MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 17, 1996

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 11, 1996, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, April 17, 1996, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, Vice President
Rob Bennett
Patricia Hocken, President, presiding
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary
Mary Murphy
Roger Saydack
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent:

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken. She stated that Mary Murphy, the Governor's nominee for the vacant Springfield position, had been confirmed by the Senate and was in the process of signing her oath of office in one of the District's conference rooms. As soon as that was done, she would be a voting member of the Board and would participate during the meeting that evening.

Ms. Hocken stated that the Board had received three communications within the last month or so from low-income people complaining about the self-employment tax. She said she knew that in the past the Board had expressed some interest in setting up some sort of program to eliminate the self-employment tax for low-income people. She planned to work with staff during the next month or so to develop some suggestions or a proposal to bring to the Board. A brief information summary had been included in the materials for that meeting, raising some concerns about the "part-time self-employed." She said she was not as concerned about people who had other sources of income and operated a small business as much as she was about people who were truly low-income and had trouble paying their bills. She said that would be her approach, but the Board would be asked to approve any proposal she and staff developed. Ms. Hocken said she had discovered some issues about the way the employment-tax issue for domestic help worked, so that someone might not have to be registered with the State of Oregon for any other program, such as state withholding, workers' compensation, self-employment taxes, etc., but would have to be registered for LTD. She thought that was a waste of time and effort for the amount of money the District would collect in that type of situation, so she said this was another issue she would bring before the Board in the next month or so.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: There was no one present who wished to address the Board on any issues.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Hocken recognized Payroll Technician Melody Bartley as the May Employee of the Month. She said that Ms. Bartley had been an LTD employee since February 1988, and previously was an Employee of the Month in 1990. The co-worker who nominated her said that employees' paychecks were very important to them, and Ms. Bartley was so good at her job that very few problems arose. When they did, they were handled willingly, without hesitation, and with a smile. Ms. Bartley was described as accurate, friendly, humorous, and always available to answer questions. The co-worker also mentioned Ms. Bartley's extra hours and hard work to be sure paychecks were correct and on time during the conversion from the old payroll system to the new, computerized one. When asked what made Ms. Bartley a good employee, Finance Manager Tamara Weaver had said that Ms. Bartley was an excellent employee who took complete responsibility for her area and treated other employees very well, with a great deal of patience. For the last two years, she had the extra project of software development, and the software consultants had said they had never worked with anyone who did a better job of debugging software. Ms. Bartley was still making suggestions for improvement, and worked with the developers to make sure it happened correctly. This had been an intense project, and Ms. Bartley deserved kudos for her handling of this extra responsibility.

Ms. Hocken presented Ms. Bartley with her letter of congratulations, plaque, and monetary reward. Ms. Bartley thanked the Board, and said that she enjoyed everyone she worked with, and LTD had been a great place to work. She said that May was becoming an extraordinary month; not only was she Employee of the Month, but she was marrying the man of her dreams, thanks to LTD, also, because she met him at work. She said that the only dark spot in May was that Ms. Weaver was leaving LTD.

MOTION **CONSENT CALENDAR**: Mr. Kleger moved the adoption of the Consent Calendar for April 17, 1996. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken asked a question on page eight of the minutes of the March 20, 1996, Board meeting. A sentence said, "The $116,000 was projected to pay the cost increases and provide about a 50 percent increase in rides." Ms. Hocken wondered if that 50 percent increase was correct. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn said that it should be 15 percent rather than 50 percent.

AMEND Mr. Kleger and Mr. Montgomery asked to amend the motion to approve the Consent Calendar with the minutes as amended. The Consent Calendar, including the minutes as

VOTE amended, was then approved by unanimous vote (6:0).

Ms. Murphy joined the meeting at this point.

INCREASE IN FREEDOM PASS PRICE: Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that in March staff had told the Board that if they waited a month to approve the pricing changes, it would not create any problems. However, one of the changes in the package was to increase the cost of the Freedom Pass, a summer youth pass. Staff had recommended that the increase take effect during the current year, with pass sales beginning in May. However, since the Board would be adopting the fare changes by ordinance, with a 30-day waiting period before the ordinance took effect, the price change for the Freedom Pass could not take effect until June. Staff had asked legal counsel what options were available. After reviewing this issue, it was counsel's preliminary opinion that the District was not required to adopt fare changes by ordinance. That had been an opinion from the District's previous attorney, so staff had begun adopting fare changes by ordinance in 1992. Before that, fare changes were adopted by motion. District counsel suggested that the Board adopt the 1996-97 fare changes by ordinance, except for this particular item of the Freedom Pass, which the Board would adopt by motion, and counsel would continue to research this question and provide an opinion for next year's fare deliberations. Therefore, staff had removed the Freedom Pass price increase from the fare ordinance, and were recommending an increase from $24.95 to $27.95 for the summer youth pass.

