District. Upon approval, the Guest Service Supervisor will prepare a gift certificate or instruct Guest Services staff to issue the appropriate fare media. Authorization for free fare media must be given in writing (email), by the Guest Services Supervisor or an LTD manager. Requests for fare media to be used for internal employee displays may be authorized by an LTD Marketing Representative.

### **MAINTENANCE**

The Marketing Manager is responsible for a semi-annual report of donations. This report will be forwarded to the LTD General Manager for review.

## **Fare Discounts**

### **Private Non-profit Agency Program**

---

#### **OBJECTIVE**

The District offers private non-profit agencies the opportunity to purchase LTD fare media at a 50 percent discount. This discount is granted in recognition of a community need for transportation services for individuals and families who are working with these agencies to seek employment, housing, and medical services.

#### **APPLICATION**

This policy applies to any private non-profit (501-3-c) agency who wishes to purchase fare media from LTD.

#### **PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

Eligibility determination is conducted through the United Way of Lane County. Agencies wishing to participate may complete the necessary application at the local United Way office. Upon successful certification, agency staff may call LTD Guest Services to place a fare media order.

Agencies are eligible for a 50 percent discount toward the purchase of \$300.00 of fare media per month. In order to maintain the purchasing power of the agencies, the \$300.00 maximum will adjust annually as LTD increases fares.

In order to fill the gap for individuals and families who are not connected with a local agency, LTD will donate \$300.00 of fare media per month to Catholic Community Services. This amount is set and will not be adjusted annually.

#### **MAINTENANCE**

The Guest Services Supervisor is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to this policy. A semi-annual report of program use will be produced by the Guest Services Supervisor and will be forwarded to the LTD General Manager for review.

## SSI Recipient Discounts

---

### OBJECTIVE

The District offers a reduced fare monthly pass price to Social Security Insurance recipients. This program recognizes that there are individuals in our community who do not qualify for reduced fare status based solely on their disability, but who are mentally disabled and are receiving SSI payments.

### APPLICATION

This policy applies to all individuals who are SSI recipients and who are not eligible for reduced fare certification based upon the need for specialized training or special accommodation for a physical disability.

### PROGRAM GUIDELINES

LTD offers a 50 percent discount on the purchase of adult monthly passes to individuals who are SSI recipients and who are working with a case worker at Senior and Disabled Services. Qualification is determined by SDS case workers, who have evaluated their clients according to the LTD reduced fare certification guidelines, and have determined they do or do not qualify for reduced fare status. SDS staff forwards a list of qualified clients to LTD Guest Services on a monthly basis. This list is used by Guest Services staff to process the sales of the discounted passes.

### MAINTENANCE

The Guest Services Supervisor is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to the SSI discount program. An annual report of SSI pass sales will be prepared by the Guest Services Supervisor and forwarded to the General Manager for review.

## Wholesale Discounts

---

### OBJECTIVE

The District offers private retail sales outlets and public agencies a wholesale discount on the purchase of fare media. This discount recognizes that these organizations play an important role in the distribution of fare media to LTD customers.

### APPLICATION

This policy applies to all private retail outlets that LTD chooses to contract with for the sales of fare media. All public agency purchases will be issued according to the same discount structure.

### PROGRAM GUIDELINES

LTD offers a 10 percent discount on the purchase of fare media for private retail sales outlets and public agencies who purchase fare media for their customers and clients. All tokens are pre-purchased by the organizations, while monthly passes will be consigned.

### MAINTENANCE

The Guest Services Supervisor is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to the wholesale discount program.

---

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

## GROUP PASS PROGRAM

---

### OBJECTIVES

A Group Pass Program is one in which the cost of transit fares is shared by a group. All persons within the group receive the transit benefit whether or not they actually use the service. The employer enters into an annual contract for services with LTD. In this way, the cost per person for the service is significantly reduced, and ridership within the group can be expected to increase significantly.

