

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 10, 2001.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, May 16, 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

Bennett \_\_\_\_\_ Gaydos \_\_\_\_\_ Hocken \_\_\_\_\_ Kleger \_\_\_\_\_

Lauritsen \_\_\_\_\_ Melnick \_\_\_\_\_ Wylie \_\_\_\_\_

**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

- Discussion of Bus Rapid Transit with Edward Thomas, associate administrator for research, demonstration, and innovation of the Federal Transit Administration, Washington, D.C. (90 minutes) 05

**The following agenda items will begin at 7 p.m. (Note – this is one-half-hour later than usual.)**

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – JUNE 2001 10

VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Consent Calendar  | 11 |
| 1. | Minutes of April 18, 2001, Regular Board Meeting<br>(Page 12)   |    |
| B. | Prioritization of Projects – Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003 Public Transit<br>Discretionary Grant Program   | 27 |
| C. | Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Recommendations for<br>STF Allocations for Special Transportation Service/Operations Contracts<br>for Fiscal Year 2002 | 31 |

IX. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

- |     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| A.  | Follow-up Discussion on Fiscal Year 2001-02 Budget Approved by LTD<br>Budget Committee on April 26, 2001 | 33 |
| B.  | Current Activities   |    |
| 1.  | Board Member Reports   |    |
| (a) | Metropolitan Policy Committee  | 34 |
| (b) | BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee   |    |
| (c) | Statewide Livability Forum   |    |
| (d) | Eugene City Council Meeting  |    |
| (e) | Joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council Meeting   |    |
| (f) | APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference  |    |
| (g) | Land Conservation and Development Commission<br>(LCDC) Testimony   |    |
| 2.  | General Manager's Report   |    |
| 3.  | Monthly Financial Report – April 2001 Financial Statements   | 36 |
| 4.  | Bus Rapid Transit Update   | 37 |
| 5.  | Springfield Station Update   | 48 |
| 6.  | TransPlan Update   | 49 |
|     |  | 50 |

	<u>Page No.</u>
7. Board Activity Calendars – Schedule Fall Strategic Planning Work Session	51
8. Correspondence	
C. Monthly Performance Group Report	60
D. Monthly Performance Report (April 2001)	69
X. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	74
A. LTD Policies and Procedures Manual	79
B. LTD Debt Financing 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. Bus Purchase	
H. TransPlan Draft Approval	
I. BRT Updates	
XI. ADJOURNMENT	

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

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** APRIL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Financial results for the first ten 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 \$662,981 over budget through April, primarily due to continued strong interest earnings (\$389,838) and self-employment tax revenues (\$473,785) that were received a month earlier than the budget anticipated. Payroll tax receipts, the primary subsidy for fixed-route operations, regained ground lost in March, and are now on budget year-to-date. Staff are cautiously optimistic that this resource will finish the fiscal year at or near budget expectations.

Passenger fares were strong in April, although ten-month results continue to lag expectations. Year-to-date receipts are below those of the same period in the last fiscal year for the fourth consecutive month, and remain more than \$200,000 below budget. If April's results signal a turnaround, the total annual shortfall may be limited to this amount. The shortfall will be covered by the strength of interest earnings.

Advertising revenue remains 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.

Administration personnel costs continue to be below budget for the first ten months of the fiscal year. Amalgamated Transit Union employee costs still are expected to be over budget for the year, but the effect is

expected to be completely mitigated by savings in other wage categories and from the effect of new work rules that reduce overtime expense.

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

The Special Transportation Fund is as expected through April, and is still 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.

As previously reported, 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 is working with LCC to assure that the paperwork is completed for payment before June 30, 2001.

The FY 2001-02 proposed budget was approved by the Budget Committee on April 26. The Finance Committee will meet in the near future to debrief the budget development and deliberation process, and also to consider finalizing debt policy that will govern the bus purchase financing planned for FY 2001-02. A public hearing on the approved budget will precede budget adoption at the June 20 Board meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attached are the following financial reports for Board review:

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

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

None

## MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, April 18, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 12, 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, April 18, 2001, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Pat Hocken

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

#### **WORK SESSION – STATUS REPORT ON EUGENE TRAIN STATION PROJECT:**

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch introduced Tom Larsen, Principle Civil Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works, to provide more detail about the City's plans and possible designs for the Eugene train station project.

Mr. Larsen said that the acquisition and renovation of the Eugene Depot had been authorized \$1.75 million under the federal Transportation Equity Act of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). Another \$1 million in federal funds that passed through the State had been obtained as well. Amtrak also had pledged up to \$1 million for the project.

Mr. Larsen reviewed schematics of the current station and the history of the funding support for the redesign. He said that while other cities owned their stations, Eugene did not. The original estimate of \$3 million for the redesign did not take into account that the property would need to be purchased, so the available funding would not cover the costs as currently designed.

Based on age and uniqueness, the current depot, built in 1899, would be placed on the national historical registry, once it was in public ownership.

Negotiations were underway to purchase the property, which included a narrow strip of land along the tracks that would be purchased for future expansion, a parking lot west of

Willamette Street, the current station building and parking lot, the building just east of the station building, and a piece of property to connect the station to Oak.

Proposals were being received from potential designers to begin the master plan design for the entire site and to obtain a more accurate cost estimate.

Mr. Larsen showed a schematic drawing that depicted the potential access from Oak Street and a possible pedestrian connection to Skinner Butte. Alternate quarters for the Amtrak operation would be needed in order for work, such as asbestos abatement, to be completed on the existing building.

Ms. Wylie asked if part of the asbestos abatement was the responsibility of the seller. Mr. Larsen said that the City was offering payment based on a clean site, and the seller had agreed to that provision.

City staff anticipated that Phase 1 would include the completion of design work by the end of the year, with construction beginning during the first quarter of 2002. Phase 2 and the completion of the project would depend upon future funding. It recently was learned that there was just under \$200,000 in Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) transportation enhancement funding that likely would be available for this project.

Mr. Melnick asked about an opportunity for Greyhound to share the site with the train station. Mr. Larsen said there had been much discussion about Greyhound moving to a new site, but no decisions had been made. Including Greyhound at the Amtrak Station was not in the original concept, but had grown from Greyhound's need to relocate from its current site. There was much interest, and the depot could be an attractive site; however, the bus staging area could be problematic, as there was not much additional space. There currently was no Greyhound component in the funding, and the impact on the neighborhood and project could be large.

Ms. Wylie asked if there was a possibility that some of the other nearby buildings could be relocated. Mr. Larsen said that it was a possibility. If Greyhound was interested in relocating to the depot site, there were larger issues to be considered, and there had been an ongoing discussion that Greyhound could be nearby on the other side of 5th Avenue. It was likely that the area could be in need of a parking structure.

Mr. Kleger said that during the design phase, he would be willing to provide accessibility consulting services free of charge. He was familiar with the depot building and had used it frequently. Mr. Larsen noted that the platforms would be built to enable level boarding with the train. He thought that the opportunity would be there for the type of involvement Mr. Kleger was suggesting.

Ms. Wylie said LTD was very interested in the multi-modal aspect with LTD's new downtown shuttle system. Mr. Larsen said the city was very interested as well, and would include LTD service in its planning efforts. The bus system and its components, such as Park & Ride and how it could all work together, would be key in the master plan.



Mr. Gaydos asked about the property located to the north of the county jail. Mr. Larsen said that was property that belonged to the same owners as the depot property, and it appeared that, if needed, it also could be included in the sale.

Mr. Gaydos asked if the railroad was willing to waive any right-of-way. Mr. Larsen said that the current plan was to buy an additional strip along the existing tracks with the objective of adding an additional rail in order to move the freight trains onto the main line and away from the passenger rail strip. Amtrak also had a need for a third rail to store a train overnight. Currently, the Amtrak train that spent the night in Eugene had to travel to the rail yards near Roosevelt and return to the depot in the morning.

Mr. Bennett said that he heard from LTD staff that, in terms of the shuttle operation, it would be helpful to have two-way traffic on Pearl Street. Service Planning Manager Andy Vobora said that he had met with City staff about Pearl Street. Mr. Larsen said that the City typically conducted a more comprehensive review when considering changing street traffic patterns; however, an exception criteria had been created for this instance, and the Pearl Street changes should be exempted from the more comprehensive process. Mr. Vobora thought an approval from ODOT on signal changes would be needed, and some design issues would need to be worked out, but he was optimistic that Pearl Street could be changed to two-way traffic by September.

**WORK SESSION – SPRINGFIELD STATION LAND ACQUISITION:** Mr. Hamm said that the final environmental approval had been received, and the site now was ready for final review and approval by the Springfield City Council and the LTD Board.

Mr. Hamm said that Springfield Station remained a priority for LTD, and it was staff's intent to keep moving forward even though construction funding was not yet realized. The Oregon congressional delegation and the LTD government relations manager were pushing forward on the issue. A copy of a letter from Governor Kitzhaber to Congressman Peter DeFazio and a letter from the Oregon delegation to the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, both encouraging the funding of the station, were distributed to the Board members.

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that the letter from Governor Kitzhaber was part of the lobbying effort for Springfield Station. The letter from the Oregon delegation to the House Appropriations Committee was a formal request for a number of appropriations projects for Oregon. Staff continued to work on other lobbying strategies.

Mr. Hamm said that LTD currently had secured \$850,000 in federal funds from the Surface Transportation Program to purchase the property and begin the design. If additional federal funds were not secured, the recommendation would be to reprioritize LTD's capital projects in order to move forward with this project as the highest priority to get it completed.

Ms. Wylie asked if the land purchase had been finalized. Mr. Hamm said that the site first had to be approved by the Springfield City Council. The Board would be discussing the issue with the Council at a joint meeting on May 14. LTD expected to receive approval from the Council, and then it would be a matter of the LTD Board taking action to proceed.

Mr. Melnick asked about the internal process for selecting a designer. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano responded that a request for proposals would be issued, and based on the responses, staff would conduct interviews and select a firm. Mr. Hamm added that staff intended to include some participation from the City of Springfield.

**WORK SESSION – BOARD POSITION ON REOPENING BROADWAY STREET:**

Mr. Gaydos had requested that the Board discuss and take a position on the reopening of Broadway Street and its impact on LTD and the community.

Mr. Bennett said that he had participated as an LTD representative on the downtown visioning committee. At the April 16 Eugene City Council meeting, there was a point in the discussion of the visioning committee's report where Councilor Gary Rayor, in trying to make the case for stronger language with respect to the bicycle path along the river and in making comments about why he was so concerned, had evoked Mr. Bennett's name. Councilor Rayor had suggested that Mr. Bennett was someone who might support building parking right on the river, which could intercept the bike path. Mr. Bennett said that he could not let the issue pass. He thought the Councilor's comments were well out of line and contrary to what Mr. Bennett would ever suggest or recommend. Mr. Bennett requested copies of the minutes of visioning committee to determine if something he had said could have been construed as support for such a project. Upon review of those minutes, Mr. Bennett did not believe that he had said anything of that nature. He then called City Manager Jim Johnson discuss it. He did not think it was an appropriate comment by the Councilor, particularly since Mr. Bennett was not present at the meeting to defend himself. Mr. Bennett was planning to write to the Council; however, in the meantime, Councilor Rayor had telephoned Mr. Bennett and apologized for the comments. Councilor Rayor said that he had become flustered in trying to make his case as strongly as possible and had made the comments in error. The Councilor said that he would apologize on the record at a later meeting. Mr. Bennett thought that if those statements were left uncorrected, it would reflect negatively on his involvement with the visioning committee and on his representation of LTD.

With respect to reopening Broadway, Mr. Bennett said that he had been an advocate for nearly 20 years. He was very involved in downtown business issues, and even though there was not a direct legal conflict of interest, the perception existed that there was a conflict of interest because of his downtown business ownership. He believed he needed to be careful, with respect to any appointed group that he was a member of, if the group was poised to take a formal position on the issue. He did not think it was a problem to be part of the discussion, but believed that it was not appropriate for him to take part in a vote on the position.

Ms. Wylie said that Mr. Bennett had a fine reputation in the community for preserving and restoring buildings, and was an admirable member of the downtown community.

Mr. Gaydos distributed a memo of support for the reopening of Broadway. He did not have an economic interest, but he was the president of the Downtown Eugene, Inc., Board of Directors, and thus was interested in ensuring that downtown Eugene functioned well. He also had an interest, and had for many years, in LTD being the transportation leader in the community, which was one of the reasons he wanted to serve on the LTD Board. LTD needed to be recognized as being about more than just mass transit, and the community

needed to recognize that the need to move people was extremely important. Mr. Gaydos believed that the reopening of Broadway fell within that category, and LTD should be involved. West Broadway currently was part of a closed mall, and it was an issue of opening that portion of the street. The issue would be included on the City Council agenda, as well as on the November ballot.

Jenny Ulum, of Ulum and Associates, was collecting petitions to form a broad coalition, and a copy of the petition was attached to the memorandum from Mr. Gaydos. LTD would be investing money in a shuttle that would cross Broadway, and the more accessibility for the shuttle, the better it would work.