Mr. Bennett asked about staff's estimate for revenue increase and ridership loss. Mr. Viggiano said that when people rode with a pass, they took "x" number of trips, and staff estimated that number. When the price increases, some people will choose not to buy a pass, maybe based on the number of trips they take per month. Those people might ride less and pay cash, but not ride as often as they would have if they had purchased a pass. He said this estimate was based on a predicted price elasticity. He thought that the estimate had been that LTD might sell 2 percent fewer passes. There were studies that predicted fare elasticity, but LTD's experience had been that the District lost much less ridership than the national studies predicted. Staff attributed that to the fact that the District was careful and somewhat innovative in the way in the way it raised prices. He thought that staff still tended to overestimate the ridership loss, so that 8,000 lost rides probably was an overestimation.

MOTION Mr. Bennett moved that the price of the Freedom Pass be increased to $27.95, effective with the summer 1996 Freedom Pass. Mr. Montgomery seconded, and the motion

VOTE carried by unanimous vote (7:0).

FISCAL YEAR 1996-97 PRICING PLAN: Mr. Viggiano stated that the rest of the items in the Pricing Plan were the same as discussed at the last meeting, except that the Freedom Pass had been removed and the monthly pass price was now recommended to increase by $2 per month instead of $1 per month. Since the last Board discussion, staff reviewed a number of suggestions, such as increasing cash at the same time, increasing the monthly pass price by $2 instead of $1, and reviewing the benefits of prepaid fare instruments. An analysis was included in the agenda packet. After considering the analysis, staff were even more strongly convinced that it made sense to make monthly passes a very attractive fare option. Therefore, staff were not comfortable going much beyond the $2 per month price increase for passes, given the current cash price, but did believe that the monthly pass would still be attractive at $26 per month for adults.

Mr. Viggiano said he had included the Fare Policy in the agenda packet. One of the sections of the policy related the prices of tokens and passes to the price of cash, and $26 was within the range of what the pass price should be, given an $.80 cash fare. Therefore, the two-dollar pass price increase was consistent with the Board-adopted Fare Policy.

There had been a suggestion to raise the cash price at the same time, in order to maintain a bigger differential between the cash and pass prices and keep people buying passes. However, that was not consistent with the Fare Policy, and staff felt uncomfortable doing that as a result. A cash fare increase was scheduled for the following year, but the actual amount of the increase had not yet been set.

Mr. Kleger commented that passes still would be a bargain at $26 per month.

Mr. Montgomery said that, based on the savings from using passes over all other fare instruments, it seemed that the District should be working very hard to encourage the use of passes. Mr. Viggiano agreed, adding that only 30 percent of the District's customers used cash, which was a low figure compared with other transit Districts, and that some of those cash users would never change. Mr. Montgomery wondered if a $2 increase was too much. Mr. Viggiano replied that the pass price still would be considerably cheaper than cash, and he thought it was still a good deal.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Montgomery moved that Fourth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Mr. Bailey seconded, and the motion carried unanimously, 7:0. Ms. Loobey informed those present that copies of the ordinance were available for anyone who wished to have one.

Ms. Hocken read the title of the ordinance: Fourth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE POLICY: Human Resources Administrator Ed Ruttledge called the Board's attention to the proposed policy in the agenda packet. He explained that his predecessor at LTD had drafted a policy, but at the time he left the District, the state legislature was meeting to adopt a new Oregon Family Medical Leave bill. Both a federal law and a state law governed family medical leave, and, as a result of the last legislative session, the state law was almost identical to the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). The only difference seemed to be a slight difference in eligibility requirements, so both were included in LTD's proposed policy. Mr. Ruttledge thought it was important to have the Family and Medical Leave Policy so employees could understand their rights and responsibilities, and managers, supervisors, and the HR staff could have a policy to refer to. Much of the language, such as the definitions, had been copied directly from the state and federal laws. Basically, the laws provided opportunities for people to take time off that could not be unreasonably denied to take care of adoption, birth of a child, or illness issues for themselves or immediate family members. Also, the laws required the maintenance of benefits for 12 weeks, if paid benefits were provided in the labor contract or by District policy for that employee.

