

MINUTES OF THE DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, June 24, 1998

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 18, 1998, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, June 24, 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  
Patricia Hocken, President, presiding  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Dean Kortge  
Mary Murphy, Secretary  
Hillary Wylie  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER:** Board President Pat Hocken called the special meeting to order at 5:38 p.m.

**WORK SESSION -- CRESWELL AND COTTAGE GROVE SERVICE:**  
Ms. Hocken recognized that there were members of the audience who were interested in this issue, and even though there was no public testimony planned during this work session, she asked if anyone wished to address the Board.

Cottage Grove resident Don Nordin stated that he had addressed the Lane County Board of Commissioners earlier that day. In the process of considering service to Cottage Grove, the Cottage Grove City Council had reviewed an option to form its own district, and contract with LTD for its bus service. There was concern from other entities, such as Oakridge and Florence, which were in need of transportation services as well. Mr. Nordin had suggested to the Lane County Commissioners that all the rural communities in Lane County form a unified rural transit district that could, in turn, form a relationship with LTD.

No one else from the audience wished to speak. Ms. Hocken introduced Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora, who would provide an update on the Cottage Grove service issue.

Prior to discussing Cottage Grove service, Mr. Vobora passed around a plaque that LTD had received from *The Register-Guard*, which recognized LTD's participation in the Partners in Education program, in which organizations sponsored the distribution of newspapers to area classrooms for teachers to use.

Mr. Vobora discussed the history of LTD's service to Cottage Grove and the options that the Cottage Grove City Council had considered. He reported that on Monday, June 22, 1998, the Cottage Grove City Council met and elected to refer a ballot measure to the voters requesting annexation into the LTD District boundaries, using the modified boundary that had been presented to the LTD Board in May. The ballot measure would be read at the council meetings in July and August. LTD would wait to see the outcome of the election in November. In addition, an amendment to the current contract with Cottage Grove would be made before September to continue the service through the November election.

If the ballot measure passed, the service package would continue through the fall bid. Modifications to service would be considered for the winter bid, and the taxing issues would be resolved during that period. Additionally, staff would present the redefined boundary ordinance to the LTD Board for approval in November.

Mr. Kortge asked if the voters would be asked only to vote on whether or not to join LTD, or also on the modified boundary. Mr. Vobora replied that they would be asked whether or not to join LTD.

Mr. Vobora also mentioned that the Friends of LTD group who had initiated the petition for the test project also had gathered signatures and had a ballot measure ready to submit, if the City Council changed its current stance.

The Creswell City Council voted to request annexation into LTD, within the narrower boundary definition, and wanted direction from the LTD Board as to what its stand was with respect to that request. Staff did not believe the Board needed to make a decision right away because of the interrelationship between the Creswell and Cottage Grove service. If the vote in Cottage Grove was negative, there would be some further considerations for Creswell service, such as the tax base and productivity standards. Staff planned to present the various options with associated costs to the Board in August.

Ms. Wylie asked if the Board had developed a rural (outside the urban area) service policy. Mr. Vobora replied that the rural service policy was contained within the overall service policy.

Ms. Hocken asked if there had ever been a situation where a rural area had requested annexation but was turned down. Ms. Loobey responded that Marcola had requested annexation, but was turned down because neither the taxing base nor the productivity standards were met.

Mr. Kortge asked if LTD would be precluded from using the standard 2.5-mile boundary application in Cottage Grove. Mr. Vobora responded that the modified boundary was preferred by the Cottage Grove City Council, and it was the only option the Council would have governance over, but LTD was not limited to imposing that modified boundary.

Ms. Wylie asked if there had been any federal programs for rural application issues. Ms. Loobey responded that the federal Section 18 program provided funds for rural areas both for capital and for operating expenses. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) was being re-written and was now called the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). Funding for rural areas had been increased in the current TEA-21. Creswell would have to become a district, or constitute itself as an acceptable entity, to use those funds.

Mr. Kortge asked if a unified rural district, as Mr. Nordin had discussed, would qualify for TEA-21 funding. Ms. Loobey responded that it would, but that it would have to meet other strict requirements, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and labor requirements.

Ms. Wylie asked if LTD could put together a rural package and apply for rural funding if Cottage Grove and Creswell joined the LTD District. Ms. Loobey responded that LTD had qualified and used Section 18 funds to support its rural routes. Ms. Wylie asked if LTD put a rural package together that included all of rural Lane County, as Mr. Nordin discussed, whether LTD could then realize more money in rural funding to pay for service to those areas. Ms. Loobey responded that she did not believe that there would be a sufficient amount of money available to LTD to buy adequate fleet to provide an acceptable level of service. There also were the operating and maintenance costs to consider.