Mr. Gaydos highlighted the reasons he thought reopening Broadway was important. The community was or should be proud of LTD's investment in the transfer station and the shuttle service. The city was dedicating a lot of money for the library, which was relatively near the area. If the area could be redeveloped in a more positive way, it would be more helpful for the library, the LTD transfer station, Broadway Place, and much of the public investment in the immediate area. Mr. Gaydos' encouragement for the LTD Board was to collectively take a position supporting the reopening of Broadway. He requested that the Board take the collective position to support the reopening of Broadway.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she was a Springfield representative, and Broadway was a Eugene street. While she was not against the reopening, she felt that unless she heard a more compelling reason than LTD wanting to maybe someday run a bus on Broadway, she could not formally support the issue. LTD's interest in mass transit was a clear issue. She asked if the Springfield representatives should abstain from voting on this issue. Mr. Gaydos said that he was seeking full Board support of the issue as a regional transportation issue. Both downtown Eugene and downtown Springfield needed to be successful. LTD invested significantly in downtown Eugene and soon would in downtown Springfield. If the Board chose not to support it as a group, he would ask that the individual members support it. Ms. Lauritsen said that was a more compelling argument in support of the proposal.

Mr. Kleger said that in the past, he would have been reluctant to support measures to put cars back in the area of the downtown mall. Now, however, he was satisfied that nothing could happen to turn around the extremely depressed situation that currently existed without making the change to Broadway Street. He noted that he did not believe reopening Broadway alone would fix the problem. It may take not only the funding for construction, but also enough funding to put a police officer on every corner and in every alley for a period of time, which he thought should have been done long ago. The city still faced the budgetary limitations, but no further private investment would be made in the area until cars were allowed on the street.

Mr. Melnick said that he appreciated Mr. Gaydos bringing the issue to the Board. He believed that whether or not buses operated on Broadway, LTD had an interest in a healthy downtown. He took exception with Mr. Kleger's comments about the additional police presence. Studies had shown in many communities that additional eyes on the street, via automobile traffic, were a natural deterrent to crime and bad behaviors. Those results already had been achieved with the reopening of Olive and Willamette Streets. Mr. Melnick was very much in favor.

Ms. Wylie said that she was deeply conflicted. Her husband was an artist and was the designer for the complex brick pattern that covered the entire plaza. He and the artists who produced the sculptures on the plaza were very upset that their artwork may be destroyed or removed in the process of reopening Broadway. It was unknown what the design of the reopened street would be. Ms. Wylie did support a healthy downtown, but she also was supportive of the work of local artists. She did not think that the benches could remain, but the sculptures could be repositioned. She also did not know if the brick pattern would need to be torn up. Whatever happened, she hoped that some concern for the artists and artwork would be shown.

Mr. Hamm said that staff had researched with the Government Standards and Practices Commission, and found that Mr. Bennett would not have a legal conflict of interest in this situation, but perception would be a more accurate way to describe the situation.

One of the visions that the City staff had for Broadway was a great street or boulevard concept. A second shuttle had been discussed that would serve the courthouse and downtown. Broadway could be the street on which that vehicle could operate. Staff recognized that transit was a piece of the transportation puzzle and should be interested in anything that improved the livability.

Mr. Gaydos said that he appreciated Ms. Wylie's comments on artwork. He knew the existing artwork would be considered, and part of it would go into the design.

Mr. Bennett asked if an amendment could be made to the motion to include a statement of respect for the artists and artwork. Ms. Wylie said that the motion would be made later in the meeting.

Mr. Bennett left the meeting.

**JACKETS FOR BOARD MEMBERS:** Mr. Hamm displayed for the members a potential jacket that could be provided to the Board members to wear while representing LTD. Ms. Wylie said that the jacket clearly represented LTD. It matched the operator jackets and hats, etc. She asked if a lighter and longer version could be made available. Ms. Wylie said that she would be representing LTD at several community outdoor events, and she would appreciate having the jacket. The Board members liked the jacket, and asked that staff explore sizes and lengths.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – MAY 2001:** Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Steve Hoisington, who had been selected as the May 2001 Employee of the Month. Mr. Hoisington was hired on October 18, 1978, and had 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. Mr. Hoisington previously had been selected as the May 1984 Employee of the Month.

Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Hoisington was a long-term employee and was a dream employee to supervise. He did everything right, and he always provided excellent service. LTD received many positive comments from customers about Mr. Hoisington. He added that

Mr. Hoisington had not missed time, and was a safe and courteous bus operator.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Hoisington and presented him with an Employee of the Month pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award. She thanked him for his excellent service to LTD and its guests. Mr. Hoisington thanked the Board for the recognition and said that he appreciated his supervisor's support. He said that it was a pleasure to work at LTD and with staff, and it was exciting to see the growth in LTD.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 2000:** Mr. Johnson then introduced Bus Operator Marcie Pope as LTD's 2000 Employee of the Year, an award that was announced at the March 18 Employee Appreciation Banquet. Ms. Pope 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 put forward to make LTD a very special place to work. Ms. Pope was selected as the November 2000 Employee of the Month after being nominated by many of her co-workers, who appreciated her wonderful sense of team spirit and the extra effort she always put forth.

Mr. Johnson said that Ms. Pope performed many functions at LTD and was like the "mom" of the Operations Department. She was in tune with the rest of the operators and knew how they were feeling. Mr. Hamm added that Ms. Pope oversaw the football shuttle service, and he had participated with Ms. Pope at three UO home football games. As a result of working with Ms. Pope, he better understood what worked. Ms. Pope also organized the operator potlucks that occurred during football games. There was camaraderie and team spirit that had developed around the football service, and right in the middle of all of it was Ms. Pope. Mr. Hamm said that Ms. Pope was an exceptional and energetic member of the team.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Ms. Pope and presented her with a plaque and a lapel pin. Ms. Pope said that she was thrilled to have her own front and center parking spot at LTD for a whole year (a new EOY designated parking space). She thanked everyone who voted for her. This coming fall would be her fourth season of football and potlucks, and there would be new instructors, who would be on-the-road trainers. Those trainers recently held a meeting and included a potluck, so it was catching on, and was one way to have fun while working.

Ms. Pope thanked the Board and said that she was very honored. She added that she was grateful that the Employee of the Month sweaters were v-necked to go over her "swollen head" after receiving this award.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 1999:** Ms. Wylie surprised Executive Assistant and Clerk of the Board Jo Sullivan by announcing that she had a presentation for her as well for having been selected as the 1999 Employee of the Year. She presented Ms. Sullivan with a lapel pin, which had not been available the previous year, and thanked her for her support of the Board of Directors.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** 1). Rob Zako of Eugene and the president of Friends of Eugene (FoE) said that the FoE had been talking to LTD for several years regarding the bus

rapid transit (BRT) project, and he was discouraged because the FoE did not feel that it was being heard by LTD. He was present at the Board meeting to inform the Board of the FoE's plan of action in opposition to the proposed BRT pilot corridor project.

The FoE BRT committee met to discuss its position on BRT and had voted 8-0 to not endorse the BRT project as currently proposed, as it would damage neighborhoods and environmental quality, and it would fail to improve transit service.

Mr. Zako said that the FoE was a group of volunteers all who agreed to not support BRT. He thought that was pretty amazing coming from a group of transit supporters, but said that LTD must have done something to turn the group against BRT.

The FoE also voted to take some further action. They planned to publish an Op-Ed piece against BRT in *The Register-Guard* opposite LTD's piece in support of BRT. The group also would be lobbying local and state officials and other community groups. In addition, the FoE already had been talking to Representative Peter DeFazio and with officials from the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA). The FoE thought it was unfortunate that there was a funding deadline and thought there should be some flexibility in that area. Lastly, the FoE was looking into a possible appeal of the Environmental Assessment (EA). Mr. Zako said that he had not reviewed many EAs, but the "Tree Huggers" were a group that had reviewed many EAs, and had been truly astounded at the inadequacy of the EA.

Mr. Zako said that he normally liked to build bridges and work issues out. The people in the FoE were anxious to take these actions, because it would feel as though something were being done, and it was easier to be against something than for something.

For the record, Mr. Zako said that there were some things the FoE was willing to discuss. The FoE wanted a BRT that they believed would be successful and would enhance transit service in the community. In order to get that, Mr. Zako provided a list of actions the FoE believed LTD should do:

a) LTD should join with the FoE in lobbying Representative DeFazio and the FTA to extend the funding for BRT, to allow more time for more design work.

b) LTD should redo the EA. The "Purpose and Need" section needed to be much more specific to actually define objectively what it was that BRT would attempt to accomplish and that would consider real alternatives. It also should thoroughly evaluate those alternatives, according to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.

c) LTD should design a longer BRT pilot route so time savings actually could make a difference. No one would care about a four-mile route that saves only a couple of minutes in travel time.

d) LTD should connect the nodes and integrate BRT with nodal development. Bob Cortright of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had stated in his TransPlan work that BRT and nodal development had to be integrated. Mr. Zako said that, currently, he did not see where the nodes were along the proposed BRT pilot route. Maybe they were not there, and LTD needed to be pushing Eugene and Springfield to get their nodal development acts together and then build BRT to go through those nodes and have the stations where the nodes were.

e) LTD should insist on a TransPlan that did not subsidize cars, but actually leveled the playing field. LTD had an opportunity, with its two Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) representatives at a recent MPC meeting, to endorse having cars pay for the cost of maintaining roads. That initiative failed. By not doing that, cars were not paying their full cost, and they ended up being subsidized and less expensive relative to riding buses. The playing field needed to be leveled in order to make buses more competitive.

f) The FoE wanted the Board to work with them to build consensus in the community to actually have the community be behind BRT rather than feeling like it was being railroaded into having to accept BRT because the funding would disappear.

g) Finally, the FoE thought it would be to the Board's benefit to ask to be elected rather than appointed by the Governor. Mr. Zako said that he realized the Board did not have that power, but he thought the Board could pass a resolution stating that it believed being elected to be a good idea. The Board could direct Ms. Lynch to lobby the state legislature to make LTD's Board locally elected.

Mr. Zako said that the FoE would move forward with its plan of action, but told the Board not to worry, as the FoE was made up of a few volunteers and did not have a paid staff. There was much support for BRT from the community, and LTD had a lot of money. LTD probably would get BRT, but it would make the FoE feel good to do the things planned in opposition of the current proposed pilot corridor plan. However, if LTD wanted to talk to the FoE and to consider the issues as presented, and if LTD wanted BRT to work, the FoE wanted to talk to LTD.

2) Sally Nunn of Eugene said that she was one of the tree huggers that Mr. Zako had referred to. She truly believed that LTD needed to go back to drawing board with the proposed BRT pilot corridor. As envisioned, the pilot project would disrupt neighborhoods, compromise existing businesses, adversely impact efficient traffic flow, and destroy the aesthetics and environmental function of Eugene's best and most beloved meridian.

Ms. Nunn said that the current EA had many problems. For instance, mitigating storm water of newly planted trees after removing 20 or more mature trees would take 60 plus years to accomplish. A case in point was the Ferry Street Bridge area. Did those trees keep rain from washing pollutants from the streets into the storm drains and into our rivers and streams? It was unsound science, unless LTD was confusing Eugene's streets with old growth forest, where this theory might actually work.

In addition, as a small business owner, Ms. Nunn said that she found the bottleneck depicted in the after picture of the 11<sup>th</sup> and Hilyard streets redo completely unacceptable. Her vehicle time significantly would increase as she attempted to access clients in the university area. With the need to carry equipment and to keep a tight time schedule, the bus was not an option for her. She would find her vehicle miles traveled much longer as a result of BRT as proposed.

Ms. Nunn said that, furthermore, as a long-time member of the Oregon Natural Resources Council, she had learned that while the Council had once supported the initial concept of BRT, it now had withdrawn that support and had decided to condition future support on a plan it expected to succeed.

Ms. Nunn said that it was not for her to say where a superior route might occur, but if the Eugene train station to the Springfield bus station route with shuttles to key substations had not been explored, she implored LTD to do so and soon. Ms. Nunn said that considering the stated effect that LTD expected its ridership to walk to fewer stations as a trade-off for speed, the train corridor route had acceptable proximity. This route would encompass important major employers, including the Waterfront Research Park, University of Oregon, Fifth Street Market, EWEB, and the new federal building. The increased speed and desired efficiency also could be attained along the rail corridor, and without adversely impacting traffic on Franklin Boulevard. It would create a win-win situation, and in doing so, would avoid removing historic trees, a loss of "Dad's Gate," or the enmity of Glenwood citizens.

She asked LTD to please go back to drawing board and try again. The risk was that without an acceptable plan, as increasing public and private support eroded, LTD stood to lose the funding. She urged LTD to make significant progress in seeking solutions, so the important transit options would be available in the future.

Ms. Wylie noted that the current BRT pilot corridor plan did not remove the 20 trees. Mr. Viggiano confirmed that only two historic trees would be removed for the Agate Street station, but the other 20 trees would not be removed.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 18, 2001, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote. The April 18, 2001, Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the March 21, 2001, regular Board meeting.

**FY 2001-02 FARE POLICY:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that 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 that had been included in the Board agenda packet was incomplete. In order to ensure that the public record was accurate and complete, the entire fare policy document was included in the current agenda packet, and staff were seeking the Board's approval of the correct and complete version of the policy.

In addition, the Board had requested a review of the day pass/transfer program, and Ms. Hellekson provided that review in the agenda packet.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Mr. Gaydos moved 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." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

**SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF TENTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35, SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES:** Ms. Hellekson distributed an amended Ordinance 35 to the Board members. She said that a previous edition that did not include some corrections to the Ordinance had been included in the agenda packet.



Ms. Hellekson said that public hearings had been held on the proposed fare structure for FY 2001-02 at the February and March 2001 Board meetings. In February, staff were directed to make the following changes to the District's 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 needed to be implemented by ordinance.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved that Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only.  
**VOTE** Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

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

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger then moved approval of 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." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.  
**VOTE**

**MISSION STATEMENT AND VISION:** Mr. Hamm said that the vision statement was discussed at the January 2001 work session and staff had made revisions according to discussions that had been held both with employees and with the Board.

