

MINUTES OF THE DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 20, 1998

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 14, 1998, 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, May 20, 1998, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, Vice President  
Rob Bennett  
Patricia Hocken, President, presiding  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Dean Kortge  
Mary Murphy, Secretary  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Hillary Wylie

**CALL TO ORDER:** Board President Pat Hocken called the meeting to order at 5:25 p.m. Mr. Bennett was not yet present.

**WORK SESSION: DISCUSSION OF COTTAGE GROVE/CRESWELL PILOT PROJECT:** Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated that the pilot project had begun in September 1997. Staff were requesting direction from the Board to amend the service boundary line should LTD receive a request from the City of Cottage Grove and/or Creswell to be included within the District. This proposed boundary would depart from the 2.5-mile standard used by the District by being established along the I-5 right-of-way and the urban growth boundaries of both cities. A more narrowly defined boundary would result in fewer payroll and self-employment tax revenues collected; however, this amount would more closely match the cost for the level of service provided.

Mr. Vobora stated that as LTD looked at establishing new service areas, the LTD Board had adopted a position that there be a demonstrated public need, an availability of funds, and, finally, that the request be community-based, and in fact, come from the elected officials of the new service area. Both the requirements for demonstrated need and availability of funds had been met.

Ridership on the Cottage Grove/Creswell route was strong, averaging 37.8 boardings per round trip, which ranked this route third among all LTD rural routes. Mr. Kortge asked if ridership counts were separated for Cottage Grove riders and Creswell riders. Mr. Vobora replied that, approximately 80 percent of the ridership was from Cottage Grove.

Mr. Vobora then discussed the availability of funds. To address that, Mr. Vobora displayed possibilities for the boundary expansion. He explained that the boundaries were defined by Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS), and could be established up to 2.5 miles from bus service. In addition, if the route actually touched a census tract, that entire tract could be included in the boundary. The 2.5-mile standard was set because it maintained a reasonable distance from which people could access the transit route.

By applying the outer boundary, using the 2.5-mile buffer, the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) was able to generate an estimate of what would be expected in payroll tax revenues. Approximately \$137,000 would be generated in Creswell and \$410,000 in Cottage Grove, which demonstrated that sufficient funds were available.

Staff continued to discuss the service with both cities, and several concerns were identified. The major concern was the difference between those projected tax revenues and the actual cost of the service that LTD would provide. In addition, there was concern that the tax source was not broad based, but was targeted at specific individuals or businesses. Finally, concern was expressed that the service would not be locally controlled.

Mr. Vobora explained that service decisions would be included in the Annual Route Review process in which the community was invited to provide input. Staff expected that the partnership with the community members of Creswell and Cottage Grove would be maintained and strengthened over the years, and that LTD would be receptive to suggestions for service changes from those members. In addition, Mr. Kortge would provide Board representation for the area.

In regard to the concern about the taxing method, the original LTD Board had determined that the payroll tax would be the taxing method used. Other taxing options were available, but that was the one chosen. Over the years, that position had been re-examined a number of times. During the 1970s, there had been two public votes on whether LTD should change from the payroll tax to an income tax. Both were defeated. In the early 1980s, there was a joint Eugene/Springfield Chambers of Commerce committee that examined the issue and determined that the payroll tax was the best taxing method to meet the needs of public transportation in the community.

The biggest concern was the difference between potential tax revenues and the cost of service. Using the standard boundary application of 2.5 miles in the Cottage Grove area only, there was approximately \$271,000 in revenues available within the urban growth boundary and approximately \$115,000 in available revenues outside the urban growth boundary. After the estimated self-employment tax was figured in, the

total estimated revenue would be \$410,000. The fully-allocated cost of the service would be \$195,000. The concern was that if the standard boundary were applied, the revenue subsidy would be much greater than the level of service provided to that area.

Staff had considered the idea of an intergovernmental agreement, which basically was the current arrangement for the pilot project, in which LTD had an agreement with the city to provide service on a per hour basis. The per-hour figure was discounted in the current agreement to meet the constraints of the ballot measure and the amount of money that was available for the pilot project. Under that option, the city could arrange to raise the money then pay for the service under the intergovernmental agreement. However, LTD staff were concerned about setting a precedent for different types of funding methods for different parts of the service area.

Another option that staff considered was a modified service boundary, where the boundary was redefined to include only the urban growth boundaries within Creswell and Cottage Grove and follow along the I-5 freeway between the cities. Staff believed that this made sense because there was no other place within the District where LTD operated along the I-5 corridor. People who lived along that I-5 corridor would not have access to the bus service, except within the urbanized areas, unlike service to Junction City where people who lived along the Highway 99 corridor were able to access the bus along that corridor. The modified service boundary would generate less in tax revenue, and would reduce the difference between the revenue and cost of service. To match those amounts even more closely, staff proposed adding two additional weekday trips, one additional Saturday midday trip, and two trips on Sunday. The community had shown that there was a significant need, and people supported using the bus. Mr. Vobora believed that of all the current rural service, this area could support a higher level of service.

Ms. Hocken asked if paratransit was included in the proposal. Mr. Vobora replied that paratransit service was provided by South Lane Wheels, and through LTD's contract with the LCOG, paratransit money would continue to flow through to South Lane Wheels. Ms. Hocken asked if that service was the same level that LTD would be required to provide if Cottage Grove were part of the District. Mr. Vobora replied that it was his understanding that the requirement for paratransit service was predicated on the level of fixed-route service. A comparable level of paratransit service was required if there were regular fixed-route circulator service or regular hourly headways to an area. The only change for paratransit service might be that by becoming an in-District service, South Lane Wheels may, through the funding mechanisms, be designated more money in terms of revenue.