Mr. Ruttledge said that it was possible under this policy and state law for employees to take up to 24 weeks off. As an example, the birth of a child, followed by care of the child, would fit this scenario. However, the employer's obligation to pay benefits did not go past 12 weeks.

Mr. Kleger asked about duration of leave on page 2; whether it meant a total of 12 weeks for two employees both employed by LTD, or 12 weeks each. Mr. Ruttledge said that this language was directly from the statute, and meant if two employees worked for LTD, the two of them together would be eligible for a total of 12 weeks. The employer probably could grant more if it wanted to, but under the law, and under this policy, a total of 12 weeks was required.

Ms. Hocken asked if there was anything in the policy that was not required by federal or state statute. Mr. Ruttledge replied that there was not; it was not his intention to do so.

MOTION Mr. Bennett moved that the Board of Directors adopt the Family and Medical Leave Policy as presented to the Board on April 17, 1996. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. There

VOTE was no further discussion, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 7:0.

POLICY ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT: Mr. Ruttledge introduced an amendment to the previously adopted Policy on Sexual Harassment.

Mr. Kleger noted that the policy applied to all District employees. He asked who that included and who that did not include, and said he was raising the issue because there were a few people who did volunteer work for LTD, as well as the Board members. He wondered if the policy should be extended to cover volunteers and Board members, company or District officers, etc. Mr. Ruttledge recommended not doing that, because the legal foundation to the policy spoke in terms of employment law. Therefore, the policy should cover the employer-employee relationship.

Staff had made some minor changes to the proposed policy revisions since the agenda packet had been distributed. Mr. Ruttledge explained what those changes were, and a revised copy was distributed to Board members. The original policy had been in effect for a number of years. The need to revise the policy arose when Mr. Ruttledge was talking with another public sector HR administrator in the area. There was a concern as to when a person could initiate a claim of sexual harassment. The District's policy said that the incidents should be reported immediately, but there could be a question as to what was meant by "immediately." On these kinds of issues, he said, the employer had a vicarious liability, and would want to deal with the issue very quickly. He wanted to include two statements in the policy that did not currently exist. First, unless there were extenuating circumstances, a sexual harassment complaint would be initiated within 180 days. Second, text was added to say that the complaints would be investigated without delay. Since this policy was being revised, staff also took the opportunity to add the word "inappropriate" in the description of physical contact, and updated the title of personnel administrator to human resources manager.

Mr. Bailey asked where Mr. Ruttledge had gotten the 180 days and what LTD's legal counsel had said. Mr. Ruttledge replied that he thought it was a reasonable period of time, and had discussed it with a couple other HR administrators, but had not checked with counsel. Ms. Loobey added that District counsel received the materials but had not called staff with any concerns. Ms. Loobey and Mr. Fraser had agreed that counsel would review the agendas and get back to staff with any concerns.

Mr. Saydack said that this was the kind of question where, because of the basis in law for claims of sexual harassment, he would ask for advice of counsel before making the change. He said it could be that imposing a 180-day restriction of this nature violated law. Mr. Ruttledge asked to table this issue until staff could receive an opinion from counsel.

BOARD MEETING TIME AND DAY: Ms. Loobey said that there was discussion among staff that the Board agendas had been very full and sometimes items were pushed out because the meetings went too late. That brought up a discussion of whether or not the Board would be interested in setting the meeting time a half-hour earlier, and even whether or not the third Wednesday of the month continued to be a good meeting time for the members of the Board. The question was raised for the Board to discuss. If a change were to be made, it would need to be made through ordinance. Ms. Loobey explained that the Board had met for years on Tuesdays, and after a Board member was appointed who could not meet on those days, the date was changed to the third Wednesday, where it had remained for a number of years. Wednesdays generally had seemed to work well. If the meeting were a week earlier, to the second Wednesday of the month, that would not provide sufficient time for staff to put together the financial statements, but other materials would not be a problem because they were not time-dated in the same way.