Group pass programs attempt to:

1. Increase ridership and ridership productivity (rides per service hour);
2. Maintain or increase the farebox to operating cost ratio; and
3. Decrease the cost per trip.

The establishment of these programs is based on the premise that increased use of transit, as a replacement to the single-occupancy vehicle, is a goal established by our community because it will provide numerous benefits. In order to meet that goal, LTD should aggressively pursue fiscally responsible programs that increase use of the bus, particularly in areas with traffic congestion, parking or air quality problems, or where there is a transportation need that can be effectively addressed with public transit.

### APPLICATION

The following guidelines apply to all group pass programs established by the District.

### PROGRAM GUIDELINES

#### *Qualifying Organizations*

The District will consider any organization, public or private, for a group pass program if it:

1. Includes at least 10 individuals
2. Is financially capable and legally empowered to enter into a contract with LTD and meet the financial obligations dictated by that contract. The group pass program will apply to all members in the organization.
3. LTD will consider qualifying organizations on a first-come/first-served basis, only if LTD has the service and equipment capacity to serve that organization.

#### *Pricing*

Revenue from organizations that participate in the group pass programs will be computed according to whether or not an organization contributes to the LTD payroll tax and to group size. All organizations participating in the group pass program will provide revenue that meets the following two criteria:

1. A base rate per employee per month will be levied on individuals within the organization. The base rate will be increased annually by the rolling average of operating costs realized by the District. The base rates are:  

Taxpayers -	\$3.00 per employee per month
Non Taxpayers -	\$3.50 per employee per month

Rates effective January 1, 2002
2. The cost of additional service that is instituted by the District to directly respond to increased ridership resulting from the group pass program

*Term of the Contract*

Contracts will normally be for a one-year period, with annual renewals. Yearly evaluation, at a level appropriate for the size of the organization, is to be conducted of each group pass program prior to renewing the contract to determine if the pricing criteria are still being satisfied.

Whenever possible, the District will seek to have the group pass programs institutionalized in order to reduce the possibility of programs becoming discontinued from one year to the next. This is obviously of greatest concern with the larger group pass programs, which require significant capital and operational investment and expenditures.

*Operational Issues*

Group pass participants are to have photo identification that is easily verified by the bus driver. The photo identification may be either the organization's, in which case it must have an LTD validating sticker, or issued by the District. In either case, the cost of issuing the photo identification will be borne by the organization. Participating organizations will be responsible for administering the program within their organizations.

*Marketing*

The District will provide trip planning assistance for the individuals of a group pass organization. Marketing of the service to individuals of a group pass organization will be conducted where it is determined to have a significant impact on ridership.

**MAINTENANCE**

The Service Planning Manager is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to this program.

## MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

April 18, 2001

### Revenue:

- **Passenger fares** are below budget for the first nine months, and also below the same period in the last fiscal year. Year-end shortfalls versus budget likely are to be in the \$300,000 range. 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 since. 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 February. 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 below budget year-to-date, and efforts have been made to maintain the savings through the remainder of the current fiscal year.
- **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 \$100,000 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 months, the projected budget deficit also has come down and likely will 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:** March 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. **Budget Committee Meetings:** An informational meeting for the seven non-Board members of the LTD Budget Committee has been scheduled for April 4, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. Budget deliberation meetings for the full Budget Committee have been scheduled for Wednesday, April 25; Thursday, April 26; and Wednesday, May 2, 2001, all beginning at 6:30 p.m.
- B. **Approval of LTD Debt Policy:** A debt policy will be placed on the agenda for Board adoption at the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting.
- C. **Springfield Station Site Selection:** The Board will be asked to make a final site decision after site approval by the Springfield City Council, possibly in May or June 2001.
- D. **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 May or June of 2001.
- E. **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.
- F. **Resolution Reaffirming District Boundaries:** State law requires that the District annually determine the territory in the District within which the transit system will operate. This resolution will be scheduled for the June 20, 2001, Board meeting.