**MOTION**

Mr. Kortge then moved that the Board direct staff to develop a menu of service and boundary options for Creswell service for future Board consideration. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Vobora for clarification about the service cost for Creswell service. Mr. Vobora responded that he developed the cost of \$120,000 based on the total trip time, average number of trips, and total number of service hours.

Ms. Murphy asked about the number of boardings that were made by group pass participants from Cottage Grove and Creswell. Mr. Vobora replied that a large number of riders held group passes. Token use, which made up 5 percent to 6 percent of the ridership in the metro area, was 12 percent to 15 percent on the Cottage Grove route. Pass use, which constituted a high percentage of the ridership in the metro area, also was high on the Cottage Grove route, with group passes making up an even higher percentage.

Ms. Murphy asked that staff include a consideration that people in Cottage Grove could park and ride from Creswell, and obtain a firm count of group pass participants from that area. Mr. Vobora stated that the Park & Ride lot in Creswell was temporary, and a new site would need to be located.

**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken called for a vote on the motion to direct staff to develop a menu of service and boundary options for Creswell service, which passed by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken added that the issue was not so much rural versus metro, but one of setting up a different funding mechanism and a different way for LTD to do business. The Board was attempting to move slowly in order to explore all the options.

**WORK SESSION -- RIDERSHIP REVIEW:** Mr. Vobora discussed the trends in ridership, the analysis of those trends, and a direction for growth. He reviewed the ridership, service, and service area population statistics between 1970 and 1997. During the last three years, LTD had increased service by 8.25 percent, but half of that increase went into service fixes, rather than new service.

Mr. Bailey asked about the decline in ridership that occurred in late 1994. Mr. Vobora was not sure what it was related to, but said that staff would research that decline and provide an answer to the Board. Mr. Kleger stated that he thought it could have been due to the unpleasant labor relationship at that time.

Mr. Vobora discussed the current trend of flat ridership. External influences could include lower fuel prices, parking availability and pricing, car ownership, weather, and development patterns. He discussed each of the influences. He noted that LTD fares had kept pace with inflation, while fuel prices had not. There was a net increase in available downtown parking spaces during the last three to five years; however, there was an overall decrease in downtown parking spaces per downtown employee. Parking prices were averaging \$32.00 to \$50.00 per month. Car ownership had increased per capita. Households without cars had dropped to fewer than 9 percent nationwide. Financing rates were low, and the economy was strong. As for development patterns, employers were moving to the fringes of the city, where adequate bus service was not available to employees.

Internal factors included price increases. The #80-series routes serving LCC had experienced a significant drop in ridership during the past four years following the phasing out of the term pass. Weekend fare was increased to regular fare in September of 1996, and a 16 percent drop in ridership occurred almost immediately. In the fall of 1997, when LTD increased cash fare from \$.80 to \$1.00, there was a 30 percent decrease in Saturday ridership, and weekend ridership had been down each month. The drop in weekend ridership fueled the overall decline in ridership. Weekend ridership generally was made up of discriminate riders, who chose to ride

the bus and pay cash fare. During the weekday, ridership was made up mainly of pass holders commuting to and from work and school.

Another internal factor was the Eugene Station. There were a number of problems with the old station along 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and during construction, ridership dropped off even more. There were several service quality issues, such as missed transfers and trips and, at times, a poor telephone response time. In addition, Mr. Vobora stated that the marketing focus had been fragmented since the staff reorganization two years ago.

In response to the decline in ridership, staff planned to focus on a number of different target markets, such as LCC, where a subsidized pass program had been developed.

Ms. Hocken added a clarification to the LCC subsidized pass program. She stated that in some recent materials, it was not clear that LTD was not subsidizing the pass. LTD was offering LCC a cost of \$54.00 per three-month pass, a 10 percent discount, and LCC was contributing the other \$25.00 per pass to enable the students to purchase a three-month term pass for \$29.00.

Mr. Vobora stated that another target market would be the downtown employees. Staff would concentrate on current group pass organizations and adding new ones. In addition, staff would concentrate more closely on the youth and senior markets.

Staff planned to be more aggressive in service quality marketing; in particular, the Eugene Station, on-time performance, and telephone service response.

