

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, April 20, 1994

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 14, 1994, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, April 20, 1994, at 6:15 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Pat Hocken, President
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary
Kirk Bailey
Rob Bennett
Steve Engel
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Coleen Fox, Minutes Recorder

Absent: Tammy Fitch, Vice President

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Hocken called the meeting to order.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Hocken informed the Board that there would be no Employee of the Month introduction that evening, but that the presentations would continue the following month.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Martin Lewis requested that he be able to speak when the Board addressed the letter from Lane Community College (LCC).

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING:

MOTION

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. Kleger, to approve the Consent Calendar for April 20, 1994, as presented. This included approval of the minutes of the February 23, 1994, work session; the March 16, 1994, regular meeting; and the April 5, 1994, special meeting. The motion passed unanimously, 5:0. Mr. Bennett was not yet present.

VOTE

EUGENE STATION: ARCHITECT SELECTION PROCESS: Mr. Kleger informed the Board that the Board's Eugene Station Committee had approved the process as outlined in the attachment. He said that proposals had already been received.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved, seconded by Mr. Bailey, that the Board approve the process recommended by the Eugene Station Committee for the selection of an architectural firm for design of the Eugene Station.

Mr. Bailey asked why the search was limited to local firms only. Ms. Hocken said that since the local business community contributed so much to the payroll tax and thereby supported LTD, LTD decided it should give its contracts to local people. Staff had researched local firms to ensure they would be qualified to do the work, but that it also was possible that local firms might have to subcontract out certain parts of the job to firms from outside the area. Mr. Bailey asked about the number of proposals that had been received. Ms. Hocken said that five high-quality proposals had been received, and interviews were planned for the week of May 9. She said the policy decision for the Board was to decide whether it wanted the committee to proceed with the dollar negotiations while selecting a firm and then bring the Board a complete package of the proposal. She said that it gave the committee more leverage to get a better price in the selection process if the Board gave it the authority to negotiate a contract. In response to a question about whether this was already in the motion, Ms. Hocken said that it was under points "3" and "4" in the attachment.

VOTE The motion carried unanimously, 5:0, with Mr. Bennett not yet present.

REPLACEMENT OF 4J HIGH SCHOOL BUS TRANSPORTATION WITH LTD:

Mr. Viggiano explained that previously this had been an information item. He said he was now looking for approval to write a letter on behalf of the Board to the State Department of Education expressing support for School District 4J's request for a waiver from the requirement to provide transportation to high school students. He said LTD would provide replacement service and tripper buses as necessary to address overloads, at an estimated cost of \$50,000. Staff projected that tripper buses would be paid for by revenues from the sale of additional passes to high school students. Mr. Viggiano said there would be some risk involved if a substantial number of students decided not to ride the bus and that the estimated cost of the trippers was \$50,000. Mr. Engel asked about the continued use of tripper service if it turned out they could not support themselves. Mr. Viggiano said they would only be used to address overloads. Mr. Engel asked if by endorsing this letter LTD essentially was entering into a "moral or community contract" to provide service for 4J. Mr. Viggiano said the letter could be worded to indicate that LTD would not be duplicating 4J's service, but rather providing an alternate service based on LTD's regular system. With respect to providing trippers, Mr. Viggiano noted that it would not be considered an overload if some students had to stand on the bus.

Mr. Kleger asked if there had been any consideration of the needs of students requiring specialized transportation. Mr. Viggiano said 4J would continue to provide transportation for those students. Mr. Kleger asked if there were any areas where LTD would have to provide additional services because the walking distance was greater than the present standard or because the walk would present certain hazards. Mr. Viggiano said LTD defined access to the system as being within one-quarter of a mile from a bus stop, but that the State defined access as being one and a half miles from a bus stop for students. Mr. Kleger thought this distance was unreasonably long.

Mr. Engel said that, as he understood it, 4J was not asking LTD to change its system, but simply to write a letter of support stating that its system met State requirements. Mr. Viggiano confirmed this.

Ms. Hocken asked about the rate for a bus pass for 4J students. Mr. Viggiano said a monthly pass would cost \$17.25. If the school district bought passes in bulk, the cost could be reduced to \$13.80 a month. He said the State might cover 70 percent of the cost of the passes. Ms. Hocken noted that this would not impact LTD. Mr. Viggiano said that it actually could impact LTD, because if the passes were highly subsidized, it was more likely that more would be sold.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved, seconded by Mr. Bailey, that the Board write a letter to the State Department of Education expressing support for 4J's request for the waiver. The motion
VOTE passed unanimously, 5:0. Mr. Bennett was not yet present.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Board Member Reports: Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken informed the Board that the MPC had met last week and that some procedural issues had been discussed. The MPC was sending a letter to the legislature about some misinformation provided by AAA.

