

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on August 9, 2001.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, August 15, 2001
5:30 p.m.

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

A G E N D A

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

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

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 | |
| 1. | Plan for November 16-17 Strategic Planning Work Session | 05 |
| 2. | Bus Rapid Transit Update | 06 |
| 3. | If time remains before 6:30 p.m., the Board should consider some of the Items for Information for this meeting (beginning on page 67). | |

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

- | | | |
|------|--|----|
| VI. | EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH – AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER 2001 | 10 |
| VII. | AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION | |
| ◆ | Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. | |

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| A. | Consent Calendar | 12 |
| 1. | Minutes of May 16, 2001, Regular Board Meeting
(Page 13) | |
| 2. | Minutes of June 20, 2001, Regular Board Meeting (Page 29) | |
| 3. | Minutes of July 18, 2001, Canceled Board Meeting (Page 41) | |
| 4. | Fiscal Year 2002-2002 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise
(DBE) Program (Page 42) | |
| B. | Fiscal Year 2001 Section 5307 Federal Grant Application | 50 |
| 1. | Staff Presentation | |
| 2. | Opening of Public Hearing by Board President | |
| 3. | Public Testimony on Proposed Grant Application | |
| | □ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. | |
| 4. | Closure of Public Hearing | |
| 5. | Board Discussion and Decision | |
| C. | New Low-Floor Bus Purchase | 53 |
| D. | Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Steering Committee Appointments | 55 |
| E. | Springfield Station Design Review Committee Appointments | 58 |
| F. | September and November Board Meetings | 61 |

IX. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

- | | | |
|-----|--|----|
| A. | Current Activities | |
| 1. | Board Member Reports | 67 |
| (a) | Metropolitan Policy Committee – July 12 meeting; August
meeting postponed until August 16 | |
| (b) | BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee –
No meetings | |
| (c) | Statewide Livability Forum – No meeting | |

(d)	LTD/ATU Pension Plan Trustees – Report on July 30 meeting	
(e)	LTD Roadeo – July 22	
(f)	LTD/ATU Employee Picnic – July 29	
2.	General Manager’s Report	69
3.	2001 Legislative Report	70
4.	Monthly Financial Report	71
5.	Springfield Station Update	72
6.	TransPlan Update	73
7.	Correspondence	74
B.	Monthly Performance Group Reports	76
C.	Monthly Performance Reports (June and July 2001)	79
X.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	84
A.	Commuter Solutions Report	
B.	TransPlan Draft Approval	
C.	2004-2007 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	
D.	Acceptance of Annual Independent Audit	
E.	Fall Board Strategic Planning Work Session	
F.	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: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: The financial report will be distributed at the Board meeting.

ATTACHMENTS: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, May 16, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 10, 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, May 16, 2001, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: None

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:48 p.m.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Wylie thanked that Board members and staff members for all the efforts that had gone into gaining the recent approvals from the Eugene City Council and the Board of County Commissioners for the bus rapid transit (BRT) pilot corridor. The Springfield City Council had given preliminary approval, with formal approval expected at its June 4 meeting. Ms. Wylie said that she was well aware that everyone who had been involved, including staff and Board members, had worked extremely hard. She said that this was a pinnacle and a starting point, and she was proud of the tremendous effort that was made to build relationships and to reach accord with many diverse people with different opinions. LTD was attempting to bring a vision for the future to the community, and she again thanked all those who had been involved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA: Ms. Hocken said that she understood that the City of Eugene would be hosting a summit workshop in mid-June about the West Eugene Parkway, and she asked if LTD planned to be a part of it. Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson said that he was a member of the Eugene Chamber of Commerce task force for the West Eugene Parkway, who would be involved in the summit.

Mr. Kleger said that he had received a mailed request for input regarding the State Transportation Improvement program (STIP). He asked that in the near future, the Board discuss the STIP and come to a common response. He thought it would be good policy for

the Board to unite on the issue. The timeline for responding was August 12, 2001. Ms. Wylie asked that the subject be placed on the June work session agenda.

WORK SESSION – DISCUSSION WITH EDWARD THOMAS: Ms. Wylie introduced Edward Thomas, Associate Administrator for Research, Demonstration, and Innovation at the Washington, D.C., headquarters office of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Ms. Wylie said that LTD had the pleasure of working with Mr. Thomas during the past few years through the BRT consortium. She added that Mr. Thomas was a person who was easy to talk with and who provided encouragement to the District in its efforts.

Mr. Thomas thanked the Board and staff for the opportunity to visit the community. It was important to him to establish relationships with the transit agencies in order to do his job. His job was to help the industry incorporate some of the available innovations, in terms of technology, new ideas, and new methods and techniques for the purpose of making transit systems safer and more environmentally friendly, as well as to improve the overall mobility and access to public transportation.

Mr. Thomas said that LTD had done a tremendous job in getting where it was with the BRT project in a fairly short period of time. It always was good, from the federal standpoint, to know that a community had its act together, which facilitated federal effectiveness. Those communities that could reach a level of consensus, through collaborative efforts, tended to be the most successful.

Mr. Kleger said that he was quite concerned about issues pertaining to accessibility for people with disabilities. BRT would depend partially on the prepayment of fares in order to be as efficient as possible. For people who used monthly passes, it would not be a problem, but Mr. Kleger had been concerned for some time about the practicality of fare vending machines at stations for people who had limited hand functions. He asked if the FTA had found any effective strategies for addressing that concern. Mr. Thomas replied that fare collection techniques was an issue that LTD would sort out locally as it arrived at the more detailed work stage of the BRT planning process. There were many techniques being used across the country. Some used a more technological approach, while others used more of an infrastructure approach. The objective was to find the quickest way to load the vehicle. The FTA would be able to assist with researching the various fare collection techniques and could provide information about where those techniques were in use and how they were working.

Ms. Wylie said that European transit systems did not use wheelchair tie-downs, but American systems did, and asked if it would be an issue if European vehicles were used for BRT. Mr. Thomas said that the FTA was researching some alternatives, such as clip-ons. The FTA had held workshops to discuss some of those issues, such as the difference between the BRT vehicle and a rail vehicle. There was one set of standards for securement for rail vehicles, while there was another standard set for buses. If the BRT vehicle was more rail-like, maybe the European approach could be followed. It would constitute a change, and Eugene would not be alone in addressing the issue. He said that there would be a national response. The BRT cities had put the issue on the table, and its resolution would benefit the entire industry.

Mr. Thomas said that at the national level, other things were happening to address the issue of accessibility. President Bush had a small transportation item on his platform, which many did not know much about. It was called the New Freedoms Initiative to increase access for people with disabilities, and was comprised of two parts with respect to transit. The first part was a \$45 million program to find more innovative ways to improve access to jobs for persons with disabilities. The second was a \$100 million competitive grant program for states and local governments to enhance what already was being done to improve access. It was an interesting program, and could have connections to BRT.

Mr. Thomas said that the competitive grant program proposal being considered would function very similarly to the Section 5310 elderly and handicapped program, which was managed by individual states. It was a formula-based program in terms of how funds were allocated. The FTA was proposing to use that mechanism for the \$100 million competitive grant program. The \$45 million pilot program, as proposed, would be distributed on a discretionary basis, based on certain criteria, including coordination and collaboration at the local level and knowing the market and where the needs and gaps were. Mr. Thomas added that the timing was excellent, and it was a logical extension to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). There already had been some experience with the ADA, and there remained some issues to be dealt with. This proposal would facilitate addressing those issues without compromising existing services. The FTA was in the early discussion phase of that proposal. Ms. Wylie said that it sounded good, because it cost so much money to operate those systems, leaving little money available for innovative improvements.

Ms. Wylie asked Mr. Thomas to provide an update on the BRT vehicle design research. Mr. Thomas said that the FTA received 58 proposals for different types of vehicle designs. Mr. Thomas had reviewed the designs in terms of art, but being an analyst, he also viewed the 58 concepts in terms of what the authors were trying to communicate to transportation officials through their designs. One of the overall messages was to make sure the system was flexible. Because there was not a need for the same capacity for each segment of each trip, the vehicles should have the capability of being broken down into smaller vehicles. There were concepts about modularity to make the vehicle simple and easy to operate, such as being able to operate the vehicle both from the front and the rear. There were a variety of sleek looking, rail-type vehicles. There were vehicles designed with safety and access in mind, and many other concepts that addressed the functionality of the vehicle. The 58 conceptual designs had undergone a technical review to determine which ones could be eliminated. For instance, one of the designs featured a "mother ship," with many smaller vehicles that disengaged to take smaller groups of people off into their neighborhoods. Many of the concepts depicted vehicles that manufacturers just would not build, and LTD would not buy.

On June 17, an awards ceremony would be held. A jury that included automobile and transit experts was judging the designs, and three awards (first, second, and third) would be given in two categories. The first category would be based on concept, and the second category would be based on how the vehicle related to the rest of system. Mr. Thomas said that this had not been an exercise to re-engineer the transit industry, but to respond to an industry that was asking for research. It was hoped that the concepts would make sense. On June 18, awards of \$30,000 to \$70,000 would be given to winners of the two categories for further development with vehicle manufacturers.

Ms. Wylie asked if FTA funds were available to assist bus manufacturers in retooling to produce a new-design bus. Mr. Thomas said that there was a financing mechanism available within the Department of Transportation (DOT), under the Transportation Innovative Finance Infrastructure Act (TIFIA) to assist agencies, including private sector companies, that would be participating in large infrastructure-based projects, like highways and transit new starts, etc. It was a credit-based program, where participants could borrow at low interest rates. A \$35 million technology component was included in the TIFIA statute and could be available both to the private and public sectors. Transit dollars in TIFIA were required to go to an eligible recipient, such as a transit agency, local government, state DOT, etc., and were not available to the private sector.

Ms. Hocken asked about the New Starts program. Mr. Thomas said that the New Starts program was part of the FTA discretionary program, and there were two types of funding that would be available. One was formula based and was allocated based on population and service area, in which the recipients fairly routinely received funding. The other funding mechanism was a capital investment program, which was discretionary and was available in three tiers, including bus, fixed-guideway modernization, and new starts. The capital investment program had a bit more than \$1 billion per year available.

The fixed-guideway modernization tier, while it was in the discretionary pool, was more of a formula-based allocation, based on a percentage contained in the statute. It was somewhat like earmarking.

The New Starts allocation was quite different. That funding was earmarked during the authorization or reauthorization of a transportation act, such as the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Congress selected the projects to be funded, however, the law stated that a new start planning process must be in place prior to funding.

The competition for new start funding was fierce, with 60 percent of the funds already spoken for. The entire balance would be allocated between proposals made for Fiscal Year 2001 and recommendations made in the budget for Fiscal Year 2002. Approximately \$8 billion already was allocated through the authorization that would expire on September 30, 2003. The whole process of reauthorizing surface transportation programs already was underway.

What occurred during this reauthorization was what LTD needed to be concerned with, unless someone in the current authorization happened to drop out. Mr. Thomas cited an incident in Honolulu, Hawaii, where that actually had happened. Money already had been appropriated for a project, but had to be reallocated because the project was dropped.

Mr. Thomas said that the funding would be based on the question of LTD's readiness and how far along LTD was in the process, and if those eventualities occurred in the next 1.5 years, LTD would be ready to compete. Those who would be able to compete most likely would be funded. The probability was around 85 percent certain that those projects that had made it as far as preliminary engineering would end up being built.

Ms. Hocken asked what the local match expectation was for the New Starts funding. Mr. Thomas said that the budget proposal of the current administration was to increase local

share from 20 percent to 50 percent. Doing so would give some relief in terms of getting more projects funded. That fact alone could cause some cities to drop out of the program.

Mr. Hamm said that there had been some dialogue at the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) reauthorization committee meetings about the uniqueness of BRT. There was discussion about the New Starts program potentially developing a tiered evaluation system, so that BRT would not be competing directly against pure fixed-guideway proposals. He asked how real some of those ideas were, at that point in time, in terms of restructuring the 40/40/20 allocation split and including BRT somewhere in the mix. Mr. Thomas said that he believed BRT projects would be competitive. The FTA currently was working with 9 of the 11 BRT projects in the New Starts process. There was a process, and Mr. Thomas believed LTD was well positioned to compete. The definition piece of BRT needed to be finalized in order to figure where it fit for funding consideration; for instance, if it should be considered a bus project or a fixed-guideway project.

Mr. Thomas said that it was a stroke of genius on LTD's part to get the Phase 1 BRT pilot project funded through the bus program. Whether it was intentional or not, it was very interesting. There were \$567 million per year available under the bus funding program. When the local match and highway transfers were added to that, it was quite likely that there were more than \$1 billion per year being spent on buses and bus-related facilities. By including BRT funding in the bus program, LTD sent a message to the nation to be a bit more rational about how money was allocated. LTD upped the bar on how bus money was spent, because LTD had all the of the planning and coordination processes already behind its project. Someone at the federal level would have to realize that a very innovative and competitive project was funded out of the bus program, and a determination would need to be made as to whether the bus program should continue to fund those types of projects. It seemed as though something like a new starts program should be included within the bus program.

Mr. Thomas said that LTD needed to consider whether to continue with BRT in the bus program, or whether to move the BRT project to the new starts program. Bus program funds were allocated according to Congressional discretion, while new starts funding was more structured.

Ms. Wylie said that LTD had lead time to do the planning in order to get in line for the TEA-21 reauthorization. By then, a piece of BRT would be built and would be used as a demonstration.

Mr. Hamm said that the Board and staff were considering what to purchase as the BRT vehicle. The dilemma was to find a vehicle that had curbside appeal and at the same time honored the commitment to the community to honor the environment. He asked where the technology was today, and where it might be in two years.