Ms. Murphy asked how LTD's web site had been used. Mr. Vobora responded that staff were having discussions about using the web site more as a marketing tool. The addition of routes and schedules was expected to be completed before the fall bid.

Another service quality issue was the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR). The research for that would begin during the fall of 1998. Also, staff were developing a strategic marketing plan, which would be a unified long-term plan for more research, such as an origin and destination (O&D) study, a non-rider survey, and a market-area study.

Over the long term, staff had observed the variations in ridership and were able to determine what some of the causes of increases or decreases were. Staff would continue to monitor ridership and hold discussions with the Board.

Mr. Kortge asked if staff could pinpoint the big ridership increases. Mr. Vobora replied that staff could account for ridership increases, but decreases were harder to pinpoint. Staff always worked to retain riders, but, in actuality,

because of the University population, about one-third of the ridership was replaced each year.

Mr. Bailey asked if staff had considered ways to influence the outside factors more positively. Mr. Vobora replied that intergovernmental partnerships and the TransPlan were critical in encouraging people to use transit. For instance, in regard to public parking pricing, Mr. Vobora thought there were some opportunities there to raise those prices to encourage bus ridership. Mr. Kleger stated that he thought the \$50.00 cap was for public parking, while the private lots had no cap. He had conversations with people who thought parking costs were too high, and others who thought the parking costs were too low.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Hocken introduced the July 1998 Employee of the Month, General Service Worker Larry Stavros. Mr. Stavros was hired on August 1, 1993, and had received awards for three years' no time loss and exceptional attendance. As a general service worker, Mr. Stavros was responsible for fueling the buses and checking fluid levels. He also checked tires and looked for and reported any potential problems.

Mr. Stavros was nominated by a co-worker who said that Mr. Stavros was always willing to do his work to the best of his abilities, and got high ratings as a worker and person and received a great deal of respect from his peers. He willingly did more than expected of him and helped with special events, such as the JoyRide or shuttling the downtown hot bus. Mr. Stavros always had a positive approach to his job and displayed that image while performing his tasks. Mr. Stavros was a very pleasant person to be around and work with.

Mr. Stavros attended the meeting, and Ms. Hocken presented him with a certificate of appreciation, a letter of congratulations, and a monetary award. Mr. Stavros thanked the Board and stated that he was very honored and that LTD was a great place to work.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Steve Leppenen of Eugene addressed the Board about Ordinance 36. He stated one of the special places that Oregon held in U.S. history was the invention of the initiative, referendum, and recall. He, personally, spent a lot of his time and energy working on two initiatives. He had been informed by the LTD management and counsel that he could not do it at the downtown station. The primary concern that had been given to him was safety of the passengers and easy access to boarding and off-loading the buses.

He stated that the station at its narrowest was 35 feet wide. That was wider than most houses. By standing on the platform with a board in his hand, he did not think that he was a liability to the safety of LTD passengers. He had talked with Assistant General manager Mark Pangborn and Executive Secretary Jo Sullivan to try to get his issue on the agenda for the meeting, but met with little luck. He asked the Board to take emergency action to amend Ordinance 36, Section 1.5, 23(b), which currently read that 'no persons shall seek signatures on any petition, collect

monies, solicit sales, or distribute anything of commercial or non-commercial value on any District vehicle, or within 5 feet of any vehicle doorway, or within 5 feet of any District station doorway, kiosk, ticket counter, boarding platform, bus stop, or shelter, nor otherwise to interfere with passenger safety.' He asked the Board to drop the part about boarding platforms, bus stops, or shelters. He stated that if the Board did not take this action, he guessed he would get arrested, if that was what it took to secure the right to petition.

He stated that he was sure LTD's lawyer was smug and confident in the idea that this statute would stand up in any court. But, he reminded the Board that the City of Eugene's lawyers were smugly confident about one of its ordinances, and they spent \$45,000 in an effort to keep the streets of Eugene safe from "Frog" jokes, and they failed. He said he really did not want to go through with getting ticketed and/or arrested, but if that was what it took, he would. Again, he strongly urged the Board to take emergency action to suspend enforcement of boarding platform, bus stop, or shelter solicitations, in section 1.5, 23(b). If not, he said, everyone would be in for a long series of hassles. He said he was sorry, but that was the way it would be.

Ms. Hocken thanked Mr. Leppenen for his comments. She stated that the Board had Ordinance 36 on the agenda for discussion later in the meeting, and she thought the Board should wait until that item came up before discussing it.