Mr. Bennett said he liked the day, but was interested in 7:00 because maybe the meetings could end a little earlier. He asked if the Board really had been pushing ahead some things that staff were concerned about. Ms. Loobey said that sometimes there were important issues in the items for information, and it was difficult to place some emphasis on them when the meetings were long and the Board members were tired and wanted to adjourn. For instance, she had asked to have a memo about the radio bids put in the agenda packet because the Board had expressed some concern about it. It was an information item only, but it was important for the Board to know that the District received a very favorable bid on the radio system, given the amount of investment. Sometimes, she said, staff were not able to discuss those kinds of things with the Board as they had been able to do in times past.

Ms. Hocken said she always managed to read through everything in her Board packet, so she felt she had the information. She thought what Mr. Bennett was concerned about was whether starting a half-hour earlier meant that the meetings would still go until the normal ending time; that is, whether the meeting time would just expand. She said that if staff believed some information items to be very important, they might want to talk about them before the action items.

Mr. Kleger said that Wednesday night was a frustration for him because he had to miss choir practice one night a month, but he knew that when he came on board. He said he tended to arrive well before meeting times, so starting time made no difference to him. He added that he had no special need to change the meeting time, since he did not care how long the meetings went, as long as they were over in time for him to catch the last bus home.

Mr. Saydack said that unless someone was very inconvenienced by the day of the week, he would prefer to keep it where it was and adjust his schedule around it. If others wanted to change the meeting time to 7:00 p.m., that was fine with him.

Ms. Hocken said her target was to finish by 10:00 p.m.

Ms. Murphy said she would like to entertain the 7:00 p.m. starting time, just for the attentiveness and alertness of beginning earlier. She also liked the Wednesday meetings.

MOTION Mr. Bailey moved that the Board direct staff to revise Fifth Amended Ordinance No. 1, An Ordinance Providing Rules for Meetings of Lane Transit District, to provide that the Board's regular monthly meetings begin at 7:00 p.m. on the third Wednesday of the month, and place the revised ordinance on the agenda for reading at two meetings of the Board. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

VOTE There was no further discussion, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 7:0.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

Board Member Updates: MPC: Ms. Hocken said that her MPC update would be very much like the TransPlan presentation scheduled for that evening. Since the Governor's Transportation Initiative also was listed as an information item, Mr. Bennett had no report to add. TransPlan Update: Mr. Kleger said he was participating on the Chairman's Goals and Objectives Committee, made up the chairs and co-chairs of the various task forces. They had met a couple of times in the last couple of months and reviewed in some detail the assessment criteria staff were using to evaluate the elements of this process and the projection modeling that was going on. They discussed what made sense, what the message was, what could be dropped, and he felt there was pretty good consensus about where TransPlan should be with that process.

Mr. Bennett said that the Ferry Street Bridge Committee had not met for a number of months, but there was a comment he wanted to make. He said that a finance committee had been appointed to look at ways in which the cost of crossing the river and various park improvements and land acquisition costs could be handled. The committee members were Paul Nicholson, Neal Hyatt, Dick Hansen, and Mr. Bennett. They ended up with a recommendation of four potential sources of revenue: a toll, a commuter tax or fee, a slight systems development increase for transportation, and an $.08 per $1,000 property tax increase. The intent was to use this as a fundamental approach, which was a compromise, on not only the Valley River bridge, which was being discussed at the time and which the committee wanted to be the first major crossing project, but also on other projects that might follow. It would apply only to those corridor projects and not to the transportation system as a whole. Federal funding would be used to improve the Ferry Street Bridge corridor, not in the context of adding a new corridor, but more for seismic improvements and some work on access points north of the bridge. Repairs were scheduled to begin in the fall of 1997 and last three years.

Mr. Bennett stated that LTD did not get what it wanted yet; that is, a specific corridor that could be called a transit corridor that would contribute to some of the new initiatives the Board would like to see happen. He said he was still making the case, but not everyone was convinced that LTD should be given that kind of priority; however, there was some support, which he appreciated. He said the committee work was over and would be pushed into the TransPlan Update as a whole, and monitored and judged accordingly. He stated that LTD had a continuing role in that regard, and Mr. Viggiano and others were continuing the effort.