Ms. Hocken further stated that the riders from Cottage Grove and Creswell most likely would use other routes in the LTD system, so she did not know if providing dollar-for-dollar service was in the best interest of the District. Mr. Vobora replied that the figures given had included only Cottage Grove. Once revenues from Creswell were factored in, it was expected that approximately \$70,000 in additional revenue would be

realized. In the survey that was conducted with riders from that area, it was determined that about 17 percent of them transferred to another bus within the system.

Mr. Kleger asked if the Cottage Grove City Council would be voting on this issue. Mr. Vobora replied that the Cottage Grove City Council had directed its city staff to draft a resolution establishing a separate transit district in Cottage Grove. A separate transit District would be established under ORS 267, much like LTD, where they could define their own boundaries and taxing method.

Mr. Bailey asked if ORS 267 required LTD to set the boundary at 2.5 miles around the transit service lines. Mr. Vobora replied that the LTD Board could set the boundary line anywhere between the bus service lines and the 2.5-mile limit. Mr. Bailey asked if there had been any other requests for intergovernmental agreements, and Mr. Vobora replied that there had not.

Ms. Hocken asked if boundary commission approval would be needed in order for Cottage Grove to form its own transportation district. Mr. Vobora replied that he did not believe Cottage Grove would need that. Once this formal action was taken in Cottage Grove, they would have to formally petition the county commissioners for approval and appointment of a board to oversee the new district. Future boards would then be elected.

One of the things that LTD would want to consider, in terms of Cottage Grove forming its own district, would be maintaining service on a contracted basis while the community members worked out the details such as the boundaries and service levels.

Mr. Bailey asked what the reaction had been in Cottage Grove to the revised boundary option that included only the urban growth boundaries. Mr. Vobora responded that he had not yet received a reaction from either city. One of the things that was discussed was the opportunity for communities to join the LTD district and then withdraw at a later date. Cottage Grove could join under the modified plan on a temporary basis.

Mr. Kortge had attended the town hall meeting in Cottage Grove, and he mentioned that one of the issues discussed was the total money spent on one-way travel to the Eugene area and that people were not riding the bus locally within Cottage Grove to visit local businesses, nor were people coming into Cottage Grove via the bus from the Creswell or Eugene areas. Another issue was with scheduling. If someone from Eugene wanted to travel to Cottage Grove via the bus, the schedule was not convenient for that. Mr. Vobora stated that there actually was a reverse commute happening; however, the primary purpose of establishing the service was to accommodate the movement north, because two-thirds of the people who rode actually were coming to Eugene/Springfield to work.

Mr. Bailey asked if the modified service that Mr. Vobora had described would address those issues. Mr. Vobora replied that the most immediate need that staff had

considered was an earlier weekday afternoon trip going back from Eugene to meet the demand from the early shift workers, who currently had to wait until a 4:30 p.m. departure. In addition, a midday trip would be added on Saturday and service would be added on Sunday, when currently there was none.

Ms. Murphy asked how many riders from Cottage Grove/Creswell were group pass holders. Mr. Vobora responded that staff had performed an Origin and Destination Study (O&D) with those riders and had learned that the number of group pass riders was very high. Cash rides totaled about 24 percent. The number of group pass riders on that route was higher than on most other LTD routes, where typically there was a larger number of monthly pass holders. Mr. Kortge added that many people spoke up at the meeting in Cottage Grove who appreciated finally being able to use the pass that was provided by Sacred Heart, the University, or other group pass participant. Ms. Murphy cautioned that LTD should be sensitive to that issue.

Ms. Murphy asked about the possibility of having two different providers if Cottage Grove formed its own transit district and how transfers between the two systems would be handled. Mr. Vobora replied that many of the larger communities dealt with several transit providers, and he thought LTD would want to cooperate in efforts to facilitate those transfers for riders. There were many possible options to provide that service.

Mr. Vobora stated that staff were recommending that LTD give clear and direct information to these communities as they considered the various options. Staff also recommended that LTD not pursue the contracting method, but pursue the modified boundary option, which met the District's needs and addressed some of the concerns that had been voiced in terms of resources versus the service cost.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Board needed to take action at this meeting, or if a decision could be delayed until the Board had time to further consider the issues. Mr. Vobora replied that putting off the decision would not jeopardize how staff were planning for service in the fall. Cottage Grove had budgeted to continue the service through the November election. Staff had scheduled the buses so that LTD could accommodate the additional length of the pilot project. However, he believed that the advantage of Board direction at this meeting would be to provide clear options to the Cottage Grove and Creswell communities as they continued to discuss the issues.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff needed action to pursue the modified boundary. Mr. Vobora replied that a modified boundary was a deviation from past practice, so staff wanted direction from the Board to pursue that option. Mr. Kleger then asked if staff had considered anything beyond the Cottage Grove and Creswell area, such as Saginaw.

Mr. Vobora replied that staff previously chose to stick closely to the I-5 corridor, as that would prove most successful in terms of attracting people to using public transit. Any deviations from that routing would increase the trip time.

**Public Testimony**

- 1) Sheila Hale of Creswell stated that she wanted to tell the Board how much that bus had meant to individuals and to the community. She encouraged the Board to please be as creative, adaptable, and flexible as Mr. Vobora had been. There were many opportunities for new ways of doing things, and she just wanted the Board to know how much it meant to have the bus.
  