- G. **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.
- H. **BRT Updates:** Various action and information items will be placed on Board meeting agendas during the design and implementation phases of the bus rapid transit project.



# LTD General Manager's Report

## April, 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**

#### United Front

The United Front team was in Washington, DC, 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 Springfield Planning Commission met March 20<sup>th</sup> and voted 6-0 to recommend BRT approval to the City Council, including the "Fast Lane" option through Glenwood.

The Eugene Planning Commission met April 3rd and endorsed BRT, provided a number of issues are addressed. Those issues went to the City of Eugene Council meeting April 9. Generally, ECC supports BRT. There are strings that they would like to attach to the project. Within the City's jurisdiction, they would like to see a commitment to 80 percent exclusive right-of-way. They would like language in an intergovernmental agreement that commits LTD to full build-out of BRT if funding is available. Staff are working through the issues.

#### RideSource Transition

I made a presentation at the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board Meeting on March 22<sup>nd</sup> regarding the transition of RideSource administration to LTD. There was significant support for it, especially from some of the rural towns. The position LTD has been compensating LCOG for since RideSource's inception is integrated into the 2001-02 LTD budget. Terry Parker will join LTD's employee team effective July 1, 2001.

Shuttle Buses

Delivery of the hybrid electric buses from AVS has been pushed back to late June. We have informed them that it is critical that the June date not slide any further. Staff are working on naming the shuttle, graphics, and promotional activities.

Other External Activities

- March 22 Eugene/LTD BRT Policy Committee meeting
- March 23 SEL Meeting (Springfield, Eugene, Lane County, LCOG, LTD Execs)
- April 4 Eugene City Manager Jim Johnson and Police Chief Jim Hill re: EPD Sub-Station at LTD's Eugene Station  
Kathy Wiltz - CMWK
- April 6 SEL Meeting
- April 10 Oregon Transit Association Board of Directors meeting
- April 13 Local CEO Meeting (UO, LCC, school districts, cities, county, EWEB, LTD, LCOG)
- April 16 Meeting with ATU in Portland re: contracting engine rebuilds
- Saturdays Follies Rehearsals – program on April 20

**Internal Activities**

Budget

The budget document is almost complete. Those non-Board members of LTD's Budget Committee met for a briefing on April 4. The full committee will meet the evenings of April 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> to review the entire budget proposal. As previously announced, staff continue to focus on efficiency and productivity as this fiscal year closes and a new one begins.

Continued Reorganization

The Transit Operations Department will transition to a new organizational model on June 1. Previously, Operations had systems supervisors and field supervisors. They will now have one group of Operations supervisors who focus on operator relations, guest service, on-time performance, emergency response, and more. Part of the restructuring includes assigning all activities at Eugene Station to a downtown services administrator.

Other Internal Activities

- March 23 Employee meeting re: policy proposals
- March 28-30 Vacation – Landscaping my back yard
- April 9 New Starts staff discussion
- April 11 United Front debriefing

# Group Pass Program

## **OBJECTIVE**

A Group Pass Program is one in which the cost of transit fares is shared by a group. All persons within the group receive the transit benefit whether or not they actually use the service. The employer enters into an annual contract for services with LTD. In this way, the cost per person for the service is significantly reduced, and ridership within the group can be expected to increase significantly.

Group pass programs attempt to:

1. Increase ridership and ridership productivity (rides per service hour);
2. Maintain or increase the farebox to operating cost ratio; and
3. Decrease the cost per trip.

The establishment of these programs is based on the premise that increased use of transit, as a replacement to the single-occupancy vehicle, is a goal established by our community because it will provide numerous benefits. In order to meet that goal, LTD should aggressively pursue fiscally responsible programs that increase use of the bus, particularly in areas with traffic congestion, parking or air quality problems, or where there is a transportation need that can be effectively addressed with public transit.

