

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 16, 1997

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 10, 1997, 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 16, 1997, at 7:00 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Rob Bennett  
One vacancy, (Subdistrict 1)

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Hocken introduced the May Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Bea Landeros. Ms. Landeros was hired on August 19, 1993, and previously was selected as Employee of the Month in September 1995. As of January 1997, she earned awards for three years of safe driving and three years of correct schedule operation. She was nominated by customers for excellence in service and job accomplishments and excellence in providing accessible bus service to customers with disabilities. The customers appreciated her polite and courteous attitude toward customers, her assistance to customers in finding destinations, and her announcement of bus stops. When asked what made Ms. Landeros a good employee, Transit Operations Manager Patricia Hansen said, "Bea is a warm and friendly person who truly has her customers' interests at heart. She seems to always be in a good mood, and her co-workers find her to be a delight to be around. Bea is a great ambassador for LTD."

Ms. Hocken thanked Ms. Landeros for her good work and presented her with her certificate and monetary award. Ms. Landeros thanked the Board, saying that she loved being appreciated and that the award meant a lot to her and she would cherish it.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Mike Farthing, attorney for the Cole family, noted memoranda the Board had received from Cole representative Al Couper, LTD Transit Planner Micki Kaplan, and LTD Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano. He

thought that in many ways the suggested criteria overlapped or were very similar, but he thought there were different ways to look at the criteria for a Park & Ride site. He said that he and Mr. Couper had concluded that Park & Ride sites served different functions in LTD's system and in other transit systems, and had been well established in the LTD system, including lots at church parking lots, pizza parlors, the Gateway shopping center, etc., which included relatively low cost and could be relocated. He said that the District could experiment with those to see what worked and what did not, and move those around on a regular basis if one did not work. Others were more significant, such as at River Road and Beltline, at 29th and Amazon, and at 58th and Main. He was not sure where the McKay lot fit in the hierarchy of Park & Ride sites. He said he believed that the big ones occurred on public land and LTD did not have to acquire that land. He said he understood that Park & Ride and BRT were linked but also tended to stand alone, and that LTD would have Park & Rides whether or not it implemented BRT. He said that led to his second observation, which was that West 11th may be a good transit corridor for BRT but West 18th may be better for Park & Ride because of the three highest-rated Park & Ride destinations (University of Oregon, Sacred Heart, and the downtown business district). He said that 18th to 13th and then on in served those sites better than 11th. He said that Al Couper and he had preliminary conversations with Al Johnson regarding sharing ideas and observations with Mr. Johnson and members of the LTD staff, and he would like to continue to do that with the Board's permission or encouragement. With regard to the criteria, he said, he and Mr. Couper believed that, as long as LTD was going to consider Park & Ride on privately-owned land, part of that consideration should be given to the loss of that land from the inventory of land. In the Coles' case, he said, it would be commercial; in other cases it might be industrial or residential. He said that a good example was the Elks' property, where the Lane County Juvenile Justice Center would remove 15 acres of high-density residential, which was in short demand and was a big consideration. Also, he said, the environmental assessment process required LTD to look at those impacts, and they believed that LTD should fold that into its criteria.

**MOTION** CONSENT CALENDAR: Ms. Hocken noted that there had been no Budget Committee nomination, so none was included in the Consent Calendar. Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for **VOTE** April 16, 1997, is approved as presented." Mr. Bailey seconded, and the vote carried unanimously, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor; none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the March 17, 1997, special meeting/work session and the March 19, 1997, regular Board meeting.

**PROPOSAL TO INCREASE RIDESOURCE AND ESCORT FARES/SIXTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35**: Transit Planner Lisa Gardner stated that fare changes needed to be implemented by ordinance, and there were some minor changes to the RideSource fares that needed to be approved before the first reading of the ordinance setting fares for the next fiscal year. Making those changes would require a public hearing.

Transit Planner Micki Kaplan explained that the Escort Program was one of the small programs provided by RideSource, along with the RideSource paratransit program and a RideSource shopper service. She said that the Escort and shopper programs were very small programs that the Board did not hear a lot about. Escort was a door-through-door

service for medical appointments that provided about 150 rides per month. The shopper service, which she said was a very efficient program, grouping people along a somewhat fixed route to Safeway and Albertsons, provided approximately 600 rides per month. RideSource provided about 6,000 rides per month. The paratransit fare had been brought to the Board the previous fall and the RideSource fare had been increased from \$.80 to \$1.00, because one of the goals was to increase revenues following declines in Special Transportation Fund revenue. That had been done, but staff were remiss in not keeping fares in the other programs in parity. Therefore, staff were proposing to raise the Escort fare to \$1.00 from \$.80, since it was a premium service. Also, the shopper program should be \$1.00 per round trip, instead of \$1.10 as listed in the ordinance.