Willamette Valley Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (V-PACT). Ms. Hocken said she would be attending a V-PACT meeting the following day, and that a consultant had been hired to do a demand analysis for high-speed rail. Mr. Bailey asked if plans for high-speed rail between Eugene and Portland were defunct. Ms. Hocken said that originally there had been plans for the high-speed rail to extend to Oregon, but that \$10 million in federal matching funds had not come through. The State of Washington had received \$4 million for a six-month high-speed rail demonstration project that would run from Vancouver, B.C., to Portland. Ms. Hocken said there was a possibility that Oregon could join the Washington demonstration project, but that the Clinton budget did not include funds for the development of high-speed rail along the Eugene-Portland corridor. She said demand analysis would continue.

TransPlan Update Symposia Process. Mr. Kleger reported that at a meeting that morning the Transportation Systems Management (TSM) task force had discussed rail transit options and had come to the conclusion that a study and professional consultation were needed. He said a light rail feasibility study would help to determine if this was a viable option at this time.

Mr. Bailey reported that the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) task force was continuing to work on bike and pedestrian issues and was taking suggestions for new ideas about how to deal with demand management. He noted that there had been a discussion about marketing ideas and that it had been agreed upon that any effort would require a lead agency. He said that LTD's name had been mentioned in connection with this, but that it had not been directly proposed as a possible lead agency. Mr. Bailey noted that he did not volunteer LTD for this position.

Mr. Bennett arrived at 6:25 p.m.

Mr. Bailey said "congestion pricing" also had been discussed. He mentioned tolls for roads with greater usage as an example of this policy. He said the intent was to encourage transportation methods that would ease congestion.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Board wanted to take a position with respect to the initiatives Mr. Bailey had been discussing. Mr. Bailey said that the task force had just been reviewing strategies and asking the question "do we think it would work in Eugene-Springfield?" He said that, at this point in the process, all of the strategies were still on the list for further review and none had been eliminated as unworkable. Mr. Kieger said that at the May 17 public hearing, the public also would have an opportunity to respond to proposals. Ms. Hocken asked if local agencies would have a similar opportunity to give input. Mr. Viggiano observed that LTD had a Board member on each task force to provide input and that the Board could take a formal position on issues at a later date. He said that a second symposium was scheduled for September, and that would be a good opportunity for the Board to take a position. Mr. Kieger said he did not think the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) staff were clear yet on how they would coordinate agency feedback, but that this would be clarified after the open house.

Mr. Bennett said that the Board member representing the group usually had an understanding of the group's general position on the issues, but that for some issues he would like to have more interaction and contact with the representative. For example, he said that he did not think, with respect to the TransPlan, that "whatever it takes to get people out of their cars" was an adequate position. He said he wanted to know more about what has worked in other areas and similar in-depth information. Mr. Bennett said he felt the TransPlan was different from a report on the MPC and that not all representatives to committees needed to maintain the degree of contact that he would like to have with TransPlan representatives.

Ms. Hocken said that it would be worthwhile to have LTD's Customer Service Administrator, Andy Vobora, make his presentation on TDM activities to the Board in order to familiarize members with what LTD currently was doing with respect to ride share and van pooling. She suggested the May meeting for this presentation and Board members agreed.

Mr. Viggiano said each task force had a catalogue of strategies that could be copied and distributed to Board members. Mr. Bennett pointed out that the reason for having representatives on the task forces was to make it unnecessary for Board members to read all of the materials for each task force. He said a summary would be preferable. Mr. Bailey noted that the TDM task force had not reached the point where there was anything conclusive to report on, but that he could provide briefings when the task force had advanced further in the process.

Mr. Viggiano gave a brief update on the TransPlan Land Use task force's activities. He said the task force was working on strategies that supported the concept of dense urban growth and nodal communities, as opposed to segregated development and strip development. Mr. Bennett said he would be interested to see how those strategies related to current land use policies. He asked how current development could be recreated to fit the nodal concept.

Mr. Bennett said that he also was concerned about LCOG spending \$15,000 to do a Visual Preference Survey. He said the 800 people who participated were more highly educated and had higher incomes than the average citizen and were therefore not representative of the

metropolitan area as a whole. He said that no cost-benefit analysis had been done on the results of the survey and that questions elicited "either/or" answers that did not allow for any middle ground. Mr. Bennett said he was worried that the results of this survey would get on record and be used as the basis for future decisions.

