

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, January 20, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on January 15, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, January 20, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, President, presiding  
Rob Bennett, Vice President  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Dean Kortge  
Hillary Wylie, Secretary  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Patricia Hocken  
Virginia Lauritsen

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Board President Kirk Bailey.

**WORK SESSION:** The first hour of the meeting was scheduled as a work session on three topics—Springfield Station, 1999 Annual Route Review, and Eugene Downtown Shuttle Study Time Line.

**Springfield Station:** Ms. Wylie reported that the previous Monday she had spoken to the Springfield City Council at a work session on bus rapid transit (BRT) and the Springfield Station. Most of the Springfield Station Steering Committee members were in attendance, as well as Board members Dave Kleger and Ginny Lauritsen. Ms. Wylie introduced herself as a liaison between the Council and the Board and told them that Springfield was represented by two out of the seven positions on the Board. She stressed that LTD and the Council were partners in the planning and implementation of BRT and the Springfield Station study, and that she would be available to the Council members, City staff, and community members who had questions or wanted to discuss Springfield issues. Ms. Wylie thought that the feedback at the end of the presentations was positive. Each person had his or her own issues or concerns, but the overall tenor was one of support. The Council did want to be sure that LTD took its time and did the right thing, but no one appeared hesitant about supporting these projects.

Mr. Kleger added that there had been an additional suggestion about site location for the Springfield Station from one new councilor. He asked Mr. Viggiano to discuss that during his presentation.

Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano updated the Board about the Springfield Station study process, what the major issues were, and what staff and the steering

committee had learned as they went through the process. He discussed the vision statement and ten objectives for site selection agreed upon by the steering committee, as well as the site selection process to date. He said that LTD had learned during site selection for the Eugene Station that it was important not to ignore any potential site. Therefore, all sites within a selected study area had been reviewed, and eight sites, including the current station site, were selected for more detailed study. Except for the current site, the remaining sites were along Main Street or North "A" Street. Staff were developing better cost estimates and operational issues for further discussion. Public workshops would be held as part of a public input process on those eight sites. The workshops were being combined with BRT open houses and workshops, because the two projects were closely related in the Springfield BRT segment.

Mr. Viggiano also discussed the Springfield Station project time line, noting that probably two or three preferred sites would be taken to the steering committee and Board for a decision in March or April.

Mr. Viggiano outlined Springfield City Councilor Fred Simmons' suggestion for a site south of Main Street, and noted staff's and the steering committee's concerns about riders having to cross Main Street to reach the main activity centers in downtown Springfield. Mr. Bennett added that in Portland, the West Side Light Rail project's strategy was to travel through some undeveloped areas to reach developed areas, but in Springfield, Mr. Simmons' suggestion would mean BRT traveling through undeveloped areas to reach more undeveloped areas. He was concerned about this suggestion for that reason.

Ms. Wylie cautioned that LTD and the steering committee should not lose sight of the site selection criteria if they began considering additional sites. She was concerned about the operational cost of deviating from the main service line. Mr. Viggiano stated that the busy Thurston route was part of the justification for moving the station closer to Main Street, and this would be an even more important consideration for BRT.

Regarding BRT, Ms. Wylie reported that the City Council seemed to be interested in a BRT line from downtown Springfield out to the Gateway area, so she thought LTD would need to respond to them about this idea at some point. Mr. Viggiano said that there was considerable right-of-way in the median along Pioneer Parkway, and that this type of BRT line seemed likely at some point in the future. It was included in the year 2015 BRT Plan.

Mr. Viggiano outlined for the Board some of the considerations for a new Springfield Station. Those included whether there should be public restrooms and a staffed customer service center, which also entailed ongoing operational considerations. Other considerations were possible joint development, either public or private, relocation of existing businesses or homes on certain sites, and obtaining funding for construction.

Ms. Wylie thought it would be very important to include restrooms and maybe a customer service center. She relayed that the steering committee wanted for Springfield what Eugene had in the Eugene Station, although they knew it would be on a smaller scale. The steering committee wanted to use this opportunity to "spruce up" downtown Springfield, and LTD needed to respect that desire and work with them on that.