This vision statement gave LTD a foundation to build the team philosophy from the core values. Guiding principles were imperative for employees to guide and judge themselves by. It was important that the mission be easily understood by staff and the community. Mr. Hamm then read the 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; and providing progressive leadership for the community's transportation needs."

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger moved approval of 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." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion.

Mr. Melnick said that he was concerned that the Mission Statement and Vision did not include a reference to energy efficiency or sustainability, etc., as a value that was held by LTD. Part of what was discussed at the work session was that by reducing dependence on the automobile, one also would accomplish a reduction in the dependence upon certain types of fuels, etc. He thought it would be appropriate to have something along those lines

in a vision statement. Implementation was another issue, but to be a mass transit-focused agency, he thought not having it as part of the vision could be seen as lacking. Mr. Hamm said that sustainability was discussed in the development of each of the sections in the statement, it was assumed as part of the efficiency.

Mr. Melnick asked that the record indicate that when the District referred to sustainability of the communities, it included environmental efficiency as part of that term. Other members agreed.

**VOTE** There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie called for a vote on the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

**MOTION** **BOARD POSITION ON OPENING OF BROADWAY STREET:** Mr. Gaydos moved approval of LTD Resolution #2001-016: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors supports the reopening of Broadway between Oak and Charnelton in Eugene and encourages the Eugene City Council to place the matter before the voters, and in doing so, that there be respect and preservation, to the extent possible, of the existing artwork."  
**VOTE** Mr. Melnick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by acclamation.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:** 1) **Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):** Ms. Wylie provided a review of the MPC meeting of April 12, 2001. There was a motion before MPC that LTD participation in MPC be limited to issues of mass transit only as opposed to the current level of participation in general transportation issues. The issue was brought by Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer. LTD had presented federal policy that required transit agencies to be at the table for planning, etc. The motion did not pass.

There also was a long list of activities that were requested to be changed in TransPlan that were generated by a letter from Lane County Commissioner Peter Sorenson. Mr. Viggiano said that three issues were brought forward by the Eugene City Council in response to Commissioner Sorenson's letter. One issue was to set more funding aside for nodal development. That measure failed at MPC. It actually had the majority of the vote, but MPC bylaws require at least one vote from every jurisdiction. The second issue was a change to the BRT policy. Ms. Hocken had recommended wording changes to the definition and intent in order to strengthen the policy. The measure appeared to be supported, but the County raised a concern, and the issue was tabled. Staff believed the concern could be addressed and that at the next MPC meeting, MPC would endorse that change. The third issue that was brought up in response to Commissioner Sorenson's letter had to do with setting priorities for operations, maintenance, and preservation funding, and that measure failed as well.

Mr. Viggiano noted that another measure was requested to set priority for funding within the bike program for priority bike miles, and that measure passed. The measure was not directly related to Commissioner Sorenson's letter.

Mr. Viggiano said that another issue at the MPC meeting was the addition of a new chapter in TransPlan addressing issues that would be addressed as part of the next

TransPlan review in three years, and that MPC decided that a new chapter was not needed at this time.

The next MPC meeting was scheduled for May 10, 2001.

2) **BRT Steering Committee**: The meeting scheduled for April 3, 2001, had been canceled. The next meeting was scheduled for May 1, 2001.

3) **Statewide Livability Forum**: Ms. Lauritsen would attend during the month of April and would report back to the Board in May.

4) **United Front Trip to Washington, D.C.**: Ms. Wylie and Mr. Gaydos provided a review of the recent lobbying trip. Mr. Gaydos thought the effort was worthwhile. He got to know some of LTD's partners better and established some personal relations that would assist in future undertakings. He praised Ms. Lynch for organizing the effort and for ensuring that everyone got to the right places at the right time. The schedule was rigorous, and there was an opportunity to talk to legislative staff people. The legislators did an excellent job spending time with and listening to the delegation. The legislators and staff were appreciative that Lane County had a United Front that was well organized in presenting information. It also had been a good experience to talk to people at the FTA, and Mr. Gaydos was impressed with the amount of time the FTA spent with the group. The FTA staff spent a lot of time talking about BRT and the concept and how it fit in federal programs. Mr. Gaydos said that Ms. Wylie also had done an excellent job in talking with FTA Administrator Edward Thomas. LTD was successful at being supportive of partner projects. Collectively, it was an effective effort, and the jurisdictions were supportive of each other.

Ms. Wylie added that the group worked very hard and established some good relationships. She believed it had been a very worthwhile trip.

5) **Eugene City Council**: Mr. Melnick reported on the April 9, 2001, City Council meeting in which the BRT project was discussed. Mr. Melnick said that Ms. Hocken made a brief presentation about BRT, and the Council discussed the project, but there was no vote. The Council recognized that the Planning Commission had voted in favor of the project.

6) **Springfield City Council**: Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen attended the April 16, 2001, Springfield City Council meeting in which the BRT project was discussed. Ms. Lauritsen said that she thought it had been a very positive meeting. The Springfield technical staff made the presentation, and there was not much opposition. The Council would discuss the project again at a later date as well as at the joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council meeting on May 14.

**LTD GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT**: Mr. Hamm said that the biggest issue was a change in the oversight of contracted services for RideSource. Historically, LTD had an agreement with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), who then contracted on LTD's behalf with a private operator to operate RideSource. The operation of that was not changing, but the person who administered the program at LCOG, Terry Parker, would be joining the LTD

staff rather than having LTD fund the position at LCOG. There had been much discussion with the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) and with the LCOG board, and it appeared to make sense to everyone. Ms. Parker would be joining LTD on July 1, 2001, and her position would become part of the General Management Performance Group. Her office would be located in the administrative area near reception. Staff were very excited, and Ms. Parker would bring to LTD a better connection to rural communities and special-needs members of the community at large. LTD would provide planning resource assistance to the Special Transportation Program that previously had not been available. Ms. Parker was excited about it as well. The contract with Special Mobility Services would come due later this year, and LTD would put out the request for proposals. Staff would make a selection based on proposals received. The operation of the RideSource service would not be brought in-house, but only the administrative oversight.

With regard to the shuttle buses, the delivery date was pushed back to late June, which still gave LTD sufficient time to program the buses into the maintenance function and to introduce them to the community.

**MARCH 2001 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:** Ms. Hellekson said that at this point in the fiscal year, staff remained somewhat concerned about the local economy. After two fairly strong months of payroll tax revenue, it had shown signs of weakening. Staff were cautiously optimistic that payroll tax revenues would meet budget by fiscal year end. Staff also were equally, if not more so, focused on the budget proposal for next year (FY 2001-2002). The first budget hearing was scheduled for Wednesday, April 25, at 6:30 p.m. Staff had changed the presentation format this year as there were no new members on the Budget Committee. Staff would present a big-picture view of LTD's business plan, rather than the typical department-by-department budget presentation, which would put a greater burden on the committee members to carefully review the budget notebooks.

**BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE:** Mr. Viggiano explained the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. He said that when the draft EA was released, the public was given an opportunity to provide comments to the District. Comments were to be addressed in the final EA. It should be expected that changes are made in the draft EA in response to comments and concerns. The final EA that reflects those changes becomes the legally binding document for the project.

Mr. Viggiano also responded to a comment at the meeting regarding mitigation for increased impervious surface. The EA recommended mitigation by planting additional trees, which would intercept rainwater before it reached the ground. The rainwater would evaporate from the leaves of the trees. One could determine the age and type of tree and the size of the tree, and make a calculation of the overall quantity as a way to mitigate an increase in the impervious service. Some people believed that to be a good approach, but it had not been scientifically proven. This approach, however, is fairly new and still needs some testing and analysis. Consequently, the recommendation in the EA will be to use more traditional methods of mitigating storm water.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** Ms. Wylie said that copies of the correspondence to and from the Board were included in the packet for review.

**MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORT:** Ms. Wylie asked if Ms. Lynch had anything to add to her monthly report. Ms. Lynch said that she had nothing to add. She was following about 150 bills at the State Legislature. There was no transportation funding package before the Legislature at this session, so there was less work. It currently was a tense time at the Legislature, because they were at a crucial point where they needed to decide what actions they would take.

**MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT (March 2001):** Mr. Kleger referred to the ridership figures in the performance report and said that when he joined the Board about seven years ago, LTD was carrying just more than 4 million rides per year, but he noticed that currently, LTD was carrying more than 6 million rides. This was an incredible rate of growth. The only thing wrong with it was the LTD was not keeping up with the growth of the community. He was disappointed and discouraged that those who most wanted LTD to go faster were not willing to support BRT unless it met all of their expectations. They were willing to “make the perfect the enemy of the good.” He believed that LTD needed to make compromises with its partner governments, or LTD would get nowhere at all. The very compromises that LTD made were looked upon by some as reasons to completely shoot down the project.

Mr. Gaydos said that there was a 2050 group that LCOG was coordinating. LCOG had asked Mr. Gaydos to facilitate a recent meeting; however, since he was an LTD Board member, he later was asked just to participate and not facilitate. The group was charged with taking a 50-year look at governments around the metro area and at the Eugene and Springfield areas in general. He believed LTD should be involved. For instance, A Westfir City Councilor was interested in having LTD provide service to Westfir, and perhaps sometime within the next 50 years that would make sense. Mr. Gaydos said that he was not participating as an official representative of LTD, and he thought LTD staff should be involved with the group. Ms. Wylie said that in the future, LTD could be providing commuter vans, or some other such service, to outlying areas such as Westfir.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There were no further discussions, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

---

Board Secretary

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**Operating Financial Report**  
For the Fiscal Period Ending 04/30/01 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	\$ 2,713,963	\$ 3,393,000	\$ 2,642,837	77.9%	-2.6%
Group pass	644,817	750,000	709,046	94.5%	10.0%
Advertising	291,608	375,000	316,273	84.3%	8.5%
Special service	130,343	131,250	124,931	95.2%	-4.2%
Miscellaneous	289,086	248,000	152,707	61.6%	-47.2%
Total operating	4,069,818	4,897,250	3,945,793	80.6%	-3.0%
Payroll tax	12,884,359	16,590,000	13,149,338	79.3%	2.1%
Self-employment tax	320,088	1,000,000	863,785	86.4%	169.9%
State-in-lieu	804,118	1,000,000	763,535	76.4%	-5.0%
FTA operating grant	216,499	448,100	257,525	57.5%	18.9%
Total taxes & grants	14,225,064	19,038,100	15,034,183	79.0%	5.7%
Interest income	902,049	892,500	1,131,838	126.8%	25.5%
Sale of assets	-	5,000	3,618	72.4%	0.0%
Total revenues and other sources	19,196,931	24,832,850	20,115,431	81.0%	4.8%
<b>Expenditures &amp; Other Uses:</b>					
<b>Personnel Costs</b>					
Administration	4,325,830	5,680,990	4,529,529	79.7%	4.7%
Administration - Funded by Capital Projects	(573,528)	(748,820)	(546,755)	73.0%	-4.7%
Administration - Net	3,752,302	4,932,170	3,982,773	80.8%	6.1%
Contract	8,811,915	11,602,060	9,664,169	83.3%	9.7%
Total personnel	12,564,217	16,534,230	13,646,943	82.5%	8.6%
<b>Materials &amp; Services</b>					
General Administration	175,618	318,072	163,363	51.4%	-7.0%
Public Affairs	17,242	155,300	128,650	82.8%	646.1%
Commuter Solutions Program	42,026	109,000	118,699	108.9%	182.4%
Finance	42,758	54,900	47,380	86.3%	10.8%
Information Services	122,848	177,849	98,079	55.1%	-20.2%
Human Resources	185,408	199,460	107,064	53.7%	-42.3%
Planning & Development	10,479	7,700	5,678	73.7%	-45.8%
Service Planning & Marketing	536,249	432,900	279,528	64.6%	-47.9%
Guest Service Center	18,506	28,505	13,647	47.9%	-26.3%
Transit Operations	173,943	265,860	215,891	81.2%	24.1%
Fleet Services	1,556,255	2,143,100	1,918,215	89.5%	23.3%
Facility Services	413,109	568,255	402,568	70.8%	-2.6%
Insurance / Liability Costs	480,609	587,000	509,356	86.8%	6.0%
STF Transfer	619,000	789,000	643,250	81.5%	3.9%
Capital Transfer - Operating	497,438	3,000,000	626,001	20.9%	25.8%
Capital Transfer - Reserves	-	4,254,817	4,254,817	100.0%	0.0%
Total materials & services	4,891,488	13,091,718	9,532,187	72.8%	94.9%
Total expenditures and other uses	17,455,706	29,625,948	23,179,130	78.2%	32.8%
Excess (deficiency) of revenues over expenditures	1,741,225	(4,793,098)	(3,063,699)		-276.0%
<b>Net to fund</b>	<b>\$ 1,741,225</b>	<b>\$ (4,793,098)</b>	<b>\$ (3,063,699)</b>		<b>-276.0%</b>

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**General Fund**  
**Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance**  
**For the period 04/01/01 - 04/30/01**