Mr. Thomas said that an expectation had been created that a BRT vehicle would be sexy looking and would be a green vehicle. A visual preference study had been conducted regarding transit vehicles. Generally, the respondents thought that buses were not safe, and they did not like the design, either externally or internally. Most people did not like transit buses. The people surveyed came from all walks of life, and the survey findings were

consistent, and it was a very valid survey instrument that could be used for more than just the design of transit vehicles.

One of the issues that was identified by the BRT consortium cities was the look and feel of the BRT vehicle, which was key to the success of any BRT project. The vehicle had to be something new looking, with a brand name that people could recognize. The challenge of new technology was that it had to be electrically driven, the systems had to be well integrated, and it needed to have enough power to do what it needed to do. There were risks, and systems should be in place to deal with them. Fleet maintenance personnel would have to do homework to understand the programs involved in the vehicle. Risk management techniques would need to be in place to test, get good data, and evaluate results. How to procure the vehicle was another important issue. It would be desirable to have a vendor and manufacturers who would be around at least beyond the warranties and long enough to get needed data. The Federal Transit Statute included leasing and lease maintenance. A leveraged lease with maintenance incorporated into the lease was a legitimate transit process.

The Tax Reform Act was amended to include qualified technology equipment to accelerate the depreciation of technology. The procurement and financing techniques could be part of the risk management.

Mr. Thomas added that it was probable that electrical engineers currently were not maintaining buses, but buses of the future would be "high tech" and would need a different level of maintenance expertise.

Ms. Wylie asked if Mr. Thomas knew where the CiViS bus currently was in the Altuna testing process. Mr. Thomas said that the Altuna Testing Center was being retrofitted to handle BRT. The CiViS vehicle had not been tested because it had not yet been delivered. The Las Vegas transit agency had ordered CiViS buses, and Mr. Thomas suggested that LTD work closely with the Las Vegas transit agency, and, in fact, that Las Vegas should be one of LTD's close partners. If Las Vegas received six CiViS vehicles, for instance, maybe they would loan one to LTD to test, or LTD should get involved with Las Vegas' testing process. LTD also might want to take a look at the CiViS contract to see how testing was dealt with. Apparently CiViS had plans to set up shop in United States; otherwise, transit agencies would need a Buy America waiver. European bus manufacturers had requested a workshop with the U.S. BRT properties. They were interested in sponsoring BRT workshops around the U.S. The European Union had replicated the FTA's demonstration program and had made it more extensive. It was likely that those workshops would take place.

Ms. Wylie asked if Mr. Thomas knew if CiViS' desire to build in America would happen and if there was a timeline. Mr. Thomas said that Mantra, the corporation under which the CiViS was built, already had an office in New Jersey. The future of CiViS coming to America depended on the market.

Mr. Kleger asked about the number of American manufacturers who had corporate linkages with European manufacturers, and if any were developing into a wider range of selection in the U.S. market. Mr. Thomas said that the problem with the American manufacturers was that they were too customized, but they were getting the sense that things were changing in the American transit industry, and that it was a growing industry.

Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, during testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, had a discussion with a Congressman from Michigan. The Congressman had said that Detroit's Big Three manufacturers were interested in developing a new transit model. New technology already was being used in the American-made buses that were being sold to other countries. For instance, Ford buses were being used in Curitiba, Brazil. They were not being sold in America, because America's regulations were too constrictive.

Mr. Thomas said that if American manufacturers did not gear up, then the European and other nations' bus makers would take away American business. American manufacturers would respond, because of the economic benefit.

Mr. Hamm said that the procurement partnering process needed to be more inclusive of the manufacturer. Mr. Thomas said that a bus summit had been held that focused on procurement in terms of how it was related to planning, standards, and technology. He noted that the proceedings from that bus summit were available on the FTA Web site. The FTA planned to hold bus roundtable discussions throughout the country to follow up on the action items from the summit.

With regard to technology deployment, Mr. Thomas said that the new technology was driving some companies out of business. Those companies were making big investments in new technology, but were not recovering those investments, and this was recognized at the federal level to be a problem area. One of the vendors at the bus summit had mentioned that the federal government needed to partner with the manufacturers and transit in the new technology deployment to provide a better cushion for the manufacturers. For instance, such a partnership might assist a manufacturer that otherwise would be spending 100 percent of its money to provide LTD with a CiVis-type vehicle that still had \$50 million to \$60 million of research and development behind it that was virtually unrecoverable.

Ms. Wylie thought that part of the low-interest loan program could assist the manufacturers with recovering some of those costs. She then thanked Mr. Thomas for visiting with the Board. Mr. Thomas thanked the Board and said that it was good to spend time with the transit policy makers.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she found interesting the references Mr. Thomas had made to "part of his everyday job." She recently had attended a meeting of the Willamette Valley Livability Forum, which was a group that also was trying to do what he was doing on a daily basis, which was to anticipate issues associated with the expected doubling of the population in the Willamette Valley by the year 2050. Traffic congestion was expected to increase by 80 percent if nothing was done. All of those same issues were being discussed at the state level. Mr. Thomas said that the transit industry was sponsoring some research called "New Paradigms." Basically, the transit industry was saying that in the future, what we called public transportation today would not be exactly the way it looked today. Transit agencies would be managing and controlling their own assets, but also would be more focused on service. Transit would be doing things tomorrow that were not imaginable today. He added that it appeared that congestion was a top priority for Secretary Mineta, who might be the right person, at this point in time, to put a dent in congestion. Mr. Thomas suggested that LTD look into the Transportation Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) to learn more about the research and Secretary Mineta's agenda.

Again, Ms. Wylie thanked Mr. Thomas and said that she looked forward to his address at the Eugene City Club the next day.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – JUNE 2001: Bus Operator Shawn Bradley was selected as the June 2001 Employee of the Month. Mr. Bradley was hired on January 12, 1998, and had earned awards for two years of safe driving, two 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. Bradley 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 Mr. Bradley's service that they gave a donation to Bratton House, a facility for the needy, in lieu of a "tip," to express their gratefulness to Mr. Bradley and LTD.

Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson said that he never tired of recognizing good employees and introduced Mr. Bradley to the Board. Mr. Johnson said that people recognized special people, and LTD's guests appreciated the service Mr. Bradley provided. Mr. Bradley had been employed with the District for only 2.5 years and had an excellent record. Mr. Bradley had served on several employee committees and was a transportation coordinator for special events. Mr. Bradley's supervisor had recognized Mr. Bradley for doing a good job. His colleagues, other transportation coordinators, were present earlier to lend their support for Mr. Bradley's selection as Employee of the Month and had wanted the Board to know how much they enjoyed working with Mr. Bradley.

Mr. Hamm added that sometimes when working in an organization, one gets to know people in different ways. Mr. Hamm had met Mr. Bradley one day, shortly after Mr. Hamm arrived at the District, and had developed a very fun relationship with him. Mr. Hamm said that it was that type of camaraderie that built teams. He told Mr. Bradley that it was a pleasure to work with him.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Bradley and presented him with an Employee of the Month lapel pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award. She said that when someone described a person like Mr. Bradley to her, she recognized that person as a leader. She thanked Mr. Bradley for his excellent service to LTD and its guests. Mr. Bradley thanked the Board, the general manager, the operations manager, and his fellow employees for their support. He appreciated the recognition and enjoyed working at LTD.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No one from the audience wished to address the Board.

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-017: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 16, 2001, is approved as presented." Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which carried by six votes in favor (Bennett, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie), and one abstention. Ms. Hocken abstained because she had not attended the April meeting. The May 16, 2001, Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the April 18, 2001, regular Board meeting.

**MOTION
VOTE**

PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS – FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003 PUBLIC TRANSIT DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAM: Special Transportation Program Administrator Terry Parker said that in previous years, this review likely was covered in Consent Calendars. This year, her move to LTD as an in-house position created an

interesting situation. LTD will serve as both the Special Transportation Fund (STF) governing body as well as an applicant and a recipient of Public Transit's discretionary grants. Applications for FY 2002-03 are standard vehicle requests, with the exception of project #2. The State has considered the maintenance of services and the replacement of vehicles its highest priority. For this reason, the RideSource facility project was listed in the second position.

The facilities project was one that staff knew would use federal money, and because federal funding would be used, a site selection process and an environmental review needed to be undertaken. Due to the FTA requirements for site selection, the grant request was for full project funding, as though a site would need to be purchased for \$1.5 million and a facility built from the ground up, which currently was not anticipated. The project ranking recommendations were being submitted to the Board from the Special Transportation Fund (STF) Advisory Committee.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved 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." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STF ALLOCATIONS FOR SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE/ OPERATIONS CONTRACTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002: Ms. Parker said that the Board also had seen parts of this item in past years. The allocations by contract already were known. Ms. Parker provided more detailed information about the various contracts for service within the District boundaries and for service outside the District boundaries.

Mr. Hamm reminded the Board about the transition of the Special Transportation Program from the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) to LTD on July 1, 2001. Some detail of this transition had not appeared before the LTD Board. LTD previously had funded the program through an agreement with LCOG. In future years, the Board would be seeing the Special Transportation Program (STP) proposals as part of its regular meeting agendas.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved 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." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken asked about legislation with regard to elderly and disabled services that President Bush was proposing. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that not much was known at this time, and she did not know what Congress would do with the President's proposal. She said that she could not remember if there was a plan to take money from another pot to fund the proposed legislation, but she would research the issue

and provide a better answer at a future Board meeting. Ms. Parker added that she received a biweekly newsletter from the Community Transportation Association of America, and when the issue was highlighted more, she would begin making more inquiries. Ms. Wylie said that from what Mr. Thomas had said, it sounded as if the \$100 million would be used for block grants to states, and that the \$45 million would be discretionary grants, so there could be an opportunity for LTD.

FOLLOW-UP DISCUSSION ON FISCAL YEAR 2001-02 BUDGET APPROVED BY LTD BUDGET COMMITTEE ON APRIL 26, 2001: Mr. Melnick expressed his disappointment with the precipitous vote that occurred at the end of the second Budget Committee meeting, which took several Board members by surprise. Following the excellent staff presentation and the listing of four major discussion questions, Mr. Melnick said that he had anticipated some conversation among the Committee members. He thought that the Board should hold the discussion before voting on the budget in June. At the very least, he believed that the Board should commend the staff for the tremendous job in presenting the budget, and at the most, he thought the Board should have the discussion to decide whether or not the proposed budget was one the Board could live with. Mr. Melnick said that he viewed the budget as a vehicle for achieving goals and implementing values. The budget in and of itself was not as important as the purpose of the budget and what LTD was trying to achieve with the budget and whether or not, as a Board, the right big-picture decisions were being made.

Mr. Kleger said that the staff presentation struck him as reflecting very well on what the Board had advised and taken action on during the past few years. He thought the past few days of BRT approvals by the Eugene City Council and the County Commissioners gave reason to believe LTD was doing something right. Despite very vocal opposition, LTD had managed to win the approval of its partner jurisdictions. His views also depended upon seeing the results of the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) implementation in September. There were elements of the CSR that Mr. Kleger hoped worked well, as he did not see any other way to increase productivity, but it would not be known until it was implemented. Staff had worked diligently to seek ways to improve productivity. Mr. Kleger did not have any particular suggestions for improvement in next year's budget presentation, as the particular format of the budget presentation rarely made much difference to him. He generally read through the materials thoroughly and was quite familiar with LTD's operations.

Ms. Wylie said that she had assigned the Board Finance Committee to work with staff on the presentation and meeting format for next year. With regard to the process, she thought that Mr. Melnick had joined the Board just before the annual strategic planning work session, in which in-depth discussions were held about major issues, which then were translated into the proposed budget. For instance, all the work on the CSR with regard to productivity issues was a result of the previous year's strategic planning work session discussion.

Ms. Hocken said that she agreed with Mr. Kleger. She had been unable to attend the first evening's budget presentation, and wondered what the difference had been about this budget process compared with the previous one. She thought the Budget Committee had been presented a more macro level than in the past. The budget was a policy document, and while there were line items in the budget, the Board appropriated it at a higher level. At some point, the macro look was appropriate; however, this year, not much time was spent

discussing general fund expenditures. There was much detail about capital expenditures, and a certain amount of time was spent on general fund revenues, but the general fund expenditures were missed. If that had been included, plus the overview and discussion, the budget meetings would have taken three nights to complete instead of two. If the objective was to keep the meetings to two nights, the format would need to be changed somewhat. Ms. Hocken said that she was not sure what the answer was, but the Board Finance Committee would be reviewing the process.

Ms. Wylie said that the Board would vote on the budget at its June meeting. She asked if Board members wanted staff to make a more in-depth presentation before the vote. The members did not believe more presentation was necessary. Ms. Lauritsen thought the frustration was from the lack of discussion at the Budget Committee level.

Mr. Gaydos agreed. He said that people did become fatigued from two nights in a row, but the LTD staff was known as a quality staff who were proactive in responding to issues. Sometimes there was a sense of "this is okay," and he thought that could have been the case with the Budget Committee. Specifically, there were "gut checks" in the budget that did not get discussed, one of which was borrowing money, which had been discussed at a certain level but needed more in-depth discussion. Mr. Gaydos said that he was comfortable with debt financing, but was nervous about the new concept.

Mr. Gaydos said that another "gut check" issue was that LTD was at the legal limit on both the payroll and self-employment tax rates, which was one reason that debt financing was being introduced. There remained a level of anger in the community about the taxes and those types of issues. When talking with people about the general acceptance of BRT, Mr. Gaydos was not sure that there also was general acceptance of LTD and how it was funded. Rising expenses also were discomfoting, but it appeared that LTD was doing all it could do to be efficient with the operations and budget. He believed that LTD was a good steward of public dollars.

Mr. Gaydos further said that he believed that efforts to increase system productivity were appropriate, but what did it mean to be productive? He thought LTD was on the right track, and he generally felt good about the proposed budget and, therefore, did not feel a need for discussion at the Budget Committee.