Mr. Bailey endorsed what Ms. Wylie said about taking steps to plan for the long term with amenities such as those at the Eugene Station, and possibly a joint development opportunity. He

thought that the District might miss an opportunity if the Springfield Station were not planned correctly.

**Annual Route Review:** Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora briefly outlined the FY 1999-2000 service recommendations that staff planned to take to the Board for discussion in February. Staff were not planning major changes for 1999-2000 because a comprehensive service redesign (CSR) was planned for study during that year and implementation in 2000.

The suggested changes were to add peak timepoints on the #13 Centennial route; add weekend industrial service for HMT; increase the frequency of the weekend #11 route; add a loop in Creswell to the #98 Creswell route; add trips to the #26C for school trips; and allow contingency funding for service to the Capstone development, LCC growth, and the Chad Drive area.

**Eugene Downtown Shuttle Study Time Line:** Mr. Vobora discussed a 1993 study that examined the feasibility of downtown Eugene shuttle service. That study concluded that a circulating shuttle most likely would have below-average ridership, but because many factors could not be predicted accurately, the study suggested that a pilot project of one to two years in length would be the best way to test the concept. Staff believed that considering the feasibility of a downtown shuttle again in 1999 made sense because the downtown area, including the Fifth Street Market district, the University of Oregon, and the Lane County Fairgrounds, had increased in density and intensity of use. Those changes, along with LTD's plan to implement a BRT system, needed to be examined with respect to how people could benefit from a well-designed, frequent, and distinctive shuttle system.

Mr. Vobora stated that staff had begun a process to conduct a more in-depth shuttle feasibility study. He outlined the components of the study, and said that the consultant would be required to work with staff and a local advisory committee representing key markets that would be impacted or served by a shuttle. The time line called for study completion by April 30, 1999, and implementation could be possible as early as September 1999, should the Board find the study results favorable. The cost for the study was estimated at \$20,000 to \$25,000. Because a downtown shuttle would be part of the BRT feeder system, funding for the study would be part of the BRT grant.

Mr. Bennett asked if it were possible for staff to look at this issue based on some of the previous shuttle study data and get some sense of how the shuttle might have a chance to succeed this time. Mr. Vobora said that staff believed that there were some benefits to providing a shuttle, and that some of the old study results were ambiguous, based on the District's needs at the time.

Mr. Bennett said that the type of vehicle was critical. He reiterated his belief that it would be better not to purchase the same type of vehicles currently in service for any future service, but he said he knew that was not practical. He hoped LTD would be able to figure out quickly what was possible and how to get there. Mr. Vobora stated that the biggest ridership changes for other transit providers had been when they changed to different propulsion systems in their vehicles, such as electric-hybrid vehicles. He said it would be important for LTD's shuttle vehicles to be quieter than diesel in order to run through campus. It should be simpler to provide a different type of shuttle vehicle than for regular service buses. Smaller alternative vehicles already were available, but it still would take approximately 18 months to two years to purchase the right type of vehicle and have it available for use.

Mr. Bennett said he was interested in knowing what was possible in terms of design, especially something a little unique from a marketing standpoint. He wondered what would be allowed in terms of window design, seat placement, open versus closed design, etc., to see what might provide new opportunities for LTD. Ms. Wylie asked staff to bring pictures of what was available on the market to show the Board. Mr. Vobora said that staff could bring pictures to show the Board, and could ask the shuttle study consultant to consider the best vehicle options to include in the study.

Ms. Loobey commented that one of the major differences about the current shuttle study was that the community was entertaining new concepts of what a shuttle could be. Community members were interested in having a different type of service that would take care of their particular needs, such as the Gateway hotels being interested in tying their hotels with the downtown areas and the rest of the community. Also, Sacred Heart Hospital and the University of Oregon did not want to build more parking garages. Ms. Loobey also suggested that LTD needed to do some market research about what appealed to people in Eugene/Springfield.

**Break:** This concluded the work session portion of the meeting. Mr. Bailey called a five-minute break at 6:40 p.m., and called the meeting back to order at 6:45 p.m.