**Public Hearing on Fare Changes:** Ms. Hocken opened the public hearing on the increase in fares for Escort and the change in fares for the shopper service. No one wished to testify, and Ms. Hocken closed the public hearing.

**Board Discussion and Decision:** Mr. Kleger stated that these changes had been thoroughly discussed by the Special Transportation Committee members, who supported the action. He said he thought the action was necessary and appropriate.

MOTION  
VOTE

Mr. Kleger moved that Sixth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Mr. Saydack seconded, and the motion carried unanimously, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. Extra copies of the ordinance were available for members of the audience.

Ms. Hocken then read the title: "Sixth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services." She stated that the second reading and adoption of the ordinance would be scheduled for the May Board meeting.

**Legislative Report from Board President:** Ms. Hocken said that she had been in Salem that day. There was a bill in the legislature that would remove the District's authority to use condemnation as a way of acquiring property. It would change ORS 267 and apply only to LTD. Apparently, she said, the theory behind the bill was that since LTD was not an elected board, it should not have the right to condemn property. She said she and Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano had spoken in opposition to the bill. A representative of Tri-Met, retired Supreme Court Justice Jacob Tanzer, pointed out that there were many non-government agencies--such as the railroads or any public utility in the state, whether privately or publicly owned, or elected or appointed--with the right to use eminent domain, so it did not seem right to single out LTD and take this power away from LTD.

Mr. Bailey asked if the committee members asked questions. Ms. Loobey said that they did. One of the issues Senator Dukes was concerned about was whether LTD had adopted formal procedures so that any member of the public could understand where the District was in the process at this point, in terms of a land acquisition transaction. Ms. Hocken had told the committee that she was not aware of any formal procedures that the Board had adopted, but the District was required to follow state and federal requirements, pay fair market value, reimburse businesses, etc., and she had talked a little about some of the District's criteria. Mr. Viggiano had pointed out that LTD had done this so rarely

in its history that the District had not really needed a policy. The four properties taken under the threat of condemnation, including only one that went to court, were all treated on an individual basis.

**LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLAN:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that typically long-range financial plans involved oceans of spreadsheets with lots of assumptions and fairly good short-term understanding of revenues and expenditures. She focused on the purpose of the plan as well as what was included in it. She stated that the purpose of any financial plan was to fund something--not to spend money, but to spend money for a certain purpose. In this particular instance, LTD wanted to fund short- and long-term District plans, some of which were fairly ambitious. In addition, LTD wanted to recognize any potential problems for the future. She said that LTD had a fairly aggressive agenda, and needed to identify if there were any possible revenue shortfalls or expenditure problems down the road.

Ms. Hellekson said that in April the Board had approved a draft strategic plan, which included four visions and a number of strategic actions that went into quite a bit of detail. For purposes of looking at the Long-Range Financial Plan, she wanted to focus on the big picture and what LTD was trying to accomplish. She thought that included three major components: to provide transportation services to LTD's core constituency (the old, the young, the poor; anyone without another transportation alternative); to attract the driver of the personal automobile in order to work toward the mandate of reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMTs); and to help support and maintain an enhanced quality of life in the community.

Ms. Hellekson discussed what the plan would fund under basic transportation services. That included maintaining fixed-route services at some level, with minimal increases included in the current Long-Range Financial Plan. She stated that BRT would in some respects replace fixed-route service, and that there would be a trade-off between fixed-route service and BRT. In the future, as staff began evaluating the core constituency service, they would be including the BRT component. The District also would be maintaining demand/response service (Escort, RideSource, etc.).

Ms. Hellekson discussed what funding would be necessary to promote activities to attract the driver of the private automobile. At the April meeting, the Board had discussed bus amenities in relation to the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), which included air conditioning for the nine buses to be delivered in August, reading lights on three of those buses, etc. She said that if these amenities were well received by riders, staff would consider expanding them onto other vehicles in the future. She stated that one of the big aspects of BRT would be to reduce travel time, including such components as prepaid fares, low-floor buses, exclusive rights-of-way, signal priority, high-occupancy vehicle lanes, and express service.

In terms of the quality of life component, Ms. Hellekson said that the TransPlan Update would be a big factor; TransPlan had to include LTD's agenda, and the community had to be on board with that agenda. Therefore, staff planned to invest funds in community outreach programs and community education programs. She said that the budget presentation would involve more specific discussion about these programs.

Ms. Hellekson provided a quick review of the assumptions that went into determining the numbers included in the Long-Range Financial Plan. She explained that service requirements and capital projects formed the plan framework, and most of the capital projects were directly related to the service that LTD intended to provide. Population growth and ridership increases were expected to result in fare revenue increases. Population was expected to increase only 1 to 2 percent per year, but staff expected to increase ridership by providing increases in service and better facilities. Ms. Hellekson said also that the preservation of assets was a big factor in the Long-Range Financial Plan. If the District put millions of dollars into a new station, it had to concurrently make a commitment to maintain that station; the same was true of any facilities the District owned, or the investment would be wasted over time. Additionally, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) was expected to be reauthorized and funded, Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI) funds were expected to become available, and staff were committed to continuing to carefully control personnel services.