	Annual	Current Month			Year To Date		
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Variance	Actual	Budget	Variance
<b>Revenues &amp; Other Sources:</b>							
Passenger Fares	\$ 3,393,000	\$ 266,222	\$ 253,840	\$ 12,382	\$ 2,642,837	\$ 2,855,463	\$ (212,626)
Group Pass Payments	750,000	72,327	74,892	(2,565)	709,046	610,651	98,395
Advertising	375,000	33,750	31,634	2,116	316,273	312,652	3,621
Special Services	131,250	64	10,938	(10,874)	124,931	109,374	15,557
Miscellaneous Income	248,000	1,444	10,636	(9,192)	152,707	198,624	(45,917)
Payroll Tax Revenue	16,590,000	723,494	663,600	59,894	13,149,338	13,106,100	43,238
Self-employment Tax	1,000,000	710,094	250,000	460,094	863,785	390,000	473,785
State In-Lieu-of-Tax	1,000,000	-	-	-	763,535	750,000	13,535
Operating Grants	448,100	1,898	37,341	(35,443)	257,525	373,418	(115,893)
Interest Income	892,500	92,505	75,250	17,255	1,131,838	742,000	389,838
Proceeds From Sale of Assets	5,000	-	416	(416)	3,618	4,168	(551)
<b>Total General Fund Revenues</b>	<b>24,832,850</b>	<b>1,901,798</b>	<b>1,408,547</b>	<b>493,251</b>	<b>20,115,431</b>	<b>19,452,450</b>	<b>662,981</b>
<b>Expenditures &amp; Other Uses:</b>							
General Administration	949,917	68,156	73,764	5,608	668,518	793,395	124,877
Public Affairs	176,390	4,415	14,699	10,284	146,612	146,990	378
Commuter Solutions Program	212,510	17,689	18,626	937	216,524	175,260	(41,264)
Finance	594,980	44,757	48,557	3,800	459,987	499,968	39,981
Information Services	552,289	35,024	43,097	8,073	370,381	441,093	70,712
Human Resources	524,950	33,930	41,406	7,476	384,429	442,125	57,696
Planning & Development	7,700	756	644	(112)	16,522	6,414	(10,108)
Service Planning & Marketing	1,172,555	80,699	72,577	(8,122)	861,659	1,031,511	169,852
Guest Service Center	500,075	30,913	41,557	10,644	348,530	416,853	68,323
Transit Operations	10,825,660	823,054	899,726	76,672	9,096,987	9,026,108	(70,879)
Fleet Services	4,576,270	395,076	369,589	(25,487)	3,885,090	3,824,484	(60,606)
Facility Services	901,835	77,141	73,750	(3,391)	690,465	760,525	70,060
Insurance/ Liability Costs	587,000	36,439	11,750	(24,689)	509,356	563,500	54,144
<b>Total before transfers</b>	<b>21,582,131</b>	<b>1,648,048</b>	<b>1,709,742</b>	<b>61,693</b>	<b>17,655,062</b>	<b>18,128,226</b>	<b>473,164</b>
STF Transfer	789,000	100,063	197,250	97,188	643,250	789,000	145,750
Capital Transfer	7,254,817	64,594	250,000	185,406	4,880,818	6,754,817	1,873,999
<b>Total General Fund Expenditures</b>	<b>29,625,948</b>	<b>1,812,705</b>	<b>2,156,992</b>	<b>344,287</b>	<b>23,179,130</b>	<b>25,672,043</b>	<b>2,492,913</b>
<b>Unreserved Fund Balance</b>							
Change to fund balance					(3,063,699)	(6,219,593)	
Beginning balance					7,746,013	7,793,098	
Ending balance					<u>\$ 4,682,314</u>	<u>\$ 1,573,505</u>	

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**Special Transportation Fund**  
**Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance**  
**For the period 04/01/01 - 04/30/01**

	Adopted Budget	Y-T-D Actual	Current Month Actual	Percent of year Balance	83% YTD% Budget
<b>Revenues &amp; Other Sources:</b>					
State Special Transp Funds	\$ 637,910	\$ 814,181	\$ 174,176	\$ 176,271	127.6%
STF - Capital	380,280	111,899	-	(268,381)	29.4%
STF - Interest Income	-	-	-	-	0.0%
Transfer from general fund	<u>789,000</u>	<u>643,250</u>	<u>100,063</u>	<u>(145,750)</u>	<u>81.5%</u>
Total Revenues	<u>1,807,190</u>	<u>1,569,330</u>	<u>274,239</u>	<u>(237,860)</u>	<u>86.8%</u>
<b>Expenditures &amp; Other Uses:</b>					
STF - flow-through transfer	1,018,190	928,531	174,176	89,659	91.2%
Direct support - Ridesource	659,000	543,000	75,000	116,000	82.4%
LTD - Capital match	29,750	-	-	29,750	0.0%
Direct support - LCOG admin	<u>100,250</u>	<u>100,250</u>	<u>25,063</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Total STF Expenditures	<u>1,807,190</u>	<u>1,571,781</u>	<u>274,239</u>	<u>235,409</u>	<u>87.0%</u>
<b>Unreserved Fund Balance</b>					
Change to fund balance	-	(2,451)			
Beginning balance	<u>119,209</u>	<u>121,660</u>			
Ending balance	<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 04/01/01 - 04/30/01**

	Adopted Budget	Y-T-D Actual	Current Month Actual	Percent of year Balance	83% Y-T-D % Budget
<b>Revenues &amp; Other Sources:</b>					
Grant income	\$ 16,038,606	\$ 1,530,781	\$ 70,243	\$ (14,507,825)	9.5%
Transfer from General Fund					
For Current Projects	3,000,000	626,001	64,594	(2,373,999)	20.9%
For Capital Reserves	4,254,817	4,254,817	-	-	100.0%
Total resources	<u>23,293,423</u>	<u>6,411,599</u>	<u>134,837</u>	<u>(16,881,824)</u>	<u>27.5%</u>
<b>Expenditures:</b>					
Grant Paid Capital					
Miscellaneous equipment	185,600	81,241	15,033	104,359	43.8%
ADP software & hardware	818,700	265,361	28,932	553,339	32.4%
Shop equipment	14,400	9,307	-	5,093	64.6%
Bus stations, stops, & terminals	445,000	256,427	60,397	188,573	57.6%
Bus rapid transit	11,700,000	741,636	57,146	10,958,364	6.3%
Springfield station relocation	700,000	7,851	4,566	692,149	1.1%
Facilities	275,000	74,103	9,288	200,897	26.9%
Signal & communication projects	2,225,000	139,863	-	2,085,137	6.3%
Revenue rolling stock	2,500,000	7,810	-	2,492,190	0.3%
Support vehicles	140,000	117,336	-	22,664	83.8%
Budgeted for capital contingency	200,000	-	-	200,000	0.0%
Total Federal Funded Capital	<u>19,203,700</u>	<u>1,700,936</u>	<u>175,362</u>	<u>17,502,764</u>	<u>8.9%</u>
Locally Funded Capital					
Communications infrastructure	-	1,316	-	-	-
LCC Station	400,000	-	-	400,000	0.0%
RideSource Facility	425,000	6,090	-	418,910	1.4%
Total Locally Funded Capital	<u>825,000</u>	<u>7,406</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>817,594</u>	<u>0.9%</u>
Total Capital Projects Fund Expenditures	<u>20,028,700</u>	<u>1,708,342</u>	<u>175,362</u>	<u>18,320,358</u>	<u>8.5%</u>
<b>Unreserved Fund Balance</b>					
Change to fund balance	4,089,723	4,703,257			
Beginning fund balance	13,290,361	11,073,760			
Ending Fund Balance	<u>\$ 17,380,084</u>	<u>\$ 15,777,017</u>			

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

	Current Balances	Balance 06/30/00 (Unaudited)
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Cash & equivalents	\$6,849,807	\$9,799,678
Receivables	410,446	440,517
Inventory of parts and supplies	605,543	611,933
Prepaid expenses	185,115	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>\$47,552,888</u></u></b>	<b><u><u>\$50,481,420</u></u></b>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable	\$0	\$298,988
Payroll payable	557,931	228,861
Unearned revenue	212,727	49,479
Liability claims/other payable	121,373	162,248
CAL/sick accrual	1,797,619	1,797,619
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	<b><u><u>2,689,650</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>(3,063,699)</u>	<u>(2,427,983)</u>
Ending fund balance	<u>4,741,980</u>	<u>7,746,013</u>
 Total Reserves and Fund Balances	 <u>44,863,239</u>	 <u>47,944,225</u>
<b>Total Liabilities &amp; Fund Balance</b>	<b><u><u>\$47,552,888</u></u></b>	<b><u><u>\$50,481,420</u></u></b>

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

	Current Balances	Balance 6/30/2000
<b>ASSETS</b>		
Cash & equivalents	\$15,655,587	\$11,156,522
Receivables	149,471	104,349
Prepaid expenses	0	0
<b>Total Assets</b>	<b><u>\$15,805,058</u></b>	<b><u>\$11,260,871</u></b>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>		
Accounts payable	\$28,041	\$187,111
Retainage payable	0	0
<b>Total Liabilities</b>	<b><u>28,041</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	4,703,257	2,488,928
Ending fund balance	15,777,017	11,073,760
<b>Total Liabilities &amp; Fund Balances</b>	<b><u>\$15,805,058</u></b>	<b><u>\$11,260,871</u></b>

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001
- ITEM TITLE:** FY 2001-02 AND FY 2002-03 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION GRANT PROGRAM <sup>1</sup> CERTIFICATION AND PROJECT PRIORITIZATION
- PREPARED BY:** Terry Parker, Special Transportation Program Administrator
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Complete Certification and Consolidated Ranking Sheets as required by ODOT for completion of Public Transportation Discretionary Program grant applications
- BACKGROUND:** The two mandated activities of the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) are (1) to review the proposed distribution of STF formula monies, and (2) to review Community Transportation discretionary grant proposals and make recommendations to LTD as the governing body. The STFAC has reviewed and ranked project requests to be submitted to ODOT Public Transit Division for FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03.
- RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Confirms to ODOT that the required process was followed and indicates local priorities to be used in the selection of grant awards
- ATTACHMENTS:**
- (1) Governing Body's Information and Certification
  - (2) Consolidated Application Ranking Sheet for Special Transportation Proposals
- PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution:
- Lane Transit District Resolution No. 2001-018: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors authorizes the submittal of the Governing Body's Information and Certification and Consolidated Application Ranking Sheet for Special Transportation Proposals for Fiscal Years 2001-02 and 2002-03 to ODOT Public Transit Division.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2001\05\Regular Mtg\AgendaSum May 01CT\_.doc

---

<sup>1</sup> As of April 2001, the Community Transportation (CT) Grant Program has been renamed as the *Public Transportation Grant Program*.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001
- ITEM TITLE:** FY 2001-02 SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION FUND (STF) FORMULA ALLOCATIONS FOR OPERATIONS CONTRACTS
- PREPARED BY:** Terry Parker, Special Transportation Program Administrator
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve the recommendation of the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) for the distribution of the FY 2001-02 STF formula allocation for Lane County
- BACKGROUND:** The two mandated activities of the STFAC are (1) to review the proposed distribution of STF formula monies, and (2) to review Community Transportation discretionary grant proposals and make recommendations to LTD as the governing body. LTD's approval of the formula allocations as recommended by the STFAC (or amended as the LTD Board so chooses) is required in order to execute contract service for FY 2001-02. All contracts are contingent upon the adoption of the FY 2001-02 LTD budget and the availability of STF monies in accordance with the Oregon Department of Transportation's (ODOT's) allocation schedule.
- RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Contracts with special transportation providers for services to the elderly and disabled will commence July 1, 2001.
- ATTACHMENT:** Draft FY 2001-02 STF Formula Allocations for Lane County Special Transportation Operations
- PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution:
- Lane Transit District Resolution No. 2001-019: Be it resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the recommendation of the STF Advisory Committee to distribute funds to the providers named and in the amounts listed in the Draft FY 2001-02 STF Formula Allocations for Lane County Special Transportation Operations.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

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

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

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

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

**MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

Wednesday, April 18, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 12, 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, April 18, 2001, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Pat Hocken

**CALL TO ORDER:** Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at

5:34 p.m.

**WORK SESSION – STATUS REPORT ON EUGENE TRAIN STATION PROJECT:**

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch introduced Tom Larsen, Principle Civil Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works, to provide more detail about the City's plans and possible designs for the Eugene train station project.

Mr. Larsen said that the acquisition and renovation of the Eugene Depot had been authorized \$1.75 million under the federal Transportation Equity Act of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). Another \$1 million in federal funds that passed through the State had been obtained as well. Amtrak also had pledged up to \$1 million for the project.



Mr. Larsen reviewed schematics of the current station and the history of the funding support for the redesign. He said that while other cities owned their stations, Eugene did not. The original estimate of \$3 million for the redesign did not take into account that the property would need to be purchased, so the available funding would not cover the costs as currently designed.

Based on age and uniqueness, the current depot, built in 1899, would be placed on the national historical registry, once it was in public ownership.

Negotiations were underway to purchase the property, which included a narrow strip of land along the tracks that would be purchased for future expansion, a parking lot west of Willamette Street, the current station building and parking lot, the building just east of the station building, and a piece of property to connect the station to Oak.

Proposals were being received from potential designers to begin the master plan design for the entire site and to obtain a more accurate cost estimate.

Mr. Larsen showed a schematic drawing that depicted the potential access from Oak Street and a possible pedestrian connection to Skinner Butte. Alternate quarters for the Amtrak operation would be needed in order for work, such as asbestos abatement, to be completed on the existing building.

Ms. Wylie asked if part of the asbestos abatement was the responsibility of the seller. Mr. Larsen said that the City was offering payment based on a clean site, and the seller had agreed to that provision.

City staff anticipated that Phase 1 would include the completion of design work by the end of the year, with construction beginning during the first quarter of 2002. Phase 2 and the completion of the project would depend upon future funding. It recently was learned that there was just under \$200,000 in Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) transportation enhancement funding that likely would be available for this project.