Eugene Station: Conditional Use Permit (CUP): Mr. Viggiano informed the Board of the April 13 CUP hearing, where there had been public testimony about the proposed Eugene Station. He said the majority of the public testimony was from people associated with Olive Plaza and was in opposition to the station. He said that negotiations with Olive Plaza were continuing. Mr. Viggiano said the biggest surprise in their testimony was that Olive Plaza representatives felt noise mitigation measures should occur at the source of the noise, not at their building. He said that options were being considered and consultants were addressing these concerns. Mr. Viggiano said a second hearing would occur May 25, and a decision would be reached within 15 days of the close of the public hearing.

Mr. Bennett said that, as he understood it, the consultants had not agreed on noise standards, with one looking at "peak periods" and the other at "average" noise impacts. He asked whether LTD would be over the allowable noise limit if the figures given by the Olive Plaza consultant were accurate. Mr. Viggiano said it was rather complicated, since standards varied depending on if they were set by the State, the City, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), or Housing and Urban Development (HUD). He noted that LTD used the averaging method and that Olive Plaza suggested using the peak method to determine noise impact. Mr. Bennett asked if the figures determined by both parties were at all similar. Mr. Viggiano said that at this time the noise standards were already being exceeded due to existing conditions, and that the Eugene Station would raise the noise impact by an average of only one to two decibels. He said that LTD's consultant had stated that anything less than three decibels was not discernible to the human ear.

LTD Strategic Plan Update: Ms. Hocken referred the Board to pages 33-35 of the agenda packet, informing the Board that staff needed feedback on various features of the process of updating the strategic plan. She said the Board needed to provide feedback on whether or not a consultant should be used in the process, and if so, how the consultant should be involved. She noted that the Board had been involved in the strategic planning process in the past; at that time, a weekend retreat was held to facilitate the process. Ms. Hocken said that a consultant might be able to help create a more sophisticated process, and staff anticipated that it would cost around \$10,000 to hire a consultant. In response to a question from Mr. Bailey about whether the consultant would be used in the same way as last year, Ms. Hocken said that last year the focus had been on communication styles and relationship-building, and that this year staff envisioned the consultant assisting in the development of strategies to achieve the stated goals. Ms. Hocken added that the Board already had approved the long-range goals as presented by staff. Mr. Bailey said he wanted to ensure that employees were involved in the planning process.

In response to a question from Mr. Engel about why a new model for developing a strategic plan was necessary, Ms. Loobey said that staff believed it to be a pivotal time in LTD's history and that there were changing community expectations of LTD. She said the Board needed to be taking a leadership role in this process. Mr. Engel agreed, but said he thought three years was not a long enough time frame for a strategic plan. Ms. Hocken agreed, saying

it should be at least five years. Mr. Engel said that he thought a long-range strategic plan was essential and that it would drive all other work that needed to be done.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved, seconded by Mr. Bailey, that the Board approve the concept of the strategic plan process and ask staff to prepare materials for more discussion at a future meeting. The motion passes unanimously, 6:0.
VOTE

Mr. Montgomery said that he would like to see some specific products that the consultant would be asked to produce in order to ensure that useable results come out of the process.

CLEAN-AIR BUSES: Ms. Hocken directed the Board members to read the attachment that outlined the information on the buses. She said no further discussion was necessary.

SALE OF GARFIELD PROPERTY: Ms. Hocken reported that the sale had been approved by the Board in 1993 but that it had been delayed due to federal paperwork.

LCC GROUP PASS: Ms. Hocken said the Board had worked hard to come up with a proposal for the LCC student senate to put on a ballot, but that the LCC board had decided the students should not be allowed to vote on this measure. Mr. Lewis explained that the LCC board rescinded the opportunity to vote based on a request by the student body president. He said there were many reasons for rescinding the opportunity to vote on the group pass. He cited the service being discriminatory against agencies outside the core and said other public agencies should not be charged differently because they did not pay taxes.

Ms. Hocken said she was disappointed that the students were not allowed to vote on the group pass. Mr. Engel asked if Ms. Hocken was expecting an official response from the LCC board. Ms. Hocken said she did not know, but that she would be in contact with the LCC board president, Peter Sorenson, because she felt LCC was dealing with misinformation when it made its decision. Mr. Montgomery said it was essentially a contractual issue and since the proposal had been rejected it should be put aside until another proposal was requested. Mr. Lewis said LCC was drafting a letter to LTD.

Ms. Hocken said no other agenda items required action and that there would be no executive session that evening.

ADJOURNMENT: With no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.


Board Secretary