#### **ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Mr. Bailey introduced Field Supervisor David Thulstrup, who was hired as a field supervisor in August 1997, as the February 1999 Employee of the Month. He was nominated by a bus operator, who said that customers were very impressed with the way Mr. Thulstrup handled a situation in which he had to awaken a young man to have him leave the bus. The customers said they thought Mr. Thulstrup needed to be recognized for the patience and care he showed for the young man, who seemed to be very sick. When asked what made Mr. Thulstrup a good employee, Transit Projects Administrator Rick Bailor responded that Mr. Thulstrup had done an outstanding job since being hired; that he was a team player and a dedicated employee who wanted to make LTD the number one transit district in the nation; and that he had a genuine desire to make things better and help his employees better themselves.

Mr. Bailey presented Mr. Thulstrup with a certificate and monetary award. Mr. Thulstrup said it was good to be at LTD; there was a lot going on and he was excited about the future. He hoped that LTD would make a big impact during the next year and beyond.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Mr. Bailey asked for comments from any member of the audience. There were none.

**MOTION**           **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for January 20, 1999, is approved as presented."  
**VOTE**             Mr. Bennett seconded, and the resolution passed by unanimous vote, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of minutes of the December 14, 1998, special Board meeting/work session and the December 16, 1998, regular Board meeting. Mr. Kleger noted that Ms. Hocken was referred to as "he" a couple places in the minutes. Mr. Bailey stated that those typographical changes could be made in the minutes without reapproval.

**1999 FEDERAL AGENDA:** Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch told the Board that the local area's United Front federal funding priorities book was being prepared and the group's trip to Washington, D.C., was being arranged for the first week in March. The group's Washington, D.C., lobbyists had been in Eugene/Springfield meeting with United Front. In addition to presenting requests for federal funding, the trip provides an opportunity to update the area's congressional delegation and staff about the status of current projects.

Ms. Lynch stated that she was not optimistic that LTD would receive earmarked funds for new buses. Transit did very well in the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21). The authorizing committee protected that by earmarking a lot of that money, so the appropriations committee was only appropriating monies for transit that had been authorized. LTD received half of its earmarked \$8.8 million, and expected the other \$4.4 million to be appropriated during this session of Congress.

## MOTION

Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the staff recommendation to limit LTD's federal lobbying request to the base amount needed for buses, \$7.772 million." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett asked what Ms. Lynch might do or pursue that might be reasonable this year if the political climate had been better. Ms. Lynch replied that it was unfortunate that tying BRT in with the Springfield Station was not ready in time for earmarking in TEA-21. If it were ready in 2001, it could be an appropriated project instead of an authorized project.

Mr. Bennett thought that LTD might need to make a stronger case for BRT funding even in the first phase of the project. Ms. Lynch thought that should be possible. She added that there were some parts of BRT for which LTD might be able to begin spending some of the \$8.8 million because they had system-wide benefits. She thought that the FTA and others understood that LTD would need to request additional funding toward the end of the initial BRT project.

Mr. Bailey asked about the funding issues for the other jurisdictions participating in the United Front effort. Ms. Lynch thought that because the Willamette River Chinook was to be named an endangered species, some of the natural resources and water issues requests would be packaged around that issue. TEA-21 also earmarked money for the I-5/Beltline Road exchange, and there were some issues about power lines that Springfield would be talking with the congressional staff about. The United Front group also would be continuing the discussions of juvenile-related issues.

## VOTE

The resolution to approve LTD's federal lobbying request passed by unanimous vote, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Lynch asked Board members about their interest in participating on this trip, and said that the decisions about lodging and airline reservations would have to be made rather quickly. The United Front group had said in the past that more participants were not necessarily an advantage, but there were a lot of new people on the city councils, etc., so there probably would be more participants this time. The same amount of work would be divided among more participants, so people would not attend as many meetings as in the past. Mr. Bailey said he would poll Board members about their interest and let staff know. He expressed an interest in participating, but said that LTD may want an additional Board member involved because of the scope of the issues to be discussed. Ms. Wylie wanted more information, but was interested in participating. Mr. Kleger said

he would not be able to participate, and Mr. Kortge thought that Board members with more experience than he had should be the ones to participate.