Mr. Melnick said that he appreciated all the comments. He asked for a short presentation of the major budget issues at the June meeting prior to the vote on the budget. For instance, he would appreciate a presentation followed by Board discussion about what debt financing would mean for the District. Debt financing was a big change, and LTD was changing. It was not just business as usual.

Ms. Hocken said that she had been disappointed in the rapid vote because in the past, the Board frequently received very good information from the Budget Committee's citizen members through the discussion process. Mr. Kleger said that the lack of discussion was due, in part, to the chairman having moved to a vote too quickly. It was common practice to have a motion on the table prior to discussion.

Ms. Lauritsen said that during the Board Finance Committee meeting, she intended to make some proposals for future Budget Committee meetings. She liked the two-night

format, but because LTD was required to have a Budget Committee, there needed to be more participation. One suggestion was to have the staff presentation at the preliminary meeting that was held for only the citizen members of the Budget Committee, as the Board was fairly familiar with the issues. Then, the Budget Committee might be more efficient in discussing an issue-type agenda in a roundtable discussion. The City of Springfield budget had passed in four nights, and the only thing Ms. Lauritsen would have done to change that process would have been to cut the staff presentations down on both the second and third nights, because the entire fourth night was spent in discussion.

Mr. Bennett said that because the Board discussed the budget issues throughout the year, he had been prepared for discussion of the budget with the Budget Committee.

Mr. Melnick said that this was the type of conversation he had desired.

Mr. Bennett said that he thought the Board should discuss the role and expectations of the Budget Committee and the budget review process. He said that, by design, LTD had handled the budget committee process with purpose but possibly not as seriously as some other budget committees might; that is, two or three meetings do not allow discussion in very much detail. A person might make the argument that the Board should engage the non-Board members of the Budget Committee differently, and that was the discussion he would like to have. His concern was not about a lack of information or understanding as a Board member. It was hard to know the worst case scenario for capital, BRT and other new initiatives, or payroll tax revenues. He thought it might have been good to have more discussion about that, because some of those were having a negative impact on the budget. Other than that, however, he felt that he as a Board member was kept very much up to date and that the financial work done at LTD was very strong.

Mr. Kleger said that he had thought about other budget committee processes that he had observed and participated in. LTD had a fairly narrowly focused activity with few flexibility factors, which was part of reason for the rapid meetings. He was surprised at how few critical questions had come from the citizen members of the Budget Committee. It surprised him each year, but he thought it really was a compliment.

Mr. Hamm said that he viewed the budget as a work in progress that began with a best guess based on various factors. The Board had a more frequent engagement with the staff. As the environment presented highs and lows, LTD had to make adjustments as stewards of the budget. Calling in some citizenry once each year for a two-day presentation may not be the best way to approach the budget. It might be better to hold quarterly meetings, so that those members were continually included in building the strategy of the District. The citizen members were stakeholders as well, and possibly should be more engaged in those discussions.

Mr. Melnick said that the Board received a monthly update of the budget, so he agreed that the Board members were kept abreast of the budget issues and were not just presented with the budget once each year, as the citizen members were. He thought it would be interesting to hear what would happen if the Board decided it was not going to go into debt and how that decision would have effected the budget. Those were the types of options in a budget discussion that the members should be presented with. Staff could present their recommendations, and if the Board did not agree, staff then could present alternatives.

Ms. Wylie said that some of those types of “what if” issues had been discussed at the retreat. This whole discussion was valid and one that needed to be followed up on.

Mr. Kleger said that he heard mentioned earlier that the Board had not held an in-depth discussion about debt financing. He thought it might be useful to put together some work sessions on that subject and invite the citizen members of the Budget Committee to join in those discussions in order to get a more broad-based look.

Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that the Board would spend some time discussing debt financing at the June meeting when it would be asked to approve the debt policies.

Ms. Hocken said that even though debt financing was in the budget, the Board was not committed to it and no decisions had been made; however, the Board was obligated to pass the budget in June. Ms. Hellekson said that while no decisions had been made, if there was any intent to use debt financing, then it needed to be appropriated in the proposed budget, and a decision could be made at a later date.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: a) **Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):**

Ms. Hocken said a most interesting thing occurred at the MPC level: MPC had resolved all the unresolved issues in TransPlan. LCOG was putting together the new draft and it would be circulated to the governing bodies. Adoption of TransPlan was expected in the next three to four months. The LTD Board could be taking action as early as the July Board meeting.

b) **BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee:** The Committee had not met and there was nothing new to report. The next BRT Steering Committee meeting was scheduled for June 5. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that the June 5 agenda would include a discussion about the role of the BRT Steering Committee as BRT moved forward into Phase 2, and whether or not the same group should stay together for future phases. The emphasis of the BRT Steering Committee would shift more to planning for future phases, rather than the construction of Phase 1. The Committee also would discuss the process for selecting the location of future phases. Mr. Bennett thought the LTD Board should discuss whether the same Board members should remain on the Steering Committee.

c) **Statewide Livability Forum:** Ms. Lauritsen reported that she had attended a meeting on April 25. She passed a book of charts around for Board members to look at, and provided several interesting facts from the book. For instance, it took the state approximately 30 years to complete Interstate 5, which was a reminder of how long it took to change anything. The group would meet again in 6 months, and, the book was available for purchase.

Ms. Lauritsen added that while in Calgary for an APTA conference, she had come across a hotel mission statement that she liked: “We will earn the loyalty of our guests by exceeding their expectations.” She thought that at some point it would be good to revisit the LTD mission statement.

d) **Eugene City Council Meeting:** Ms. Hocken reported that the Eugene City Council voted 6-2 to support the BRT Phase 1 pilot corridor and added a few amendments to the

staff resolution. The last amendment made was that LTD make a good faith effort to meet the schedule that was put together for completion of Phase 1 and the design and building of future phases.

Mr. Hamm said that Ms. Hocken did an excellent job representing LTD at the Council meeting. He added that he had received a congratulatory email message from Eugene Mayor Jim Torrey, thanking the Board and staff for their efforts.

Ms. Hocken added that she had been at the Council meeting only to answer questions, but the positive vote was more a result of all the Board members having spent time talking to people in the community, and the marvelous work of staff. There had been an intense effort to discredit the process during the past few weeks, but staff were quick to respond to those efforts. One of the core values for the District was tenacity, and Ms. Hocken thought that was what the Board and staff had exhibited in this process. Mr. Hamm said that much of the help behind the scenes came from the City of Eugene staff. They always had been partners who were committed to the project, and they continued to be excited about it.

e) **Joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council Meeting**: Ms. Wylie said that the joint meeting had been an excellent and very cordial meeting. The Council had asked good questions and had good discussions about the BRT project. The Board and staff had worked hard to build relationships with Springfield, which had paid off. Both jurisdictions were working together on common goals.

f) **APTA Bus and Paratransit Conference**: Ms. Lauritsen had attended the conference in Calgary. She said that she had enjoyed seeing all of the technology and other bus applications that had been discussed at Board meetings.

g) **Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) Testimony**: Ms. Hocken said that she had talked earlier about TransPlan and how it was her expectation that it would be adopted within the next four months. The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), which was put forward by the LCDC, required local governments to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) per capita by 5 percent over the next 20 years. In adopting the TPR, the LCDC also allowed local jurisdictions to define a set of alternative measures that would demonstrate how the region was reducing reliance on the automobile, which was the goal of the TPR. The Eugene/Springfield metropolitan area had put together a set of seven alternative measures to use in TransPlan, and those measures had to be approved by the LCDC before TransPlan could be finalized. The LCDC approved the alternative measures that were developed by an MPC subcommittee and later adopted by all the jurisdictions. There were a couple of conditions, primarily measurement issues that would result in a better way to count non-auto trips. The LCDC staff made a recommendation for additional guidance to be given to the local area, primarily in nodal development. Those were just guidelines, not conditions. The LCDC wanted those items incorporated into TransPlan, and MPC had added them to the implementation chapter of TransPlan.

Ms. Hocken had been asked to attend the LCDC meeting to testify, along with representatives from the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and from LCOG. Testimony also was given from the Friends of Eugene (FoE) and others. Bob Cortright from LCDC previously had come to Eugene and attended some of the meetings of the MPC

subcommittee, and he was aware that there had been discussions of substance about what would make TransPlan work.

h) **Lane County Commissioners Meeting**: Mr. Kleger said that Commissioner Sorenson, who also had served on the BRT Steering Committee, had done a good job in presenting the Phase 1 BRT project for approval, and the Commissioners had voted 4 to 1 to approve the project.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Hamm highlighted the Bus Roadeo, which would be held on July 22, and the annual team LTD picnic, which would be held on July 29 at Jasper Park. Board members were invited to participate in both events. He noted that Salem Transit would be participating in the Bus Roadeo along with LTD.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – APRIL 2001 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson noted that both ridership and revenue were up and had more than met expectations. It appeared to be a beginning of a stronger cash fare trend for LTD. LTD was experiencing record numbers of trips taken, and the payroll tax was back on budget for the year-to-date. The self-employment tax was strong as well. Staff also had brought the projected overrun in personnel services under control by offsetting contract overruns with administrative services. The Board Finance Committee would meet on May 29 to debrief the budget process, to review another version of the draft debt policy, and to discuss the next round of BRT financing.

Mr. Bennett asked staff to comment on why passenger fares were down while ridership was up. Ms. Hellekson said that the youth fare project was a factor. There were larger numbers of youth riding, but they were paying less, which resulted in a net loss in revenue. The fare per ride also dropped when more people used prepaid fare instruments.

Mr. Bennett asked about the effects of the fare increase. Ms. Hellekson said that 30 percent of LTD riders used cash fares, and those 30 percent would be affected by the fare increase scheduled for July 1. It generally took one to two years to realize the full effect of a fare increase. Mr. Kleger said that he also was seeing very heavy use of day passes by youth. Some were buying a day pass every day on Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays. He thought that also was a factor in the increased ridership and depressed fare revenue.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE: Mr. Viggiano said that he had nothing to add to what was written in the agenda packet.

SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE: There was nothing to add to the agenda materials that were presented.

TRANSPLAN UPDATE: There was nothing to add to this agenda item.

BOARD ACTIVITY CALENDARS – SCHEDULE FALL STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION: Ms. Wylie noted that there was a calendar included in the agenda packet to assist the Board in deciding on a date for the fall strategic planning work session. She asked the Board members to be prepared to select the date at the June meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE: Ms. Wylie asked the Board to read the materials in the Board packet with regard to correspondence, the monthly performance group report, and the monthly LTD performance report. She said that even though these items typically were not discussed at the Board meetings, they provided information that the Board had requested.

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORT: There was no discussion on this topic.

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT (APRIL 2001): Mr. Hamm asked the Board to pay attention to the ridership recap on page 77 for both the fixed-route and the RideSource services. LTD was nearing 1 million rides per month in its combined toolbox of services.

ADJOURNMENT: There were no further discussions, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:43 p.m.

Board Secretary

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, June 20, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 15, 2001, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, June 20, 2001, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Virginia Lauritsen, Board Secretary
Pat Hocken

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

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT/ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA: No comments, announcements, or additions to the agenda were made.

WORK SESSION – Presentation of Los Angeles, California, Metro Rapid: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that Los Angeles had implemented a two-line Metro Rapid system as a bus signal priority demonstration program. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn, Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner, and Mr. Viggiano recently had visited the Metro Rapid in Los Angeles. Mr. Viggiano thought that program would provide some valuable background information to the Board on the impact of BRT-type enhancements to bus service. The operating environments of Los Angeles and Eugene were substantially different, but the results of the Los Angeles project provided useful information as LTD moved forward with its BRT project.

Mr. Viggiano said that the Metro Rapid lines operating in Los Angeles utilized some of the proposed BRT features, including simple route layout, frequent service, headway-based schedules, less frequent stops, and bus signal priority. Even though the system used bus signal priority, the buses did not use an exclusive lane, so any traffic ahead of the bus benefited from the signal priority as well.

The Metro Rapid featured 40-seat, low-floor buses with a special exterior image. The three station designs featured overhead protection without blocking sidewalks or interfering with adjacent properties and a real-time, “next bus” display.

Mr. Bennett asked if the "next bus" displays were expensive. Mr. Viggiano said that they were not too expensive, but an automatic vehicle locator (AVL) system had to be in place, and depending on the type of system used, that part of it was expensive. Los Angeles used hard-wiring along the route to locate buses as opposed to a satellite locating system.

Mr. Pangborn said that the bus stops along the Metro Rapid were spaced one mile apart to speed up the bus movement. Ms. Wylie asked if park and ride lots were located along or at either end of the routes. Mr. Pangborn said that the area in which the routes operated was too dense for a park and ride lot. Another unique feature of the Metro Rapid was that local service was maintained along the Metro Rapid corridor. Mr. Pangborn said that stop lights were spaced farther apart, every three to four blocks, and the blocks were longer than in Eugene.

Mr. Viggiano said that the signal priority system in use by Metro Rapid did not use queue jumpers to allow buses to get to the front of traffic. Their goal for Phase 2 of the Metro Rapid was for exclusive bus lanes. Mr. Bennett asked how Los Angeles planned to acquire the exclusive bus lanes, and if there was a time frame to complete future phases. Mr. Viggiano said that those issues had not been resolved. Los Angeles originally had a plan for an extensive rail system, but it was deemed too expensive. BRT, in combination with continued rail expansion, was what Los Angeles was touting as the future of transit in that area.

Mr. Viggiano said that the Wilshire-Whittier Rapid corridor, which operated between Santa Monica and East Los Angeles, was 26 miles long with 30 stations. The original plan was to operate 58 weekday peak buses with 3-minute peak and 10-minute off-peak and weekend service. The ridership had increased 33 percent, and, currently, 71 weekday peak buses provided 2.5-minute peak frequency.