## **APPLICATION**

The following guidelines apply to all group pass programs established by the District.

## **PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

### *Qualifying Organizations*

The District will consider any organization, public or private, for a group pass program if it:

1. Includes at least 10 individuals
2. Is financially capable and legally empowered to enter into a contract with LTD and meet the financial obligations dictated by that contract. The group pass program will apply to all members in the organization.
3. LTD will consider qualifying organizations on a first-come/first-served basis, only if LTD has the service and equipment capacity to serve that organization.

### *Pricing*

Revenue from organizations that participate in the group pass programs will be computed according to whether or not an organization contributes to the LTD payroll tax and to group size. All organizations participating in the group pass program will provide revenue that meets the following two criteria:

1. A base rate per employee per month will be levied on individuals within the organization. The base rate will be increased annually by the rolling average of operating costs realized by the District. The base rates are:

Taxpayers - \$3.00 per employee per month

Non Taxpayers - \$3.50 per employee per month

Rates effective January 1, 2002

2. The cost of additional service that is instituted by the District to directly respond to increased ridership resulting from the group pass program

#### *Term of the Contract*

Contracts will normally be for a one-year period, with annual renewals. Yearly evaluation, at a level appropriate for the size of the organization, is to be conducted of each group pass program prior to renewing the contract to determine if the pricing criteria are still being satisfied.

Whenever possible, the District will seek to have the group pass programs institutionalized in order to reduce the possibility of programs becoming discontinued from one year to the next. This is obviously of greatest concern with the larger group pass programs, which require significant capital and operational investment and expenditures.

#### *Operational Issues*

Group pass participants are to have photo identification that is easily verified by the bus driver. The photo identification may be either the organization's, in which case it must have an LTD validating sticker, or issued by the District. In either case, the cost of issuing the photo identification will be borne by the organization. Participating organizations will be responsible for administering the program within their organizations.

#### *Marketing*

The District will provide trip planning assistance for the individuals of a group pass organization. Marketing of the service to individuals of a group pass organization will be conducted where it is determined to have a significant impact on ridership.

### **MAINTENANCE**

The Service Planning Manager is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to this program.



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** LTD MISSION STATEMENT AND VISION

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Board adopt the revised LTD Vision and Mission Statement as discussed with the Board at the January 2001 strategic planning work session

**BACKGROUND:** Healthy organizations periodically assess where they are and what their direction should be for the future. This is a new time for LTD. LTD has very dynamic and aggressive capital and operating programs targeted at the immediate and distant future. It is a time for unity and commitment to an understandable vision and mission. It is a time for cementing the character of the Team LTD philosophy through core values and guiding principles.

Initially drafted at the Leadership Council's fall retreat, discussed and revised at the Board's January strategic work session, and discussed and revised at employee meetings, this document represents the heart and soul of LTD. The Board, management, and employees of LTD do not want to be "just another bus company." LTD should be the model other transit systems emulate. We are committed to being industry leaders in performance, innovation, partnerships, organizational strategies, operating practices, and more.

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** An easy to understand, easy to commit to vision and mission that define LTD's future for its public, governing board, and staff