Mr. Melnick asked about an opportunity for Greyhound to share the site with the train station. Mr. Larsen said there had been much discussion about Greyhound moving to a new site, but no decisions had been made. Including Greyhound at the Amtrak Station was not in the original concept, but had grown from Greyhound's need to relocate from its current site. There was much interest, and the depot could be an attractive site; however, the bus staging area could be problematic, as there was not much additional space. There currently was no Greyhound component in the funding, and the impact on the neighborhood and project could be large.

Ms. Wylie asked if there was a possibility that some of the other nearby buildings could be relocated. Mr. Larsen said that it was a possibility. If Greyhound was interested in relocating to the depot site, there were larger issues to be considered, and there had been an ongoing discussion that Greyhound could be nearby on the other side of 5th Avenue. It was likely that the area could be in need of a parking structure.

Mr. Kleger said that during the design phase, he would be willing to provide accessibility consulting services free of charge. He was familiar with the depot building and had used it frequently. Mr. Larsen noted that the platforms would be built to enable level boarding with the train. He thought that the opportunity would be there for the type of involvement Mr. Kleger was suggesting.

Ms. Wylie said LTD was very interested in the multi-modal aspect with LTD's new downtown shuttle system. Mr. Larsen said the city was very interested as well, and would include LTD service in its planning efforts. The bus system and its components, such as Park & Ride and how it could all work together, would be key in the master plan.

Mr. Gaydos asked about the property located to the north of the county jail. Mr. Larsen said that was property that belonged to the same owners as the depot property, and it appeared that, if needed, it also could be included in the sale.

Mr. Gaydos asked if the railroad was willing to waive any right-of-way. Mr. Larsen said that the current plan was to buy an additional strip along the existing tracks with the objective of adding an additional rail in order to move the freight trains onto the main line and away from the passenger rail strip. Amtrak also had a need for a third rail to store a train overnight. Currently, the Amtrak train that spent the night in Eugene had to travel to the rail yards near Roosevelt and return to the depot in the morning.

Mr. Bennett said that he heard from LTD staff that, in terms of the shuttle operation, it would be helpful to have two-way traffic on Pearl Street. Service Planning Manager Andy Vobora said that he had met with City staff about Pearl Street. Mr. Larsen said that the City

typically conducted a more comprehensive review when considering changing street traffic patterns; however, an exception criteria had been created for this instance, and the Pearl Street changes should be exempted from the more comprehensive process. Mr. Vobora thought an approval from ODOT on signal changes would be needed, and some design issues would need to be worked out, but he was optimistic that Pearl Street could be changed to two-way traffic by September.

**WORK SESSION – SPRINGFIELD STATION LAND ACQUISITION:** Mr. Hamm said that the final environmental approval had been received, and the site now was ready for final review and approval by the Springfield City Council and the LTD Board.

Mr. Hamm said that Springfield Station remained a priority for LTD, and it was staff's intent to keep moving forward even though construction funding was not yet realized. The Oregon congressional delegation and the LTD government relations manager were pushing forward on the issue. A copy of a letter from Governor Kitzhaber to Congressman Peter DeFazio and a letter from the Oregon delegation to the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, both encouraging the funding of the station, were distributed to the Board members.

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that the letter from Governor Kitzhaber was part of the lobbying effort for Springfield Station. The letter from the Oregon delegation to the House Appropriations Committee was a formal request for a number of appropriations projects for Oregon. Staff continued to work on other lobbying strategies.

Mr. Hamm said that LTD currently had secured \$850,000 in federal funds from the Surface Transportation Program to purchase the property and begin the design. If additional federal

funds were not secured, the recommendation would be to reprioritize LTD's capital projects in order to move forward with this project as the highest priority to get it completed.

Ms. Wylie asked if the land purchase had been finalized. Mr. Hamm said that the site first had to be approved by the Springfield City Council. The Board would be discussing the issue with the Council at a joint meeting on May 14. LTD expected to receive approval from the Council, and then it would be a matter of the LTD Board taking action to proceed.

Mr. Melnick asked about the internal process for selecting a designer. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano responded that a request for proposals would be issued, and based on the responses, staff would conduct interviews and select a firm. Mr. Hamm added that staff intended to include some participation from the City of Springfield.

**WORK SESSION – BOARD POSITION ON REOPENING BROADWAY STREET:**

Mr. Gaydos had requested that the Board discuss and take a position on the reopening of Broadway Street and its impact on LTD and the community.

Mr. Bennett said that he had participated as an LTD representative on the downtown visioning committee. At the April 16 Eugene City Council meeting, there was a point in the discussion of the visioning committee's report where Councilor Gary Rayor, in trying to make the case for stronger language with respect to the bicycle path along the river and in making comments about why he was so concerned, had evoked Mr. Bennett's name. Councilor Rayor had suggested that Mr. Bennett was someone who might support building parking right on the river, which could intercept the bike path. Mr. Bennett said that he could not let the issue pass. He thought the Councilor's comments were well out of line and contrary to what Mr. Bennett

would ever suggest or recommend. Mr. Bennett requested copies of the minutes of visioning committee to determine if something he had said could have been construed as support for such a project. Upon review of those minutes, Mr. Bennett did not believe that he had said anything of that nature. He then called City Manager Jim Johnson discuss it. He did not think it was an appropriate comment by the Councilor, particularly since Mr. Bennett was not present at the meeting to defend himself. Mr. Bennett was planning to write to the Council; however, in the meantime, Councilor Rayor had telephoned Mr. Bennett and apologized for the comments. Councilor Rayor said that he had become flustered in trying to make his case as strongly as possible and had made the comments in error. The Councilor said that he would apologize on the record at a later meeting. Mr. Bennett thought that if those statements were left uncorrected, it would reflect negatively on his involvement with the visioning committee and on his representation of LTD.

With respect to reopening Broadway, Mr. Bennett said that he had been an advocate for nearly 20 years. He was very involved in downtown business issues, and even though there was not a direct legal conflict of interest, the perception existed that there was a conflict of interest because of his downtown business ownership. He believed he needed to be careful, with respect to any appointed group that he was a member of, if the group was poised to take a formal position on the issue. He did not think it was a problem to be part of the discussion, but believed that it was not appropriate for him to take part in a vote on the position.

Ms. Wylie said that Mr. Bennett had a fine reputation in the community for preserving and restoring buildings, and was an admirable member of the downtown community.

Mr. Gaydos distributed a memo of support for the reopening of Broadway. He did not have an economic interest, but he was the president of the Downtown Eugene, Inc., Board of Directors, and thus was interested in ensuring that downtown Eugene functioned well. He also had an interest, and had for many years, in LTD being the transportation leader in the community, which was one of the reasons he wanted to serve on the LTD Board. LTD needed to be recognized as being about more than just mass transit, and the community needed to recognize that the need to move people was extremely important. Mr. Gaydos believed that the reopening of Broadway fell within that category, and LTD should be involved. West Broadway currently was part of a closed mall, and it was an issue of opening that portion of the street. The issue would be included on the City Council agenda, as well as on the November ballot.

Jenny Ulum, of Ulum and Associates, was collecting petitions to form a broad coalition, and a copy of the petition was attached to the memorandum from Mr. Gaydos. LTD would be investing money in a shuttle that would cross Broadway, and the more accessibility for the shuttle, the better it would work.

Mr. Gaydos highlighted the reasons he thought reopening Broadway was important. The community was or should be proud of LTD's investment in the transfer station and the shuttle service. The city was dedicating a lot of money for the library, which was relatively near the area. If the area could be redeveloped in a more positive way, it would be more helpful for the library, the LTD transfer station, Broadway Place, and much of the public investment in the immediate area. Mr. Gaydos' encouragement for the LTD Board was to collectively take a position supporting the reopening of Broadway. He requested that the Board take the collective position to support the reopening of Broadway.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she was a Springfield representative, and Broadway was a Eugene street. While she was not against the reopening, she felt that unless she heard a more compelling reason than LTD wanting to maybe someday run a bus on Broadway, she could not formally support the issue. LTD's interest in mass transit was a clear issue. She asked if the Springfield representatives should abstain from voting on this issue. Mr. Gaydos said that he was seeking full Board support of the issue as a regional transportation issue. Both downtown Eugene and downtown Springfield needed to be successful. LTD invested significantly in downtown Eugene and soon would in downtown Springfield. If the Board chose not to support it as a group, he would ask that the individual members support it. Ms. Lauritsen said that was a more compelling argument in support of the proposal.

Mr. Kleger said that in the past, he would have been reluctant to support measures to put cars back in the area of the downtown mall. Now, however, he was satisfied that nothing could happen to turn around the extremely depressed situation that currently existed without making the change to Broadway Street. He noted that he did not believe reopening Broadway alone would fix the problem. It may take not only the funding for construction, but also enough funding to put a police officer on every corner and in every alley for a period of time, which he thought should have been done long ago. The city still faced the budgetary limitations, but no further private investment would be made in the area until cars were allowed on the street.

Mr. Melnick said that he appreciated Mr. Gaydos bringing the issue to the Board. He believed that whether or not buses operated on Broadway, LTD had an interest in a healthy downtown. He took exception with Mr. Kleger's comments about the additional police presence. Studies had shown in many communities that additional eyes on the street, via



automobile traffic, were a natural deterrent to crime and bad behaviors. Those results already had been achieved with the reopening of Olive and Willamette Streets. Mr. Melnick was very much in favor.

Ms. Wylie said that she was deeply conflicted. Her husband was an artist and was the designer for the complex brick pattern that covered the entire plaza. He and the artists who produced the sculptures on the plaza were very upset that their artwork may be destroyed or removed in the process of reopening Broadway. It was unknown what the design of the reopened street would be. Ms. Wylie did support a healthy downtown, but she also was supportive of the work of local artists. She did not think that the benches could remain, but the sculptures could be repositioned. She also did not know if the brick pattern would need to be torn up. Whatever happened, she hoped that some concern for the artists and artwork would be shown.

Mr. Hamm said that staff had researched with the Government Standards and Practices Commission, and found that Mr. Bennett would not have a legal conflict of interest in this situation, but perception would be a more accurate way to describe the situation.

One of the visions that the City staff had for Broadway was a great street or boulevard concept. A second shuttle had been discussed that would serve the courthouse and downtown. Broadway could be the street on which that vehicle could operate. Staff recognized that transit was a piece of the transportation puzzle and should be interested in anything that improved the livability.

Mr. Gaydos said that he appreciated Ms. Wylie's comments on artwork. He knew the existing artwork would be considered, and part of it would go into the design.

Mr. Bennett asked if an amendment could be made to the motion to include a statement of respect for the artists and artwork. Ms. Wylie said that a motion would not be made until later in the meeting.

**JACKETS FOR BOARD MEMBERS:** Mr. Hamm displayed for the members a potential jacket that could be provided to the Board members to wear while representing LTD. Ms. Wylie said that the jacket clearly represented LTD. It matched the operator jackets and hats, etc. She asked if a lighter and longer version could be made available. Ms. Wylie said that she would be representing LTD at several community outdoor events, and she would appreciate having the jacket. The Board members liked the jacket, and asked that staff explore sizes and lengths.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – MAY 2001:** Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Steve Hoisington, who had been selected as the May 2001 Employee of the Month. Mr. Hoisington was hired on October 18, 1978, and had 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. Mr. Hoisington previously had been selected as the May 1984 Employee of the Month.

Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Hoisington was a long-term employee and was a dream employee to supervise. He did everything right, and he always provided excellent service.

LTD received many positive comments from customers about Mr. Hoisington. He added that Mr. Hoisington had not missed time, and was a safe and courteous bus operator.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Hoisington and presented him with an Employee of the Month pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award. She thanked him for his excellent service to LTD and its guests. Mr. Hoisington thanked the Board for the recognition and said that he appreciated his supervisor's support. He said that it was a pleasure to work at LTD and with staff, and it was exciting to see the growth in LTD.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 2000:** Mr. Johnson then introduced Bus Operator Marcie Pope as LTD's 2000 Employee of the Year, an award that was announced at the March 18 Employee Appreciation Banquet. Ms. Pope 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 put forward to make LTD a very special place to work. Ms. Pope was selected as the November 2000 Employee of the Month after being nominated by many of her co-workers, who appreciated her wonderful sense of team spirit and the extra effort she always put forth.

Mr. Johnson said that Ms. Pope performed many functions at LTD and was the "mom" of the Operations Department. She was in tune with the rest of the operators and knew how they were feeling. Mr. Hamm added that Ms. Pope oversaw the football shuttle service, and he had participated with Ms. Pope at three UO home football games. As a result of working with Ms. Pope, he better understood what worked. Ms. Pope also organized the operator potlucks that occurred during football games. There was camaraderie and team spirit that had developed

around the football service, and right in the middle of all of it was Ms. Pope. Mr. Hamm said that Ms. Pope was an exceptional and energetic member of the team.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Ms. Pope and presented her with a plaque and a lapel pin. Ms. Pope said that she was thrilled to have her own front and center parking spot at LTD for a whole year (a new EOY designated parking space). She thanked everyone who voted for her. This coming fall would be her fourth season of football and potlucks, and there would be new instructors, who would be on-the-road trainers. Those trainers recently held a meeting and included a potluck, so it was catching on, and was one way to have fun while working. Ms. Pope thanked the Board and said that she was very honored. She added that she was grateful that the Employee of the Month sweaters were v-necked to go over her "swollen head" after receiving this award.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 1999:** Ms. Wylie surprised Executive Assistant and Clerk of the Board Jo Sullivan by announcing that she had a presentation for her as well for having been selected as the 1999 Employee of the Year. She presented Ms. Sullivan with a lapel pin, which had not been available the previous year, and thanked her for her support of the Board of Directors.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** 1). Rob Zako of Eugene and the president of Friends of Eugene (FoE) said that the FoE had been talking to LTD for several years regarding the bus rapid transit (BRT) project, and he was discouraged because the FoE did not feel that it was being heard by LTD. He was present at the Board meeting to inform the Board of the FoE's plan of action in opposition to the proposed BRT pilot corridor project.