The Ventura Rapid corridor operated from Warner Center to Universal City. It was 16 miles long with 15 stations. The original plan was to operate 16 weekday peak buses with 10-minute peak and 12-minute off-peak and weekend service. The ridership along that corridor had increased 26 percent, and, currently, 22 weekday peak buses were in operation, and the 10-minute peak frequency was maintained.

The Metro Rapid program has been successful, and all program objectives have been met. Passenger travel times on the Wilshire corridor had been reduced by 29 percent and by 23 percent on the Ventura corridor. One of the objectives was to attract new riders, and surveys had shown that one-third of the ridership increase was new riders, one-third was current riders riding more often, and one-third was current riders who had changed routes to use the Metro Rapid.

Mr. Viggiano added that Los Angeles was interested in the same type bus that LTD was seeking for BRT, as well as in the left-side door option that would be utilized with median stations. Mr. Bennett asked about the issues Los Angeles faced with regard to acquiring exclusive lanes. Mr. Viggiano said that the issues primarily were loss of parking and access to businesses. Operating buses in the median would have restricted cross traffic and left turns. Los Angeles currently was looking at just removing parking during the peak hours.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff had wanted the Board to see this presentation, because it depicted how just a piece of BRT could have very successful results. It also showed that

exclusive right-of-way (ROW) was a key piece of making BRT a total success. Mr. Viggiano added that Los Angeles realized that exclusive ROW would be needed to further enhance the system, and was working toward that in the next phase of the project.

Mr. Melnick asked if the study of Metro Rapid had caused staff to think further or differently about LTD's BRT plan. Mr. Viggiano said that Metro Rapid showed the results of what LTD could have achieved if it used just those BRT attributes that Los Angeles had used. The Metro Rapid experience also showed that it was important to take the steps now to get exclusive ROW, which would help down the road.

Mr. Gaydos asked if Los Angeles had used an extensive public involvement process. Mr. Viggiano said that Metro Rapid was planned with little public involvement, as the first phase would have little impact along the corridors. Mr. Gaydos was said that he was concerned about not meeting the expectation of the public.

Mr. Viggiano added that the Metro Rapid had resulted from a very strong partnership with the Los Angeles transit authority and the City of Los Angeles, and phase one of the project had very strong political support. Because regular, local service continued to operate along the same corridors, Los Angeles had not yet realized any savings with the Metro Rapid system, but the system had been well received.

BREEZE UPDATE: Service Planning Manager Andy Vobora said that the written update could be found beginning on page 151 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He discussed how and why the name "Breeze Around Town" had been selected. He presented an illustration of the painted bus with the logo, and a mock-up of the *Breeze* bus stops that would be placed along the route. He reported that the hybrid-electric buses that had been ordered for the shuttle would begin arriving in late July or early August. One of the buses would be on display at the Lane County Fair.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that her report could be found on page 168 of the Board meeting agenda packet. She highlighted some of the information contained in her written report. She added that since the writing of her report, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation had released its list of earmarks, and LTD had not been named. It was hoped that LTD would be named a recipient in the Senate appropriations process.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Hamm said that his written report was located on page 130 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He added that staff had been paying close attention to the local discussions about the expansion of Sacred Heart Hospital. He had discussed with Sacred Heart staff the importance of transit consideration in the location of the hospital. Mr. Hamm reported also that the City of Eugene would maintain the office and community service officer at the Eugene Station and had planned to add an officer to the mid-town area.

Mr. Bennett asked about LTD's involvement in the possible reopening of West Broadway Street. Mr. Vobora said that LTD had provided comments about the desired accommodations for transit services. Actual design work would not begin until the results of the election in September were known, and LTD would be involved at that time.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – MAY 2001 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson referred to the financial report located on page 140 of the Board meeting agenda packet and highlighted some of the information contained in the report.

FAMILIES IN GOOD COMPANY RECOGNITION AND AWARD: Human Resources Manager Dave Dickman referred to page 131 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He said that LTD had been named one of ten companies from around the state to demonstrate dedication to families and community. He presented a plaque to the Board of Directors.

BOARD ACTIVITY CALENDARS – SCHEDULE FALL STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION: Executive Assistant Jo Sullivan said that the calendars could be found on page 132 of the Board meeting agenda packet. After calendars were checked, the fall strategic planning work session was scheduled for November 16 and 17, 2001.

Ms. Wylie suggested canceling the July 2001 regular Board meeting due to lack of business. Other Board members agreed, and the July 2001 regular Board meeting was canceled. The August 2001 Board meeting would be held as scheduled.

Ms. Wylie noted that the LTD Bus Roadeo and annual employee picnic would be held in July, and she encouraged Board members to attend each of these events.

Mr. Kleger suggested that the November regular Board meeting, scheduled for November 21, 2001, be moved to Wednesday, November 14, as the 21st was the day before the Thanksgiving holiday. Other Board members agreed, and the date of November 14 was tentatively selected.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – JULY 2001: Bus Operator Marcia Maffei was selected as the July 2001 Employee of the Month. Ms. Maffei was hired on August 3, 1987, and had earned awards for seven years of safe driving, good attendance, and Correct Schedule Operation. Ms. Maffei was a member of LTD's Take Care Committee and the Accessible Issues Committee. She was nominated by a guest who said that Ms. Maffei always had a wonderful smile and tried to make accommodations for all of her passengers. The guest added that Ms. Maffei was very patient and worked well with varying groups of guests and with those who have special needs.

Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Ms. Maffei to the Board and said that Ms. Maffei was a pleasure to work with, and that she worked hard to make LTD a better place. As a member of the Take Care Committee, Ms. Maffei would be representing LTD at a Wellness Conference in Seaside, Oregon.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Ms. Maffei and presented her with an Employee of the Month lapel pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award. Ms. Maffei thanked the Board.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Bennett called attention to the draft minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting. He said that on page 32, where the Board discussed the Budget Committee process, the recorder had not captured correctly what he had tried to

communicate, and he asked that the minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting be changed to better reflect his intent.

Because the Board held discussions throughout the year regarding budgetary issues, he felt that he was very informed, and he had been prepared for and had looked forward to a discussion of the issues with other Budget Committee members. His concern was not about a lack of information or understanding as a Board member. In hindsight, because some of the budget policy and strategy was changing, it might have helped him to have been presented a worse-case scenario on issues such as BRT, capital funding, or payroll tax revenues for further discussion. Other than that, however, he felt that he as a Board member was kept very much up to date and that the financial work done at LTD was very strong.

The minutes of the May 16, 2001, Board meeting would be revised to better reflect Mr. Bennett's intent and would be presented for Board approval at the next Board meeting.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Kleger then moved adoption of the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-020: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for June 20, 2001, with the exception of the minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote, with Bennett, Melnick, Gaydos, Kleger, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. The June 20, 2001, Consent Calendar, as revised, consisted of the minutes of the May 14, 2001, special joint meeting with the Springfield City Council; a resolution amending consolidated application ranking sheet for Special Transportation proposals to the State of Oregon; Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Membership recommendations; and a resolution reaffirming the District Boundaries for FY 2001-02. The approval of the minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting would be postponed until the next regular Board meeting.

ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2001-2002 BUDGET: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson pointed out that there was a typographical error in the proposed motion found on page 45 of the Board meeting agenda packet. The total budget appropriation was listed as \$81,303,240,922, but should have been listed at \$81,303,240. Ms. Hellekson provided a brief review of the proposed budget. She noted that there were two changes, resulting in an increase of \$1.8 million to the proposed budget that had occurred since the Budget Committee review. The shuttle vehicles that were ordered earlier in Fiscal Year 2000-01 would not be received until after July 1, 2001, which would require the appropriation in the current year to roll over into FY 2001-02. Also, the financial systems conversion project expected to be completed by July 1 actually would begin on that date, requiring \$200,000 of current-year capital appropriations to roll forward. The changes were within Oregon budget law and did not require additional action on the part of the Budget Committee. The total approved budget appropriation presented for adoption was \$81,303,204.

Mr. Melnick asked about the \$3.5 million reserves in the General Fund. Ms. Hellekson said that the reserves had been growing, and previous Board policy allowed for 25 to 40 percent of the operating budget to be held in reserves. The new policy, implemented in FY 2000-01, set a minimum of \$3 million in total reserves, but could fluctuate some, and would cover self insurance, payroll for a period, and an operating contingency.

The Board also decided that given LTD's very aggressive capital agenda, reserves should be built in the fund where they would be most needed. Staff were attempting to simultaneously build reserves in both the Capital and General Funds. Mr. Melnick said that he thought the reserve policy was appropriate, and it made sense to tie the reserves to certain events.

Public Hearing: No one in the audience wished to address the Board.

Board Deliberation: Mr. Kleger said that staff again had presented a reasonable budget that addressed the needs of the community within the available resources. He thanked staff for their hard work in producing the budget on time and presenting it clearly.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved approval of the following resolution: "Lane Transit District Resolution No. 2001-023 adopting the LTD Fiscal Year 2001-2002 budget and appropriating \$81,303,240 as represented in the Resolution." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion.

Mr. Melnick said that this had been his first LTD budget process. He thought that the budget reflected current operations, future thinking and growth, yet with cautious elements that he thought were appropriate. Mr. Gaydos said that it was good that the Board approved the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR), which he hoped would show a dramatic impact. One of the concerns that he heard in the community was with regard to the payroll tax. He thought the public needed to hear more about the benefits of the transit system and BRT. The budget did a good job of communicating those benefits to those who understood it, but not to the community as a whole.

VOTE

There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken by voice on the motion, which carried by unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

APPROVAL OF REMAINING MPC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN:

Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner said that all jurisdictions were taking action, and the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board would be taking action on the federal plan. Mr. Bennett asked if Eugene and Springfield had agreed to disagree on some of the issues. Mr. Viggiano said that was true on some issues, but the two cities were in agreement on most issues.

MOTION

Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "Lane Transit District Resolution No. 2001-024: Resolved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves policy changes for TransPlan, as proposed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee and included in the May 10, 2001, LCOG TransPlan materials." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Kleger commented that there were many times when he doubted that this time would come, but he was happy to get to this point after seven years, with the only disagreement coming around fairly small issues. The financing of transportation in our community was not in conformance with the philosophy in TransPlan, not because jurisdictions did not want it to be that way, but because of regulations. The community was told by state and federal authorities to write the plan, but was not getting control of the money to carry out the plan.

There was no further discussion. A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

BRT PHASE 1 APPROVAL: Mr. Viggiano said that all partner agencies had approved the BRT Phase 1 package. Staff were now asking the Board to approve the Phase 1 project as a whole. The Board previously had approved individual segments. The approval also would authorize the general manager to take action to execute contracts on behalf of LTD. The Environmental Assessment (EA) had not yet been approved. The EA currently was out for a 30-day comment period. Staff expected to have final approval by August 1, and further action was contingent upon that approval. At a later meeting, the Board would be asked to pass a resolution to go forward with required land purchases. This approval would allow LTD to hire a design contractor.

Mr. Kleger wondered if it would be possible for the Board to approve a resolution regarding acquisition of the property by telephone polling rather than having to get the members together, if that were the only business item to come up in August. Ms. Sullivan said that a meeting by conference call could be called, and at least one Board member would need to be present and the others would be polled by telephone.

Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-025: It is resolved that the LTD Board approves the BRT Phase 1 Project, as described in the attached description, with the project to proceed once final environmental approval is received from the Federal Transit Administration. The general manager is authorized to execute all necessary contracts to implement the BRT Phase 1 Project." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

MOTION

VOTE

SPRINGFIELD STATION SITE SELECTION: Mr. Viggiano said that he had nothing to add to the written report found on page 104 of the Board meeting agenda packet. Mr. Kleger asked if the Springfield City Council had any further questions or concerns. Mr. Viggiano replied that there had been none, and the Council had unanimously approved the site.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Gaydos moved that the Board adopt LTD Resolution No. 2001-026, a Resolution declaring the public necessity to acquire property for the construction of the Springfield Transit Station. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

MOTION

VOTE

DEBT POLICY: Ms. Hellekson said that the Board Finance Committee and LTD's attorney had reviewed the proposed debt policy and were very comfortable with the wording to more than adequately protect all parties, and it committed LTD to a very strong fiduciary position. The Board Finance Committee had met and reviewed the policy and were comfortable with it.

Ms. Hellekson asked the Board to consider an important aspect of the policy. Debt financing was a new arena for LTD, but a necessary one for bus acquisitions. There were some timing issues to be considered. Assuming the policy was approved, staff would act

quickly to consider options for financing. If a decision was made to lease buses, staff would do nothing for a year, but if a bank loan or bonds were used for financing, the rates currently were at a very favorable level, and staff would want to move quickly. A major national bank was willing to lend LTD up to \$9,999,000 (anything over \$10 million would have arbitrage implications) on good faith and would not keep the titles to the buses. General obligation bonds would require a vote. If the Board was comfortable with the policy, Ms. Hellekson asked if the members also would be comfortable delegating to the general manager the authority to act if the business case was strong to do so before the Board met again.

Mr. Gaydos said that he supported the policy, and he was comfortable with giving the general manager the authority to act on LTD's behalf. LTD had a strong sense of stewardship. He supported delegating authority to two staff members, the general manager and finance manager, and he suggested that a mechanism be in place for regular reporting back to the Board in the interim between Board meetings. He did not think it was necessary to call a full meeting.

Mr. Melnick said that he supported the policy. LTD had been fairly conservative and cautious about debt financing. He also recognized that 60 days in a market was way too long to wait for approval from the Board. He understood the need for approval of delegations. Mr. Kleger said that he supported the policy and delegating authority.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger then moved approval of LTD Resolution No. 2001-027, adopting a debt policy for Lane Transit District. Mr. Melnick seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett asked about the local match ratio. Ms. Hellekson said that if LTD were successful in the federal New Starts grant program, then it would enter into a full-funding grant agreement, where funding would be granted at up to a maximum of 50 percent. Federal funds did not grow along with any growth in costs.