- 2) Richard Meyers, Cottage Grove City Manager, thanked the Board for the support and the service that had been provided in Cottage Grove and the opportunity to work with Mr. Vobora, who had been enjoyable to work with. The meeting at the Bohemia School had been informative and helpful to the community. Cottage Grove was considering a number of issues in providing this service. One of the things the Council was very specifically interested in was forming its own district and contracting for the transit services. Doing that would provide for some intra-city transit services and the ability to perform those services in the area. In addition, Mr. Meyers stated that city staff wanted to know what direction the LTD Board would take, since there were deadlines that the city staff needed to meet in order to get information on the ballot.

Another question city staff had was the impact to South Lane Wheels of the various options that had been presented.

He stated that Cottage Grove was very interested in finding the best way to provide transit services in Cottage Grove. Details, such as the fees and transferring the fares, could be worked out later.

- 3) Ron Hanson, City of Creswell Administrator, stated that Creswell had tagged along on the demonstration project. There had been no initiative in Creswell to request a pilot program. He asked if Cottage Grove were to invite LTD in, would Creswell automatically be brought in as a result, or would Creswell have the option to not be included. In addition, he asked if LTD would be interested in going just as far as Creswell, if Cottage Grove formed its own district. The other issue was if Cottage Grove formed its own district, could Creswell join that district.

He stated that his council most likely would have to make a decision in June. Creswell was pleased to have been included in the pilot program. The current ridership in Creswell was encouraging.

Ms. Hocken asked if Mr. Vobora had answers to Mr. Hanson's questions. Mr. Vobora stated that Creswell could opt to join either district, and even if Cottage Grove joined LTD's district, Creswell still would have the option. If Cottage Grove opted

not to join the LTD District, but Creswell wanted to join, several issues would be considered, including the ridership. LTD had a minimum ride standard that it used to determine the viability of a route, and that would have to be considered for service to Creswell. He did not believe that Creswell ridership met the minimum standard, but that lifeline-type service could be considered. He did not believe that funding would be an issue.

Ms. Murphy asked about the availability of parking in Creswell if Cottage Grove residents wanted to drive to Creswell and use Park & Ride services. Mr. Vobora replied that the Creswell Park & Ride lot was located across the street from City Hall. There was a shelter there, and the lot would hold 22 to 25 vehicles. Currently, the lot was averaging 6 to 10 cars per weekday.

Mr. Vobora responded to Mr. Meyers' remarks about paratransit services in Cottage Grove by saying that staff were confident that South Lane Wheels would not suffer in the scenario of Cottage Grove joining the LTD district. South Lane Wheels would continue to be in charge of its own services, and most likely would receive additional revenues.

- 4) Don Nordin of Cottage Grove stated that he had been the chief petitioner for getting the LTD initiative on the ballot. In addition, he was a member of the Lane County Rural Community Improvement Council and the chair of the subcommittee on transportation. He also served as a member of the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STF). More recently, he was the candidate for the democratic nomination in House District 44, which included the entire LTD boundary of Creswell and Cottage Grove. He commented that he knew staff were trying to match service with costs, and it was important to draw the boundary lines very narrowly, but he had canvassed the whole area, and he knew there was a lot of interest. In a prior discussion he had with District counsel Joe Richards, he learned that there was a possibility to have a rural transportation district that would interface with LTD. He asked the Board to consider a much broader transportation district outside the urban area and consider solutions for the whole of Lane County. The people in Oakridge and Florence also were very interested to have some sort of transportation option. Those communities were watching the Cottage Grove project very closely.

Board Deliberation: Mr. Kortge asked what the intent of the motion was regarding the formal request of the elected officials. Mr. Vobora responded that unless a formal request was received from the elected officials in Cottage Grove and Creswell, staff would not pursue the inclusion of those areas in the LTD service boundary.

Mr. Bennett stated that he did not have enough information to vote on this issue. He had several questions and concerns, and he did not feel comfortable to make a decision at this time. He asked Mr. Meyers to comment about why the Cottage Grove

City Council would lean in the direction of forming its own district. He wanted to know if it was a cost issue, an intra-city issue, or if there were other reasons. Mr. Meyers responded that cost was a big issue. The Council was concerned about the excess revenue leaving the Cottage Grove area and being used to subsidize the Eugene/Springfield service. In addition, LTD provided its services based on need and ridership, and the community could have other needs for intra-city transportation that would not meet LTD's ridership standard.

Mr. Bennett asked if Cottage Grove was considering setting up its own bus company or contracting for the bus service. Mr. Meyers responded that the primary idea was to contract the bus service, much like the city of Corvallis did. The preferred option would be to contract with LTD.

Mr. Bennett asked if Cottage Grove were leaning in that direction, why the Board would need to make the motion as presented in the agenda packet. Ms. Hocken stated that if the option for joining the LTD district were the preferred option, it would have included the entire boundary at 2.5 miles surrounding the bus service. That was how LTD always had done business when another community was annexed to the District. The proposed motion would allow staff to pursue the option of a modified boundary. It was not known if this option would appeal to the City of Cottage Grove. Mr. Bennett said that if they contracted for LTD service, the boundary would not be an issue, as Cottage Grove would raise the funds using whatever means it chose. Mr. Vobora added that staff would not recommend the contract method on a long-term basis. It was done in Cottage Grove as a test project to determine if other criteria would be met, such as ridership. Those criteria were met, so staff were recommending to provide District-wide consistency and not create a separate way of doing business.

Mr. Bennett asked if the service would be contracted on a fully-allocated basis or if it would be negotiable. Mr. Vobora responded that it should be fully allocated, plus additional funds to help pay for the infrastructure in the Eugene/Springfield area, where those riders from Cottage Grove would be using further bus services. The LTD cost would then need to be compared with the cost of a private provider that might not require additional funds.