Ms. Hellekson next reviewed the major plan components, including certain projects (the Eugene Station, BRT, passenger boarding improvements, etc.) and funding. She said that staff were assuming that grant funding for future bus purchases would continue at about 25 percent of the cost. They also assumed that the demonstration grant for BRT would be approved at \$10 million and that subsequent applications for grants in support of passenger boarding improvements, BRT, computer upgrades, etc., would be funded at 50 percent. Overall, slightly less than 50 percent of the total project cost would be grant funded. Tax revenues included the payroll tax, the self-employment tax, and the State in-lieu-of-payroll tax program. Fares included group passes and other fare instruments, and the "other" category included interest earnings, advertising, and miscellaneous refunds, sales of items, etc. Ms. Hellekson said that LTD's interest earnings were quite healthy because the District maintained high levels of reserves.

The Eugene Station was expected to increase ridership and operating costs. It was assumed that BRT would not increase operating costs, because it would replace some fixed-route service and automate some fairly labor-intensive activities (fare payment, etc.), but would increase ridership.

Ms. Hellekson provided a capital summary, which had been discussed at the March Board meeting. She then discussed revenues as assumed in the Plan, including sustaining a 10 percent per year increase in fare revenues, an increase in payroll tax revenues of 5 percent per year, an increase of 2 percent per year in State in-lieu-of tax revenues, and less than .5 percent increase in self-employment tax revenues.

Ms. Hellekson summarized by saying that LTD was well positioned for the future; operating income was increasing; locally-controlled funds were increasing; there was no current debt; there were no unfunded liabilities; there would be an ongoing search for new funding for BRT; ridership increases were expected; and staff would continue to provide careful expenditure controls.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the proposed Long-Range Financial Plan for fiscal years 1997-98 through 2016-17 is approved as presented." Mr. Bailey seconded, and the resolution was approved by unanimous vote, 5 to 0 (Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor; none opposed).

VOTE

**WEST 11TH PARK & RIDE CRITERIA:** Ms. Kaplan stated that in March Mr. Viggiano had talked about revising criteria to reorient the focus for the West 11th Park & Ride site. She mentioned that this was a subjective process and that no one site would ever meet all the criteria. She stated that there were 15 criteria during the first phase of site selection the previous summer. Those 15 had been reduced to six proposed main criteria: site is affordable, is compatible with nearby land uses, has high visibility, serves a large market area, provides for convenient access by customers, and is efficiently accessed by the bus. She discussed those criteria, included on page 41 of the agenda packet, in somewhat more detail and said that they would be used as guidelines to evaluate potential sites for further review.

Mr. Saydack asked if staff were suggesting that the criteria were prioritized or weighted. Ms. Kaplan said that they were not. Mr. Saydack then asked how the River Road Transit Station would rate based on these criteria. Ms. Kaplan said that it was affordable; it was near McDonald's and shopping; it was very visible from Beltline and River Road; it served a large market area, with demonstrated success in terms of use, based on 50 to 60 percent occupancy; and it was convenient and accessible, with signals and good bus access.

Ms. Hocken commented that when she testified before the Senate committee that day, it had been suggested that the economic impact on the property that was being acquired was something that the District should consider. She had not yet seen the proposed criteria, but basically had told the committee that an undeveloped site was more attractive than a site with existing businesses, for which LTD would have to pay relocation costs. She thought that the "site is affordable" criteria did incorporate the Board's preference to take bare land or less-developed land because it restricted the cost. She added that one criteria that did not appear to be there was to say that a particular site had enough spaces to make it feasible, and wondered if that needed to be incorporated into this set of proposed criteria. Ms. Kaplan said that her assumption in developing these criteria was that LTD would not look at a site as a potential site if it did not meet the District's basic needs for capacity. Ms. Hocken said that different-sized sites did different things, so she wondered about including a criteria saying that the size of the site was appropriate for the function; however, that may be implied. Ms. Kaplan said it was not implied, but that the District had a lot of flexibility in the size of the site because the goal was to acquire multiple sites along major corridors. She thought that the District typically would be looking in the range of 50 to 100 spaces.

Mr. Bailey said that #4, "site serves a large market area," might get to the question of whether a certain site would be productive, serving a larger market area and being more likely to catch the riders from that area. He wondered if staff had considered evaluation of a site based on its environmental impact, or whether that was included under #2, "site is

compatible with nearby land uses." Ms. Kaplan said that potential environmental impact was a concern, and the Environmental Assessment process would evaluate the environmental impact of the project on the site. She said that not including it did not mean that it was not an important consideration, and it could be added to the list.

