

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 16, 2004.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT SPECIAL BOARD MEETING/WORK SESSION

Monday, April 19, 2004  
2 p.m.

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

### A G E N D A

	<u>Page No.</u>
I. CALL TO ORDER	
II. ROLL CALL	
Kleger _____ Lauritsen _____ Wylie _____ Ban _____	
Gant _____ Gaydos _____ Hocken _____	
III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT	
IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA	
V. WORK SESSION	
A. Board Working Agreements Discussion	02
B. EmX System Development	03
VI. ADJOURNMENT	

**Alternative formats of printed material and/or a sign language interpreter will be made available with 48 hours' notice. The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. For more information, please call 682-6100 (voice) or 1-800-735-2900 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).**

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 19, 2004

**ITEM TITLE:** BOARD WORKING AGREEMENTS DISCUSSION

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Discussion Item Only

**BACKGROUND:** The Board of Directors is the policy-making body of the District. The Board sets the strategic direction for the District and for the general manager to administer the District. As the District and the environment around it evolve, the Board must visit its strategic plan and policies to be sure they help LTD succeed.

During recent meetings, questions have been raised about some strategic objectives of the District, specifically regarding bus rapid transit. The Board also began a discussion about the roles of the Board, the general manager, and the staff.

At the last Board meeting, the Board agreed to hold this special meeting to agree to some norms for Board conduct and to benchmark where they are on key strategic pieces like BRT. The Board asked that a facilitator be hired to guide them through this discussion. At the Board president's direction, Margot Helphand has been hired for this purpose.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**MOTION:** None



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

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

## **Bus Rapid Transit Goals and Performance Objectives June 2002**

### ***Bus Rapid Transit Overview***

Bus rapid transit (BRT) is a concept that uses rubber-tired vehicles to emulate the positive service characteristics and image of a rail system. The system is intended as a cost-effective major upgrade in transit service that is appropriate for the size and characteristics of the Eugene/Springfield community. BRT adds capacity to the transportation system, works well with the community's other transportation and land use strategies, and will provide increasingly important benefits into the future.

The system is composed of high-frequency, fast transit service along the major corridors, and small-bus neighborhood service that connects with the corridor service at neighborhood activity centers. The BRT corridor service, as proposed, eventually would be implemented on many major arterials within the community.

### ***Bus Rapid Transit Design Elements***

The following are the preferred design elements for BRT service. While it is the goal of every BRT corridor plan to meet all of these design elements, it is recognized that it may not be possible to do so in all cases. For example, it may not be feasible in many corridors to achieve exclusive transit right-of-way along the entire length of the BRT corridor.

#### **Corridor Service**

- Use exclusive bus lanes or bus guideways.
- Provide transit signal priority at signalized intersections.
- Use wider stop spacing (approximately every half-mile).
- Improve stops and stations and provide a higher level of passenger amenities.
- Use prepaid fares.
- Provide 10-minute service during the daytime on weekdays.
- Use vehicles for BRT service that convey a "rail-like" image, are environmentally friendly, can carry bicycles, and facilitate fast and efficient passenger boarding and deboarding.

#### **Neighborhood Service**

- Provide convenient neighborhood service that connects with the corridor service at neighborhood activity centers.
- Use small, environmentally-friendly vehicles for the neighborhood connector service.
- Continue to provide direct access to major activity centers (such as downtown Eugene) from nearby neighborhoods.

### ***Goals and Performance Objectives***

#### **Goal 1: Improve vehicle travel time, service reliability, rider comfort and convenience, and the image of the service in order to achieve an increase in the transit market share of trips along BRT corridors.**

- Increase peak-hour, peak-direction transit mode split (the percentage of trips taken by transit) along BRT corridors by at least 30 percent within ten years of implementation (e.g., from 10 percent to 13 percent of all person trips along the corridor), and by an additional 10 percent during the following ten years.
- Reduce peak-hour bus travel time along BRT corridors by at least 20 percent within ten years of implementation and by an additional 10 percent within the following ten years, compared with running times that would have occurred without BRT.
- Show no significant increase in vehicle travel times from year to year.
- Improve vehicle travel times to at least match car travel times along BRT corridors within 20 years of BRT implementation.
- Provide convenient neighborhood connector service that links neighborhood residents with the BRT line and nearby activity centers.
- Reduce vehicle emissions along BRT corridors compared with levels that would have occurred without BRT.
- Achieve 99 percent on-time performance for BRT service.
- Improve LTD approval ratings of “excellent” in community surveys by at least 10 percent within five years of BRT implementation.

#### **Goal 2: Reduce the operating cost for transit service along BRT corridors.**

- Reduce the annual direct operating cost for service along BRT corridors by at least 10 percent during the first ten years and by 15 percent thereafter, compared with costs that would have been required for an equivalent level of non-BRT service.

#### **Goal 3: Increase the person-carrying capacity of BRT corridors.**

- Increase the carrying capacity of BRT corridors by an average of 30 percent with the implementation of BRT.
- Develop a system that will facilitate future conversion to rail or another higher-capacity transit mode, if and when such a change becomes feasible.

**Goal 4: Design the BRT service to support planned land use patterns.**

- Provide convenient service to land use nodes along BRT corridors.
- Provide neighborhood connector service to link nearby residential, commercial, and employment areas with the BRT corridor service.
- Provide convenient access to major activity centers along BRT corridors.