Mr. Bailey said that the High Speed Rail Siting Steering Committee concluded its work on the study and was not scheduled to meet again in the near future. Mr. Bailey also attended the Cascadia Rail Stakeholders Session the week before. It was organized by the Oregon Business Council for High Speed Rail and the Discovery Institute, which was shepherding the Cascadia project for Washington, Oregon, and Vancouver, B.C. The biggest point to come out of the all-day conference was the push to solidify public support and public funding for the high speed rail project. The City of Eugene and other communities along the corridor had agreed in principle to allocate a percentage of their Transportation Equity Fund dollars to funding high speed rail. That included Albany, Salem, Portland, Marion County. The big push was to get Portland on board with high speed rail, because Portland had the political muscle to make this happen, but during the last Oregon legislative session, everything sort of fizzled out. The federal level people had identified that the project needed support from the Portland area, in order to make sure that the state came up with the funding for the project. Washington was contributing $80 million to the funding, and Oregon was aiming for $60 million for the Oregon section of the corridor, but had nowhere near that amount available. Some people had noted that even the Equity Fund money was a little shaky. Mr. Bailey said that the Governor attended the conference and put his support behind the project. Another positive note was that several legislators were there, all from the Salem and Portland areas, and had an opportunity to see the breadth of support for the project.

Ms. Loobey added that it was very important to bring the tri-county area on board. They had not been interested during the last legislative session because their interest was in light rail. However, their support was needed for the high speed rail project along the 1-5 corridor. She said that up and down the valley, communities needed to continue to work on the delegation from the tri-county area. In fact, there needed to be investment in the section of rail that crossed the river and came out of Union Station in Portland, which would save five to seven minutes. She stated that the tri-county area could spend no money at all and still have high speed rail, but the rail might not extend to Eugene/Springfield.

Ms. Loobey said that the Springfield City Council had been approached by the high speed rail business council. Dan Eagan, the new executive director of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, appeared as a citizen, but there was a lukewarm response from the Springfield Council. Ms. Loobey and Mr. Bergeron planned to attend a meeting the following week at the Springfield City Hall between Chamber representatives and the Springfield Council to talk about the high speed rail project. She said it was very important that Springfield get on board, also.

Mr. Bailey stated that the corridor coordinator position, a joint position between Washington and Oregon, had recently been filled by John Magnano, a Clark County, Washington, commissioner. It was expected that this would increase dramatically the energy for the project and the prospects for the entire project, since one person would be leading the charge.

Mr. Kleger stated that he had ridden the Talgo Train during the promotional trip. He had been told that there were problems with the accessibility equipment, which he and Kate Hunter-Jaworski of Oregon State University had talked with Bob Krebs of the Oregon Department of Transportation. He said that what had been done inside the train was excellent, but getting in and out lacked practicality and safety. They identified several ways to solve the problem without being too expensive. He stated that the Spanish engineers of the Talgo still had not gotten the idea of providing maximum independence for people with disabilities.

Eugene Station Update: Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora discussed a new opportunity in relation to the construction of the new Eugene Station. He explained that as part of the project, LTD had to mitigate the parking loss from the surface lots, specifically for the station's downtown neighbors. While working on a communication plan for communicating with the neighbors about the construction process, it occurred to staff that with all the construction downtown scheduled for the coming summer, LTD had an opportunity to expand the mitigation work with the neighbors to target all of downtown, which was a primary target for the District in terms of long-range ridership goals. Staff had been working with the City of Eugene and Downtown Eugene, Incorporated (DEI), to produce a program to address the needs of everyone in downtown Eugene, because a lot of construction would be occurring at the same time, on Willamette Street, at the Register-Guard site, on East 11th, and at LTD, among others. Everyone going downtown would be affected.

Mr. Vobora explained that staff were putting together a package to help mitigate some of the problems for people who worked downtown and maybe keep some of the parking open for people who went downtown to shop or eat. Staff proposed to provide a shuttle from the fairgrounds that would circulate through downtown and to the 5th Street area and then back to Charnelton and the fairground. The shuttle service would increase the current frequency of four buses per hour past the fairgrounds during the morning and afternoon commute periods. Students would have a place to park and get to the LCC downtown campus. This construction period also provided an opportunity to offer a discounted pass for downtown employees and others in the DEI district. Staff hoped that by doing so, some of the new riders would continue to ride after construction was completed. DEI was willing to administer the program, sell the passes, and get them out to employees. Employee could either park at the fairgrounds or at other Park and Ride locations and ride the shuttle downtown, or ride the regular system from their homes.