No one else wished to speak to the Board, so Ms. Hocken closed the audience participation portion of the meeting.

**MOTION****VOTE**

**CONSENT:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for June 24, 1998, is approved as presented." Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, which passed by a unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 1998-99 BUDGET: Staff Presentation:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson reported that the Budget Committee approved the budget for Fiscal Year 1998-99 on April 23, 1998. The operating budget was \$18,954,537, which represented an 8.4 percent increase. The grand total of all combined funds plus reserves and transfers was \$47,897,187, or 1.3 percent more than the current year.

Ms. Hellekson noted a change to the appropriations by general category. The Personnel Services category was reduced by \$50,633 in order to remove appropriations for the weekend cleaning of the Eugene Station that originally had been budgeted for an employee, but now would be contracted from an outside service provider, and to eliminate the inadvertently double-budgeted amount for a Transit Operations training position. The Materials and Services category had been increased by the same amount to provide for the additional Eugene Station contracted cleaning and to adequately provide for the net debt service that would be

required after December 31, 1998, for the loan from the Oregon Transportation Infrastructure Bank (OTIB).

The total appropriation for the Capital Fund had been increased by \$410,000. Four projects that originally were scheduled for completion in FY 1997-98 accounted for this increase. The \$410,000 did not represent an increase in spending, but rather a reprogramming of project expenditures from the current fiscal year to FY 1998-99.

Ms. Hellekson explained that all of the changes proposed for the General Fund and Capital Fund were well within the scope of what legally could be approved by the Board without referral back to the Budget Committee. However, a description of those changes, if approved, would be reported to the non-Board members of the Budget Committee.

**Public Hearing:** Ms. Hocken opened a public hearing on the proposed Fiscal Year 1998-99 budget. No one wished to address the Board, and Ms. Hocken closed the public hearing.

**MOTION**

**Board Deliberation:** Mr. Kleger moved approval of a Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 1998-99 budget and appropriating \$47,897,187 as represented in the Resolution. Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. Mr. Kleger thanked Ms. Hellekson for a job well done.

**VOTE**

**SOUTH WILLAMETTE STREET SERVICE REQUEST:** A request for service south of 46<sup>th</sup> Avenue on Willamette Street was made at the May Board meeting by a resident of that neighborhood, and the Board had requested a staff response at the June meeting. Mr. Vobora reported that staff had reviewed previously considered service options and completed an on-site visit of the area to examine changes that had occurred. Staff had several concerns regarding the adding of service to the FY 1998-99 service package, which already had been approved, and recommended that this request for service be included in the FY 1999-00 annual route review process, in which all service requests would be considered.

Mr. Bailey asked if staff had talked with the proponents. Mr. Vobora responded that he had sent a summary of findings. Mr. Hocken suggested sending a time line for the annual route review.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kortge moved that staff include this request for service in the 1999 annual route review. Ms. Murphy seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against. Mr. Bailey commented that he appreciated that people came to the Board outside the annual route review process.

**VOTE**

**SECOND READING AND ADOPTION: SEVENTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35, AN ORDINANCE SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES:** Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano was present to answer any



further questions the Board might have regarding the ordinance, but stated that the Board previously had received information about it. There were no questions from the Board.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Mr. Bailey moved that Seventh Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

Ms. Hocken then read the ordinance by title only, "Seventh Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services." This was the seconded reading of the Ordinance, and Ms. Hocken stated that the Board now could adopt the Ordinance.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the Board of Directors adopts Seventh Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services, effective 30 days after adoption. Ms. Wylie seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

**SECOND READING AND ADOPTION: ORDINANCE NO. 36 – SECOND 1998 REVISION, REGULATIONS GOVERNING CONDUCT ON DISTRICT PROPERTY:**

Ms. Hocken stated that this was the ordinance that Mr. Leppenen had referred to in his earlier testimony to the Board. She asked if staff had a response to Mr. Leppenen's concerns. Ms. Loobey stated that staff had carefully looked at the issue of safety and security at the station. One-third of the square footage in the two plazas was available for other activities, such as collecting signatures for initiative petitions, which were not allowed on the platforms proper for safety and operational reasons. Staff believed that the growing body of case law allowed transit districts latitude to protect the use of their properties, and staff had carefully crafted and done the research around this issue. Staff also recognized that this was a sensitive issue.

Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn added that the Board had held this discussion when Roger Saydack was a member of the Board. Mr. Saydack had stated that LTD would want to be very careful about the legal precedent in terms of limited use. The most significant issue was that LTD was not disallowing the use of the station for other activities, but those activities were limited to those areas, such as the plazas, that were not specifically designed for the purpose of boarding, deboarding, and transferring passengers. He stated that if someone wished to challenge the ordinance, LTD would work through that challenge in a judicious way. However, Mr. Pangborn thought that the Board had been very mindful of the issue and concern.

In response to the issue that Mr. Lepennen raised about one person on the platform with a clipboard taking up little space, Mr. Pangborn stated that LTD could not limit the use to one person or one activity. If it were opened to activities at all, it

would be to the full range of activities, which could result in many people using the platforms for those other activities.

Mr. Kleger stated that he had seen many occasions where people encountered friends on the platform, which tended to cause a traffic jam. He also had watched petition gatherers, and he believed that LTD needed to craft ordinances to meet the general pattern, and not to what an individual would do. He has experienced petition gatherers who were blocking his entrance into a grocery store, and he believed that the same thing would happen on the platform. He believed it would be dangerous on the platform, particularly during peak pulse times. He noted that the plaza areas were available, and he thought the traffic flow was good in those areas, and while friendly encounters were not lasting long, people already were stepping off the platform to avoid those groups.

Ms. Murphy stated that she had issue with the captive audience issue, and that was as the Board dealt with setting policy and giving direction, LTD was about the business of transportation. She believed in the free speech in the forum of petition-seeking instruments, but she also believed in the northeast corner being available for the free flow of public and the public plaza area. She was concerned about the captive audience issue, and the fact that people were unable to remove themselves from that environment or that situation, where they were about the business of transportation, whether for boarding, transferring, or meeting someone there. She stated that she believed the captive audience issue was one that needed to be considered in addition to the activities that could take place.

Mr. Bailey stated that he thought this was an important issue. The Board had not been unmindful of the free speech issues, and in fact, because there had been concern about it, the Board had attempted to design an ordinance that would have the least amount of impact, yet still accommodate the safety issues. The "Frog" case, which Mr. Leppenen had mentioned, was a very interesting one. The key thing about that case was not that the ordinance that was impacting that situation was wrong on its face, but was applied inappropriately. Mr. Bailey thought that in a democracy in the great state of Oregon, all ordinances should be vigilantly applied in a fashion that was fair and equitable for everyone. It was the intent of the Board that this ordinance be applied appropriately, and staff and the Board would be vigilant to make sure that, in fact, it was applied as it was intended, fairly and equitably for all. Mr. Bailey repeated that the Board was not unmindful of the first amendment concern, while still trying to protect the safety of LTD passengers and the citizens of Eugene and Springfield.

Mr. Kortge stated that while he had not been a member of the Board during Mr. Saydack's term, but having been mindful of individual rights, he could appreciate the petition. Although it could seem from the vantage point of one petitioner to be the sole person allowed to conduct business on the platform, the Board should be mindful of what that would open. Not only would LTD have one petitioner on the platform, but the possibility of the platform becoming crowded with similar activities.

He was in favor of keeping the boundaries as they were in Ordinance 36, to protect the transit users. He believed it was a fair application of the ordinance.

Ms. Hocken asked the other members of the Board if they wished to take any other action regarding Ordinance 36 than what was proposed by staff in the agenda packet. They did not.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey moved that Ordinance 36, Second 1998 Revision, be read by title only. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against. Copies of the full ordinance were available to the audience.

**VOTE**

Ms. Hocken read the Ordinance by title only: "Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, Second 1998 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property." She explained that this had been the second reading of the ordinance, and the Board could now adopt the ordinance if it wished to do so.

**MOTION**

Mr. Bailey then moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, Second 1998 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property, as read. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion.

Mr. Kleger stated that the Board had been working on this ordinance primarily because of the smoking issues, and he had noticed that some of the no-smoking signs had disappeared. Mr. Vobora stated that staff were working on permanent signage that would be attached to trash receptacles. The signs would address more than just the smoking issue.

Ms. Wylie asked about a clause in the ordinance that read, ". . . the General Manager or his or her designee may designate appropriate areas where smoking is permitted . . ." She wondered if something had changed, and why non-smoking areas were not designated in the ordinance. Ms. Loobey stated that the ordinance addressed all District property, and not just the Eugene Station.