Ms. Hellekson added that bus purchases would use no federal funds up front, but LTD would use federal funds to retire the debt.

VOTE

There being no further discussion, the Board voted on the motion, which carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger then moved that the Board delegate to the general manager and finance manager the authority to act on the Debt Policy to take advantage of desirable opportunities and that they inform the Board within 90 days when taking such actions. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

LOW-FLOOR BUS, ARTICULATED BUS, AND HYBRID-ELECTRIC BUS PURCHASE:
Fleet Services Manager Ron Berkshire said that background information could be found on page 120 of the Board meeting agenda packet. Staff were seeking direction from the Board to procure 5 articulated buses, 18 low-floor buses, and 6 hybrid-electric buses to be used as fleet replacement.

Mr. Bennett asked if Gillig was the only manufacturer. Mr. Berkshire said that there were other manufacturers, but LTD had an existing contract with Gillig. Also, it was

important to receive a product that LTD was familiar with. Mr. Berkshire did not think that any other manufacturers had a better product.

Mr. Berkshire noted that staff would prefer to move ahead with hybrid-electric buses; however, the heavy-duty, hybrid-electric buses were not yet available. It was expected that they would be available by the year 2004.

Mr. Bennett said that he appreciated the comments about Gillig, and asked if Gillig was also the manufacturer of the articulated buses. Mr. Berkshire said that Gillig did not build articulated buses, but LTD would prefer to tag onto an existing contract with another agency, if the specifications met LTD's needs.

Mr. Bennett said that he was concerned about not looking at other manufacturers for the 18 low-floor buses and not getting appropriate competitive pricing. Mr. Berkshire said that staff would be comparing Gillig's proposed price with prices from other manufacturers. Mr. Hamm added that several years ago, the Board approved a multi-year purchase agreement with Gillig. There was one purchase left before that agreement expired. The majority of the fleet was Gillig buses, and because of the purchasing agreement, LTD could forego the competitive process and get its order into the manufacturing line right away rather than waiting for the competitive bidding process. Staff would compare prices to ensure that Gillig's price was consistent with the market.

Mr. Berkshire reiterated that the Board's action would direct staff to proceed with the procurement process. Staff would then begin the analysis work of preparing to purchase the buses, which would include the cost comparisons. The Board would take action at a later date to give staff the authorization to sign contracts for the purchases.

Mr. Melnick asked about the impacts of buying articulated buses on LTD's maintenance and bus storage facilities. Mr. Berkshire said that LTD would need an immediate expenditure of a six-point hoist. Staff were analyzing what would be needed in the shop with the addition of the articulated buses and the BRT vehicles.

Mr. Kleger said that LTD had acquired some used articulated buses to be used for sport shuttles, which would give LTD some experience. He asked if manufacturers were moving forward on the size of the hybrid-electric buses. Mr. Berkshire said that the hybrid-electric technology had yet to be proven. AVS was the only manufacturer that was aggressive in the market place. AVS had developed 30- and 35-foot hybrid-electric buses, and was now developing a 40-foot bus. LTD wanted to get some experience with the shuttle buses before deciding to move forward with the more heavy-duty buses.

Mr. Hamm said that from a technology standpoint, staff would prefer to wait until the hybrid, heavy-duty bus was tried in the marketplace to see what the other manufacturers might do. Even though staff were seeking Board approval to begin the process to purchase six 30-foot hybrid-electric buses, staff would put off the purchase in order to gain experience with the hybrid-electric technology.

Mr. Kleger asked if the motion should be revised to include 6 heavy-duty hybrid buses, just so staff would not be limited to 30-footers if the market changed.

Mr. Bennett asked if a figure for the sale of the replaced buses was reflected in the budget. Ms. Hellekson said that those buses were not worth much, about \$2,000 each, by the time LTD retired them. Mr. Bennett also asked if LTD planned to offer external advertising on the 22-foot hybrid-electric buses. Mr. Hamm said that no exterior advertising was being planned on the new shuttle buses. The advertising contract specified the number of buses available for advertising space.

Mr. Melnick added that students at the UO were designing a prototype for non-usable buses for cleaning them out and redesigning them for homeless housing. He commended Mr. Berkshire and Mr. Pangborn for their assistance to the students. The students also were talking to people in the community to determine the need. If the project moved forward, it would be a great win-win situation for both LTD and the UO for public service. Mr. Berkshire added that the students had visited LTD to measure the buses, then came back at the end of the term to show their ideas. There were many interesting concepts.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution, "LTD Resolution No. 2001-028: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board directs staff to begin the procurement process for five articulated buses, six heavy-duty hybrid-electric buses, and eighteen low-floor buses to replace buses that have exceeded their life expectancy, and to return to the Board for authority to purchase the buses." Mr. Melnick second the motion, which carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEE PERSONNEL POLICY HANDBOOK: Mr. Dickman said that the Board had received individual copies of the proposed handbook, and the background information could be found on page 123 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He reviewed the major changes that had a fiscal impact, including the addition of one holiday, including holiday hours as "time worked" in the calculation for overtime, and increasing the amount of annual educational assistance available to employees from \$200 per year to \$500 per year for approved programs.

MOTION Mr. Gaydos moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-029: The Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby ratifies and adopts the revised *Administrative Employee Personnel Policy Handbook*, as presented, and further authorizes the general manager to make future amendments and implement these amended policies as may be needed as a result of law, efficiency, or minor correction." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion.

Mr. Gaydos noted that the Board Human Resources Committee had changed the motion to reflect that the Board should not have to deal with those amendments that were required by law. The HR Committee believed the handbook created a sense of fairness and was part of what made LTD a good family place.

Mr. Kleger said that he personally had been involved in the writing of employee handbooks, and he had not seen as clean a job of writing as this handbook. He thanked staff for their hard work on this document

VOTE There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: a) **Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):** The MPC did not meet in June.

b) **BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee:** Mr. Hamm said that the committee members had discussed the role of the steering committee and the membership of the committee. There was general discussion about adding an additional citizen member from each of the two cities or potentially from the county. There was enthusiasm to retain the current membership. The committee members discussed the focus of the committee, and the members stated their desire to have oversight of BRT considerations both in Eugene and in Springfield, much like a regional oversight committee.

Ms. Wylie added that the committee members wanted to continue to meet and continue to represent all the jurisdictions.

Mr. Viggiano reminded the Board that the BRT Steering Committee was an advisory committee to the LTD Board, and the Board appointed the committee members. The Steering Committee would meet again in early September.

c) **Statewide Livability Forum:** No meeting had been held in June.

d) **Board Finance Committee:** Ms. Hellekson said that the committee had debriefed the budget process and discussed the Debt Policy and the New Start Program timeline. Mr. Bennett asked if staff believed the New Start Program was a probability for LTD. Ms. Hellekson said that staff were learning all they could about the potential of the program and how it might apply to the BRT project.

e) **Board Human Resources Committee:** Mr. Gaydos said that the committee met in early June, and the bulk of the discussion was about the update of the Personnel Policy Handbook. The Committee had a good discussion and appreciated Mr. Kleger's thorough review of the handbook.

f) **West-Eugene Parkway (WEP):** Mr. Gaydos attended a meeting sponsored by ODOT and the City of Eugene. Bill Glosser, a past member of the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) facilitated the meeting. ODOT, the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) were well represented, as were the Cities and County. The goal of the meeting was to look at the WEP situation and attempt to find solutions. The first day consisted of a series of presentations to bring participants to a common ground. The second day consisted of discussion among the participants, and Mr. Gaydos was impressed by how many people stressed the importance of LTD to the community in addressing congestion issues.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) suggested the alternative to build a continuation of Beltline that hooked directly into 6th & 7th Avenues. The City of Eugene was favoring improvements for West 11th Avenue, and LTD was mentioned often. The thoroughfare concept was brought up, where West 11th Avenue would remain in the middle, and two side streets would be built to carry the local traffic.

g) **LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan Trustees:** Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn said that LTD had two pension trust plans – The LTD Salaried Employees

Retirement Plan and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU)/LTD Pension Plan. The Trustees for the ATU/LTD plan included Mr. Hamm, Ms. Wylie, and two representatives from the ATU. The salaried plan Trustees were Ms. Wylie, Mr. Hamm, and Mr. Pangborn. The Trustees for the salaried plan met on May 31, 2001. Mr. Pangborn provided a description of the two pension plans.

LTD had not, in the history of the LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan, sought new professional advisors until recently. Requests for Quotes (RFQ) were issued for a trust investment firm, trust attorney, trust actuarial, trust auditor, and trust administrator. The Trustees reviewed the RFQs that were received. There had been no competition for the investment firm, Columbia Trust. The Trustees selected Grove, Mueller, & Swank as the trust auditor. Milliman & Robertson was retained as the trust actuarial, and had proposed that LTD become the plan's own administrator. With the appropriate software, LTD could administer the trust, but that process had not yet been analyzed, so, no change in trust administrator was being made at this time. Two quotes were received for trust actuarial, and the Trustees had selected Milliman USA, based both on cost and service. Milliman USA was a leading actuarial firm for public plans in the Northwest. Four legal firms had submitted quotes for legal services, and two local firms would be interviewed.

2001-2002 PACIFIC PROGRAM: Mr. Pangborn said that the Pacific Program would hold its fall session on October 6 through 13, 2001, in Welches, Oregon. The Pacific Program was a week-long, intensive management training course that had been designed by Jeff Luke and focused on public sector management. It was an excellent program, and if Board members were interested in additional information, Mr. Pangborn could provide additional material.

2001 LTD BUS ROADEO AND EMPLOYEE PICNIC: Ms. Wylie reminded the Board that the LTD Bus Roadeo would be held on Sunday, July 22, and the LTD Employee Picnic would be held on Sunday, July 30. She encouraged Board members to participate in the Bus Roadeo and to attend the picnic.

ADJOURNMENT: There were no further discussions, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: JULY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Due to the demands of the fiscal year-end closure process and the early date of the August Board meeting, it was not possible to complete the July financial statements in time for inclusion in the Board packets. The July report will be distributed on August 15 (or mailed on that date to any Board members unable to attend the August meeting).

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

2

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: JULY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

PREPARED BY: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: Financial results for the first month of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports. Passenger fares were 4 percent over monthly budget and nearly 8 percent ahead of the previous July. The cash fare increase effective July 1 does not appear to have affected ridership or choice of fare medium. In fact, July performance was the opposite of what is expected following a cash fare increase. Cash fare use increased, and use of most of the prepaid instruments (including tokens) decreased.

Payroll tax revenue also was better than budget and ahead of the prior year. However, receipts were below expectations last year, and current-year receipts were budgeted conservatively. It is too early to speculate on possible current fiscal year annual receipts, other than to note that there are no concerns based on July performance.

Interest income for July was down as compared with both budget and prior year. The year to year comparison shows the effect of rate reductions that have substantially reduced earning potential in the last several months. The current-year budget anticipated the investment of bond sale proceeds, with earnings spread over the entire fiscal year. There has been no action taken on debt financing, although research continues. Therefore, there have been fewer funds with which to invest. The Board Finance Committee is expected to meet in September to review debt financing options for bus purchases and the results of staff research to date. Borrowing rates remain favorable.

Personnel services expenses are within budget parameters for July. Expenses have increased 16.1 percent compared with July 2000. The majority of the wage increase comes from Amalgamated Transit Union employee expense increases. General Fund materials and services expenses show some timing errors in how the current budget anticipated that they would occur (notably insurance). However, there are no General Fund expenditure concerns versus budget at this time.

Special Transportation Fund expenses are as anticipated through July. July Capital Fund expenses also are as anticipated. As noted in previous

reports, grant processing had been delayed in the Seattle Region 10 FTA office for several months. As a result, more than \$800,000 in expenses that were incurred in the last fiscal year were not recovered by fiscal year-end. Although the opportunity cost cannot be recovered, there is good news in the fact that the grants were finalized in early August and funds were successfully drawn down on August 14, 2001.

Fieldwork for the audit of the 2000-2001 fiscal year is scheduled for September 4 - 7. The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), including auditors' statements, will be distributed before the November Board meeting. A representative of the audit firm Grove, Mueller & Swank will attend the November meeting to present audit findings and answer any questions that Board members may have. Lane Transit District recently was notified that the FY 1999-2000 CAFR received an award for reporting excellence from the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) of the United States and Canada. This award is the fifth consecutive recognition for LTD's CAFR.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attached are the following financial reports for Board review:

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

PROPOSED MOTION:

None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: FY 2001 SECTION 5307 FEDERAL GRANT APPLICATION

PREPARED BY: Lisa Gardner, Capital Grants Administrator

ACTION REQUESTED:

- (1) Hold a public hearing on the grant application
- (2) Approve grant application

BACKGROUND: Following the capital budget process, LTD applies for federal funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). These funds are from several federal programs, and have different match requirements. Section 5307 funds are allocated to LTD on an annual formula basis, and provide capital project funding at 80 percent.

This grant request is for \$993,360 in Federal Section 5307 funds, which includes \$254,754 in 2000 Section 5307 funds, and \$738,606 in 2001 Section 5307 funds. The request funds the 2001-2002 Capital Improvements Program and includes computer hardware and software, miscellaneous office equipment, Automatic Vehicle Locator/Automatic Passenger Counter, and used Bus Rolling Stock. The grant also includes \$525,000 for bus replacement spare parts, which includes tires, transmission kits, and miscellaneous spare parts. Including the local match of 20 percent, the grant total is \$1,241,700.

ATTACHMENT: Program of Projects and Budgets for Section 5307 Grant

PROPOSED MOTION: I move the following resolution: LTD Resolution No. 2001-032: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed FY 2001 Section 5307 federal grant application for \$993,360 in federal funds, and authorizes the general manager to submit this application to the Federal Transit Administration for approval.