Mr. Vobora explained that this shuttle and pass program would add significant costs that had not been budgeted. There would be some lost fare revenue because of the discounted passes, costs to provide the shuttles, and some marketing and communication costs. Staff anticipated that the costs would range from $35,000 to $45,000 for a six-month period.

Ms. Hocken asked if parking space was available at the fairgrounds. Mr. Vobora replied that staff were working with the fairgrounds staff to use the new east lot. There would be a couple of big events during this six-month period that would have an impact on available parking, including the Lane County Fair. However, since this would be a defined market, staff thought it would be relatively easy to inform the riders of these problem times and let them know they would need to use other Park and Ride locations or ride the regular system during those events at the fairgrounds.

Ms. Hocken also asked about LTD's ability to circulate downtown during this construction period. Mr. Vobora replied that it would be a nightmare to try to operate the regular LTD routing through downtown and to the University of Oregon. Staff would be reviewing the construction projects and all the detour routing that would be necessary. He said there would be a lot of communication challenges.

Mr. Vobora said that staff would continue to work on the shuttle and pass program and report back to the Board at the May meeting. He added that staff needed to begin working on the project if there were no major concerns on the part of the Board members. Mr. Kleger stated that he thought it was a good idea.

TransPlan Update: Tom Schwetz, LCOG's TransPlan project manager, provided an update on the TransPlan Update process. He handed out copies of his presentation notes and some background information. He discussed the schedule for a public involvement process to look at several alternatives and technical evaluations. Two workshops were scheduled, with a symposium in mid-June and a series of Joint Planning Commission hearings and work sessions in late June, with a recommendation being forwarded to the respective councils and boards. A public survey was underway to obtain input on some of the strategies being considered for different plans. The base case used existing land use policies with a set of planned system improvements and the existing levels of transportation demand management. This base case would be measured against other options.

Mr. Schwetz provided an overview of the modeling process, which combined the characteristics of the traveler with the characteristics of the activity system. He also discussed the year 2015 base case conditions. Automobile vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and vehicle trips per capita were expected to increase, with VMTs growing faster than population.

Mr. Bennett said that Mr. Schwetz previously had stated that it would not be possible to meet the required single-occupant vehicle VMT reductions (10 percent in twenty years) unless there were changes in the demand side of the equation. Mr. Schwetz replied that this was correct. System improvements and land use changes would not get the community to that decrease, so the demand side would play an important role. Mr. Bennett asked about the percentage of increase in trips in the local metro area. Mr. Schwetz said he had heard that travel had increased slightly faster than population and employment, approximately 2 percent on an annual basis. All trips were measured by mileage per capita.

Ms. Murphy asked how trips were defined. Mr. Schwetz replied that for the survey and modeling, each piece of a "trip" was considered its own trip. Going from home to daycare to work would be two trips, but the same mileage as if they were considered one trip. Mr. Kleger added that the trips needed to be broken up for a per capita count because there might be a different number of people in each segment.

Mr. Bennett asked to make a comment. He said he had been listening and participating at the appointed committee level and particularly as a member of the LTD Board. When looking for ways to contribute to changing the balance in transportation modes, what concerned him was that people had not been willing to accept changes that might make a fairly rapid change. He questioned whether people in the Ferry Street Bridge area were going to be willing to wait for these changes to have an effect. On the demand side, he was worried about people's acceptance at a moderate to high level. He said he would continue to argue for a system in which cars were going to be with us, but also honest, competitive alternatives to address peak hour usage. He said he knew that staff believed in TDM more than he did, but he was hopeful that there were some things that would work. He asked Mr. Schwetz for examples of what might work. Mr. Schwetz said that research was showing that land use was not making the progress that needed to be made in a 20-year period. System improvements were constrained somewhat by financing, which meant that the community would not be able to build its way toward VMT reductions. The level of service that could be provided to the automobile was not going to be able to be maintained as congestion grew. That was why demand management was being considered, in a two-pronged process. The first question was what level of acceptable TDM might be able to be implemented as a trade-off to system improvements. The next step would be some higher level of demand management.

Mr. Schwetz said that the most direct way to affect demand was through pricing. ECO Northwest, a consulting firm, had advised that during the next 20 years it was unlikely that the community would be in a position where congestion pricing would make economic sense, because of the administrative costs. Therefore, other pricing was being considered, such as parking fees or a gas tax. A gas tax already was in use so would be easy to test how much it would have to change in order to change demand.