**VOTE**

There being no further questions, Ms. Hocken called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

**RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES:** Ms. Loobey stated that the Board was required to reaffirm the District's boundaries on an annual basis. Ms. Hocken asked about the time line that was listed in the agenda packet for future boundary action. There was a comprehensive review of the boundaries to ensure that they were in compliance, and the Board would hold two readings of the boundary ordinance in October, then the Cottage Grove service issue would be decided by election in November.

Mr. Pangborn responded that state law required that prior to the end of the fiscal year, the Board must reaffirm the boundaries. Ms. Hellekson stated that she had received communications from several self-employed taxpayers, who had inquired as to why the boundaries were drawn where they were. When it was just the payroll tax being assessed, the boundary lines were relatively immaterial, because most of the major businesses fell within the 2.5 mile limit, and most were within the urban growth boundary. Once the self-employment tax was imposed, there were a number of rural taxpayers who were well beyond 2.5 miles of the nearest service. As she had investigated those individual cases, she determined that when the boundary was originally drawn, LTD had not been considering a potential self-employment tax. She was working with Mr. Vobora on a project to come up with a rationale for a new boundary that would be more equitable, primarily for self-employment taxpayers, but also for all taxpayers. There was a formula that defined where the boundary should be.

Mr. Vobora added that with respect to the addition of Cottage Grove and Creswell to the boundaries, staff wanted to keep that issue separate, since it would have no impact on the rest of the District boundary. Notifications would need to be sent to people who would be affected by the boundary change. Staff would propose that the original boundary modifications go forward irrespective of the Cottage Grove/Creswell issue.

Ms. Hellekson added that there was a correction to the time line found on page 69 of the Board packet. There were some restrictions to making changes in an election year. LTD could not make changes to the boundaries within 90 days of a primary or general election. The attorney recommended, and staff agreed, that the application of the ordinance change be prospective to January 1, 1999, and not November, 1998, as indicated in the agenda packet.

Mr. Bailey asked if the law stated that a vote on the District boundary ordinance or implementation of modifications to the boundaries could not be held within 90 days of an election. Ms. Hellekson responded that it addressed implementation, and the Board would, in fact, hold two readings of the ordinance prior to the election, but the effective date would occur 30 days after the second reading or on a date specified by the Board. Ms. Hellekson added that the effective date could be longer, but not shorter than 30 days after the second reading. By setting the effective date to January 1, 1999, the paperwork involved for the taxpayers would be simplified.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the resolution reaffirming that Lane Transit District will continue to operate service within the boundaries specified in Lane Transit District Ordinance No. 24. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote of 6 to 0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**VOTE**

**ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS:** Ms. Hocken stated that the Board would elect four officers, President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer, to

each serve two years. She stated that she was stepping down as President of the Board, and she thanked everyone for her opportunity to serve as President for the past four and one-half years. She said it had been a lot of fun, a lot of work, and she was looking forward to just being a member. Mr. Kleger stated that he had enjoyed her presidency. Mr. Bailey echoed Mr. Kleger's sentiment and thanked Ms. Hocken for serving as President.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken then called for nominations for the office of President of the Board for a two-year term. Mr. Kleger nominated Mr. Bailey, and Mr. Kortge seconded the nomination. There being no other nominations, a vote was taken, and Mr. Bailey was elected Board President by a vote of 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken then called for nominations for the office of Vice President of the Board for a two-year term. Mr. Bailey nominated Mr. Bennett, and Mr. Kleger seconded the nomination. There being no other nominations, a vote was taken, and Mr. Bennett was elected Vice President of the Board by a vote of 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken then called for nominations for the office of Secretary of the Board for a two-year term. Ms. Murphy nominated Ms. Wylie, and Mr. Kortge seconded the nomination. There being no other nominations, a vote was taken, and Ms. Wylie was elected Secretary of the Board by a vote of 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken then called for nominations for the office of Treasurer of the Board for a two-year term. Mr. Kortge nominated incumbent Dave Kleger, and Mr. Bailey seconded the nomination. There being no other nominations, a vote was taken, and Mr. Kleger was re-elected Treasurer of the Board by a vote of 6-0, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Murphy, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**TRANSIT INFORMATION EXCHANGE:** Ms. Hocken mentioned that the Board had been given information regarding the Transit Information Exchange conference that LTD would be hosting in Eugene at the Valley River Inn. If Board members were interested in attending any of the sessions, they were to let Executive Secretary Jo Sullivan know.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:** a) MPC. Ms. Hocken reported that TransPlan issues were moving forward. She thought the key issue was the Transportation Planning Rule and the VMT reduction. There would be more information later from Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano. b) STATEWIDE LIVABILITY FORUM. Ms. Hocken reported that the last meeting had been held in April, and there were no more meetings scheduled until October. c) BRT STEERING COMMITTEE. Mr. Bailey reported that the last meeting was held on June 10, 1998. The community outreach plan was discussed, and committee members wanted more information. A public design workshop was being planned for September. Ms.