Mr. Saydack said it occurred to him as he looked at the list that the process had several parts. One of the things the District had to do was determine that there was a need for a Park & Ride on a particular corridor, and that general determination was made first, separate from the factors being discussed. Second, the District needed to identify some potential sites that it could consider as serving that need, and that was where this list came in, to make that next level of specificity about potential sites. Third was the next level of specificity, which he thought Mr. Bailey was alluding to, when the District began looking at the characteristics of a particular site, including the environmental implications of that site, whether there was a willing seller, whether there were other problems that would increase the cost, etc. He said that the Board was at the second stage with the West 11th project.

Ms. Kaplan thanked Mr. Saydack for his synopsis and agreed that the District was in the middle step. She affirmed that the list under discussion was to help identify several potential sites, and that specific sites were considered in more detail after that.

Ms. Hocken said that maybe the District needed a procedures manual that would cover her concerns about the size and function of a site, the criteria for evaluating the sites that appeared to meet that basic need, and then the environmental and other issues for specific sites. Mr. Saydack agreed that this would be helpful, but said that what the document would do would be to articulate what the District had been doing. As Mr. Bailey had pointed out earlier, the District had addressed a lot of those issues all along, and such a document would be a formalization of the criteria for making the general determination of need, identifying potential sites, and evaluating specific sites. He said that the District had been examining those issues all along, and now was trying to itemize them.

Ms. Kaplan added that the main objective of the Environmental Assessment was to measure the impact of LTD's project on the property, the business, etc. That was a huge process in and of itself, which LTD would pay a lot of money to go through, to measure impacts, so although that was not necessarily on the list of criteria, it was a step that LTD would go through further down the road. Mr. Saydack agreed that it was important to keep in mind that LTD would do that before the selection process was finished.

Mr. Viggiano stated that at the March meeting staff had laid out steps as part of the process for an overall Park & Ride development plan. One of the steps was how best to meet demand, and used the River Road as a model, with one space for every 270 residents. He stated that those were different steps in the process, and the next step was to develop criteria, which were before the Board that evening. The steps to follow would include identifying sites, evaluating them, obtaining initial information on estimated appraisals, the Environmental Site Assessment, and the full Environmental Assessment. What the Board was looking at that evening was a set of criteria to help choose the best site, and was not intended to cover the whole process. He agreed that the District should

develop a long-range Park & Ride plan, and said that in the short run, these steps should be clearly identified in writing, for the Board's reference.

Mr. Viggiano suggested bringing the process back to the Board the following month, but that would not preclude the Board from taking action on the criteria. If the Board took that action, staff could begin looking for alternative sites for further evaluation.

Mr. Bailey suggested adding a criteria for "other criteria that may impact selection of the site." He thought it would be prudent to add some appropriate language that recognized that there may be factors that would arise that the Board could not anticipate but that might affect the decision.

Ms. Hocken said that even though the resolution did focus specifically on the West 11th corridor, she thought the Board was actually doing something a little bit broader than that, and was actually adopting criteria for Park & Ride sites throughout the system. Mr. Saydack thought that this was a good way to fold in Mr. Bailey's suggestion, because his other category could be other criteria specific to the corridor in question, which may be different from corridor to corridor. Ms. Kaplan agreed that the Board may want to add different criteria as it went along, rather than be bound by a rigid set of criteria. Again, she said, she saw these criteria as a guideline, and did not think it was appropriate to have subjective criteria be hard and fast.

Mr. Saydack said he would like to see the Board take what action needed to be taken so the staff could move forward with identifying alternative sites on West 11th. He thought the Board should do that with the understanding that this was part of a larger process that would be articulated as the District moved through it; the Board was not attempting to do that now, but was creating a framework that could be used to identify alternative sites on West 11th.

MOTION Mr. Saydack moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed criteria, with the amendment suggested by Mr. Bailey, for locating potential sites for a Park & Ride lot in the West 11th corridor. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Mr. Kleger expressed his appreciation for the material provided by Mr. Couper, and said that it was nice to see a discussion other than "don't come here."

VOTE There was no further discussion, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

**ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COMPENSATION:** Human Resources Manager Ed Rutledge stated that this topic dealt with the administrative salary schedule. He said that there basically were two groups of employees at LTD: bargaining unit employees, and those who were not in a bargaining unit, described as administrative employees. The compensation and benefits of bargaining unit employees were subject to the collective bargaining process. Administrative salaries and benefits were subject to an annual review, most often done by the Board Compensation Committee, followed by Board action. Last



year, he said, the Compensation Committee had asked that a comprehensive classification and compensation study be done. Human Resources commissioned a project with a vendor out of Seattle, with the idea that the study would be completed by now. However, the study had run into some difficulties and staff were engaged in discussions with the vendor. It appeared that the study results would be delayed for up to three months, perhaps even longer.

In the meantime, Human Resources was recommending a 3.2 percent increase to the salary schedule. The Compensation Committee would meet to review the compensation/classification study when it became available, and would then make a recommendation to the Board regarding the study.