**Goal 5: Where feasible, incorporate “non-transit” enhancements as part of BRT projects, including improvements in traffic safety, traffic flow, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and aesthetics.**

- Consider improvements to bicycle facilities along BRT corridors.
- Provide bicycle parking at BRT stops, where feasible.
- Consider the addition of sidewalks adjacent to the BRT service where they now do not exist.
- Work with state and traffic engineers to identify possible improvements to traffic safety and traffic flow along BRT corridors.
- Add landscaping along the BRT line, where appropriate.
- Consider including fiber optics or other communication and utility upgrades as part of BRT corridor construction.

***Implementation Guidelines***

In meeting the project goals, the design for BRT corridors should carefully consider the following:

- Cost.
- Pedestrian, bicycle, and traffic safety.
- Impact on businesses.
- Impact on residences.
- Traffic congestion.
- Parking.
- Movement of freight.
- Auto capacity.
- Access for persons with disabilities.

## BRT presentation to the Board.

- I. Discuss BRT as the next iteration of the improvement of fixed route transit. Two options for getting there:
  - A. Incremental approach
    1. Advantages
      - a. Slower, less threatening, more obvious that each step is an incremental improvement on the current system. Example is LA
      - b. Less costly: You can pick off the low hanging fruit, attack the real obvious problem, be careful how much you attempt to do at any one time. Avoid argument that a full blown BRT system is so costly that other service is sacrificed.
      - c. Less controversial: Since you are moving slower, you don't have a whole lot of difficult issues to address at the same time. Also, BRT does not become a lightning rod or scapegoat for other types of complaints that the public has about transit, i.e. increasing fares, cutting service, poorly maintained facilities, not enough security, etc.
    2. Disadvantages
      - a. Improvements to transit are so incremental that they are not obvious and consequently fail to move people more quickly and appeal to a larger market. It looks like, feels like, travels like transit, which doesn't meet my needs now. Why should I try it, nothing different.
      - b. The real advantage of BRT is in the exclusive right of way, EROW. This is the single pivotal issue of BRT. It is what makes BRT, rapid. Without EROW, it really is not BRT and all the other incremental improvements are not consequential.
      - c. Controversy is really not diminished. Experience in other cities is that when you start talking about EROW there is controversy. It cannot be avoided.
      - d. A current disadvantage is that the planning that has occurred so far is for a full blown BRT system, not incremental. The funding and environmental assessment was sold on this premise. While it does not appear that any Board member is suggesting that we start all over on the Franklin Corridor, if LTD were to move to a BRT lite approach on future corridors, we would need to rethink funding and EIS strategies.
  - B. Full BRT
    1. Advantages
      - a.

- II. Issues facing Board now
  - A. Franklin Corridor – Trade-offs on the vehicle, design issues of median stations/curbside stations, erow in Glenwood, cost of land acquisition, lane width, guidance,etc. Where do all the other fancy systems fit into the picture, i.e. AVL, APC, signal priority, trade off of one time costs against on-going service costs,
  - B. Pioneer Parkway corridor
  - C. Eugene corridor
  - D. Integration of BRT message into the PR plan

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** April 19, 2004

**ITEM TITLE:** WORK SESSION ON EmX

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Director of Development Services

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None.

**BACKGROUND:** The Board requested a work session to discuss plans and policies for the development of the EmX system. Staff will provide information on the history of development of the BRT concept and on the goals and objectives of the EmX system. Staff also will suggest key policy questions for the Board. The bulk of the work session time is expected to be Board discussion of this issue.

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Staff will amend EmX development plans based on direction provided by the Board.

**ATTACHMENT:** BRT Goals and Performance Objectives

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None





# Thinking About Governance

A Workshop for  
Lane Transit District

Margot Helphand  
April 19, 2004

# Common Governance Pitfalls

Too much Board time spent on detail that belongs to management

Short-term bias

Reactive stance

Focus is on reviewing, rehashing, redoing

“Leaky” accountability

Has lack of clarity regarding board and CEO authority

Tends to random behavior

# Inadequate Prescriptions for Governance

More involvement

Less involvement

Board as watchdog

Board as cheerleader

Board as manager

Board as planner

Board as communicator

**ALL THESE PRESCRIPTIONS FALL SHORT**

# Principles of GOOD PRACTICE For Boards

- Principle 1: The Trust in Trusteeship
- Principle 2: The Board Speaks with One Voice or Not at All
- Principle 3: Board Decisions Should Predominantly Be Policy Decisions
- Principle 4: Mission determination is the pivotal duty of governance
- Principle 5: A Board Should Define and Delegate, Rather Than React and Ratify
- Principle 6: A Board Must Explicitly Design Its Own Products and Process
- Principle 7: A Board Must Forge a Linkage with Management That is Both Empowering and Safe
- Principle 8: Performance of the CEO Must be Monitored Rigorously, but only Against Policy Criteria

# Board Policy Making

How the Board conceives, carries out, and monitors their performance

**Governance Process**

What results for which people; at what cost

**Ends/  
Mission**

How authority is delegated and its proper use monitored

**Board CEO Linkage**

**CEO Limitations**

Describes the constraints on CEO authority