Mr. Vobora further stated that staff believed it was more equitable to treat the entire District evenly. The Board had the authority to impose a different taxing method than the current payroll taxing method, but if it were changed, it would apply to the entire District. Staff preferred that Cottage Grove join the District, or contract with a private provider. Ms. Loobey added that LTD had the same issue with all the incorporated rural communities that it served. It would not be desirable to dismantle the District by offering different revenue methods to different areas. Whether or not the Board would choose to move the District in that direction was a policy issue.

Mr. Bailey stated that the original meaning of ORS.267 allowed the District to establish a service boundary within certain perimeters to address exactly this problem. The boundary could be crafted in such a fashion that made sense and was not casting



too wide of a net. He said that it was very apparent to him that using the standard policy to set the boundary to encompass the 2.5 miles surrounding the bus route was too wide, and he favored being creative about how the boundary would be established. He believed that making exceptions to the standard taxing policy would create a run on intergovernmental agreements, which would create a more uncertain and non-broad based taxing policy.

Ms. Murphy stated that it should be apparent from the beginning whether or not a seamless system or a two-party system would be in place.

Ms. Hocken added that it appeared as though the only decision the Board might be prepared to make was if it would be willing to adopt the modified District boundary if Cottage Grove approached LTD about joining the District. She said that maybe the Board was not ready to make that decision at this meeting, because it was involved a larger policy decision.

Mr. Kortge said that the way he read the motion was that the Board would simply authorize some flexibility, but no policy decision would be made. It would then be up to Cottage Grove and Creswell to decide what they wanted to do. He stated that it made sense to him.

Mr. Kleger stated that he supported giving staff the room to move on the issue. He believed it was the appropriate thing to do under the circumstances. He also felt that it was important for the people of Cottage Grove and Creswell to be able to make up their own minds with the best and most information that could be available. As far as he was concerned, as long as the service paid for itself, expanding the service boundaries would be all right, as long those boundaries did not encompass areas that were not already developed. There already was urbanization in Creswell and Cottage Grove that would need transit services. Mr. Kleger asked if Mr. Vobora thought that the motion, as proposed, would give staff enough room to negotiate in terms of the boundaries. Mr. Vobora stated that it would.

Mr. Bennett stated that he would vote against the motion. He thought it was too close to a Board policy decision, and he was not comfortable giving the authority to staff to use a different boundary method.

Mr. Vobora stated that the only thing that would come back to the LTD Board would be a formal request for inclusion in the LTD district. Mr. Bennett added that Cottage Grove and/or Creswell also could make a formal request for a contract, even though LTD staff were not in support of that option. Mr. Vobora stated that the Cottage Grove City Council had not formally taken that action, but was favoring that option. LTD was being included in the language of Cottage Grove's draft plan to form its own district in the context of contracted service. Mr. Vobora thought it was important for LTD to give clear information to Cottage Grove and Creswell regarding the options that would be available to them, such as the only way to get LTD service would be to join the District.

Ms. Hocken stated that Mr. Bennett's point was that he was not ready to make that decision, because the Board had not really discussed the pros and cons of the options. Mr. Vobora asked if there were some answers that staff could work on for the next meeting in June that would help clarify the issues and options. One of the things that had occurred to staff was the impact on the other incorporated rural areas that LTD currently served.

Mr. Bennett stated that the relationship between Junction City, Veneta, Coburg, Pleasant Hill, and Elmira and the District, in his mind, was somewhat different than Cottage Grove. Cottage Grove was larger. He was interested in getting, on a competitive basis, as many public transit facilities in the region as possible. In Creswell, the payroll tax did not have the support of the business community. Mr. Bennett said he was very interested in being creative and considering this issue carefully. He was not willing to disregard the option of LTD providing service to the area on a negotiated contract basis.

Mr. Kortge stated that the users of the service were vociferous in wanting the service to continue. Business people were against paying a tax for people who would ride the bus to work in Eugene or Springfield. The business community was more favorable of building its own system to take care of internal ridership within Cottage Grove. Different tax options were discussed at the meeting. He thought that the motion would give staff more direction, but the broader policy issue would need further review and discussion.

Mr. Bailey stated that he did not understand the motion to ultimately decide the policy issue, but simply to provide some guidance in the negotiations. If a policy decision were to be made at a later date, then the Board did not need to vote on the motion. He thought as many options as possible should be considered.

Ms. Hocken stated that she had reviewed the motion. It did not say anything about other options that might be brought up at a later date.

**MOTION**

Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that, upon formal request of the elected officials of Cottage Grove and/or Creswell, LTD staff will work with LCOG to produce a new service boundary that follows the I-5 right-of-way and encompasses the urban growth boundaries of Cottage Grove and/or Creswell." Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett asked if the modified boundary essentially addressed only commuter service. Mr. Vobora responded that LTD would maintain the current intra-city circulator service, but would not necessarily expand that intra-city circulator service. Eventually, staff could review and propose a larger boundary to address additional service. Mr. Vobora added that any further boundary changes would need to be approved by the Board.

Ms. Loobey stated that once an area was in the service District, the Board had the authority to change the boundaries. Mr. Vobora added that boundary changes would be included as part of the Annual Route Review (ARR).

Mr. Bennett asked if Cottage Grove would support this new proposal. Mr. Meyer stated that he was not prepared to answer that question. The City of Cottage Grove had not had a chance to review and discuss the revised boundary option.