Mr. Kleger asked about the basis for the 3.2 percent recommendation. Mr. Rutledge said that it was reflective of the Consumer Price Index (CPI), with an averaging system that looked at the 12 months in the calendar year of 1996. For instance, when comparing January 1996 with January 1995, the result was 12 figures, which were then averaged. That did not amount to exactly 3.2 percent, but it was reflective of the CPI. Mr. Rutledge stated that the all-cities CPI was used, since the Portland index, the closest one available in the region, was no longer reported on a monthly basis. Because it was reported on a semi-annual basis, Mr. Rutledge did not consider it to be adequate in providing a good, averaged-out snapshot.

Mr. Bailey asked how the requested action would relate to what other properties had done. Mr. Rutledge said that he was not absolutely certain what other properties had done with administrative employees. He was more familiar with what had been happening with bargaining unit employees, for which he received regular reports. Bargaining unit employees in the Pacific Northwest seemed to be receiving somewhere between 3 and 4 percent, with individualized adjustments depending on certain crafts or skills. For example, higher adjustments were being made for mechanic positions, which were harder to hire. He said he did not remember seeing a report for anything below 3 percent.

Ms. Loobey stated that on an annual basis the Board reviewed the compensation for the administrative staff and made the decision during the spring in preparation for the budget deliberations. Staff did not like to draft the budget without having some understanding of what the annual adjustment to the salary schedule would be, so those costs could be calculated for the coming year. It had been staff's and the committee's goal to accomplish that some months ago with the commission of the compensation/classification study, and to have that information in preparation for the next year's budget. She said that this recommendation was a substitute at that time for what might have been included as a result of that study.

Ms. Hocken said she was curious how the effective date of June 29 worked, and if that was the effective date of the pay period for paychecks issued in July. Ms. Hellekson said that was the first day of the first pay period in FY 97-98.

Mr. Saydack said, as a member of the Compensation Committee, that this recommendation came from Human Resources, but he wanted to speak in support of it. He

said he thought it was reasonable, and that the Committee might propose some other adjustments after reviewing the compensation/classification study. Pending receipt of that study, this recommendation was what needed to be done. He said he did not view it as an adjustment that was in any way out of line, even given the climate present with Measure 47 and what was happening in other government agencies. He said that LTD had an extraordinary administrative staff, and he thought the Board members all recognized that and appreciated them a great deal.

Ms. Hocken asked about the cost of benefits and what that did to LTD's costs. Mr. Rutledge said that the District would not be adding or subtracting any benefits. An estimate from the benefits consultant anticipated a 12 percent increase in health insurance costs. The District had a three-year package from the health insurance provider, at 12 percent, 8 percent, and 8 percent, which appeared to be below the current market experience. Mr. Rutledge said that he had heard figures as high as 42 percent, and the District's health insurance carrier originally had estimated 24.6 percent. He said that those increases were being caused for two reasons. First, the political pressure of a couple of years ago, which resulted from talk about nationalized health care, had eased to some degree, and the industry, which had held its rates, was catching up with costs. Second, demographics were part of the rating for any particular group, and LTD had some interesting demographics. The benefits were commingled between the administrative staff and bargaining unit employees. The average age at LTD was in the neighborhood of 47 years old, which was considered in the upper end in terms of average age.

MOTION

Mr. Bailey moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Administrative Salary Schedule will be adjusted by 3.2 percent, effective June 29, 1997." Mr. Kleger seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and no one opposed.

VOTE

#### **ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Joint Meeting with Springfield City Council:** Ms. Hocken stated that the LTD Board had been invited to meet with the Springfield City Council on either May 5 or May 27, before one of the Council's regular meetings. She suggested that the Board also could invite the Council to a meeting at LTD, since she was not sure one hour would be enough time to discuss issues of mutual concern. The Board members were polled, and May 27 appeared to be a date when all present could attend. The Board also liked the idea of inviting the Council to join the Board at LTD at 6:00 p.m. before one of the Board's regular meetings for any follow-up discussions.

**Appointment of New Board Member:** Ms. Hocken stated that the Governor had appointed a new Springfield member, Hillary Larsen-Wylie, to the Board, pending Senate confirmation. Her confirmation hearing before the full Senate would not occur until sometime in May, but she had indicated that she would begin attending meetings as soon as she could clear her calendar. Staff planned to hold a briefing for her to help prepare her to step into her position.

**Board Member Reports:** **MPC:** Ms. Hocken said that there were no transportation items on the Metropolitan Policy Committee agenda that month, so there was no report.