Graham Carey asked what sort of reserve capacity there was; that is, if there were no improvements, when would the community reach gridlock. Mr. Schwetz said that kind of modeling currently was being done, to identify those choke points. What was known was that congestion was going up considerably, with five times as many miles of congestion expected in 2015 than currently.

Mr. Bennett asked if Portland was doing anything with TDM. Mr. Schwetz replied that Portland had done quite a bit with respect to controlling parking in the downtown area; limiting parking had increased the prices. Portland currently was pursuing a pricing demonstration project. Mr. Carey added that Portland was looking at having tolls on all the bridges.

Ms. Hocken asked about the Board's future involvement in the TransPlan Update. She said that since this was a transportation plan that had to be adopted by the entire metropolitan area, LTD had the same status as the cities and Lane County in its adoption. She asked at what point the Board would want to be involved. Mr. Schwetz said that LCOG staff could bring the Board the same presentation the other agencies received. Mr. Bennett said that the Board needed to be aggressively proactive in pushing LTD's position and making the opportunity to be heard. He said he would guess that the Board ought to be appearing everywhere, to advocate for the bus company and what the Board thought the future meant for LTD.

Ms. Hocken said she thought the Board had two roles: official adoption of the plan, and advocating a position that might not be shared by other plan adopters. Mr. Bennett said that he hoped the Board would be represented as often as possible in terms of representing LTD's objectives. Otherwise, the District might end up being official adopters of a plan that the Board was not able to buy into as much as it would like. He said he would rather adopt a plan that included some of LTD's initiatives. One of the things he had said as a Ferry Street Bridge committee member was that BRT was extremely important to the District. He did not think that LTD was a high priority in the process Mr. Schwetz was speaking about. He said that LTD was not the only answer, but the Board needed to stay very involved in order to be included as part of the metro transportation plan. He said that LTD had a viable long-term alternative to the car; he was not sure that people would be willing to pay for LTD's capital improvements project, but he would like to be able to make the case for BRT.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Schwetz how BRT fit into the modeling being done. Mr. Schwetz replied that it would be included as a system improvement, and a level of BRT would be tested, maybe in conjunction with some strategic road improvements.

Mr. Viggiano suggested that the Board hold a work session on TransPlan separate from the Planning Commission's work session. The Board could see how the modeling worked in combination with land use issue, TDM strategies, etc. After that, the Board members could begin advocating for the District's position on BRT. Ms. Hocken suggested that staff let the Board know the appropriate time for such a work session.

BRT Update: Mr. Viggiano discussed the five alternatives for BRT corridors, and said that selection of the first corridor, or at least the preferred alternative, would be scheduled for the May Board meeting. A key issue for selection was route length, and the two corridors would be between seven and eight miles in total length. Current ridership, or boardings per mile for each corridor, also was considered, with Springfield, Franklin, and Main having the highest number of boardings because of the University ridership. Another consideration was population per mile, and staff were working with preliminary data regarding population within one-fourth of a mile on each side of the corridor. Willamette Street had the largest population per mile, with more housing than the other more commercial corridors.

Mr. Montgomery asked if population in the UO dorms had been included. Mr. Viggiano said he had just received the information that day and was still checking it. He was not sure how the UO residences had been treated.

Employees per mile also were considered. Mr. Viggiano said that the Franklin/Main corridor did not include the University of Oregon, so that would add approximately another 1,000 employees per mile for four miles. Also, students were not counted as employees, and may or may not have been counted as residents. Mr. Viggiano said that they clearly were commuters and affected the number of riders per mile.

Mr. Viggiano said that information also was collected on how fast the buses traveled on the corridors and how fast (miles per hour) cars traveled. The bus average was 10 to 14 miles per hour. Total trip time was divided by mileage and included signals, bus stops, etc. The average automobile traveled 17 to 24 miles per hour along the corridors. Information was gathered on actual bus travel time (including how long a bus stopped at signals, etc.); the amount of time spent at bus stops (five seconds to over a minute), amounting to plus or minus 20 percent of total trip time; time spent waiting at signals, which amounted to about 20 percent; and time the bus actually was moving, which was 50 percent to 70 percent of total trip time. That did not mean moving at the optimum speed, since all data was taken during peak time.