Ms. Hocken reiterated that this motion addressed a different way of doing business for LTD. LTD provided service within those boundaries where there was a demand. LTD did not decide not to send a bus down a particular street because there was not a business located there that paid the payroll tax. This motion introduced a different concept by matching the service to the revenue that was generated in the area.

**VOTE**

Ms. Hocken restated the motion and called for a vote. The vote was taken, and the motion passed by a vote of 4-2, with Bailey, Kleger, Kortge, and Murphy voting in favor, and Bennett and Hocken voting against.

**WORK SESSION: RIDERSHIP REVIEW:** Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the next meeting of the Board of Directors.

**EUGENE STATION PRESENTATION:** Ms. Loobey presented each Board member with a plaque commemorating his/her involvement with the design and building of the Eugene Station. The plaque contained a piece of the dichroic glass that was used in the station design. Ms. Hocken stated that when she used the bus she truly enjoyed the new station. It looked great, and she was impressed by how many people were there.

Ms. Murphy said that she had heard that using the new station reminded some people of using the euro-rail system. The feel and atmosphere of the station complemented Eugene.

Marketing Representative Dan Tutt stated that the plaques had been made by John Rose, who was the artist for the Eugene Station pyramids in the clock tower and the banners.

**REGULAR SESSION:** Ms. Hocken called to order the regular session of the Board of Directors at 7:00 p.m.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Hocken introduced the May 1998 Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Richard Shrope. Mr. Shrope was hired on August 24, 1995, and had achieved one year of safe driving, two years of correct schedule operation (CSO), and exceptional attendance. He was nominated by a customer for excellence in service and job accomplishments and excellence in providing accessible

bus service to customers with disabilities. The customer reported that "Richard got out of the bus at Harlow and Gateway streets and wheeled a sick man in a wheelchair across the street, because he felt the man would not make it across safely. He was very kind and caring."

Field Supervisor Marylee Bohrer wrote that Mr. Shrope not only had an excellent attendance record, but also he came to work like he really enjoyed it. His attitude about his job was extraordinary.

Ms. Hocken presented Mr. Shrope with a certificate of achievement, and a letter of congratulations. Mr. Shrope previously had received his monetary award. Mr. Shrope stated that he appreciated the honor and had been quite surprised at the recognition. He thanked the Board.

Ms. Hocken then introduced the June 1998 Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Rebecca (Becca) Emerson. Ms. Emerson was nominated by a customer with a disability, who used to be a professional driver and admitted to being extremely critical of other drivers and very nervous about trusting them. He described Ms. Emerson as an exceptional, pleasant driver who watched her mirrors. He said he could "relax and unbrace his feet from the back of the seat in front of him." When he was asked if he now trusted our buses enough to become a regular rider, he said that he did and would ride regularly. Additionally, Ms. Emerson received praise from the Eugene Police Department in June 1997 for her "exemplary assistance," along with two Downtown Guides and LTD System Supervisor Dennis Potter, in apprehending a person who had robbed someone at gunpoint.

Field Supervisor Gary Taylor wrote that Ms. Emerson deserved this award because she had been an exceptional employee who had "given 125 percent."

Ms. Hocken presented Ms. Emerson with a Certificate of Achievement, letter of congratulations, and a monetary award. Ms. Emerson thanked everyone for the award.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Ms. Hocken opened the audience participation portion of the meeting to anyone in the audience who wished to address the Board.

- 1) Mr. Lawrence Kagan of Eugene stated that in the south hills of Eugene, bus service stopped at 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue, yet the service boundary extended beyond that by one mile. He asked that bus service be increased to the city limits of Eugene and that the Board consider that service before school begins in the fall. There were many school children as well as people who shopped at the nearby Safeway who lived beyond 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He stated that he and two LTD staff members had taken a 30-foot bus out that afternoon to try the route. A turnaround area could be enlarged to accommodate the bus. There were several thousand people who had moved into Eugene and had moved into those hills and who were not served by the bus. He thought it was an error on LTD's part that should be corrected.

- 2) City Councilor Tim Laue of Eugene stated that he supported Mr. Kagan's suggestion. South Central Eugene was the Ward that he represented. The current growth was occurring near the urban growth boundary at the fringe of the city. School bus service for students had decreased quite a bit, and he asked the Board to at least do a survey and emulate the Crest Drive service using the smaller buses. He urged the Board to take a close look at this issue.

There was no further testimony. Ms. Hocken explained the Annual Route Review (ARR) process that already had been done for the Fall 1998 service changes. She asked if staff would have a revised recommendation. Mr. Vobora replied that he had reviewed the area. It had been considered before when a petition had been received from the Solar Heights neighborhood. Subsequently, a few of the neighbors in the area disagreed with the request, so the request was withdrawn. A 30-foot bus would allow LTD some opportunities in that area, but there were still some concerns with the timing involved. There was a potential turnaround spot that could be used and probably would be the best option. In order to address the request in the short term, there was an existing commuter route operating in the area that could be extended up into the requested area and could use the turnaround area. It would not add too much time to the schedule and would provide at least some commuter trips and school trips. Even though it was outside of the ARR process, there was money budgeted for contingency service as well as an ability to flex and meet needs. Mr. Vobora was concerned about it being outside of the ARR process. The city was growing in many different directions, and there were areas of the city that deserved service as much or more. While it would be nice to be able to extend service to the edge of all the urban growth boundaries, it was not something that could be done at this time, nor did it make sense in terms of productivity.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff had done a productivity analysis of the requested route. Mr. Vobora replied that deviations were hard to gauge. Seeing people walking into the neighborhood did not indicate that they would use the service, but if they were current riders, this might meet their needs. The greater concern was that it would be commuter service and would not be very flexible. He was not confident that adding the loop onto the existing route would generate a lot of additional ridership, although it would serve a large condominium complex. The route could be extended on a trial basis.