The FoE BRT committee met to discuss its position on BRT and had voted 8-0 to not endorse the BRT project as currently proposed, as it would damage neighborhoods and environmental quality, and it would fail to improve transit service.

Mr. Zako said that the FoE was a group of volunteers all who agreed to not support BRT. He thought that was pretty amazing coming from a group of transit supporters, but said that LTD must have done something to turn the group against BRT.

The FoE also voted to take some further action. They planned to publish an Op-Ed piece against BRT in *The Register-Guard* opposite LTD's piece in support of BRT. The group also would be lobbying local and state officials and other community groups. In addition, the FoE already had been talking to Representative Peter DeFazio and with officials from the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA). The FoE thought it was unfortunate that there was a funding deadline and thought there should be some flexibility in that area. Lastly, the FoE was looking into a possible appeal of the Environmental Assessment (EA). Mr. Zako said that he had not reviewed many EAs, but the "Tree Huggers" were a group that had reviewed many EAs, and had been truly astounded at the inadequacy of the EA.

Mr. Zako said that he normally liked to build bridges and work issues out. The people in the FoE were anxious to take these actions, because it would feel as though something were being done, and it was easier to be against something than for something.

For the record, Mr. Zako said that there were some things the FoE was willing to discuss. The FoE wanted a BRT that they believed would be successful and would enhance transit

service in the community. In order to get that, Mr. Zako provided a list of actions the FoE believed LTD should do:

a) LTD should join with the FoE in lobbying Representative DeFazio and the FTA to extend the funding for BRT, to allow more time for more design work.

b) LTD should redo the EA. The "Purpose and Need" section needed to be much more specific to actually define objectively what it was that BRT would attempt to accomplish and that would consider real alternatives. It also should thoroughly evaluate those alternatives, according to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.

c) LTD should design a longer BRT pilot route so time savings actually could make a difference. No one would care about a four-mile route that saves only a couple of minutes in travel time.

d) LTD should connect the nodes and integrate BRT with nodal development. Bob Cortright of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had stated in his TransPlan work that BRT and nodal development had to be integrated. Mr. Zako said that, currently, he did not see where the nodes were along the proposed BRT pilot route. Maybe they were not there, and LTD needed to be pushing Eugene and Springfield to get their nodal development acts together and then build BRT to go through those nodes and have the stations where the nodes were.

e) LTD should insist on a TransPlan that did not subsidize cars, but actually leveled the playing field. LTD had an opportunity, with its two Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) representatives at a recent MPC meeting, to endorse having cars pay for the cost of maintaining roads. That initiative failed. By not doing that, cars were not paying their full cost, and they ended up being subsidized and less expensive relative to riding buses. The playing field needed to be leveled in order to make buses more competitive.

f) The FoE wanted the Board to work with them to build consensus in the community to actually have the community be behind BRT rather than feeling like it was being railroaded into having to accept BRT because the funding would disappear.

g) Finally, the FoE thought it would be to the Board's benefit to ask to be elected rather than appointed by the Governor. Mr. Zako said that he realized the Board did not have that power, but he thought the Board could pass a resolution stating that it believed being elected to be a good idea. The Board could direct Ms. Lynch to lobby the state legislature to make LTD's Board locally elected.

Mr. Zako said that the FoE would move forward with its plan of action, but told the Board not to worry, as the FoE was made up of a few volunteers and did not have a paid staff. There was much support for BRT from the community, and LTD had a lot of money. LTD probably would get BRT, but it would make the FoE feel good to do the things planned in opposition of the current proposed pilot corridor plan. However, if LTD wanted to talk to the FoE and to consider the issues as presented, and if LTD wanted BRT to work, the FoE wanted to talk to LTD.

2) Sally Nunn of Eugene said that she was one of the tree huggers that Mr. Zako had referred to. She truly believed that LTD needed to go back to drawing board with the proposed BRT pilot corridor. As envisioned, the pilot project would disrupt neighborhoods, compromise existing businesses, adversely impact efficient traffic flow, and destroy the aesthetics and environmental function of Eugene's best and most beloved meridian.

Ms. Nunn said that the current EA had many problems. For instance, mitigating storm water of newly planted trees after removing 20 or more mature trees would take 60 plus years

to accomplish. A case in point was the Ferry Street Bridge area. Did those trees keep rain from washing pollutants from the streets into the storm drains and into our rivers and streams? It was unsound science, unless LTD was confusing Eugene's streets with old growth forest, where this theory might actually work.

In addition, as a small business owner, Ms. Nunn said that she found the bottleneck depicted in the after picture of the 11<sup>th</sup> and Hilyard streets redo completely unacceptable. Her vehicle time significantly would increase as she attempted to access clients in the university area. With the need to carry equipment and to keep a tight time schedule, the bus was not an option for her. She would find her vehicle miles traveled much longer as a result of BRT as proposed.

Ms. Nunn said that, furthermore, as a long-time member of the Oregon Natural Resources Council, she had learned that while the Council had once supported the initial concept of BRT, it now had withdrawn that support and had decided to condition future support on a plan it expected to succeed.

Ms. Nunn said that it was not for her to say where a superior route might occur, but if the Eugene train station to the Springfield bus station route with shuttles to key substations had not been explored, she implored LTD to do so and soon. Ms. Nunn said that considering the stated effect that LTD expected its ridership to walk to fewer stations as a trade-off for speed, the train corridor route had acceptable proximity. This route would encompass important major employers, including the Waterfront Research Park, University of Oregon, Fifth Street Market, EWEB, and the new federal building. The increased speed and desired efficiency also could be attained along the rail corridor, and without adversely impacting traffic on Franklin



Boulevard. It would create a win-win situation, and in doing so, would avoid removing historic trees, a loss of "Dad's Gate," or the enmity of Glenwood citizens.

She asked LTD to please go back to drawing board and try again. The risk was that without an acceptable plan, as increasing public and private support eroded, LTD stood to lose the funding. She urged LTD to make significant progress in seeking solutions, so the important transit options would be available in the future.

Ms. Wylie noted that the current BRT pilot corridor plan did not remove the 20 trees. Mr. Viggiano confirmed that only two historic trees would be removed for the Agate Street station, but the other 20 trees would not be removed.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 18, 2001, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote. The April 18, 2001, Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the March 21, 2001, regular Board meeting.

**FY 2001-02 FARE POLICY:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that 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 that had been included in the Board agenda packet was incomplete. In order to ensure that the public record was accurate and complete, the entire fare policy document was included in the current agenda

packet, and staff were seeking the Board's approval of the correct and complete version of the policy.

In addition, the Board had requested a review of the day pass/transfer program, and Ms. Hellekson provided that review in the agenda packet.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Mr. Gaydos moved 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." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

**SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF TENTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35,**

**SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES:** Ms. Hellekson distributed an amended Ordinance 35 to the Board members. She said that a previous edition that did not include some corrections to the Ordinance had been included in the agenda packet.

Ms. Hellekson said that public hearings had been held on the proposed fare structure for FY 2001-02 at the February and March 2001 Board meetings. In February, staff were directed to make the following changes to the District's 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 needed to be implemented by ordinance.

Ms. Lauritsen moved that Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

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

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Mr. Kleger then moved approval of 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." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

**MISSION STATEMENT AND VISION:** Mr. Hamm said that the vision statement was discussed at the January 2001 work session and staff had made revisions according to discussions that had been held both with employees and with the Board.

This vision statement gave LTD a foundation to build the team philosophy from the core values. Guiding principles were imperative for employees to guide and judge themselves by.

It was important that the mission be easily understood by staff and the community. Mr. Hamm then read the 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; and providing progressive leadership for the community's transportation needs."

**MOTION**

Mr. Kleger moved approval of 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." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion.

Mr. Melnick said that he was concerned that the Mission Statement and Vision did not include a reference to energy efficiency or sustainability, etc., as a value that was held by LTD. Part of what was discussed at the work session was that by reducing dependence on the automobile, one also would accomplish a reduction in the dependence upon certain types of fuels, etc. He thought it would be appropriate to have something along those lines in a vision statement. Implementation was another issue, but to be a mass transit-focused agency, he thought not having it as part of the vision could be seen as lacking. Mr. Hamm said that sustainability was discussed in the development of each of the sections in the statement, it was assumed as part of the efficiency.

Mr. Melnick asked that the record indicate that when the District referred to sustainability of the communities, it included environmental efficiency as part of that term. Other members agreed.

**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie called for a vote on the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

**MOTION****BOARD POSITION ON OPENING OF BROADWAY STREET:** Mr. Gaydos moved

approval of LTD Resolution #2001-016: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors supports the reopening of Broadway between Oak and Charnelton in Eugene and encourages the Eugene City Council to place the matter before the voters, and in doing so, that there be respect and preservation, to the extent possible, of the existing artwork."

**VOTE**

Mr. Melnick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by acclamation.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:** 1) **Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):** Ms. Wylie

provided a review of the MPC meeting of April 12, 2001. There was a motion before MPC that LTD participation in MPC be limited to issues of mass transit only as opposed to the current level of participation in general transportation issues. The issue was brought by Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer. LTD had presented federal policy that required transit agencies to be at the table for planning, etc. The motion did not pass.

There also was a long list of activities that were requested to be changed in TransPlan that were generated by a letter from Lane County Commissioner Peter Sorenson. Mr. Viggiano said that three issues were brought forward by the Eugene City Council in response to Commissioner Sorenson's letter. One issue was to set more funding aside for nodal development. That measure failed at MPC. It actually had the majority of the vote, but MPC bylaws require at least one vote from every jurisdiction. The second issue was a change

to the BRT policy. Ms. Hocken had recommended wording changes to the definition and intent in order to strengthen the policy. The measure appeared to be supported, but the County raised a concern, and the issue was tabled. Staff believed the concern could be addressed and that at the next MPC meeting, MPC would endorse that change. The third issue that was brought up in response to Commissioner Sorenson's letter had to do with setting priorities for operations, maintenance, and preservation funding, and that measure failed as well.

Mr. Viggiano noted that another measure was requested to set priority for funding within the bike program for priority bike miles, and that measure passed. The measure was not directly related to Commissioner Sorenson's letter.

Mr. Viggiano said that another issue at the MPC meeting was the addition of a new chapter in TransPlan addressing issues that would be addressed as part of the next TransPlan review in three years, and that MPC decided that a new chapter was not needed at this time.

The next MPC meeting was scheduled for May 10, 2001.

2) **BRT Steering Committee**: The meeting scheduled for April 3, 2001, had been canceled. The next meeting was scheduled for May 1, 2001.

3) **Statewide Livability Forum**: Ms. Lauritsen would attend during the month of April and would report back to the Board in May.

3) **United Front Trip to Washington, D.C.**: Ms. Wylie and Mr. Gaydos provided a review of the recent lobbying trip. Mr. Gaydos thought the effort was worthwhile. He got to know some of LTD's partners better and established some personal relations that would assist in future undertakings. He praised Ms. Lynch for organizing the effort and for ensuring that everyone got to the right places at the right time. The schedule was rigorous, and there was an opportunity to talk to legislative staff people. The legislators did an excellent job spending time with and listening to the delegation. The legislators and staff were appreciative that Lane County had a United Front that was well organized in presenting information. It also had been a good experience to talk to people at the FTA, and Mr. Gaydos was impressed with the amount of time the FTA spent with the group. The FTA staff spent a lot of time talking about BRT and the concept and how it fit in federal programs. Mr. Gaydos said that Ms. Wylie also had done an excellent job in talking with FTA Administrator Edward Thomas. LTD was successful at being supportive of partner projects. Collectively, it was an effective effort, and the jurisdictions were supportive of each other.

Ms. Wylie added that the group worked very hard and established some good relationships. She believed it had been a very worthwhile trip.

5) **Eugene City Council**: Mr. Melnick reported on the April 9, 2001, City Council meeting in which the BRT project was discussed. Mr. Melnick said that Ms. Hocken made a brief presentation about BRT, and the Council discussed the project, but there was no vote. The Council recognized that the Planning Commission had voted in favor of the project.

6) **Springfield City Council**: Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen attended the April 16, 2001, Springfield City Council meeting in which the BRT project was discussed. Ms. Lauritsen said

that she thought it had been a very positive meeting. The Springfield technical staff made the presentation, and there was not much opposition. The Council would discuss the project again at a later date as well as at the joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council meeting on May 14.

**LTD GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT:** Mr. Hamm said that the biggest issue was a change in the oversight of contracted services for *RideSource*. Historically, LTD had an agreement with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), who then contracted on LTD's behalf with a private operator to operate *RideSource*. The operation of that was not changing, but the person who administered the program at LCOG, Terry Parker, would be joining the LTD staff rather than having LTD fund the position at LCOG. There had been much discussion with the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) and with the LCOG board, and it appeared to make sense to everyone. Ms. Parker would be joining LTD on July 1, 2001, and her position would become part of the General Management Performance Group. Her office would be located in the administrative area near reception. Staff were very excited, and Ms. Parker would bring to LTD a better connection to rural communities and special-needs members of the community at large. LTD would provide planning resource assistance to the Special Transportation Program that previously had not been available. Ms. Parker was excited about it as well. The contract with Special Mobility Services would come due later this year, and LTD would put out the request for proposals. Staff would make a selection based on proposals received. The operation of the *RideSource* service would not be brought in-house, but only the administrative oversight.