Ms. Loobey explained that the entire United Front delegation worked as a team, attending meetings with the congressional delegation, their staffs, and certain federal agencies in support of each other's issues. Ms. Lynch added that there would be 40 to 50 meetings during a two- to three-day period.

**APPOINTMENT OF LEGAL COUNSEL TO THE LTD BOARD OF DIRECTORS:** Mr. Bailey stated that a Board Legal Services Committee (Mr. Bailey, Mr. Kortge, and Ms. Lauritsen) met after receiving letters of qualification from three firms and interviewing all three firms. The committee's decision was to recommend retaining the firm of Arnold Gallagher Saydack Percell & Roberts, P.C., as the Board's counsel, and retaining Luvaas Cobb Richards & Fraser, P.C., for administrative legal work. He noted that the Board members had received letters from Luvaas Cobb for consideration.

Mr. Bailey said that he thought the attorneys from Arnold Gallagher did a wonderful job of representing their abilities, interest, perspective on public law matters, and the benefits that they would bring to the Board as Board counsel. He also complimented their creative thinking and problem-solving abilities. Mr. Kortge agreed with Mr. Bailey and noted another of Arnold Gallagher's strengths, which was their depth in representing the business community and their knowledge of condemnation procedures.

Mr. Bennett stated that he had a significant conflict of interest so would not be taking part in the discussion or voting on this issue. He said that the firm of Arnold Gallagher represented his firm, and one of Arnold Gallagher's members was a very good friend of his. Also, his company did business with several partners of Luvaas Cobb, as building managers.

Ms. Loobey explained how LTD would implement the change, should the Board approve the committee's recommendation. She said that staff would draw up a letter of agreement with Arnold Gallagher, et al., and a new letter of agreement with Luvaas Cobb, et al., reflecting the change caused by bifurcating the legal work (Board policy issues and administrative legal implementation work).

Mr. Kleger asked if staff anticipated any difficulties in this new system. Ms. Loobey said they did not anticipate difficulties, but there would be some gray areas that would have to be worked out. She stated that these were two highly-qualified firms with very honorable people. She noted that Luvaas Cobb was disappointed to lose the Board policy aspect of the work, but excited about continuing to work with staff. She expected that there would be a productive working relationship between the two firms, when needed.

#### MOTION

Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: "The LTD Board of Directors hereby approves the appointment of the law firm of Arnold Gallagher Saydack Percell and Roberts, P.C., as legal counsel to the LTD Board for a contract term of three years, with a permissible two-year contract extension." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion.

Mr. Kortge noted that he had been very impressed with the firms' presentations, and that it was not a simple decision. He thought it was very rewarding to have such competent people in our community. Mr. Bailey agreed that it was fortunate to have such a wide range of good legal expertise in the Springfield/Eugene community.

## VOTE

The resolution to appoint Arnold Gallagher Saydack Percell and Roberts, P.C., as legal counsel to the LTD Board passed by a vote of 4 to 0, with one abstention (Bailey, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and Mr. Bennett abstaining).

**SMOKING AT EUGENE STATION:** Ms. Loobey stated that Board member Virginia Lauritsen had requested that this issue be deferred so she could be present for the discussion. Ms. Loobey noted that the idea had been to implement a non-smoking policy for the entire Eugene Station with the new bid on February 7. Although that would be convenient, it was not absolutely necessary to make a change at that time.

Mr. Bailey asked if there were other downsides to putting off this discussion. Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson said that there were not, other than continuing with the problems that LTD had been having at the station.

Mr. Kortge asked if this was a contract issue. Mr. Johnson replied that it was not. Staff had wanted time to talk with the contract employees about the issue, but it was not governed by the bargaining unit contract. Ms. Loobey added that the union could have made this a contract issue as a change in working conditions, but chose not to. Mr. Johnson noted that staff had received a good amount of input from affected employees.