Ms. Hocken stated that the Board could not give staff direction on this issue until further research and discussion took place.

Mr. Bennett explained the productivity standard that was used as criteria to extend service or establish a new route. There were exceptions, such as lifeline service, where there was absolutely no nearby service at all. The Board would have to review this issue very carefully.

Mr. Kagan stated that the hill was a hardship in itself. He was not encouraging sprawl, and he was willing to pay a portion of black-topping the turnaround.

Mr. Bennett stated that he was trying to explain the policy context of this request in terms of trying to move LTD forward; where LTD was allocating its resources; how it was trying to increase its productivity so it could operate more efficiently and do the capital things that would get LTD ahead in the future.

Ms. Hocken stated that staff would further evaluate the issues and report back to the Board. Another issue was that buses would need to be rescheduled to ensure that a 30-foot bus always was on that route.

Ms. Murphy thanked Mr. Kagan and Mr. Laue for coming. She realized that students often carried very heavy backpacks. She thought that since school was in session just nine months of the year, possibly the bus service could be extended just during those nine months.

Mr. Kagan thanked the Board for considering the issue. Ms. Hocken thanked Mr. Kagan and Mr. Laue for coming.

MOTION

VOTE

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Bailey moved approval of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote of 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Murphy voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the March 18, 1998, regular Board meeting; the minutes of the April 15, 1998, canceled meeting; and Fiscal Year 1998-99 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goals.

MOTION

VOTE

**FIRST READING: SEVENTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35, AN ORDINANCE SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES:**

Ms. Loobey provided a brief background of the Ordinance. It had been presented to the Board at a prior meeting following a public hearing on the proposed fares. This was the Ordinance that implemented the results of discussion, analysis, and approval by the Board of the fare increases that were described. There were copies available for members of the audience. Mr. Kleger moved that Seventh Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Murphy voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken then read the Ordinance by title: "Seventh Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District services."

**FIRST READING: ORDINANCE NO. 36 - SECOND 1998 REVISION, REGULATIONS GOVERNING CONDUCT ON DISTRICT PROPERTY:**

Ms. Loobey stated that at the March meeting of the Board, the Board had directed staff to establish smoking and non-smoking areas on the platform of the Eugene Station. It had been done, and this Ordinance was the enabling and enacting Ordinance. The Board could

adopt it by reading the title only. She stated that copies were available for members of the audience. She mentioned that the document had been prepared in legislative style with deletions and additions shown.

**MOTION**

Mr. Kleger moved that Ordinance 36, Second 1998 Revision, be read by title only. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken noted that the title of item #1.15 (22) on page 6 of the Ordinance was different than the text. The text addressed any District station, while the title address only the Eugene Station. Transit Projects Administrator Rick Bailor stated that he was not sure what the intent was to label that section to be specific to the Eugene Station. Ms. Loobey added that other parts of the Ordinance applied District-wide. Ms. Loobey stated that "Eugene Station" would be stricken from the title, and the title would become "Boarding Platforms."

Ms. Hocken stated that if the Board approved the motion to read the Ordinance by title only, the Ordinance that would be read by title only would be the Ordinance as changed by the typographical correction to section 1.15(22). The other Board members agreed.

**VOTE**

Ms. Hocken then called for a vote on the motion, which passed by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Murphy voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken then read the Ordinance by title only: "Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, Second 1998 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property."

**VOLUNTARY RECOGNITION ISSUE:** Human Resources Manager Ed Ruttledge stated that with the creation of the new Eugene Station, a new customer area custodian position was created. Previously, all facility custodial services had been performed by contracted services. However, it was determined that this arrangement did not work well for some of the work to be done at the Eugene Station. The customer area custodian was created to be identifiable as an LTD employee who would be on the station performing custodial duties while customers were present to add an additional presence on the platform. Mr. Ruttledge stated that the person employed in this position was working as staff had intended, keeping the station neat and tidy, interacting with customers, and providing an extra set of eyes for problems that might occur.

The Local 757 of the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) approached Human Resources with its request that LTD voluntarily recognize that position as a represented position. ORS 243.666, paragraph 3, allowed an organization to voluntarily recognize a labor organization short of forcing the issue to an election. Mr. Ruttledge stated that it was his opinion that the Employment Relations Board would recognize this position as an appropriate part of the bargaining unit.

Mr. Ruttledge stated that there was the issue of how back-up and additional marginal work would be handled. This position worked 40 hours per week, but there were 58 hours of work available. With the specific recognition being proposed by staff, the marginal and back-up work would be performed by contracted services and would be performed during evenings, weekends, vacations, and holidays. If that marginal work became 30 or more hours, a second bargaining unit position would be created.

The union had tacitly agreed to the proposed recognition clause for contracted back-up and marginal work, and Mr. Ruttledge's recommendation was for the Board to approve the voluntary recognition. Once the Board adopted the recognition, negotiations would be held to discuss wages, hours, and terms and conditions for this position.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Ruttledge to explain the position description. Mr. Ruttledge stated that this position was responsible for keeping the platforms neat during peak customer hours. It mostly was exterior work, but rounds were made through the customer restrooms and inside customer areas.