**ATTACHMENT:** Revised LTD Mission Statement and Vision

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2001-015: Be it resolved that the LTD Board of Directors hereby adopts the revised LTD Mission and Vision Statement as presented by staff on April 18, 2001.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001
- ITEM TITLE:** SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF AMENDED FARE ORDINANCE
- PREPARED BY:** Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Hold the second reading of Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, which sets fares for Fiscal Year 2001-2002, and then adopt the revised ordinance.
- BACKGROUND:** Public hearings on the proposed fare structure for FY 2001-02 were held at the February and March 2001 Board meetings. In February, staff were directed to make the following changes to District fare structure:
1. Increase the adult cash fare from \$1.00 to \$1.25 effective July 1, 2001
  2. Increase the youth cash fare and reduced price cash fare from \$.50 to \$.60 effective July 1, 2001
  3. Increase the day pass price from \$2.00 to \$2.50 effective July 1, 2001
  4. Increase the price charged for group pass programs by 4.1 percent effective January 1, 2002
  5. Increase the price of the *RideSource* and *RideSource* Escort fares from \$1.75 to \$2.00 per one-way trip effective July 1, 2001
- The fare changes must be implemented by ordinance. The first such ordinance, Ordinance No. 35, was adopted in June 1992. This will be the tenth amendment to Ordinance No. 35. The first reading of Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 was held on March 21, 2001. The second reading and adoption of the ordinance are scheduled for the April 18 Board meeting. The Board can elect to read the ordinance by title only. Staff will have additional copies of the ordinance available for anyone in the audience who desires a copy.
- CONSEQUENCES OF REQUESTED ACTION:** Following adoption, a copy of Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 will be filed with the County Clerk and made available for public inspection. Fare information will be updated in the District's informational materials.



**ATTACHMENTS:**

- (1) Pricing Plan
- (2) Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services

**PROPOSED MOTIONS:**

- (1) I move that Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only.

(Following an affirmative vote, the ordinance title should be read:  
**Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services.**)

- (2) I move the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2001-014: Be it resolved that the LTD Board of Directors hereby adopts Lane Transit District Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services.



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

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

## **MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORTS**

April 18, 2001

### **GENERAL MANAGEMENT GROUP**

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

#### **WASHINGTON, D.C., TRIP**

During the past five weeks, the nation's capital has seen several Lane Transit District representatives. Ken Hamm and Linda Lynch attended the legislative conference of the American Public Transportation Association and Stefano Viggiano attended the BRT Consortium meeting. Board president Hillary Wylie, Board member Gerry Gaydos, Linda Lynch, and Mark Pangborn spent three days lobbying a variety of local issues in addition to LTD's. They were part of the annual local coalition of the cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, and Springfield School District.

During these trips we had the opportunity to meet with:

- both Senator Smith and Senator Wyden
- all their staff members who work on local issues
- Congressman DeFazio and all of his staff
- Congressman Walden (very briefly) and his legislative director
- Staff from the offices of the rest of the Oregon House delegation
- Appropriations and other committee staff
- White House Intergovernmental Relations staff
- Administration staff from a variety of federal agencies.

At the Federal Transit Administration over the course of these trips and meetings, LTD officials met with Edward Thomas, Associate Administrator, Office of Research, Innovation and Demonstration; Bert Arriaga, Service Innovation Division Chief; Walt Kulyk, Office of

Mobility Innovation Director; and David Vozzolo, Office of Planning, Innovation and Analysis. Edward Thomas will be visiting Lane Transit District in May.

## STATE LEGISLATURE

At the State Legislature, while no one is willing to call this a “do-nothing” session, there appears to be little cause for excitement for transit properties. Pundits and lobbyists alike have concentrated on the more genial atmosphere, commenting on the apparent cooperation between the Republican leadership and the Governor. However, as legislators reach the difficult part of the session – finalizing a budget in light of a new revenue forecast in May, disagreements will become more public. The Governor has made “early” repayment of a state tax obligation to federal retirees a political and therefore partisan issue. Some Republicans responded with radio ads urging people to call and oppose this proposal in order to maintain a tax “kicker” refund in 2002. Those ads were paid for by the national Republican Senate Campaign Committee, elevating a possible U.S. Senate bid by Governor Kitzhaber to part of the state budget debate. Further, these disagreements have extended into and within the Republican majority in the state Senate, undermining that chamber’s decision-making ability.

Speaker of the House Mark Simmons continues to press for restoration of the \$921,000 cut from the Public Transit Division budget for transportation services to the elderly and people with disabilities. However, it is unlikely that the May revenue forecast will provide an adequate cover for this and other leadership priorities. The Ways and Means Committee has completed its work on the Public Transit Division budget without restoring these funds, but they could of course be added in a later measure.