Hocken stated that she thought the community members and other agency members would be great on that committee. Mr. Viggiano stated that one of the key elements in the public involvement process was to divide the BRT corridor into segments. Each segment would have a fairly intensive public involvement process, such as a design workshop, and staff/Board walkabouts. The first segment to be worked on was the Franklin Blvd segment. d) SPRINGFIELD STATION STEERING COMMITTEE. Ms. Murphy reported that the committee met recently to discuss public involvement, whom to involve, how, and when. Also, the committee debriefed the walking tour that had taken place in May. A mission statement and objectives for the project were developed. The committee will meet again in July. Ms. Hocken noted that Ms. Murphy would continue to chair the steering committee following her departure from the Board of Directors.

**MAY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS:** Ms. Hellekson stated that there were no adverse conditions to report. The good news was that there was a slowing of the ridership decline that had been experienced, and for the month of May a fairly good rebound was experienced in fare collection. Staff expected to be close to budget by year-end. The firm of Grove, Mueller, Hall, & Swank had been selected as the new auditors for LTD.

**TRANSPLAN COMMENTS FROM EUGENE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE:** Several letters from the Eugene Chamber of Commerce related to TransPlan were included in the agenda packet. Mr. Viggiano stated that the reason for several letters was that the Chamber reviewed the TransPlan in sections and had commented on each section. In general, Mr. Viggiano believed that with regard to the projects and strategies that most interested LTD, and BRT, in particular, the Chamber had expressed cautious support. The Chamber acknowledged the need to make transit service more attractive, and suggested that LTD go ahead with the pilot corridor, but reserved judgement on full implementation based on the experience with that corridor. Ms. Hocken noted that there was repeated mention of the Chamber's desire for LTD not to increase the payroll tax rate, and she did not believe that LTD could legally increase that rate. Mr. Bailey stated that he had attended the Chamber meeting, and had pointed out that the payroll tax currently was at the legal limit, and the Board had no intention of going to the legislature to try to change that rate. He thought the Chamber was fairly supportive of the BRT concept.

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE AMENDMENTS:** Mr. Viggiano stated that there had been an ongoing concern about the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) requirement that was in the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The current requirement in the TPR was that VMTs per capita be reduced by 10 percent in 20 years and 20 percent in 30 years. The concerns were that it was difficult to measure VMTs and that it was one measure of how effective the transportation policies were, but that there were several other potential measures that should be considered as well. Relying on one measure to determine whether the plan successfully met the community's goal could be inaccurate. The draft TransPlan actually showed an

increase in VMTs over the 20-year period, instead of the required 10 percent decrease.

Other communities were in similar situations, where their planning showed that they would not reach those goals. As a result, the Department of Land Conservation and Development (LCDC) was considering amendments to the TPR. The LCDC proposal would reduce the requirement, but would leave VMTs as the only measure to gauge success. The Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) had proposed a broader set of measures. For example, VMTs throughout the community might not be as important as what actually happened along a particular congested corridor, and if car use could be reduced along that corridor without having to widen the street, there was a very significant benefit in that, which may not be reflected in total VMT per capita measures. LTD supported the concept of increasing the range of performance measures that would be used to evaluate the plan.

Ms. Hocken asked who adopted the TPR. Mr. Viggiano stated that the LCDC made the recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission for adoption.

**EUGENE STATION BUDGET SUMMARY:** This was an informational item, and no staff presentation was made.

**BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROJECT UPDATE:** This was an informational item, and no staff presentation was made.

**SENECA STATION:** This was an information item, and no staff presentation was made.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** There was correspondence from Mayor Jim Torrey, Congressman Peter DeFazio, and District counsel.

Ms. Hocken stated that the good news was that \$8.8 million was earmarked in the TEA-21 legislation for LTD, which should be enough for the pilot BRT corridor. Congressman DeFazio requested that LTD make some crucial decisions about where the elements of BRT would be used prior to spending any of the money. Mr. Bailey asked if Congressman DeFazio had received a summary of efforts to date. Ms. Loobey said that staff were keeping the Congressman and his staff well informed.