**Board Walkabout:** (1) Mr. Bailey reported that he had been making the rounds for the last few weeks with representatives of the Hilton, local businesses, downtown Eugene, and others on a personal basis, and that people generally continued to be very supportive of LTD's activities. He had heard a lot of questions about the Eugene Station project and excitement about its progress. He discussed BRT with them as well, and said that the discussions were positive. (2) Mr. Kleger said that he had gotten almost all the way through his list for the walkabout, and that the results were very similar to Mr. Bailey's report. He said he met with each of the school district superintendents, with Ms. Murphy joining him for the meeting with the Springfield superintendent. Mr. Kleger said he was delighted with the favorable response from each of the people he had met with. He said he also had given a presentation to a group of seniors who met at the Peterson Barn, where he heard a desire for more service and more convenient, quicker service, but a fairly favorable response. He said he had been impressed by the people's understanding that LTD could not do everything at once. (3) Mary Murphy said that she had met with the management staff at the Red Lion, and found them to be enthusiastic in support of BRT and expansion of LTD, possibly, to facilitate the conference focus that they would like to incorporate in the Gateway area. She said they would be willing partners in that regard. She also had met with Donna Buell of Buell Chapel, who was an enthusiastic supporter of LTD but had made Ms. Murphy aware of a concern about a specific bus departure from the Springfield Station, which coincided often with their memorial services. Ms. Murphy had shared with her the possibility of relocating the Springfield Station, and said that LTD would be sensitive to that issue, but there was in fact a stop sign there, which buses and automobile traffic all had to comply with. Ms. Murphy said that Jamon Kent of the Springfield School District had been very receptive to working in partnership with LTD, and as the new middle school in Springfield came on line, LTD might be able to facilitate some transportation needs as a result of the limitations of Ballot Measure 47. She and Mr. Kleger had given Mr. Kent some additional information about the high school pass program in Eugene, and he had been in contact with the Eugene school superintendent about the success of that program. (4) Mr. Saydack said that he had several meetings scheduled for early May and would report about them at the May Board meeting.

**Talgo Train Accessibility:** Mr. Kleger reported that he and Transit Planner Micki Kaplan had met the previous day with representatives of the Washington State Department of Transportation regarding the Talgo train. Steve Fosdick from the Oregon Department of Transportation had been present by telephone, as well. Mr. Kleger reported that they had discussed the processes that would be used to accommodate people with disabilities on the new trains that Washington and Amtrak were buying. He said they were asking the right questions and seemed to be trying to make sure that the service would work. He said that the tilt mechanism in the train required that the walkways from car to car were narrower than any wheelchair, so they had an accommodation issue to address very carefully.

**Springfield Chamber of Commerce Legislative Affairs Committee:** Ms. Murphy stated that Mr. Saydack had done an outstanding job in speaking to this group; he was articulate and presented the elected versus appointed board issue and addressed issues and questions. She said that one person who was present stated his preference for the elected board, basically because of a concern regarding taxation without representation, and that Mr. Saydack was able to share information with a great deal of respect and courtesy. She said that Mr. Bailey also presented at the meeting in his role at the University

of Oregon, and that she was proud to be associated with LTD and to have Eugene people cross over the river for these kinds of discussions. Mr. Saydack added that there were 20 to 22 people there, and they voted 15 or 16 to 5 to oppose the elected board bill; however, some people in that Chamber did believe that the elected board was the way to go. Lane Community College Group Pass Program: Ms. Hocken said that she met with LCC President Jerry Moskus, at his request. It was not likely that a group pass program would be in place for the 1997-98 school year, because there would have to be two votes in May (one to raise the limits on student fees, and one to designate the group pass program as a student fee). Ms. Hocken said she shared with him the results of a survey of LCC students regarding how they got to school, whether they would be willing to pay \$10 a term for a pass, etc. LCC staff had the results of the survey, which was done at the end of 1995, but President Moskus had not seen it and was very interested in it. He was still concerned that LTD's calculation to charge for the pass would include an in-lieu-of taxes amount, because LCC did not pay the payroll tax or make an in-lieu-of-tax payment. Ms. Hocken told him that this was part of LTD's policy, but it would be appropriate for the Board to discuss the policy. President Moskus suggested that LTD may want to make an exception for the students, but probably not the staff, and said that he would like to address the Board. Ms. Hocken said that staff were doing some analyses of possible costs for further discussion.

**March Financial Statement**: Ms. Hellekson stated that things were going well. Staff anticipated receiving \$400,000 more than budgeted in payroll tax receipts. Self-employment tax revenues were just beginning to arrive, so that final amount was still uncertain. Staff had discovered a \$44,000 shortfall in the State in-lieu-of payroll tax receipts, and the District had been reimbursed. The only major concern was with the cost of diesel fuel. The increased cost had been accommodated within the Materials & Supplies budget, so staff would not be requesting a budget transfer for that expense. Ms. Hellekson added that Tri-Met had invested in a system to read the Department of Revenue (DOR) reports, so LTD would be able to pay Tri-Met to read its reports from the DOR. LTD and Tri-Met were working together to have DOR provide information in a readable form.