Some bills of interest to Lane Transit District include:

- HB 2379, removing our ability to make fare evasion a felony
- HB 2680, limiting the telecom authority of local governments
- HB 3504, requiring election of members of the board of certain mass transit districts
- SB 521, allowing the energy tax credit businesses may receive for providing transit passes to be claimed in one year, instead of spreading a relatively small amount over five years
- SB 634, establishing a State Elderly and Disabled Transportation Commission within the Department of Human Services
- SB 949, requiring election of members of the board of certain mass transit districts
- A variety of proposed transportation demand management measures
- A variety of proposed ODOT mandates to move money, perform studies, construct certain projects, or move programs
- SB 5545, the ODOT budget

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
GROUP**

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

**SPECIAL SERVICES**

Football shuttles – Meetings continue with University of Oregon (UO) staff, the architects, and the construction representatives. LTD staff met with the architects and laid out all the necessary turns in the parking lot at Autzen. A number of issues were identified and the specifications were modified to make the turns safer and easier to negotiate. The next steps include permitting, final construction documents, and finally construction, beginning in July. Completion is scheduled for August 15. During the interim, LTD staff will work with UO events staff to identify signage placement, barrier placement, staffing issues, and everything else that goes along with successfully moving 7,000 fans for the opening game on September 1.

Basketball shuttle ridership –

Season (Number of Home Games)	Rides for Season	Rides per Game	Attendance per Game	Modal Split
Women -15 games	10,602	707	4,860	7.3%
Men -16 games	13,812	863	7,740	5.6%

Men’s attendance remained strong this year; however, ridership dipped slightly. Women’s attendance increased along with ridership. As you can see, the modal split for women’s games remains higher than men’s, which we believe is due in part to the crowd make-up for women’s games.

**SHUTTLE PLANNING**

A name and color scheme for the new shuttle service will be developed and presented to the Board in May. Work continues on the final bus stop placement issues. LTD was informed by the State that a stop on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, in front of 5<sup>th</sup> Street Market, would not be approved. Discussions with the City staff continue regarding the change of Pearl Street to two-way, which would allow the inbound 5<sup>th</sup> Street Market stop to be placed adjacent to the west entrance to the Market. Valley River Center has agreed to allow parking spaces

for an LTD Park & Ride. This is a very significant addition to our Park & Ride system and will directly benefit potential shuttle riders who live the north part of Eugene.

## **RESEARCH**

LTD, the City, and a class at the UO are working on a pair of surveys related to the 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue corridor. The first is a survey to test delays to buses between 13<sup>th</sup> and Hilyard and 13<sup>th</sup> and Kincaid. This traditionally has been a highly congested area for the buses, resulting in significant delays during certain times of the term and at specific times of the day. The second survey is an intercept survey of customers who visit the businesses along 13<sup>th</sup> between Alder and Kincaid. The intent is to learn how customers arrive (mode), what their buying habits are, and how a change in the vehicular traffic may affect these buying habits. The hypothesis is that most arrive by foot, bike, or bus and that a change to traffic flow would not affect their patronage of these businesses. The UO class will handle the surveying and produce a final report as part of their project. LTD has met with the University Small Business Association president to review the work, and an informational letter has been sent to all businesses in the area.

## **TRANSPORTATION SERVICES GROUP**

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

## **DELIVERY OF 22-FOOT AVS BUSES DELAYED**

LTD recently received word from Advanced Vehicle Systems (AVS) that due to production problems the delivery date for our new buses has been pushed back. The delivery of the new 22' foot buses now is expected to be in late June or early July. This still allows time for LTD to prepare the buses for service, but additional delays could be problematic. Staff will be staying in close contact with AVS to monitor the delivery schedule.