Ms. Hocken noted the correspondence from District counsel regarding the initiative petition on the General Manager's salary. The case had been decided by the Oregon Supreme Court, which ruled that setting the General Manger's salary was an administrative matter and not subject to the initiative petition process. Mr. Bailey noted that there had been excellent representation on this matter by counsel. Ms. Loobey noted the value to the District and the Board in that LTD would not have to shoulder the cost to pay for an election. Mr. Kleger stated that another implication was that if this initiative had been approved for an election process, it would have

opened the door for a much larger attack on public employees' pay rates, and not just at the executive level.

**MONTHLY STAFF REPORT:** Ms. Loobey reported that Mark Johnson had been hired as Transit Operations Manager. Mr. Johnson previously worked in operations at Pierce Transit in Tacoma, Washington. Ms. Wylie asked about the progress in hiring the Intergovernmental Relations Manager. Ms. Loobey responded that the application process had closed and interviews were being scheduled.

Ms. Loobey announced that Human Resources Manager Ed Rutledge had accepted a position with the Springfield School District. Ms. Hocken stated that Mr. Rutledge had done many good things for LTD, such as setting up the Labor-Management Council (LMC). Ms. Loobey stated that Mr. Rutledge was a person of considerable talent, who had accomplished a lot for the District, most significantly, the turn around in labor/management relations.

**PRESENTATION TO BOARD MEMBER MARY MURPHY:** Ms. Hocken stated that Ms. Murphy was leaving the Board. She said that Ms. Murphy had provided excellent Springfield representation on the Board. She presented Ms. Murphy with a wooden bus.

Ms. Murphy stated that the support and encouragement had been tremendous. It had been exciting to be a part of the Thurston Station Park & Ride facility, the Eugene Station, and Bus Rapid Transit, and she looked forward to her continued work on the Springfield Station project. She said it had been great to share the common sense of purpose as the Board led a direction in policy and working with the talented group of people that Ms. Loobey had on board at LTD. It had been her honor to be associated with LTD. When she spoke to people in the community, she spoke with pride of her association with LTD. LTD was not just about providing buses and transportation, it also was about providing family-wage jobs for people who lived in our community. One of the new roles she had taken on was with the blue-ribbon campaign, "Let it End Here," following the Thurston shooting. Springfield Fire Chief Dennis Murphy had taken her on board as the educator and communicator, and in that role she had met and talked with President Clinton and had given him a blue ribbon.

Mr. Bailey said that it had been a pleasure serving on the Board with Ms. Murphy. Mr. Kleger echoed Mr. Bailey's sentiments, and said that it had been a delight. Ms. Wylie stated that Ms. Murphy had laid down a hard road to follow, and Ms. Hocken stated that she was glad that Ms. Murphy had agreed to remain on the Springfield Station Steering Committee.

**MISCELLANEOUS:** a) There would be no July Board meeting. b) The Fall Board Strategic Planning retreat was being planned for October 10 and 11, 1998. Ms. Loobey asked the Board members to let staff know their ideas about where to hold the retreat, whether in or out of the metropolitan area, and any topics they would like to see included on the agenda.



Staff were considering using a facilitator to assist with the dialogue, Susan Phillips, who previously had worked with the Board.

The following is a list of possible topics the Board might wish to discuss:

- Tension between fare increases and ridership growth
- How to handle service requests, particularly from outlying areas
- The impact of a rural transit district
- If other in-county transit districts were formed, what role would LTD play
- How to go about hiring a new general manager
- Political issues for next year
- Year 2000 Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) and how to serve areas newly developed on the fringes.

Ms. Loobey noted that there not only was new development on the fringes, but also a redevelopment of older industrial areas. Annually, approximately \$2 million in service requests were made that LTD could not fill.

Ms. Murphy asked if staff were addressing the year 2000 in computers and how it might impact the District. Ms. Hellekson responded that the Information Services Manager had reported that internal software at LTD was cleared for the changeover in the year 2000, but staff were concerned about outside vendors, such as banks and other outside agencies. A state task force was working on tax issues, and the banks also were working on it. Staff were checking on the vendors one by one in an attempt to be ready.

Ms. Wylie asked about the political issues for next year and what the Intergovernmental Relations Manager would be working on. Ms. Loobey responded that the political agenda usually was set in September and October. Elderly and handicapped funding is an ongoing issue.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Secretary