**Legislative Update**: Ms. Loobey stated that the most significant issue was the flexible funding bill and implementation of the Oregon Transportation Initiative. She said that there was no acceptance among legislators of the suggested VMT fee, but there were many features, such as increases in registration fees, gas taxes, the weight mile tax, or imposition of a transportation safety and service fee. She stated that those fees were associated with vehicle usage, which in the past had been restricted to roads and highways. She said that if the package were accepted by the legislature, the transportation safety and service fee would generate approximately \$40 million per year. It would fund elderly and handicapped transportation in the state, and would be the first time that the State accepted the responsibility for those services. Instead of operating on grants, bake sales, and volunteer actions, elderly and handicapped services in rural areas would receive funding. LTD also would receive funding for those types of services. There would be a smaller amount for flexible funding that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) could use for any kind of project, such as a joint LTD Park & Ride and state highway project.

Ms. Loobey stated that the Governor had appointed a flexible funding steering committee, and that she was a member. Other members included the private sector, cities, and

counties. Ms. Loobey called this landmark legislation, and A *Register-Guard* editorial had stated that it was the best piece of transportation funding legislation to come out of the legislature, ever. Sacred Heart Hospital and Oregon Medical Labs had signed on in support, and there had been contact with electronics firms with which LTD had group pass programs, with Pape' and Wildish, and with others.

Ms. Loobey said that the issue over the weight mile tax still had the potential to cause this transportation funding legislation to not move forward. She explained that the truckers did not want such an increase, and had proposed other ways to tax themselves to maintain their cost responsibility policies within the state. The Association of Oregon Industries (AOI) also had expressed that concern, and remained neutral regarding the bill. One suggestion for funding was to charge \$2 per household on utility bills. The rural electric cooperatives were concerned about collecting these fees, and wanted to be compensated for the extra costs and not be liable if people did not pay. Discussions about how to collect the fee were continuing.

**TransPlan Update:** Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano stated that in December and January the Board had considered the TransPlan Decision Package and had included 14 strategies, with changes to the strategies related to Bus Rapid Transit and transit funding, making both of those more specific. Within the past month, the Eugene City Council, Springfield City Council, and the Lane County Board of Commissioners had taken action on that package, as well. A lot of little changes had been made by the different bodies, but the one LTD had been following most closely was the one about BRT. Mr. Viggiano said that the Eugene City Council had adopted the LTD Board's wording about BRT, which included a list of the different elements of BRT. The Springfield City Council and the Lane County Board adopted wording to focus resources on what would be called an "enhanced transit system," which did not spell out BRT. In both cases, he said, the reasoning was that those groups felt they needed more information about BRT before they could endorse it as a concept. They indicated in their comments that they were willing to consider BRT, but wanted to learn more about it before committing to it as "the" transit strategy. The LTD Board would have an opportunity to meet with the Springfield City Council in May. Mr. Viggiano said it was not clear from the Lane County Commissioners' comments whether they would like a joint meeting with the LTD Board or would like to be briefed in some other way, so staff were working together to determine their preference.

Ms. Hocken said that while in Washington, D.C., she and Cindy Weeldreyer had agreed that LTD and the Board of Commissioners needed to have a joint meeting. Mr. Viggiano said that Ms. Weeldreyer had spoken in favor of BRT, possibly because she was exposed to the concept in Washington, D.C. Commissioner Sorenson also spoke in support of BRT, but there was still a need for more information sharing.

Mr. Viggiano said that even though there were some different options approved by the different bodies in several strategies, he thought the differences were not significant enough that they would preclude proceeding with the draft BRT plan. The draft plan could include a couple of different strategies or approaches that then could be discussed and one selected for TransPlan. "Enhanced transit system" was very general and could mean almost anything, from the improved service for the fall of 1997 to a full BRT system with exclusive

rights-of-way, so it was difficult to translate that direction from those two groups to include in a plan. He thought that a lot of the elements of BRT would end up being elements of an enhanced transit system; there were a lot of things that people could agree with as far as BRT. It appeared that exclusive rights-of-way might be one of the key concerns about BRT. There were some concerns about how that would be implemented. Mr. Viggiano said it was not clear when specific answers would be available, but the important thing to communicate was that the other governmental bodies would be involved in the implementation of BRT.

**Thurston Station:** Mr. Viggiano said that there were two recent actions on the Park & Ride in East Springfield. Staff attended a meeting of the Springfield Planning Commission because the project would require discretionary use, which was similar to what Eugene called a conditional use. It was not allowed outright in the zoning district; it had to be approved by the Planning Commission. Mr. Viggiano reported that the Planning Commission members were enthusiastic and agreed that this was a good project, and approved the discretionary use. He stated that staff also had gone to the Lane County Board of Commissioners that morning because the access road to the Springfield Park & Ride ended up being part of a new access road south of the highway, called the Jasper Road Extension. Therefore, LTD would be building part of a new road and making signal modifications that would be required for that road. One of LTD's engineering consultants, who was on the Lane County Roads Advisory Committee, approached Commissioner Cornacchia to say that there should be some cost sharing and some county road funds should be used for that project. Commissioner Cornacchia thought that made sense and took it to the rest of the Commissioners, and they had agreed that morning to contribute up to \$125,000 to the Park & Ride project, assuming LTD built a full-width road. LTD had not intended to build a full-width road, so the \$125,000 actually would offset about \$75,000 of LTD's planned expenses.