Mr. Bennett said that he would like to wait for this discussion if possible, since one other Board member did wish to contribute to the discussion. Mr. Kleger voiced his agreement, and Mr. Bailey stated that since this was a non-urgent issue, it would be postponed until February 17. Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Johnson to remind the Board again the following month about the discussions with the bus operators.

**REQUEST FOR CONTINUATION OF .5 FTE SECRETARY IN GENERAL ADMINISTRATION:** Mr. Pangborn reminded the Board that when staff requested a temporary .5 FTE secretary position for the first six months of the fiscal year, they had been bringing BRT on full bore, and were not sure what the workload would be. Additionally, the government relations manager position was brand new, and had an impact on the need for secretarial support. Compacting the BRT time line also had quite an impact. Mr. Pangborn stated that staff needed authorization from the Board to continue the position for the rest of the fiscal year, but would not need a budget transfer. He explained that if staff determined the need to continue the position next year, they would include it in the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 budget, for the Board's approval.

## MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the addition of a .5 FTE Administrative I Secretary position from January to June 30, 1999, to the approved LTD 1998-1999 budget." Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett said that LTD kept ramping up for BRT responsibilities and for implementation and construction, and that if the District had any success, the need would not go away. He asked if staff were running into operating problems that they did not anticipate. Mr. Pangborn replied that they probably were not, but as they pushed forward, it was a new experience for LTD staff. For example, the second BRT segment, in Glenwood, provided a new set of challenges, so there were more meetings with the community, etc., which were pushing staff resources. He explained that staff were considering moving the funding for staff working on BRT to grant funds, which would free up some resources for general operating expenses. However, they wanted to be careful about that,

so that LTD would not have too many staff if the BRT project collapsed. They did not want to overstaff and expend money unnecessarily, so they had been moving slowly and carefully in this regard.

Mr. Pangborn stated that if LTD pushed forward with BRT funding in some parts of the project, it was likely that LTD would need more funding to finish the pilot corridor. The District could start building with the funding it already had, unless something extraordinary happened. The \$8.8 million in federal funding and the local match of 20 percent brought the total for the pilot corridor to approximately \$11 million. Staff thought the District could come pretty close to finishing the first corridor with that amount, but that would not include funding for the Springfield Station or BRT vehicles.

Mr. Bennett asked if there would be a point at which LTD would have enough information about the segments to put together an estimate for the entire first phase. Mr. Pangborn said that staff currently had a Franklin segment cost estimate. Mr. Bennett thought it would be important for the District to do that, to have a better understanding of where things stood vis-à-vis a cost estimate, and then to be able to plan a strategy with respect to funding needs. Mr. Pangborn said that this would be the agenda for the 2000 United Front lobbying trip to Washington, D.C.

VOTE

There was no further discussion, and the resolution to continue the .5 FTE secretary position through the rest of the fiscal year carried by unanimous vote, 5 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Kleger, Kortge, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

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

**Lane Community College Term Pass Program Update:** Mr. Vobora explained that for the current school year, LTD and LCC had put in place a term pass program subsidized by the college. LCC had allocated \$100,000 for three terms; however, 2,000 passes were sold during the first term, which depleted half of the subsidy. That was an increase of 1,300 passes over the previous year, when there had been no subsidy to lower the cost to the students. Additionally, 82 staff were using passes and 224 passes were sold at the downtown center, so not only main campus students were using the passes.

Mr. Vobora introduced Lloyd Rain, the director of purchasing at LCC. Mr. Rain noted that LCC had been negotiating with LTD for a pass program for ten years. Part of the negotiations resulted from the issues at LCC that were different than at the University of Oregon, such as in travel patterns, organization, student numbers, etc., and how to service all of the conflicting interests. He acknowledged Ms. Hocken for her suggestion for a two-year trial program with a 10 percent reduction in term pass costs. Then LCC decided to contribute something to reduce the cost for the students even more. LCC President Jerry Moskus had dedicated \$100,000 in bookstore revenues to subsidize term passes for the year. The LCC and LTD team working to establish a pass program agreed that this would be an information-gathering exercise. Sales of the subsidized passes were two times higher than anticipated, and showed that such a program could reduce by a considerable amount the traffic on McVey Highway and in the parking area, and reduce costs for parking upkeep. It also showed that there was interest among all student groups, so there was no group that the college could cut from the program as a result of disinterest. Therefore, it would not be possible to assess student fees for this program, since those fees would apply to only about one-half of the bus riders.