**FY 2001 PROGRAM OF PROJECTS AND BUDGET
 SECTION 5307**

GRANTEE: Lane Transit District
 Eugene, Oregon

GRANT NO.: FY 2001

	FEDERAL AMOUNT	TOTAL AMOUNT
<u>SCOPE</u>		
111-00 BUS ROLLING STOCK		
<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
11.12.40 BUS REPLACEMENT SPARE PARTS/ASSOC. CAPITAL STIP KEY # 09467 5307 (80% / 20%)	420,000	525,000
11.13.12 BUS EXPANSION-USED 6 ARTICULATED BUSES STIP KEY # 09467 5307 (80/20%)	<u>76,800</u>	<u>96,000</u>
<u>TOTAL SCOPE</u>	496,800	621,000

<u>SCOPE</u>		
112-00 BUS TRANSITWAYS/LINES		
<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
11.21.01 ENGINEERING/DESIGN (BRT Phase 2) STIP KEY # 11362 5307 (80% / 20%)	<u>196,000</u>	<u>245,000</u>
<u>TOTAL SCOPE</u>	196,000	245,000

	FEDERAL AMOUNT	TOTAL AMOUNT
SCOPE		
114-01 BUS : SUPPORT EQUIP AND FACILITIES STIP KEY # 09469		
<u>ACTIVITY</u>		
11.42.08 COMPUTER SOFTWARE IMPROVEMENTS 5307 (80/20%)	232,800	291,000
11.42.11 SUPPORT VEHICLES 5307 (80/20%)	3,760	4,700
11.42.20 OFFICE/MISC. EQUIPMENT 5307 (80/20%)	64,000	80,000
<u>TOTAL SCOPE</u>	300,560	375,700

TOTAL **\$993,360** **\$1,241,700**

SOURCES OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

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

FY 2000, SECTION 5307 CAPITAL (CARRYOVER) \$ 254,754
 FY 2001, SECTION 5307 CAPITAL 738,606

TOTAL **\$993,360**

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 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

CANCELED REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, July 18, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on July 12, 2001, the regular monthly meeting of the Lane Transit District Board of Directors, scheduled for Wednesday, July 18, 2001, was canceled for lack of agenda items requiring action.

Board Secretary

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 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. LTD's MPC representatives are Board members Pat Hocken and Hillary Wylie, with Rob Bennett and Gerry Gaydos as alternates. At the Board meeting, they can provide a brief report on the July 12, 2001, MPC meeting. The next MPC meeting is scheduled for August 16, 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 June 5, and probably will not meet again until September 4.
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. There is no report this month.
4. **LTD/ATU Pension Plan Trust:** The Trustees of the LTD/ Amalgamated Transit Union Pension Plan met on July 30, 2001. The LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan Trustees did not meet that

day. Board President Hillary Wylie is a trustee for both plans and can provide a brief report at the August 15, 2001, Board meeting.

5. **LTD Rodeo**: The LTD Rodeo was held at LTD on Sunday, July 22. Board members Dave Kleger and Pat Hocken were present and can provide a brief description of the day at the Board meeting.
6. **LTD/ATU Employee Picnic**: Several Board members attended the employee picnic on Sunday, July 29, and can report to the Board about the event at the August meeting.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: CORRESPONDENCE

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

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

- ◆ July 19, 2001, letter from Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer to Springfield City Manager Mike Kelly regarding the Pioneer Parkway extension

At the August 15, 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: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: WORK SESSION: BOARD WORKSHOP NOVEMBER 16-17, 2001

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Assist LTD Leadership Council in assembling workshop agenda

BACKGROUND: Annually, the LTD Board of Directors and LTD's Leadership Council spend a day and a half dialoguing about the state of the organization and what the priorities for the future are. It's a time for reflection on the year, what went well, and what could have gone better. It's about assuring that there is a common understanding of the goals and objectives of the organization for the future. And, it's about continuing to build on the teamwork that has led us to the success we have had to date.

This agenda item is a tickler to stimulate the Board's input for this workshop. We need to focus efforts on the interests of the Board and staff. To help trigger some of your thoughts, you should know that the Leadership Council has a retreat scheduled for October 18-19. Items we are considering for our focus include: budget process and priorities, system performance measures, evaluations and professional development plans, internal and external communications, monthly performance reporting, LTD's logo and identification, and organizational philosophy.

Priority setting by calendar year-end sets the foundation for 2002-2003 budget discussions. Attention to Board interests keeps everyone on the same page regarding agency policy and priorities.

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION: To generate a list of Board and staff topics that merit consideration at this workshop and help us set clear directions for the following year.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None



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

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

August 1, 2001

TO: Hillary Wylie, President, LTD Board of Directors
FROM: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager
RE: BRT Steering Committee Membership

The BRT Steering Committee is appointed by and is advisory to the Board. Any changes in committee membership will require Board approval. In preparation for this next phase of BRT work, there is a need to reconsider the Steering Committee membership. We would like to have the Board act on the changes at the August 15, 2001, Board meeting, so that the new members could attend the September Steering Committee meeting. In preparation for that, we offer the following staff recommendation for your consideration.

Current Membership

▪ Rob Bennett, Chair	LTD Board	continuing
▪ Tammy Fitch	Springfield City Council	continuing
▪ Pat Hocken	LTD Board	continuing
▪ Dave Jewett	At-Large	continuing
▪ John Lively	At-Large	not continuing
▪ Scott Meisner	Eugene City Council	continuing
▪ Bob Pirrie	ODOT	continuing
▪ Peter Sorenson	Lane County Board	continuing
▪ Hillary Wylie	LTD Board	continuing

Membership Needs

- New at-large member to replace John Lively.
- New at-large member(s) to represent environmental, neighborhood, and/or bus rider perspectives.

Staff Recommendation

- New at large member: Dan Egan, Springfield Chamber of Commerce
- New at-large member: Rob Bennett (once his term on the Board expires in December). Note that a Board member will need to be appointed to replace Rob as a Board representative on the Steering Committee when Rob leaves the Board.
- New at-large member: Charlie McGee (member of Citizens for Public Accountability)

Hillary Wylie
August 1, 2001
Page 2

With those staff recommendations, the Steering Committee would, following Rob's departure from the Board, increase to 11 members and have the following composition:

- Rob Bennett, Chair At-Large
- Dan Egan At-Large
- Tammy Fitch Springfield City Council
- Pat Hocken LTD Board
- Dave Jewett At-Large
- Charlie McGee At-Large
- Scott Meisner Eugene City Council
- Bob Pirrie ODOT
- Peter Sorenson Lane County Board
- Hillary Wylie LTD Board
- To be appointed LTD Board

Q:\BRT\Committees\Steering Comm\membership options.doc;
Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2001\08\Regular Mtg\BRT StCo membership options.doc

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** August 15, 2001
- ITEM TITLE:** BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) STEERING COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
- PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Approve appointments to the BRT Steering Committee
- BACKGROUND:** The BRT Steering Committee was established about three years ago as an advisory body to the LTD Board on key BRT issues. The Committee includes elected representatives from Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County, as well as some at-large representatives. Staff believe that the Steering Committee has played an important role in the BRT development process and recommend that it be continued as we move into the design and construction of the Phase 1 corridor and the selection of the next BRT lines.
- The Steering Committee has discussed its role in the BRT process, and generally believes that it has been positive and valuable. All committee members wish to continue to serve on the committee except John Lively, who, while interested in and supportive of the BRT project, cannot commit the time to the committee. The Steering Committee also recommended extending its membership to include citizens who could provide a more environmental/neighborhood perspective, and suggested that a citizen representing bus riders be appointed to the committee.
- The attached memorandum to Board President Hillary Wylie provides additional information about the Steering Committee and a staff recommendation for new appointments. The recommended appointees have been contacted and are interested in serving on the Steering Committee.
- ATTACHMENT:** Memorandum to Board President Hillary Wylie regarding BRT Steering Committee Appointments.
- PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution: LTD Resolution No. 2001-034: It is hereby resolved that Charles McGee and Dan Egan be appointed to the BRT Steering Committee.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: WORK SESSION: BRT UPDATE

PREPARED BY: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information and discussion only.

BACKGROUND: **Environmental Assessment (EA):** The final draft of the EA was released on June 21, 2001. The review period was extended until August 21, 2001, as a result of problems with access to the document at the Eugene Library. Staff expect that a Finding of No Significant Impact ("FONSI") will be issued by the end of August 2001.

Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs):

Staff are working with Eugene, Springfield, and the Oregon Department of Transportation on IGAs that will guide the interjurisdictional coordination of the Phase 1 design. Both the Eugene and Springfield City Councils stipulated as part of project approval that the IGAs be developed.

Design Team Selection

Interviews were held with the two firms who submitted proposals to conduct the design work on the BRT Phase 1 project. Both firms had assembled excellent design teams. The interview panel has selected one of the firms, and contract negotiations are underway.

Next BRT Corridors

Staff are collecting information to be used to select the next extensions to the BRT system at both the east and west ends of the BRT Phase 1 line. The extension of the BRT system on the east end of the Phase 1 line has been narrowed to two options: East on Main Street or north on Pioneer Parkway to Gateway. It is expected that the Springfield Planning Commission and Springfield City Council will take action to select a corridor next month.

The Eugene corridor selection process has been more extensive. Nine corridors are under consideration by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission held a public forum on August 7, 2001, to solicit comments on the corridor options. They are scheduled to meet on August 13, 2001, to recommend two or three corridors for further study.

That recommendation will go to the Eugene City Council on September 10, 2001. A final selection for the general alignment will not be made until later this fall.

The process for selection of the next Eugene corridor is taking longer than expected. This creates some problems in meeting the Eugene City Council's expectations for the schedule of development of the next corridor. The attached memorandum provides some additional information about this issue.

It has been suggested that LTD form a stakeholder group to provide for greater public involvement in the corridor selection process. Staff wish to discuss this option with the Board. Key issues/questions are:

- ❑ How the stakeholder process fits into the other public and decision-making processes, such as the BRT Steering Committee and the forums and open houses for the general public.
- ❑ Is the stakeholder process limited to the corridor selection process, or should it continue through the corridor preliminary design? If the latter, does it replace or complement the design workshop process that was used for the Phase 1 project?
- ❑ How large is the stakeholder committee? What interests are represented? How are the members selected?

ATTACHMENT: Memorandum to Board on the Eugene corridor selection process.

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 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 August 15, 2001:

- ◆ Approval of minutes: May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting
- ◆ Approval of minutes: June 20, 2001, regular Board meeting
- ◆ Approval of minutes: July 18, 2001, canceled Board meeting
- ◆ Approval of revised Fiscal Year 2001-02 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program

ATTACHMENTS:

- (1) Minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting
- (2) Minutes of the June 20, 2001, regular Board meeting
- (3) Minutes of the July 18, 2001, canceled Board meeting
- (4) Fiscal Year 2001-02 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program (including LTD Resolution No. 2001-031, Revising DBE Policies and DBE Affirmative Action Program)

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

LTD Resolution No. 2001-030: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for August 15, 2001, is approved as presented.



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

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

August 15, 2001

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager
RE: Eugene Selection Process for the Next BRT Corridor

The Eugene City Council's approval on May 14, 2001, of the bus rapid transit (BRT) Phase 1 project included several conditions. One of the conditions stated that an intergovernmental agreement was to be executed between the City and LTD that would, among other things, "include a best effort commitment by Eugene and LTD to the current schedule for the pilot corridor and the first extension of the pilot corridor in Eugene." The schedule currently indicates that the Phase 1 Project will be completed in the fall of 2003, while the first extension of the pilot corridor in Eugene will be completed by the fall of 2005.

The pilot corridor work is proceeding. The design team has been selected and design work should begin next month. While completion of the Phase 1 project by fall of 2003 is an ambitious schedule, it appears doable.

Work also has started on the development of the extension of the pilot corridor within Eugene. The scheduled completion of that corridor by fall of 2005 is ambitious, and will require that funding be made available and that review and approvals occur in a timely manner. There already have been some delays during the early planning phase.

LTD is working with the City of Eugene to determine the next corridor to be built in Eugene (a similar process is underway in Springfield). It should be noted that there is an expectation that all the planned BRT corridors eventually will be constructed, so the process is really one of determining a priority for construction. The original schedule for the development of the next extension generally is as follows:

June – July 2001	Narrow general alignment options to the top two or three corridors
July – September 2001	Select general alignment
October 2001 – June 2002	Determine preferred design within the selected corridor (preliminary engineering)
July 2002 – June 2003	Conduct environmental review and approval
July 2003 – June 2004	Design
July 2004 – September 2005	Construction

Memorandum to Board of Directors
Eugene Selection Process for Next BRT Corridor
August 15, 2001
Page 2

As noted on the schedule, the selection of the general alignment for the next BRT corridor was proposed to occur in two steps. The first step was to narrow the possible corridor options to the top two or three. Those two or three options then would be subject to more detailed research and analysis before the general alignment is selected. It was anticipated that the first step would occur with minimal data and be completed by now, and that the second step would be completed in September 2001. It is now clear that the first step will require considerably more data and a more extensive process, and will not be completed until next month. The Planning Commission is scheduled to narrow the corridor options to the top two or three on August 13, 2001, and the City Council will review that recommendation on September 10, 2001. Final selection of the general alignment will not likely until November or December, at the earliest.

The delay in the selection of the next BRT corridor may be only two or three months. However, it is a two- or three-month delay in a process that was scheduled to take only four months. It is also indicative of the type of issues that will be faced throughout this process. The goal of a fast and expedient corridor development process can be at odds with the goal to provide for a more extensive public and review process at all stages and with difficulty in obtaining access to Planning Commission and City Council meeting time.