With regard to the shuttle buses, the delivery date was pushed back to late June, which still gave LTD sufficient time to program the buses into the maintenance function and to introduce them to the community.



**MARCH 2001 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:** Ms. Hellekson said that at this point in the fiscal year, staff remained somewhat concerned about the local economy. After two fairly strong months of payroll tax revenue, it had shown signs of weakening. Staff were cautiously optimistic that payroll tax revenues would meet budget by fiscal year end. Staff also were equally, if not more so, focused on the budget proposal for next year (FY 2001-2002). The first budget hearing was scheduled for Wednesday, April 25, at 6:30 p.m. Staff had changed the presentation format this year as there were no new members on the Budget Committee. Staff would present a big-picture view of LTD's business plan, rather than the typical department-by-department budget presentation, which would put a greater burden on the committee members to carefully review the budget notebooks.

**BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE:** Mr. Viggiano explained the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. He said that when the draft EA was released, the public was given an opportunity to provide comments to the District. Comments were to be addressed in the final EA. It should be expected that changes are made in the draft EA in response to comments and concerns. The final EA that reflects those changes becomes the legally binding document for the project.

Mr. Viggiano also responded to a comment at the meeting regarding mitigation for increased impervious surface. The EA recommended mitigation by planting additional trees, which would intercept rainwater before it reached the ground. The rainwater would evaporate from the leaves of the trees. One could determine the age and type of tree and the size of the tree, and make a calculation of the overall quantity as a way to mitigate an increase in the

impervious service. Some people believed that to be a good approach, but it had not been scientifically proven. This approach, however, is fairly new and still needs some testing and analysis. Consequently, the recommendation in the EA will be to use more traditional methods of mitigating storm water.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** Ms. Wylie said that copies of the correspondence to and from the Board were included in the packet for review.

**MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORT:** Ms. Wylie asked if Ms. Lynch had anything to add to her monthly report. Ms. Lynch said that she had nothing to add. She was following about 150 bills at the State Legislature. There was no transportation funding package before the Legislature at this session, so there was less work. It currently was a tense time at the Legislature, because they were at a crucial point where they needed to decide what actions they would take.

**MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT (March 2001):** Mr. Kleger referred to the ridership figures in the performance report and said that when he joined the Board about seven years ago, LTD was carrying just more than 4 million rides per year, but he noticed that currently, LTD was carrying more than 6 million rides. This was an incredible rate of growth. The only thing wrong with it was the LTD was not keeping up with the growth of the community. He was disappointed and discouraged that those who most wanted LTD to go faster were not willing to support BRT unless it met all of their expectations. They were willing to “make the perfect the enemy of the good.” He believed that LTD needed to make compromises with its

partner governments, or LTD would get nowhere at all. The very compromises that LTD made were looked upon by some as reasons to completely shoot down the project.

Mr. Gaydos said that there was a 2050 group that LCOG was coordinating. LCOG had asked Mr. Gaydos to facilitate a recent meeting; however, since he was an LTD Board member, he later was asked just to participate and not facilitate. The group was charged with taking a 50-year look at governments around the metro area and at the Eugene and Springfield areas in general. He believed LTD should be involved. For instance, A Westfir City Councilor was interested in having LTD provide service to Westfir, and perhaps sometime within the next 50 years that would make sense. Mr. Gaydos said that he was not participating as an official representative of LTD, and he thought LTD staff should be involved with the group. Ms. Wylie said that in the future, LTD could be providing commuter vans, or some other such service, to outlying areas such as Westfir.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There were no further discussions, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

---

Board Secretary

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 10, 2001.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, May 16, 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

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

**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

- Discussion of Bus Rapid Transit with Edward Thomas, associate administrator for research, demonstration, and innovation of the Federal Transit Administration, Washington, D.C. (90 minutes)

05

**The following agenda items will begin at 7 p.m. (Note – this is one-half-hour later than usual.)**

VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – JUNE 2001

10

VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

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

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Consent Calendar  | 11 |
|    | 1. Minutes of April 18, 2001, Regular Board Meeting<br>(Page 12)  |    |
| B. | Prioritization of Projects – Fiscal Years 2002 and 2003 Public Transit Discretionary Grant Program  | 27 |
| C. | Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Recommendations for STF Allocations for Special Transportation Service/Operations Contracts for Fiscal Year 2002 | 31 |
| D. | Follow-up Discussion on Fiscal Year 2001-02 Budget Approved by LTD Budget Committee on April 26, 2001   | 33 |

IX. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Current Activities  |    |
|    | 1. Board Member Reports   | 34 |
|    | (a) Metropolitan Policy Committee                                 |    |
|    | (b) BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee                |    |
|    | (c) Statewide Livability Forum                                    |    |
|    | (d) Eugene City Council Meeting                                   |    |
|    | (e) Joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council Meeting              |    |
|    | (f) APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference                           |    |
|    | (g) Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) Testimony |    |
|    | 2. General Manager's Report                                       | 36 |
|    | 3. Monthly Financial Report – April 2001 Financial Statements     | 37 |
|    | 4. Bus Rapid Transit Update                                       | 48 |
|    | 5. Springfield Station Update                                     | 49 |
|    | 6. TransPlan Update   | 50 |

	<u>Page No.</u>
7. Board Activity Calendars – Schedule Fall Strategic Planning Work Session	51
8. Correspondence	60
B. Monthly Performance Group Report	69
C. Monthly Performance Report (April 2001)	74
X. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	79
A. LTD Policies and Procedures Manual	
B. LTD Debt Financing 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. Bus Purchase	
H. TransPlan Draft Approval	
I. BRT Updates	
XI. ADJOURNMENT	

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

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 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 May 10, 2001, MPC meeting. The next MPC meeting is scheduled for June 14, 2001.
2. **BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT 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 three LTD Board members also meet separately as the Board BRT Committee, and last met on May 1. The full Steering Committee last met on March 6. The April 3 and May 1 meetings were cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for June 5, 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 last met in April 2001. Ms. Lauritsen attended an all-day *Willamette Valley: Choices for the Future* valley-wide conference sponsored by the Willamette Valley Livability Forum on April 25, 2001, in Corvallis, and can report on this conference at the May Board meeting.

4. **Eugene City Council:** The BRT project was discussed by the Eugene City Council at its May 14, 2001, meeting. Ms. Hocken attended the Council meeting and can provide a report and answer questions during the May 16, 2001, Board meeting.
5. **Joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council Meeting:** The LTD Board met in a joint work session with the Springfield City Council on Monday, May 14. The Board members may wish to hold a follow-up discussion, or debriefing, at the May 16 Board meeting.
6. **APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference:** Board member Ginny Lauritsen attended the May 6-10 American Public Transit Association Bus and Paratransit Conference in Calgary, Alberta, Canada. At the Board meeting, she can provide a brief report on this conference.
7. **LCDC TransPlan Alternative Measures Meeting:** Board member Pat Hocken provided testimony on BRT and TransPlan before the Land Conservation and Development Commission on May 4, 2001. At the May 16 Board meeting, she can provide a brief report about this hearing.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** CORRESPONDENCE

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

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

- ❑ February 17, 2001, letter (received at LTD on May 3) from residents of Daneland Mobile Park regarding service to Daneland
- ❑ April 13, 2001, memorandum from the Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce to Senators Ron Wyden and Gordon Smith regarding Chamber support for the proposed new Springfield Station
- ❑ May 4, 2001, letter from Board Member Pat Hocken to Steven Pfeiffer, Chair, Lane Conservation and Development Commission, as testimony regarding TransPlan and bus rapid transit
- ❑ May 4, 2001, memorandum from Lane Council of Governments Executive Director George Kloeppe regarding LCOG Board adoption of TransPlan Update
- ❑ May 8, 2001, letter from State Representative Vicki Walker regarding LTD's *Families in Good Company* Quality Seal award

At the May 16, 2001, meeting, staff will respond to any questions the Board members may have about this correspondence.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 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. Staff are targeting completion of the final EA in June 2001, with the issuance of a "FONSI" (Finding of No Significant Impact) by the end of July 2001.

**Phase 1 Review and Approval:**

Partner agency review sessions are planned for the week of the Board meeting. The LTD Board will hold a joint meeting with the Springfield City Council on May 14, 2001, to discuss BRT Phase 1, the Springfield Station, and future BRT phases. That same evening, the Eugene City Council will be discussing and possibly taking action on BRT Phase 1. The following day, May 15, 2001, the Board of County Commissioners is scheduled to take action on the BRT project. Reports on these meetings will be provided to the Board at the May 16 meeting. The Board members also may wish to take some time to discuss and debrief the joint meeting with the Springfield City Council.

**Design Team Selection**

A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to conduct the design work on the BRT Phase 1 project was issued on May 7, 2001, with responses due on June 4, 2001. The Board BRT Committee (Hillary Wylie, Rob Bennett, and Pat Hocken) met on May 1, 2001 and discussed the BRT design team selection. They concluded that Board member involvement in the process is important, and that they (the Board BRT Committee) would serve on the design team selection committee. There also may be participation from partner agency representatives in the selection process. Once this is confirmed, a more detailed schedule and process will be developed.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** APPROVED BUDGET DISCUSSION

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** At the conclusion of the Budget Committee meetings held in late April, a request was made by a Board member to further discuss FY 2001-02 budget issues prior to the public hearing and adoption action scheduled for June 20, 2001. While the Board can take no action on the approved budget during such a discussion, there is no reason why a supplemental discussion of the approved budget by Board members cannot be held.

To assist in budget deliberations, a list of questions was included at the conclusion of the budget presentation on April 26. These questions were not addressed by Budget Committee members. Should Board members wish to revisit these questions as part of a supplemental budget discussion, they are repeated below:

- Given the values and goals shared by staff, are we on the right track with the FY 2001-2002 proposed budget?
- Has the effort focused on community support for BRT been effective? Is the plan for the future focused on appropriate keys to success?
- Are efforts to increase system productivity appropriate and adequate?
- What aspect of our business next year (or in the future) might you do differently?

**ATTACHMENTS:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 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 May 16, 2001:

- ◆ Approval of minutes: April 18, 2001, regular Board meeting

**ATTACHMENTS:** (1) Minutes of the April 18, 2001, regular Board meeting

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

LTD Resolution No. 2001-017: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 16, 2001, is approved as presented.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

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

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **JUNE 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Bus Operator Shawn Bradley has been selected as the June 2001 Employee of the Month. Shawn was hired on January 12, 1998, and has earned awards for 2 years of safe driving, 2 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. Shawn was nominated by a group of people from Resurrection Community Church for his humor and thoughtfulness during a Holiday Lights Tour through Springfield. The church members were so delighted with Shawn that they gave a check to Bratton House, a facility for the needy, in lieu of a "tip" to express their gratefulness to Shawn and LTD.

When asked to provide an additional statement about what makes Shawn a good employee, Field Supervisor David Thulstrup said:

Shawn Bradley Shawn has an excellent work ethic and very strong feelings about how LTD employees should feel a commitment to their job and the community. He breezed through his probationary year, and has been an excellent representative of the District ever since. He has been involved with the District's Transportation Coordinator program, helping direct both football and basketball shuttles at the University of Oregon. He also served for more than a year on a committee to review, draft, and implement a new performance management package for all the District's operators. The package included establishing operator incentives for performance excellence, as well as recommending operator performance standards, to help LTD operators better understand and achieve their full potential at the District. There isn't an operator more deserving than Shawn to receive the June 2001 Employee of the Month award.

Our congratulations to Shawn on his selection!

**AWARD:** Shawn will attend the May 16, 2001, meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

## MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

May 16, 2001

### Revenue:

- **Passenger fares** are below budget for the first ten months, and also below the same period in the last fiscal year, although April was a fairly strong month. Year-end shortfalls versus budget likely are to be in the \$200,000 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 slightly 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 by fiscal year-end, but will be mitigated by savings in other wage line items.
- **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:** June 20, 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. **LTD Policies and Procedures Manual**: A new policies and procedures manual for administrative staff is being prepared and will be brought to the Board as an informational item on June 20, 2001.
- B. **Approval of LTD Debt Financing Policy**: A debt financing policy is undergoing review by District counsel and will be placed on the agenda for Board adoption at the June 20, 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, most likely on June 20, 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 on June 20, 2001.
- E. **Fiscal Year 2001-2002 Budget Adoption**: Following approval of the proposed budget by the LTD Budget Committee on April 26, 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. **Bus Purchase**: Approval of the purchase of 26 low-floor buses, to replace the District's 1985 800-series buses, will be placed on the agenda in June or July, 2001.
- H. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval**: Approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur in September 2001. Specific TransPlan action and information items will be included in Board agenda packets before that time.
- I. **BRT Updates**: Various action and information items will be placed on Board meeting agendas during the design and implementation phases of the bus rapid transit project.