## **TRANSIT OPERATIONS IN TRANSITION**

The Transit Operations Department is fast approaching the final phase of its restructure. There has been a lot of training, new positions have been filled, and work schedules have been reorganized. The Operations staff have been very professional, supportive, and cooperative in making the transition. Change is always difficult, but the Operations Team has stepped up to the plate and given a lot of extra effort to make this change successful. They are a great group.

### **CHANGE OF THE GUARD AT THE EUGENE STATION**

The guest services supervisor position currently held by Angie Sifuentez also will be changing during the next couple of months. Angie will be returning to the Marketing Department, where the team is looking forward to her expertise and experience in helping maintain a strong community image for LTD. Angie has been an excellent contributor to the Guest Services success and we appreciate all of her hard work. She will be missed and we wish her the best.

Rick Bailor, who is currently the security and field operations administrator, will be assuming the guest service supervisor responsibility as the overall station management is incorporated into his position. Rick will oversee all aspects of the day-to-day operation of the station as well as manage the LTD security program. We are looking forward to Rick's success and using his expertise to continue to improve service to our guests.

### **EUGENE POLICE DEPARTMENT DOWNTOWN SUBSTATION**

It is budget time once again and discussions have surfaced about how to finance the substation that is currently housed at the 1099 Olive facility owned by LTD. The issue has become complex for LTD because, even though LTD receives a significant value from the substation, the space could be used for LTD's own needs. The police department is unsure of the funding for the community service officer (CSO) for next fiscal year and if forced to make a choice between patrols and the CSO, probably will opt for the additional patrol officer. EPD is waiting for the City Council to approve the final budget before the issue is resolved. LTD has agreed to continue to offer office space and pay for the equivalent of one-third of the CSO. If the substation is closed and additional patrol is added, LTD will support that because it is direct, added service to LTD.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES GROUP**

*David Dickman, Human Resources Manager*  
*Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager*  
*Steve Parrott, Information Services Manager*

There is no Administrative Services Group report this month.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 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 March 2001 Performance Reports are included this month. Staff will be available at the April 18 meeting to answer any questions the Board may have about this information.

**ATTACHMENTS:** March 2001 Performance Reports

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** WORK SESSION: SPRINGFIELD STATION LAND ACQUISITION

**PREPARED BY:** Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Stef Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

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

**BACKGROUND:** Final environmental approval for the Site I-West (the site located south of South "A" between the extensions of 4<sup>th</sup> and Pioneer Parkway East) has been received. The site is now ready for final review and approval by the Springfield City Council and the LTD Board. Staff are in the process of scheduling the Springfield City Council's review of the station site. LTD Board action would follow.

Currently, approximately \$850,000 in federal funds (from the Surface Transportation Program) has been approved for the station. This would be enough to purchase the land and begin design work. The LTD Board has prioritized this as our number one capital priority. As soon as City of Springfield approval is attained, the general manager will authorize staff to proceed with land acquisition. Staff also will begin the process to select a design team and engineering firms for the project. This will be done in partnership with City of Springfield staff.

Funding has not been identified for construction of this project. LTD has made a request to our congressional delegation for TEA-21 funds. It is the general manager's understanding both the City of Springfield and LTD are committed to completing this project. If federal assistance does not materialize, LTD's capital program can be reprioritized. That would assure completion of Springfield Station in a timely manor and keep its completion coordinated with BRT.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**MOTION:** None



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 18, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** WORK SESSION ITEM: STATUS REPORT ON EUGENE TRAIN STATION PROJECT

**PREPARED BY:** Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager  
Tom Larsen, Principle Civil Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None; information only

**BACKGROUND:** Acquisition and renovation of the Eugene Depot was authorized in TEA-21. That legislation authorized \$1.75 million for the project. Another \$1 million in federal funds that pass through the State have been obtained by the City of Eugene to proceed with this project. In addition, Amtrak has pledged up to \$1 million to assist.