Mr. Bennett asked about the office space custodial services. Mr. Ruttledge said that inside custodial services were performed at night by contracted services. Mr. Bennett said that if most janitorial work was contracted out, this work appeared to be more important than the other custodial work. If there was another 18 to 20 hours of work needed, Mr. Bennett asked why another person was not hired on a part-time basis within the constraints of the bargaining unit. Mr. Ruttledge responded that it would be more expensive than contracting the service. The current position covered the highest use, peak customer hours, which was the best coverage.

Mr. Bennett thought that if the position were so important, an employee who could cover the full-time position during vacations and other times should cover the other 18 hours. Mr. Ruttledge responded that staff would reevaluate the position in six months, and if warranted, would approach the Board for the additional hourly position. There was not yet enough data to make that determination. Mr. Ruttledge added that while sick days could not be pre-determined, vacations could be planned ahead in accordance with the low-usage periods, such as in the summer, when fewer people used the station.

Mr. Kleger added that the person in the current position was doing a great job, and he had heard positive comments from others as well.

Mr. Kortge agreed with Mr. Bennett that if the position were so important, the additional 18 hours should be covered by an employee as well, but he deferred to the judgement of staff.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors voluntarily recognizes Local 757 of



## VOTE

the Amalgamated Transit Union to be the bargaining agent for the position of Customer Service Custodian as occupied by Diane Petersen. Further, in the event that the residual work for such position is increased to thirty (30) or more regularly-scheduled hours per week, a second position of Customer Service Custodian shall be created and be included in the bargaining unit." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, and Murphy voting in favor, and none opposed.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: LCC GROUP PASS UPDATE:** Ms. Hocken stated that an agreement had been reached with LCC. She asked Mr. Vobora to explain the agreement. Mr. Vobora stated that LCC had agreed to allocate \$100,000 from bookstore profits to subsidize the student passes for one year, and LTD agreed to discount the three-month pass to \$29.00 per term. Mr. Vobora would discuss this issue in more detail during the ridership work session to be held in June. This would be a demonstration project to gather data. Ms. Hocken stated that the reason LTD did not further pursue the traditional group pass program was that LCC did not want the students or the college to assess additional student fees.

**MPC:** Mr. Bennett reported that the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) had discussed the issue around the new tax initiative, the transportation utility tax. The proposed tax would allow for ongoing maintenance and preservation work in addition to capital projects. Mr. Bennett favored the concept of tolls for capital projects, even though he did not know all the technical implications. The proposed tax was not gaining much momentum politically. Ms. Hocken added that there also was some discussion about the financing issues for TransPlan. Part of the concern was that Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) was included with references to a large amount of money, but not specifically how much money would be needed. Short-term figures were included to ensure a place in TransPlan, and it was indicated that there would be longer-term costs, but LTD did not yet know what those costs would be. TransPlan was to be a 20-year plan, and it was important that there be a way to get the financing for the 20-year BRT plan into TransPlan.

**STATEWIDE LIVABILITY FORUM:** Ms. Hocken had been unable to attend the last meeting, which was held in April, so she had no information about that forum.

**SPRINGFIELD STATION STEERING COMMITTEE:** Ms. Murphy reported that she was very pleased with the committee, and at its initial meeting, the committee toured the Eugene Station, several other stations, and the Springfield Station study area. The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, May 21, 1998.

Ms. Murphy added that she and Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn had attended a Civic Entrepreneur Group workshop in California. There were 13 civic leaders from Springfield in attendance. The group chose the Springfield Station as one of the pilot projects that it wanted to see happen in the near future. It was seen as a nucleus for revitalizing the downtown Springfield area.

**BRT STEERING COMMITTEE:** Mr. Bailey reported that the initial meeting of the committee had been held. He also thought that this was a good group; however, there was not yet a Springfield City Council representation on the committee. The initial meeting was very informational. Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) representative Don Erich had presented ODOT concerns about BRT route configuration. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano stated that staff would hold more conversations with ODOT staff to further understand what their concerns were. Two-thirds of the pilot corridor were ODOT governed.

**MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson reported that there were no adverse conditions during March and April. Revenues were strong. In June, staff would present the approved budget for adoption by the Board. With the exception of minor adjustments to the capital budget to account for projects originally budgeted for this spring that had now been delayed until summer, the budget would be presented as approved by the Budget Committee. Those projects were the radio and parking lot sealing projects.

Mr. Bennett asked Ms. Hellekson to address budget assumptions that had been made with respect to increased ridership that were consistent with recent prior years. Ms. Hellekson said that the budget that had been approved in April took the recent trends in ridership and ridership fares into account and projected conservative estimates for FY 1998-99. She was comfortable that staff had been conservative enough in their estimates. Mr. Vobora would talk about what staff thought was going on with ridership at next month's work session.

**GFOA AWARD:** Ms. Hocken reported that for the second year in a row, LTD had been given the Government Finance Officer's Association Certificate of Achievement for excellence in financial reporting. Ms. Hocken congratulated Ms. Hellekson. Ms. Hellekson added that Assistant Finance Manager Roy Burling deserved recognition as well. He had worked very hard on the project.

**TRANSIT LESSONS FROM SOUTH AMERICA:** Mr. Viggiano had been chosen to participate in an International Transit Studies Program (ITSP) tour of transit systems in five South American cities. The ITSP was funded through the National Academy of Sciences, was associated with the Transportation Research Board, and was managed by the ENO Foundation. The group, composed of 14 transit professionals from around the United States, visited Buenos Aires, Argentina; Montevideo, Uruguay; and the Brazilian cities of Porto Alegre, Curitiba, and Sao Paulo. Each of the five cities had very high transit ridership and provided some valuable lessons for the group.