**Fred Meyer Park & Ride:** Mr. Viggiano said that an executive session on this topic was not necessary that evening.

MOTION **Executive Session Pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d):** Mr. Saydack moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations. Mr. Bailey  
VOTE seconded, and the motion passed unanimously, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. Human Resources Manager Ed Ruttledge and other members of the District's negotiating team were present for this discussion, which began at 9:05 p.m.

**Return to Regular Session:** The Board unanimously returned to regular session at 9:25 p.m.

**Eugene Station Update:** Mr. Viggiano reminded the Board that tours of the Eugene Station would be held each month, and the Board members were invited to arrange with staff to attend either the regular monthly tour or a specially-arranged tour. Mr. Kleger commented that he was hearing positive feedback from the public about the station and about Wildish as the contractor. Ms. Murphy stated that she had received a negative contact from a Springfield resident who managed a business in Eugene, Emerald Credit

Union, about the temporary relocation of the station to 10th and Charnelton. The gentleman was meeting with his board of directors that evening and discussing his concerns that his business was not contacted prior to the decision to relocate the station to that area. She had asked staff to fax him copies of letters sent about the relocation project, and had suggested that he could be part of a problem-solving team with an LTD Board member and staff. He was worried about graffiti and a decline in business because of LTD's customers being near his business. Ms. Murphy said that LTD staff had contacted the owner of the building about the move, but regretted that individual businesses within the complex were not informed of the move. Ms. Loobey explained that buses would not be stopping in front of the complex where his business was located on 10th Avenue; they would be along the side on Charnelton. Staff had investigated leasing space for a temporary Customer Service Center in that building, but the property owner was unwilling to lease to LTD. Ms. Loobey stated that the District had been working with the City through its permit processes and requirements, and had notified people in the area of the move; other public processes had not been suggested or required.

**Cost Comparison between Automobile and Bus:** Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn said that an interesting part of the report summary, shown on pages 62 and 63 of the agenda packet, was the factors used in computing costs per passenger mile in a national study. The study looked at both the peak and off-peak costs in terms of congestion, user time, parking, municipal services, accidents, etc., which were a burden of costs that people did not think about when using single-occupant vehicles, but which society had to bear.


**Deferred Compensation Quarterly Report:** It was explained that a change in how deferred amounts were held in trust for employees meant that the funds were no longer the District's assets. The effective date for that change would be January 1, 1998, but the District could implement the change earlier if there were any advantages to doing so.

**Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Feedback on BRT:** Ms. Loobey said LTD had received a telephone call from Charlotte Adams, the director of planning for the FTA. She and her staff had met with LTD representatives two or three times regarding BRT. Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron said that in testimony in a congressional committee, FTA Administrator Gordon Linton used LTD's BRT project as an example of an innovative, low-cost approach, and one that they were interested in. He also mentioned BRT the next day at a staff meeting, and said he may want to visit Eugene and see it personally. Ms. Adams asked when might be a good time for him to visit and what they could do to help LTD move the project forward. Ms. Loobey said that the FTA could not do anything before the reauthorization of ISTEA, and LTD would need to have something more material to show if he were to visit.

**U2 Concert/Special Services:** Mr. Saydack said he found it remarkable that an event like the U2 concert could occur in Eugene and shuttle services were not required. Ms. Hocken said she had been invited to participate on a new Willamette Valley Livability Forum, along with University of Oregon (UO) President David Frohnmayer. She said she would try to talk with him about this issue, especially since it was related to the livability in the community. Mr. Saydack wondered if LTD made a proposal to provide bus service.

Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora explained that the concert organizers had contacted LTD, but the District had difficulty with the date chosen for the concert and did not have the ability to provide enough buses and bus operators. However, he believed that the UO should have negotiated with another provider, but did not pursue another plan. Ms. Hocken stated that the TransPlan should include a requirement that this kind of service be part of an event. Mr. Bergeron said he had met with Jan Oliver at the UO regarding the previous Promise Keepers event and the problems with large events, and she had promised to pursue those issues with the athletic department. The U2 concert was the first test, and showed that there had been no progress. He had told her that it would be better if LTD and the UO could cooperate on these event services than to have to mandate something through the TransPlan process. Ms. Hocken noted that it was not essential for LTD to be the provider, and she thought there was someone else with the equipment to provide the necessary services.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:50 p.m. upon a motion by Mr. Bailey.

  
Board Secretary

C:\WPDATA\BDMN416R.DOC