The City of Eugene is anxious to keep its local service partners informed about the challenges and opportunities presented by this project. Project engineer Tom Larsen will present more detail about the City's plans and possible designs at the Board's Wednesday work session. Some components of the project's status follow.

### ODOT Funding Agreement

The City of Eugene has a funding agreement in place for \$2 million in federal TEA-21 earmarked funds and an additional \$1 million in Transportation Enhancement funds. These funds require approximately \$500,000 in local matching funds. The City intends to use the Amtrak funds to provide the matching funds. No City money is budgeted for match or participation in this project. Amtrak funding is key to providing the needed match for federal funds. The preliminary estimate puts the overall project cost at about \$ 5,000,000. The City will continue to look for additional funding, especially after the consultant has prepared a detailed design and a more accurate estimate.

### Amtrak Funding Agreement

The City now has a signed agreement for up to \$1,000,000 in Amtrak funds— \$250,000 this year and the balance in future years.

Acquisition

The owner has told the City there are no major disagreements with what the City has offered and that a formal response will be forthcoming. City staff are attempting to schedule another meeting with the owner, and hope to have a signed agreement soon.

Design services

The City received Requests for Proposals for Consultant Services on April 13 and is continuing with the consultant selection process.

Future actions/other issues

- ❑ Finding a solution to the funding shortfall will become the key future action.
  
- ❑ The first phase of construction was anticipated in 2002. However, doubt about Amtrak funding may affect the schedule. Completion of the project master plan and/or acquisition could be held up pending a funding package.
  
- ❑ The ODOT Rail Division will continue to work with Union Pacific on improved rail access for the depot and the freight yards.
  
- ❑ Amtrak has insisted on free use of the site in exchange for Amtrak's participation in the capital expenditure. The lease remains to be negotiated.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

None, but more background information is on pages 32 – 34 of the local Federal Priorities 2001 book previously distributed.

**MOTION:**

None

# TEAM LTD

## VISION

To be the best transit system in North America

## MISSION

LTD: Your partner for a livable community

We enhance the community's quality of life by:

- ❑ Delivering reliable public transit service
- ❑ Offering innovative service that reduces dependency on the automobile
- ❑ Providing progressive leadership for the community's transportation needs

## CORE VALUES

- ❑ **Teamwork** - *Working together makes sense. We "team" internally and externally to achieve our mission.*
- ❑ **Respect** - *We are committed to treating everyone with respect and dignity.*
- ❑ **Honesty** - *We are credible, reliable and hold the highest standards of ethical conduct.*
- ❑ **Integrity** - *We are unshakeable in our integrity and commitment to our Vision, Mission, Values and Guiding Principles.*
- ❑ **Accountability** - *We are accountable for our resources, actions and outcomes.*
- ❑ **Tenacity** - *We are persistent in pursuing our important mission.*

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- ❑ **Safety:** *People may assume that LTD is safe. We make every effort never to fail them in that responsibility. LTD will have safe employees, practices, equipment, and facilities.*
- ❑ **Courtesy:** *LTD shall treat all people who come in contact with our organization as our guests. We are sincerely committed to providing comfortable, friendly services.*
- ❑ **Efficiency:** *We will never stop improving. The LTD Team will continue to find ways to provide innovative transportation solutions while improving productivity and effectively managing public funds. We are deeply committed to delivering efficient services that promote the sustainability of our communities.*
- ❑ **Image:** *LTD represents the quality of the communities we serve. We have pride in our appearance and demeanor, and create professional facilities and services.*

## OUTCOMES

We will know we have succeeded when:

- ❑ Ridership increases annually and our guests become our best advocates.
- ❑ LTD is acknowledged as innovative and an effective steward of the community's transportation investment.
- ❑ LTD has earned the public's respect for our commitment to community, the environment, and economic development.
- ❑ We are viewed as a great place to work (an employer of choice) in our community.