Mr. Rain said that the LCC Board had agreed to spend another \$50,000 to subsidize the program during spring term, hoping that some funding would be left for summer term, as well. Mr. Rain said he believed, but could not guarantee, that the LCC Board wanted this program continued, with the implication that they would find \$150,000 within the budget process for next year.

Mr. Rain stated that LTD staff had been outstanding to work with. He said that Mr. Vobora had worked hard to provide extra buses when needed. He complimented Commuter Solutions Specialist Connie Bloom Williams for the advertising of the program. He said that the program was very professionally handled and well done, and he complimented LTD for making this program happen.

Mr. Kleger said he was gratified with the cooperation that LTD received from LCC. Mr. Bailey added that it was a pleasure working together with LCC to find a solution, and exciting to see the response to the project. He added that Ms. Hocken and Ms. Williams deserved a lot of the credit and thanks, and he celebrated Ms. Hocken's contribution to this project.

**Nodal Development Update:** Allen Lowe, a land use planner in the City of Eugene planning department, provided the Board with an update on nodal development planning. He handed out an updated nodal development map and recommended plan diagrams and text amendments. He said that the Eugene Planning Commission had held meetings on TransPlan, but the focus had not been on nodal development. To the extent that they had talked about it, nodal development was represented in the memorandum he handed out. There was agreement among the planning commissioners regarding the objectives to try to achieve with nodal development. Those were: mixed use; seeking to increase employment and development; providing transit access within one-fourth mile; encouraging alternative modes use; having mixed uses and services available within walking distance; having parks and open spaces available within walking distance; and allowing twelve units per net residential acre.

The City had recommended a grant-funded pilot project for nodal development at Royal near Greenhill and at Chambers and West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, to test the application on an actual site. The Chambers site was selected because it was on a potential BRT route. The City had until June to develop an implementation recommendation plan. Zone changes and whatever else it would take to put nodal development on the sites were to be included in that plan. There was no blanket nodal development concept for all areas. Mr. Lowe thought the areas would have to be individually crafted and developed, so it might take longer. In fact, a long-term effort could take 50 years to play out. On the other hand, some nodal developments could be accomplished fairly soon, especially with BRT development. Mr. Lowe stated that the City was not a developer, and that the nodal development concept would be successful as long as it worked with the market. In general, people seemed to embrace the idea if they thought it would enhance the quality of their neighborhoods, but not if they did not believe that or if they misunderstood the intentions of the program.

Mr. Lowe said that the City was about halfway through this project. There still were a lot of questions, and compatibility issues still were being worked out.

Mr. Bennett asked about the residential density range. Mr. Lowe replied that in TransPlan, density was discussed without being defined as gross or net. Now it was being discussed in more specific terms, as 12 residential units per net residential acre, or nine dwelling units per gross acre. The Chambers site had fewer than 11 overall, so 100 more units would have to be brought onto that

70 acres, which the people who lived there found somewhat threatening. In the Bethel area, the people wanted more services, so nodal development was viewed as positive in terms of creating more demand for development as the area grew.

Mr. Bailey thanked Mr. Lowe for providing this update for the Board.