This memorandum is intended to highlight this issue for the Board and to solicit from the Board direction on how to respond to the situation.

Q:\BRT\Board Material\ecc - schedule.doc;
Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2001\08\Regular Mtg\ecc - schedule.doc

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER 2001 EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH

PREPARED BY: Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: **AUGUST 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Larry Storm, database administrator/software engineer, was selected as the August 2001, Employee of the Month. Larry was hired on September 11, 2000. Although he has been with the District for less than a year, his co-workers are so appreciative of him that they nominated him for this award. One co-worker stated that he appreciates Larry's desire to make the jobs others do easier, and his great sense of humor. Another co-worker said that he appreciates the time Larry takes to ensure that others understand the updates and changes to LTD's computer system. One of the nominators said, "Larry exemplifies teamwork."

Larry said that he enjoys working at Lane Transit District because he has the opportunity to help people and solve problems. He added that the consistency between the product that the District produces and his personal beliefs in public transportation and alternative transportation makes his work even more enjoyable. Because Larry usually rides his bike or the bus to and from work, he requested that bids be taken for his month's use of the Employee of the Month parking place and the proceeds donated to United Way. As a result, a contribution of \$46 was made to United Way.

When asked to provide an additional statement about what makes Larry a good employee, IS Manager Steve Parrott said: LTD is very fortunate to have Larry working with us. His experiences with development of many complex business software applications throughout the world and his depth of technical knowledge have enabled Larry to make very significant contributions to the automated systems used by LTD employees everyday. His good-natured personality and warm, caring spirit make Larry a pleasure to work with for all who have had the good fortune to meet him. I am proud to have Larry's efforts recognized and appreciated by his fellow LTD co-workers.

SEPTEMBER 2001 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Receptionist/Clerical Assistant Kelly Perron was selected as the September 2001 Employee of the Month. She was hired by LTD on May 1, 1998, and as a result of her efforts and accomplishments in performing receptionist and clerical duties

for the District, this is her second selection as Employee of the Month (she was first selected in October 1998, only five months after her hire date).

Kelly was nominated for this award for the outstanding manner in which she accepted and performed the added assignment of assisting Linda Lynch, LTD's government relations manager, during the legislative session. The work involved independent discovery and review of the Oregon State Legislature's Web site for bills of interest to LTD, close attention to detail, maintenance of a bill status log, and tracking of staff responses to requests for comments about particular bills—all in addition to Kelly's regular duties. Linda stated that she does not believe an event, a party, a meeting, or any other organized activity could occur at LTD without Kelly's organizational skills, her enthusiasm, and her follow-through abilities. Linda added that Kelly is an exceptional guest contact, fielding complaints and helping people get to where they want to go, while ably completing her regular work assignments. In Linda's words, "LTD would not be the organization it is without Kelly."

In making additional comments about why Kelly deserves this award, Jo Sullivan, executive assistant/clerk of the board, stated:

Kelly is worth her weight in gold to those of us who work with her—she personifies exceptional guest service, has a strong work ethic, and is a consistently hard worker who never appears to be under stress from working so hard. She is incredibly organized, and has a gift for anticipating and remembering what needs to be done—and then she follows through to be sure it does get done on time. She always is doing several things at once, and keeps track of them all. She has an exceptionally positive attitude and can find humor in most situations. Not only is she helpful, friendly, and dedicated to doing a good job—she's a lot of fun, too. We are lucky to have Kelly on the LTD team.

Our congratulations to Larry and Kelly on their selection as the August and September Employees of the Month!

AWARDS:

Larry and Kelly will attend the August 15, 2001, meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive their awards.

APPENDIX E
FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
AGREEMENT ASSURANCE

I, Kenneth P. Hamm, General Manager, hereby certify on behalf of Lane Transit District that:

The undersigned shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the award and performance of any DOT assisted contract or in the administration of its DBE Program or the requirements of 49 CFR Part 26. The recipient shall take all necessary and reasonable steps under 49 CFR Part 26 to ensure nondiscrimination in the award and administration of DOT assisted contracts. The recipient's DBE Program, as required by 49 CFR Part 26 and as approved by DOT, is incorporated by reference in this agreement. Implementation of this program is a legal obligation, and failure to carry out its terms shall be treated as a violation of this agreement. Upon notification to the undersigned of its failure to carry out its approved program, the Department may impose sanctions as provided for under Part 26 and may, in appropriate cases, refer the matter for enforcement under 18 USC 1001 and/or the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act of 1986 (31 USC 3801 et seq.).

Executed this _____ day of _____, 2001.

By _____
Kenneth P. Hamm, General Manager
Lane Transit District

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** August 15, 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. **Commuter Solutions Report:** Staff will prepare a report on the Commuter Solutions program for the Board's information at the September 17 Board meeting.
 - B. **TransPlan Draft Plan Approval:** Approval of the Draft TransPlan could occur in September 2001. Specific TransPlan action and information items already have been discussed by the Board.
 - C. **2004-2007 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program STIP:** The Oregon Department of Transportation has begun preliminary planning for the 2004-2007 STIP process. Following completion of a Statewide STIP Stakeholder Process commissioned by the Oregon Transportation Commission, programming direction will be set for the STIP process. Results of the Stakeholder process, and OTC direction for the 2004-2007 STIP process, will be discussed at a future Board meeting. The Stakeholder input on the STIP process is due to the Commission in September, hopefully providing direction for the Commission's October discussion on 2004-07 STIP goals.
 - D. **Acceptance of Annual Independent Audit:** At the November 21, 2001, meeting, the Board will hear a presentation on the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and be asked to approve the audit report for the year ending June 30, 2001.
 - E. **Fall Board Strategic Planning Work Session:** The Board will hold its annual two-day strategic planning work session on November 16 and 17, 2001. Staff will work with the Board regarding the location, and to prepare the agenda.
 - F. **BRT Updates:** Various action and information items will be placed on Board meeting agendas during the design and implementation phases of the bus rapid transit project.



LTD General Manager's Report

August 2001 Board Meeting

Future Dates to Remember in 2001-2001

September 30- American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Annual Meeting,
October 4 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

External Activities of General Manager

June 28-29 Visitors from VIATrans in Boise, Idaho, to study LTD service toolbox
July 4-15 Ken and Cindi on very relaxing vacation in British Columbia
July 18

- Get-acquainted meeting with *Springfield News* Publisher Doris Towery
- Get-acquainted meeting with Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2 Director Jeff Scheick

July 20 Memorial Service for City of Eugene employee Les Lyle
July 24 Joint Chamber of Commerce Golf Tournament
July 25

- Presentation to Springfield Rotary on LTD, BRT, and Springfield Station
- United Way Community Leaders' Breakfast

July 26-27 APTA Nominating Committee Meeting, Chicago
August 2 Meeting with New Flyer Coach representatives regarding articulated buses
August 10 Springfield/Eugene/Lane County/LTD CEO meeting – discuss processes for future corridor selections in both cities
August 14 Presentation to Eugene Downtown Rotary – LTD, BRT, and the future
Weekly Eugene Downtown Rotary

Internal Activities

June 25-27 Springfield Station and BRT Design Team Interviews
July 16 Monthly meeting with Board President Hillary Wylie
July 19 Ride buses for half a day
July 22 LTD Bus Roadeo
July 25 Presentation at new operator training
July 29 LTD-ATU Employee Picnic
July 30 LTD/ATU Pension Trust meeting
August 6 Critical incident review meeting
July 20 –
August 7 Twelve Leadership staff evaluations



LTD General Manager's Report

December 2001

Future Dates to Remember

January 14, 2002 Possible Board Work Session
January 16, 2002 Regular Board Meeting

LTD and The Community

LTD is a partner in the communities we serve. Besides delivering first-class transportation services, LTD employees deliver in other ways.

Recently, there was a stabbing incident that took place at 11th and Jackson in Eugene. The Eugene Police department asked LTD Dispatch to notify our Operators to be on the alert for a suspect. Gary Bennett spotted the suspect and notified Dispatch. EPD was contacted and the suspect was apprehended. EPD called to say thank you and this was there man. That is community support and teamwork at its best.

Other things that routinely go on are operators and guest service staff who help lost people get where they want to go. Since LTD has buses out all day in most places, we've alerted the police to burglars, helped people when their cars were broke down, found runaways, returned lost items, and been good Samaritans in many other ways.

Additionally, LTD employees are involved in community service organizations, public committees, youth activities, and much, much more.

Reauthorization

I attended the APTA Legislative, Reauthorization, and Funding Committee meetings in Washington, D.C. last week. Bus Rapid Transit is now significantly included in all funding discussions. The LTD White Paper on BRT was presented by APTA at every meeting. Other BRT Consortium members are now stepping up and helping carry the message. It isn't over, but BRT has come a long way in these discussions since the first meetings last year.

BRT Vehicles

Ron Berkshire, Jack Gonzalves (Parsons Brinkerhoff) and I will visit manufacturers in the Netherlands and France in January. The BRT Strategy Team has been meeting to develop all the questions that we need answered to help us make a vehicle recommendation to the board. FTA plans to be in Europe at the same time. We are working to coordinate our trip with them.

FTA is looking at testing standards used for equipment in Europe and how their standards compare to those used in our country. Jenna Dorn, FTA Administrator has a lot of energy around solving the purchasing needs for BRT properties.

On another front, Neoplan, USA is developing a BRT vehicle. They are willing to engineer a vehicle that meets most, if not all, of our requirements. We are talking with FTA about the feasibility of LTD being a demonstration project for this vehicle and whether FTA could assist Neoplan and LTD with the costs. I'll keep you posted. This is very preliminary.

Fuel Costs

On a positive note, Ron reports that fuel prices have fallen to 50 cents a gallon for bulk diesel purchases. This is good news for our budget for the time being. Fuel was budgeted at \$1.10 per gallon.

Happy Holidays

LTD wishes our board members the happiest of holiday seasons. We will be closed for service on Christmas Day and New Year's Day.

Thank you Rob Bennett

This will be Rob's last LTD Board meeting. The board members and staff at LTD want to thank you for eight very energetic and committed years to our organization and its programs. We wish you the best in all that you do. If Norma gets tired of having you around too many evenings, we have lots of opportunities for you to stay active with our project committees.



LTD General Manager's Report

November 2001

Future Dates to Remember

December 19 Regular Board Meeting

Breeze Shuttle

Two issues have arisen. First, running time is affected by traffic. We can't meet the fifty-minute running time originally scheduled. It needs to be increased to sixty minutes. Second, we can't meet the current capacity with 30ft. Gilligs operating service.

Proposed solutions: We have increased the frequency of service from 10 minutes to 12 minutes. It would cost an additional \$90,000 annually to put additional buses on to recreate the 10 minute headways originally promised.

The AVS buses do not have the capacity to carry everyone who is waiting at the U of O Station. They also have some access and capacity problems for our disabled guests. We propose to mix AVS and Gillig buses on this service. With the U of O census up, it may become necessary to reconsider this strategy.

U of O Football and Basketball Service

The Transit Operations and Service Planning teams have placed Duck sports services in full swing. Extra effort has gone into assuring the quality of service for these special events. Event time changes and other last-minute adjustments have challenged the team and caused additional costs, but LTD has responded well. Ridership appears strong.

Security Awareness

Because of recent events, LTD has evaluated our security policies and procedures. The Operations security group has raised the awareness of employees about potential security issues and suspicious activities. New procedures have been implemented to better protect our guests and employees. While we do not believe LTD is a target, it is good to review programs, policies and procedures periodically, especially around system security and preventive strategies.

Accident Record Improves

The 2001 accident statistics are complete through September. Overall, accidents have decreased significantly through the corresponding period last year. There have been 36 preventable accidents this year as compared to 49 last year. That's a 27% reduction in accidents that resulted from our Operators errors or judgements. This is the direct result of refresher training programs and a commitment by the Operations staff, as well as the entire organization, to prioritizing safety in our guiding principles.



LTD General Manager's Report

October 2001

This is intended to be a confidential report between the Board of Directors and the General Manager. This is a departure from the monthly reports that I have provided for board meetings. It is healthy, from time to time, for the GM to share what his analysis of the organization is and to share strategies for addressing future opportunities and issues.

FINANCIAL STATUS OF LTD

LTD is experiencing the impacts of a recession. By the Board Retreat, we will have received our third quarter payroll tax reports and they will give us an indication of the impacts on the 2001-2002 Budget. Diane has projected a 2% loss in revenues for this fiscal year. In addition, she is forecasting up to a 5% drop in revenues for FY2002-2003. Those two impacts combined with the fact that LTD did not make a full transfer from operating to capital this year translate to approximately \$3 million.

What that means is that LTD can no longer do business as we have in recent years. It is a time to be retrospective and to employ strategies that maximize our productivity.

At the Leadership Retreat, we began the journey of evaluating everything we do and everything we plan to do. A laundry list of the options for streamlining was begun. Nothing, for purposes of the discussion was held sacred. The capital, operating and special transportation budgets were all discussed. Options discussed ranged from improved efficiency strategies and materials cuts to reorganization, layoffs and service cuts.

Leadership unanimously decided to share the basics of our discussions with the LTD staff. Two all-employee meetings were held on October 22 and 23. The situation was framed for the staff and they were asked to participate with leadership in identifying all opportunities to improve the bottom line. Department managers have been meeting with their staffs this week to collect, discuss and prioritize ideas. Managers will submit their respective strategies to Diane and I by the end of the work day, Friday, October 26.

I have scheduled a meeting with the Amalgamated Transit Union for November 1. ATU leadership will be apprised of the budget projections and asked to participate with us in developing strategies that reduce the cost of doing business. Dave Dickman and I are developing some suggestions for them to consider. It may come down to the number of jobs versus the amount of pay/benefits. We're hoping that they will step up and be the partners that they have said they want to be.