The question, then, was what BRT could do to improve bus travel time. Staff believed that BRT could reduce passenger stop time by 50 percent by using low-floor buses, different fare collection methods, more doors, and fewer stops. Also, signal priorities and queue jumpers could reduce signal delays by 30 percent to 40 percent. Some exclusive bus lanes would allow buses to travel faster, as well. With all those changes, bus and auto speeds could be much closer, and staff expected that the BRT system should be able to hold the line on bus travel time as congestion increased for cars and auto speeds were reduced. The goal would be that bus travel time would be faster than the auto in the long term, and much more competitive in the short term.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were concerned about a BRT corridor on Willamette. It was a short corridor, right-of-way options were limited, and the travel time savings would amount to only a minute or two. A long-term solution for Willamette might be to shift some auto traffic to Amazon Parkway.

Staff also studied the number of buses per hour on the corridors, the number of existing lanes, the existing feet of right-of-way, etc., and some potential problems for implementing BRT.

Mr. Bennett asked about the possibility of providing a Park and Ride facility for BRT on Willamette Street. Mr. Viggiano said it would be a little tougher on Willamette because it was already all developed, but a Park and Ride did provide a larger "capture" area. Any corridor would have Park and Ride facilities located along them and a large one at the end, to increase the capture area for that corridor. Some assumptions could be made about what that capture area would be.

Mr. Viggiano said that the easiest pilot corridor might be an east-west corridor along West 11th in Eugene to Main Street in Springfield. Coburg Road was being developed rapidly, and the Ferry Street Bridge would be under construction for three years, beginning in 1997. He suggested that the District might not want to implement BRT on that corridor while the bridge was under construction, but might want to move up the implementation of the second corridor to include Coburg Road before it was developed much more.

Mr. Viggiano said that an east-west corridor would connect Springfield and Eugene. The Springfield staff working with the District were interested in BRT.

Ms. Murphy was concerned about the Gateway and Sony area being viable. Mr. Viggiano said that currently the BRT route was planned to end in downtown Springfield, probably with a station relocated to Main Street. Then the corridor could go farther east, so it could cover a good part of the main business district. Conceivably, it could extend to the new 58th and Main Park and Ride. Service to the Gateway area probably would be by connecting bus, until a future BRT corridor to that area was designated. Mr. Montgomery mentioned the old railroad right of way along Pioneer Parkway, where buses might be able to run to Main Street.

Mr. Bergeron showed the latest version of a draft BRT brochure. No particular name or color scheme were yet associated with BRT. When the brochures were finished, they would be available in large quantities as a piece to leave behind during the Board's walkabout visits. He asked the Board members to call with feedback about the draft brochure.

Land Acquisition Specialist: Staff briefly explained the plan to contract with a land acquisition specialist to help with potential Park and Ride lots, land acquisition for rights of way, etc. This service would be on a fee-for-service basis with a commercial broker.

Creswell Payroll Tax Analysis: Ms. Loobey said that the best estimate given the data available was that payroll tax revenues from the Creswell area would amount to approximately $95,000 per year. Mr. Bennett commented that this would be nearly a break-even proposition, because initial service estimates were that service would cost approximately that amount. Ms. Loobey stated that the decision to fund a demonstration project would be made by the Creswell votes at the May 14 election.

Governor's Transportation Initiative: Ms. Loobey stated that Ms. Hocken would be testifying at the April 18 meeting of the Governor's Transportation Initiative regional advisory committee in Eugene.

Deferred Compensation Quarterly Report: Ms. Loobey said that there had been no diminution of Hartford's rating from the last reporting period. Mr. Bennett re-raised his concerns about financial consulting for employee investment decisions. Ms. Loobey said she had talked with a number of financial planners and was continuing to gather information. Because LTD was the employer and the sponsor of the program, the District had a fiduciary responsibility for the program. Because the District was a public agency offering a deferred compensation program to employees, there was a limited number of places that money could be invested. Hartford did not have a financial planner to meet with employees, and Ms. Loobey did not know if other companies did.

Finance Manager Tamara Weaver said that the District's deferred compensation program offered an excellent range of investment options in mutual funds. She thought it might be valuable to provide more encouragement to employees to use the deferred compensation program that was available.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Board Secretary

C:\WPDATA\BDMN417R.DOC