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Because of General Manager Ken Hamm's attendance at the APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference May 6-10, his report to the Board will not be ready for delivery with the agenda packet for the May 16 Board meeting. It will be distributed to the Board at the meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** None at this time

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



# LTD General Manager's Report

## May 2001 Board Meeting

### Future Dates to Remember in 2001

July 15-19	APTA Board Members Seminar, Denver, Colorado
July 22	LTD Bus Roadeo at Glenwood (Salem Transit will be competing)
July 29	Team LTD Annual Picnic at Jasper Park
September 30- October 4	APTA Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

### External Activities of General Manager

April 20	Participated in Eugene Follies benefit performance
April 20	SEL (Springfield/Eugene/Lane County) meeting of all public CEO's
April 28	Participated in Spencer Butte clean-up project for Rotary
April 30	Congressman DeFazio at LTD for BRT briefing
May 3	Meeting in Seattle with FTA Region X Administrator Helen Knoll regarding BRT project status and Section 5309 grant status
May 5-10	APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference in Calgary
May 15	Campaign kick-off for Kiss-A-Pig for Diabetes fundraiser

### Internal Activities

April 19	Ride buses for half a day
April 25	Ride buses for half a day
April 25-26	Budget Committee meetings
May 2	LTD Health and Welfare Committee meeting
May 3	Team meetings with all employees
May 14	Eugene City Council meeting for BRT vote
May 14	Joint meeting between the City of Springfield Council and LTD Board
May 15	Lane County Commission meeting on BRT vote
May 16	Edward Thomas, FTA Director of Innovation and Technology, visit

FY2001-2002 & 2002-2003 Public Transportation Discretionary Grant Program

Governing Body's Information and Certification

Lane Transit District

---

Governing Body:

3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue / P.O. Box 7070 Eugene, OR 97401

---

Address:

Terry Parker

---

(541) 682-4380

---

Contact Person:

Phone

Indicate with YES or NO if the governing body certifies the following for Special Transportation Fund projects:

1.  Yes  No Proposed projects directly support transportation services to seniors and/or people with disabilities.
2.  Yes  No Each proposal submitted to Public Transit Division for funding consideration was reviewed by the local STF advisory committee and approved by the governing body with consideration given to the advice of the advisory committee.
3.  Yes  No Each proposal submitted to Public Transit Division is ranked as to local priority. No two proposals have the same rank. Each project is assigned a project-type category.
4.  Yes  No The governing body conducted the required public involvement process, including public notice of proposed projects and consultation with private transportation providers.
5.  Yes  No The governing body and the project applicants consulted with local human service agencies when identifying transportation service needs of seniors and persons with disabilities and in consideration of the project proposals submitted to Public Transit Division.
6.  Yes  No The governing body considered the efficient coordination of transportation resources and providers when considering and prioritizing proposed projects.

---

Signature of authorized representative

Kenneth P. Hamm

---

(541) 682-6100

---

Name (print or type)

Telephone number

General Manager

---

5/17/01

---

Title

Date signed

**Public Transportation Discretionary Grant Program**  
**Consolidated Application Ranking Sheet for Special Transportation Proposals**

Governing Body: Lane Transit District

Applicant: Lane Transit District

Rank for this project: # 1 of # 4 total projects.

Indicate year(s) for which this project is being proposed:

2001-2002       2002-2003

Project category:

Direct Service       Indirect Service       Facility or Non-service

Project type:

Planning       Operations       Capital

Project description (brief): Replacement of three (3) RideSource vehicles

---

Total Project Cost \$ 193,500    Project Request \$ \$154,800    Match \$ 38,700

---

Applicant: Lane Transit District

Rank for this project: # 2 of # 4 total projects.

Indicate year(s) for which this project is being proposed:

2001-2002       2002-2003

Project category:

Direct Service       Indirect Service       Facility or Non-service

Project type:

Planning       Operations       Capital

Project description (brief): Siting and construction of facility for the RideSource program that serves Eugene and Springfield. RideSource meets the complementary paratransit requirements of the ADA.

---

Total Project Cost \$ 4,750,000    Project Request \$ 1,775,000    Match \$ 2,975,000

---

Applicant: Lane Transit District

Rank for this project: # 3 of # 4 total projects.

Indicate year(s) for which this project is being proposed:

2001-2002       2002-2003

Project category:

Direct Service       Indirect Service       Facility or Non-service

Project type:

Planning       Operations       Capital

Project description (brief): Replacement of three (3) RideSource vehicles

---

Total Project Cost \$ 173,000      Project Request \$ 138,400      Match \$ 34,600

---

Applicant: Lane Transit District

Rank for this project: # 4 of # 4 total projects.

Indicate year(s) for which this project is being proposed:

2001-2002       2002-2003

Project category:

Direct Service       Indirect Service       Facility or Non-service

Project type:

Planning       Operations       Capital

Project description (brief): Purchase one (1) new RideSource vehicle

---

Total Project Cost \$ 64,500      Project Request \$ 51,600      Match \$ 12,900

## FY 2001-02 Special Transportation Fund Formula Allocations for Lane County Special Transportation Operations

The Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) is forwarding recommendations to the LTD Board for the operation of special needs transportation services throughout Lane County for FY 2001-02.

- ◆ The STF Formula allocation for FY 2001-02 remained essentially the same as in FY 2000-01.
- ◆ Allocations for specific contracts that show increases from last year are possible due to lower anticipated expenses and the ability to carry forward STF monies.
- ◆ The Eugene Station Transit Host project and the Rhody Express were start-up projects in FY 2000-01 and will be funded for the full year in FY 2001-02.

	FY 2000-01 Projected	FY 2001-02 STF Budg	% change + or -
<b>In-District Contract:</b>			
Eugene Station Transit Hosts	24,500	30,190	23%
Special Mobility Services - RideSource	473,985	473,985	0%
South Lane Wheels - Cottage Grove & Creswell	31,890	31,890	0%
White Bird Clinic	26,800	29,828	11%
<b>TOTAL Operations</b>	<b>\$557,175</b>	<b>\$565,893</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Out-of-District Contract:</b>			
	<b>FY 2000-01 Projected</b>	<b>FY 2001-02 STF Budg</b>	
Special Mobility Services - Rural Volunteer Escort	9,870	9,870	0%
South Lane Wheels - Dorena, Culp Creek & Lorane	10,630	10,630	0%
River Cities Taxi - Rhody Express Florence	14,600	19,875	36%
Mid-Coast Enterprises – Florence	1,300	1,300	0%
City of Oakridge - Oakridge & Westfir	20,335	23,351	15%
Siuslaw Area Women's Center – Florence	780	0	-100%
LCOG S&DS Outreach - Florence	12,740	11,956	-6%
<b>TOTAL Operations</b>	<b>\$70,255</b>	<b>\$76,982</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>TOTAL In- &amp; Out-of-District</b>	<b>\$627,430</b>	<b>\$642,875</b>	<b>2%</b>



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

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

## **MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORTS**

May 16, 2001

### **GENERAL MANAGEMENT GROUP**

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

### **STATE LEGISLATURE**

The pace of the legislature definitely has accelerated in the past month. Bills are moving from one house to the other. This generally means that bills that have not yet moved are not going to, that they are unlikely to see action this session. The caveat is that no bill is really dead until the last gavel falls. A common activity at this time of session is a procedure commonly referred to as "gut and stuff." A committee will use a bill about one thing, delete the entire contents of the bill and substitute a new bill. The committee is required to make the new contents conform to the relating clause, or title, of the bill. An example is House Bill 3408, relating to transportation. The bill originally was about regulation of taxis, but will become a measure about local funding of transportation projects. This procedure is required because no new bills are likely to be introduced at this time of the session, except for emergency spending or revenue measures. Not paying close attention can have serious consequences, as well as result in missed opportunities.

Compared with previous sessions, this seems early in the year to be considering it late in the session. On the Senate side, where the leadership is very committed to a timely adjournment, four committees have been closed, three of which can meet with permission of the Senate President. The fourth is the General Government and Transportation Committee, which is permanently closed and has been the subject of many news stories regarding the rift between Sen. Gary George and Senate President Gene Derfler. The Transportation Committee has been replaced by a Special Committee on Public Affairs. There were about 150 bills still in the Transportation Committee when it was closed. Of

those, about 40 were moved *en bloc* by Senate vote to the Public Affairs Committee, whose members are the same as the former General Government and Transportation Committee members, except for the Chairman. The new chair is Sen. Verne Duncan, replacing Sen. George.

## **IN CONGRESS**

Transportation-related activity in the Congress right now is focused on the budget resolution and some discussion of what airline-related issues could be addressed before the summer travel season. The final budget is expected to keep the White House commitment to honor spending guarantees for highway, transit, and aviation trust fund programs for the next budget year. However, appropriators warn that the budget will be tight for those programs that do not have TEA-21 and AIR-21 guarantees, such as the Coast Guard and FAA Operations.

The Executive Director of the Oregon Transit Association was in Washington, D.C., this past week to advance the Oregon transit appropriations requests. All Member requests have been submitted to all Appropriation Committees, but mark-ups have not yet been scheduled.

## **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES GROUP**

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

There is no Development Services Group report this month.



## **TRANSPORTATION SERVICES GROUP**

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

### **FIRST QUARTER 2001 ACCIDENT STATISTICS ARE STRONG**

Total accidents for the first quarter of 2001 are the lowest for a first quarter in five years. There were only 38 accidents for the first quarter of 2001; this is the safest first quarter since 1996. The first quarter usually is the worst quarter of the year because of adverse weather conditions and long hours of darkness. With such a great start, I look forward to the continued strong performance by LTD's operators.

### **STAFF GO THE EXTRA MILE FOR SPECIAL-NEEDS GUESTS**

Station Manager Rick Bailor and Wackenhut Security Supervisor Ed Fowler recently received a letter from Dawn Stahlberg, an Autism Specialist with Autism Training and Support, Inc. The letter indicated her appreciation to them for going out of their way to learn more about autism, how to recognize people with autism, and how best to deal with people with autism. People with various disabilities and special needs are common guests for LTD. Autistic individuals have been presenting unique issues that Rick and Ed recognized, and then took action to understand more about the disability. The letter is attached.

## **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:** May 16, 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 April 2001 Performance Reports are included this month. Staff will be available at the May 16 meeting to answer any questions the Board may have about this information.

**ATTACHMENTS:** April 2001 Performance Reports

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** SCHEDULE BOARD STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Board select the dates for a two-day strategic planning work session in October or November 2001

**BACKGROUND:** The Board generally participates in a two-day strategic planning work session during the fall or winter of each year. Because of one Board member's resignation last year and the full schedule of District activities during the fall of 2000, the last Board "retreat" was not held until January 2001. Staff now ask that the Board members select a date in October or November and schedule a two-day work session, and determine whether they would prefer to meet in town or at an out-of-town location. Staff will begin making arrangements for the work session, and will work with the Board to set the agenda.

Attached are updated calendars for May through December 2001 for the Board's information. It would be helpful for staff to know when Board members will be out of the area during these months.

**ATTACHMENTS:** Board Activity Calendars, May through December 2001

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE

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

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

**BACKGROUND:** The site selection for a new Springfield Station is planned for discussion at the joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council meeting scheduled for May 14, 2001. The Springfield City Council is not expected to take action on the station site at that work session, but at a subsequent regular council meeting. That means that the Board's final action to select the station site would not occur until June 2001.

Following Board approval of the site, staff will begin land acquisition and design. The first step in the design process is the selection of the design team. A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to conduct the design work on the Springfield Station design was issued on May 7, 2001, with responses due on June 4, 2001. The Board BRT Committee (Hillary Wylie, Rob Bennett, and Pat Hocken) met on May 1, 2001 and discussed design team selection for both BRT and the Springfield Station. They concluded that Board member involvement in the process is important, and recommended that Dave Kleger, Robert Melnick, and Hillary Wylie serve on the Springfield Station design team selection committee. There also may be participation by Springfield representatives in the design team selection. Once this is confirmed, a more detailed schedule and process will be developed.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 16, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** DISCUSSION WITH EDWARD THOMAS, FTA ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR

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

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

**BACKGROUND:** Edward Thomas, Associate Administrator for Research, Demonstration and Innovation at the Washington, D.C., headquarters office of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), will discuss BRT issues with the Board. Under Mr. Thomas' leadership, FTA has expanded national deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems, completed development of the Advance Technology Transit Bus Program, initiated an International Mass Transportation Program, organized a Public/Private Partnership Program to deploy transit innovations, and launched the Bus Rapid Transit Demonstration Program. Mr. Thomas has met on several occasions with LTD staff and Board members to discuss our BRT project. He also is familiar with other BRT projects around the country.

Suggested BRT topics for the discussion include:

- The LTD BRT project compared with other BRT projects around the country, both in terms of project scope and implementation schedule
- Funding options for future BRT phases, including consideration of "new starts" funds
- BRT vehicle selection
- The BRT Consortium and ways in which the consortium can assist with BRT project development

**ATTACHMENT:** Bio for Edward Thomas

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 15, 2001

**ITEM TITLE:** TRANSPLAN UPDATE

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

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

**BACKGROUND:** The Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), reached agreement on two remaining unresolved issues at their meeting on May 10, 2001. One issue was a revision of language to the Definition/Intent section of the Bus Rapid Transit Policy that is designed to strengthen the policy. The policy language itself remains unchanged. The other issue involved establishing a funding category for implementation of nodal development. Funds identified for nodal development initially will include those identified by Eugene and LTD, with Springfield's allocation to nodal determined over the next two years. A remaining issue is the commitment to funding operation, maintenance, and preservation of the roads and bicycle system. MPC agreed that Eugene would develop some plan language that would pertain only to their roads and bikeways. The Board will be asked in June to approve these latest changes to the draft plan.

If the recommendations by MPC are approved by the adopting agencies, the plan may be ready for adoption. However, in order to make sure that projects are not delayed, MPC discussed the option of having the LCOG Board adopt a plan that meets federal requirements. This action would occur on June 28, 2001. The plan adopted by LCOG would be amended, if necessary, to conform to the version that eventually is adopted by the four adopting agencies. There appeared to be general agreement by MPC to proceed with this approach.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None