LTD is a service organization. Over 80% of our expenses are employee wages and benefits. My experience tells me that LTD has an inflated administrative staff. I am doing some research on that currently. However, my point is that differences between revenues and expenditures in the magnitude we are projecting can only be found in personnel.

As your General Manager, my initial read of these fiscal circumstances is simple, although not fully developed. I believe there are some things that we should not touch unless the economy gets significantly worse. Those things are 1) fixed route service (implement minor efficiency improvements), 2) special transportation programs, and 3) BRT Phase I. Holding the line on those key pieces is a policy decision for the board. I will present more information on these pieces by the time of your retreat.

I need the board's backing for what I think is a key piece of our long-range fiscal health and integrity. I plan to implement a reorganization of LTD. That reorganization will mean layoffs at all levels and potentially in all departments. As your CEO, I believe this has been needed for some time. While the economy was strong, LTD got fat. We don't have that luxury anymore. This is how private sector business responds to a declining bottom line. This is how LTD should respond.

Additionally, I propose that LTD postpone its procurement of an "exotic" BRT vehicle and utilize articulated buses for start-up. The public will accept the economic realities our area is faced with and probably appreciate that LTD is proceeding more prudently. This move could save millions of dollars. It does not mean that we abandon our objective for a rail-like, alternative powered vehicle. We'll continue to seek funding and weigh the possibilities. This also means that LTD would not spend \$15-20,000 for travel to Europe to evaluate vehicle manufacturers at this time.

Other strategies are being



LTD General Manager's Report

September 2001 Board Meeting

Future Dates to Remember in 2001-2001

September 19 Oregon Transportation Commission meeting and dinner
September 30 APTA Annual Meeting in Philadelphia
October 18-19 LTD Leadership Council retreat
October 29-30 Oregon Transit Association Conference, Seaside

External Activities of General Manager

August 17 Staff booth at the Lane County fair
August 22 Meeting with Tony baker re: 2001 united Way Campaign
August 23 Duck Football Dinner at Town Club
August 24 Eugene/Springfield leadership meeting
August 25-26 Participate on LTD Team in Transit Softball Tournament in Tacoma, WA.
August 27 Golf game with Kerry Tymchuk, Chief of Staff for Senator Gordon Smith, Kevin Fromer, Chief of Staff for Congressman Rogers, Chair of the House Sub-Committee on Transportation Appropriations, and Roger Martin, Executive Director of the Oregon Transit Association.
Hosted dinner at Hamm's house with reps from Safety Vision, American Seating, Clever Devices, and New Flyer Buses
August 31 Five hour meeting with the new ODOT Region II Director, Jeff Scheik, re: LTD services, BRT plans, specific issues with ODOT on BRT
September 4 Half day meeting with consultant on project management and oversight
September 5 Meeting with Julie Huff, Goodwill Industries re: their services and our needs
September 12 Conference call with FTA re: LTD leading BRT Consortium meeting at APTA
Eugene City Council meeting re: selection of two BRT corridors to study
September 16 Staff display on new Hybrid bus with Breeze paint scheme at Eugene Station

Internal Activities

September 20 Meeting with Andy and Mark on new service costs and focus on efficiency
September 21 BRT Strategy meeting, dividing the management responsibilities
September 30 Meeting on RideSource facility development
September 4 Begin presentations to Coach Operator refresher training groups focused on their roles in LTD's vision, mission, and objectives; and on teamwork
September 6 BRT Strategy Team meeting
September 10 Oregon Club luncheon

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: 2001 LEGISLATIVE REPORT

PREPARED BY: Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None

BACKGROUND: The 2001 Legislative session concluded July 7, 2001. Lane Transit District's legislative goals for this session were relatively modest:

- protect the gains made in 1999
- support any and all efforts to fund transportation infrastructure
- maintain the independence of the Board and the District's ability to make its own business decisions
- begin to make the case for funding fixed-route transit as part of the transportation infrastructure

The Report on the 2001 Legislative Assembly lists all the bills that staff followed during session, and details bills of special interest to the District.

ATTACHMENT: Report on 2001 Legislative Assembly (enclosed as separate document)

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: NEW LOW-FLOOR BUS PURCHASE

PREPARED BY: Ron Berkshire, Fleet Services Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Review and approve a change notice to existing contract with Gillig to purchase eighteen low-floor buses

BACKGROUND: At the June 20, 2001, meeting, the Board directed staff to prepare a proposal to purchase 18 low-floor buses to replace buses that have exceeded their life expectancy. As discussed at that meeting, although hybrid-electric technology is preferred by staff, availability is lacking and there is an urgency in replacing aging vehicles to maintain reliability of service. Therefore, staff recommended exercising an option on the existing contract between LTD and Gillig for 18 diesel-powered, low-floor buses.

In August 1997, Lane Transit District signed a contract with Gillig Corporation for providing diesel-powered, 40-foot, low-floor buses over a five-year period. Within this contract is a formula for determining the price of buses ordered after the initial order, using the original quoted base price plus any escalation based on the US Department of Labor/Bureau of Labor Statistics Producer Price Index. Based on the last purchase price of \$250,978 per bus and the PPI index, the new base price is \$256,750 per bus. This is a 2.3 percent increase in price.

Included in the Capital Improvements Program for fiscal year 2001-2002 are planned expenditures of \$9.8 million for the purchase of revenue vehicles. Funding for revenue vehicles would be acquired through debt financing, as approved at the June 20, 2001, Board meeting.

Staff recommend purchase of 18 Gillig low-floor buses as specified in the contract, with the following additions:

Bus base price	\$256,750
Upgrade destination sign	\$1,400
Upgrade engine	\$2,392
Install security camera system	\$8,000
Total price per bus	\$268,542
Total 18 buses	\$4,833,756

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Gillig will manufacture 18 new 40-foot, low-floor buses and deliver them to LTD during the first half of 2003.

ATTACHMENT:

None

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move the following resolution: LTD Resolution No. 2001-033: The LTD Board of Directors hereby gives approval for staff to proceed with a change notice to the existing contract with Gillig and authorizes the general manager to purchase 18 new low-floor buses from Gillig Corporation.



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

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

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORTS

August 15, 2001

GENERAL MANAGEMENT GROUP

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

STATE LEGISLATURE

Please see separate Item for Information. The session report is enclosed as a separate document.

IN CONGRESS

As announced at the June Board meeting, Lane Transit District was not mentioned in the House version of the FY 03 Transportation Appropriations Measure. The Senate version of the measure includes \$4 million for Springfield Station, the total needed federal share. The bill will go to conference in late September, but there are many issues to work out. First, the requirements imposed on Mexican trucks have been part of the transportation appropriations measure. If the issue can be resolved in another arena, it will help speed this bill to final passage. The second issue and the one of most importance to LTD is the fact that there is very little correlation between the earmarks in the House and Senate versions of the bill. Each chamber fully allocated the funds available, however, for road and transit projects.

How the differences will be worked out is unknown at this time. Springfield Station supporters will need to help keep this project a funding priority for both Senator Wyden and Senator Smith.

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
Rick Bailor, Eugene Station Administrator

ARTICULATED BUSES

The five used articulated buses have arrived on the property. They look great with their new, white paint job, and are ready for football season. They have been named the "UO DUCK EXPRESS," which will be applied to each side of the buses.

2001 BUS ROADEO

The annual LTD Bus Roadeo was held on July 22. It was a very successful event with more than 40 participants, including some operators from Cherriots in Salem. The weather was beautiful and the competition was tough. This year's winner, Bus Operator Lee Duncan, will go to Philadelphia to compete in the International competition. Good job, Lee, and a special thanks to Board members and volunteers for helping make the event a success. Operations Supervisor Ralph Dinnel has been coordinating all special events and did an outstanding job, as well.

SOFTWARE UPDATE

This is an update on the latest in the MIDAS software installation. MIDAS is a product of MultiSystems, Inc. (MSI), and is being used for dispatching, bid, and timekeeping functions. Because there are continuing problems with the application, MSI representatives will be on site the week of August 20 to address problem areas. Staff are cautiously optimistic that many of the outstanding issues will be resolved.

**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: August 15, 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 June 2001 Performance Report is attached. The July 2001 Performance Report will be completed in time to distribute at the August 15 Board meeting.

Staff will be available at the August 15 meeting to answer any questions the Board may have about this information.

ATTACHMENTS: June 2001 Performance Report

PROPOSED MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: SEPTEMBER AND NOVEMBER BOARD MEETINGS

PREPARED BY: Ken Hamm, General Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Board select an alternate date for the November 2001, regular meeting

BACKGROUND: The Board has been invited to a dinner meeting with the Oregon Transportation Commission on September 19, 2001, the date of the regular LTD Board meeting. Board President Hillary Wylie has determined that the regular meeting on September 19 will be canceled and a special meeting called for Monday, September 17, during the time reserved for LTD Board work sessions.

Additionally, the regular November Board meeting falls on November 21, the evening before the Thanksgiving holiday. The Board's annual strategic planning retreat is scheduled for November 16-17. At the June meeting, the Board briefly discussed holding this meeting on Wednesday, November 14. Another option is to hold the meeting on Monday, November 19.

At the August meeting, staff would like the Board to select the date for the November meeting. The auditors will be attending that meeting, and their time needs to be scheduled as soon as possible.

Attached are updated calendars for August 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, August through December 2001

PROPOSED MOTION: None



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

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

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
SPRINGFIELD STATION DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE CHARGE**

August 2001

Lane Transit District has selected a site for a new Springfield Station to replace the current station at 5th and North "B" Streets. The new site is located on the south side of South A Street, between Pioneer Parkway East and 4th Street. Design work for the new station is expected to begin in September 2001. It is anticipated that the station will be completed and operational by the fall of 2003.

The Springfield Station Design Review Committee (DRC) is charged with providing guidance to the Lane Transit District Board of Directors on key design issues for the new Springfield Station. The DRC will be provided background material and research on particular issues and asked to formulate recommendations to the LTD Board. Typically, an inter-jurisdictional staff Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will have discussed the issue and have a recommendation for the DRC.

The key design issues are expected to include the following:

- The general site layout
- Whether or not to include a Park & Ride lot as part of the project
- Design of the area adjacent to the Mill Race
- Design of South A Street streetscape, including possible on-street parking
- Traffic calming measures on South A Street
- Design of an extended 4th Street, including possible on-street parking
- The design and layout of the Guest Services Center
- Bus shelter and passenger boarding area design
- Design of northeast part of the site planned for private development
- Materials used for structures and pavements
- Life-cycle costing/value engineering
- Accessibility issues for persons with disabilities
- Landscaping
- Public art
- Disposition of the old station site at 5th and North B

Committee Membership

- Bus Rider Representative
- Chamber of Commerce Representative
- City Councilor
- Design/Architectural Representative
- Downtown Business Representatives (2)
- Downtown Resident
- Historic Commission Representative
- LTD Board Representatives (3)
- Planning Commissioner
- Springfield Renaissance Development Corporation (SRDC) Representative

Project Duration and Committee Meeting Schedule

The design of the station is expected to begin in September 2001 and be completed by late spring of 2002. The DRC will be scheduled to meet on a monthly basis during that period, though meetings may be added or cancelled depending on the progress of the design work. Meeting times will be scheduled to accommodate members' schedules as much as possible.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE

PREPARED BY: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND

Interviews have been held with three firms who had submitted proposals for design services for the Springfield Station. A preferred firm has been selected and contract negotiations with that firm are underway. It is expected that a contract will be signed by the end of the month.

Staff are forming a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to provide staff-level coordination during the design and construction of the station. Staff also recommend that a citizen Design Review Committee be established for the project. Board action regarding the formation of that committee is requested at this meeting as a separate agenda item.

ATTACHMENT: None

MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE

PREPARED BY: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND

Interviews have been held with three firms who had submitted proposals for design services for the Springfield Station. A preferred firm has been selected and contract negotiations with that firm are underway. It is expected that a contract will be signed by the end of the month.

Staff are forming a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to provide staff-level coordination during the design and construction of the station. Staff also recommend that a citizen Design Review Committee be established for the project. Board action regarding the formation of that committee is requested at this meeting as a separate agenda item.

ATTACHMENT: None

MOTION: None

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: SPRINGFIELD STATION DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

PREPARED BY: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the formation of a Springfield Station Design Review Committee

BACKGROUND: Staff recommend that a Design Review Committee (DRC) be established to serve in an advisory capacity to the LTD Board on key issues related to the design and construction of the Springfield Station. A similar process was used for the Eugene Station project, and provided a valuable contribution to that project. The attachment provides information on the responsibilities and membership of the DRC.

If the Board approves the formation of the DRC, staff will provide a recommendation for Board approval next month on membership to the committee. The DRC would include three LTD Board members. These three Board members also will be the Board Springfield Station Committee. That Board Committee will need to meet, on occasion, separately from the DRC. Board President Hillary Wylie has indicated that she, Dave Kleger, and Robert Melnick will serve as the Board Springfield Station Committee.

ATTACHMENT: "Committee Charge" for the Springfield Station Design Review Committee

MOTION: I move the following resolution: LTD Resolution No. 2001-035: It is hereby resolved that a Springfield Station Design Review Committee will be formed to serve in an advisory capacity to the LTD Board on Springfield Station design issues.

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: August 15, 2001

ITEM TITLE: TRANSPLAN UPDATE

PREPARED BY: Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND: On June 28, 2001, the Lane Council of Governments (LOGC) Board approved the updated TransPlan. This approval meets the federal requirements, and allows the development and implementation of local transportation projects, including bus rapid transit, to proceed.

There remains the need to have the plan approved by the four local adopting agencies: the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, and LTD. It appears that all areas of disagreement among the four agencies have been resolved, and that the plan is ready for local adoption. That action is expected to occur during the next two months. LTD Board approval is scheduled for the September 2001 meeting.

ATTACHMENT: None

PROPOSED MOTION: None