**Board Member Reports:** Metropolitan Policy Committee—The January MPC meeting was canceled, so there was no report. BRT Steering Committee—Mr. Bailey reported that the Steering Committee recently had discussed the current status of plans in the Glenwood area. A Glenwood working group also was discussing some of the alignments. A public workshop was scheduled for the following week, and then a proposal would be brought to the Board. Mr. Viggiano explained that the working group was formed as a way for a smaller group to get into some of the details and narrow the options for the larger group to discuss on January 26. There was a preliminary discussion about the Springfield Sector and how that tied in with possible sites for the Springfield Station. Springfield Station Steering Committee: Ms. Wylie reported that the Steering Committee would meet the following evening to look at how individual sites would work with specific layouts. Governor's Inaugural Hoe-Down—Ms. Wylie, Ms. Lauritsen, and Mr. Bailey all attended the Governor's inaugural hoe-down. They reported that it was crowded and fun, with everyone dressed in jeans and Western wear, and the Governor playing guitar with a Western band. Mr. Bailey noted that no shuttle transit service had been arranged to serve the site. Board Finance Committee—Ms. Loobey stated that the Board Finance Committee had met, and Ms. Hocken had been selected chair of the committee. The committee discussed key planning documents for development of the budget document for Budget Committee review during the spring.

**Monthly Financial Report:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson called the Board's attention to the operating fund income statement on page 64 of the agenda packet, noting that the operating fund drove what went on in the rest of the organization. She stated that everything looked fine at that point. The contract for advertising revenue would come in somewhat under budget, basically because the low-flow buses had a smaller number of square feet for advertising.

Mr. Bennett asked for an explanation of why passenger fares were not what the District had expected, even though they had increased over the previous year. Ms. Hellekson replied that the budget had anticipated a continuation of the trend and the same number of people paying cash fares, but that had not happened. She added that in February staff would bring to the Board a recommendation regarding fares for the next fiscal year. She also noted that expenditures were on schedule for the first half of the fiscal year.

**Bus Rapid Transit Update:** Mr. Viggiano discussed a BRT demonstration program for which the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was ready to select transit districts to participate. LTD staff had been told that LTD would be an obvious selection. Staff were developing a formal proposal to submit to the FTA.

Mr. Bennett said he was excited about being part of a demonstration project. He appreciated that fact that staff were not taking selection for granted and were working on a professional proposal. Mr. Viggiano added that at a recent meeting, FTA Administrator Gordon Linton mentioned LTD early in his remarks.

**Boundary Change Update:** Mr. Vobora said that he wanted to clarify for the Board, Creswell, and Cottage Grove what the process would be for leaving the District, so there would be

no surprises. As explained in his agenda item summary of page 79 of the agenda packet for that evening, the simplest way would be to ask to be let out of the District. If the Board did not agree with that request, there was a lengthier process to follow.

**Ridership Update:** Mr. Vobora used charts and graphs to try to explain why there currently was ridership growth, following a year of little to no growth. He provided some background on fuel pricing and the fact that the expense of driving virtually was unchanged during the last 20 years. Ms. Wylie and Mr. Bennett thought that traffic congestion had increased greatly during the past year. Mr. Vobora agreed and said that there had been little change in other external factors, such as weather and gasoline prices or availability, during the past year, but there had been changes in service and population. He thought the Eugene Station had a lot to do with the growth in trips, and said that ridership had been increasing ever since the new station opened.


Ms. Loobey said that an interesting piece of the demographics and ridership was that the percentage of riders with cars available for their trips was rising, as was the number of higher-income people using the system. She said that about one-third of LTD's riders now had a car available for the trip, which was a major change from past experience. Mr. Vobora added that after the next origin and destination (O&D) study, staff would know more about trips that generated vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and choice riders (riders who had other options available but chose to ride the bus).

Mr. Vobora noted that LTD was carrying more people for the number of hours of service, which was a positive change. Pass sales had increased, and the LCC term pass and other group pass programs were having a positive impact on ridership.

Mr. Vobora said that target markets for 1998-99 were LCC, senior programs, group pass organizations, youth (4J students; summer pass riders), and downtown Eugene employees. He added that the District would celebrate the first year of operation from the Eugene Station during the spring.

**Board Correspondence:** Ms. Loobey informed the Board that County Administrator Bill VanVactor had called in response to the letter to the County Commissioners from LTD Board President Kirk Bailey. The Commissioners had invited LTD to provide an update on BRT at the Commissioners' February 24 meeting, at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Loobey hoped that a Board member or two would be able to attend. Mr. Kortge said he would be out of town. Ms. Wylie and Mr. Kleger said they would try to attend.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further business, and Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

  
Board Secretary