Mr. Viggiano showed some slides of busways and discussed the recent trip. The purpose of the trip was twofold. One was to look at privatization, and the other was to look at low-cost solutions. Three of the cities visited used busways, which was Mr. Viggiano's main interest since it was a key element in the proposed BRT system.

Mr. Viggiano noted that Buenos Aires was the largest city visited, with 13 million people. There were 11,000 buses in its transit system. Buses carried 50 percent of total trips, which was down from 70 percent; car ownership was increasing. One of the lessons that LTD could learn from Buenos Aires and Montevideo was that they were not doing anything to try to give their buses priority on their city streets, and unless there was a clear advantage, people would choose the car over the bus in congested areas. In Curitiba and Porto Alegre, where buses were given priority, the modal split was held much better, even though car ownership was increasing in those locations. Also, people would choose the car if the bus waiting platforms were not attractive or comfortable. It was clear that even when the roads became extremely congested, people would not choose the bus, unless there was a distinct advantage. He thought this was consistent with LTD's approach on BRT.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Viggiano to comment about whether the fundamentals the he saw on the trip were consistent with what LTD was planning with BRT.

Mr. Viggiano concluded that what he saw reinforced that LTD was on the right track and that the concepts that LTD was proposing in BRT really did work. It would take time to implement something like BRT and be successful, and LTD needed to reinforce the benefits of the long-range strategy. In Curitiba, it took 30 years to create the transit system that they now had.

Ms. Murphy asked if LTD had looked at other brands of buses, like Volvo. Mr. Viggiano replied that in order for LTD to use federal funds, the buses must be at least 51 percent American made, and they must pass the Altoona testing. As far as he knew, Volvo would not meet either of those specifications. Mr. Bennett added that he and Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron had talked with FTA Director Ed Thomas about the limited design standards. Mr. Thomas sounded very receptive, and Mr. Bennett was hoping for change to get more flexibility in bus purchases.

Ms. Loobey stated that LTD might be able to get some type of an exemption by working through the Oregon delegation and Senator Frank Wolfe. Congress set up those rules, and they were in the law. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) would need to be amended to do that; however, special consideration could be given for demonstration projects.

Mr. Viggiano thought that an American company might be convinced to develop a more modern-looking bus. Ms. Loobey stated that she had a discussion with Gary Wilms of Gillig about developing a new design, and he stated that if a large windshield were installed, and it became cracked or chipped, the entire unit needed to be replaced at great cost. He said that Gillig had tried that with little success. There were other design issues that could be considered, and Ms. Loobey said that the pressure was on the American manufacturers to work on new designs. Ms. Hellekson added that the Buy America rule only applied to purchases using federal funds.

Mr. Kleger stated that some international trade agreements had provisions that could be interpreted as excluding domestic content regulations as being non-tariff barriers. Ms. Loobey added that part of the problem had been with the up and down cycle of federal funding that resulted in an inconsistent ordering process for new coaches.

Ms. Loobey further stated that since rail rehabilitation dollars had increased at the expense of buses, there was very little bus money available, and that imbalance had hurt the competition for larger transit vehicles.

Ms. Loobey added that Cleveland was sending a large delegation to visit South American transit agencies because American transit districts were now beginning to seriously consider the BRT concept. Mr. Viggiano added that Cleveland, Boston, and Los Angeles were now considering BRT.

**BOARD SCHEDULES:** Mr. Bennett stated that he would be out of town often during the summer, and he asked if any of the Board members would be interested in moving the June meeting from June 17 to June 10. It was possible that Mr. Bennett could be reached by conference call on June 17 to vote on the budget. He also questioned whether it made sense for him to continue as Chair of the BRT Steering Committee or even to participate from a distance.

Ms. Loobey stated that there would be three members of the Board absent on June 17, so she would work with her secretary to adjourn that meeting to another date, either to June 10 or June 24.


Mr. Viggiano stated that he had looked at Mr. Bennett's schedule, and the BRT Steering Committee meetings were scheduled for the first Thursday of each month. It appeared that Mr. Bennett would be able to attend the June meeting, and it was likely that there would not be a July meeting. Mr. Bennett would be in town for the August meeting. Mr. Bennett agreed to continue as Chair of that committee.

Ms. Loobey would notify the Board of the date for the June Board meeting.

**MONTHLY STAFF REPORT:** A) Ridership. Ms. Loobey reported that April ridership statistics showed a 12 percent increase in Saturday ridership and a 2-percent increase in weekday ridership. This was the first month of operation in the Eugene Station, and staff were pleased by those numbers. B) McDonald Building. Ms. Loobey spoke with Mr. Geiger, who owned both the McDonald Theatre and the Gibson buildings. He revealed some very exciting plans for those buildings, such as the location of a pharmacy in the northeast corner where the LTD CSC used to be, the addition of a deli, and the location of a restaurant facing the Eugene Station platform. The Rice-n-Spice store had planned to become more of a general convenience store instead of a specialty store and would be located in the Gibson building. The outside of the building was to be updated with new windows, doors, and awnings. He mentioned that the awnings would be the same color as the arches at the Eugene Station. Ms.

Loobey stated that this was all very exciting, and the area would be even more enhanced if the library were to be located across from the Sears Building. C) Eugene Station Operational Issues. Ms. Loobey noted that a report was included in the packet about the operational issues at the station. She said that the station was working even better than hoped with all the effort and input that went into the design. Issues that came up were being dealt with and resolved. D) Low-floor bus prototype. The prototype has been returned to Gillig to address problems in the drivers' cabin. The Board would have the opportunity to tour the bus once it returned to LTD.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken adjourned the meeting at 8:47 p.m.

  
Board Secretary