MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, March 17, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 11, 1999, 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, March 17, 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 Pat Hocken Dave Kleger, Treasurer Virginia Lauritsen Hillary Wylie, Board Secretary Phyllis Loobey, General Manager Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary
Absent:	Dean Kortge

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m. He noted that there was a quorum present. Mr. Bailey adjusted the order of the work session agenda to place the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project Update as the first item on the agenda.

I. WORK SESSION

BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) PROJECT UPDATE: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano stated that the only part of the agenda item summary on page 8 of the agenda packet that he wanted to adjust was the BRT goals and performance objectives. He distributed revised BRT goals and objectives. He explained that the goals and objectives as presented in the Board packet previously were presented to the BRT Steering Committee. As a result of the Steering Committee discussion, the goals and objectives were revised. The new draft was dated March 17, 1999. Mr. Viggiano then highlighted the revisions for the Board. An overview of BRT was added to the document, the design elements previously were listed as objectives, and the goals and performance objectives were separated from the design elements.

Previously, there were goals and objectives included in the project development plan, and the revised draft document added measurable objectives and addressed what LTD hoped to achieve with BRT performance objectives. Mr. Viggiano stated that it was a draft, and staff were not asking for Board approval at that time. The revisions would be presented to the Steering Committee, who would make a recommendation to the Board for adoption in April. Staff did however, desire to begin sharing the document in draft form with other groups, and in particular, the Lane County Commissioners, who had requested some follow-up information. Staff would ask the Commissioners to comment on the draft goals and objectives.

Mr. Viggiano also reported that the third workshop for the downtown Springfield segment had been held, and there still were a number of issues that staff were working on. The four design alternatives for the downtown Springfield segment were listed in the agenda item summary. Data analysis would continue, and staff were not prepared to make a recommendation at this time.

Workshops were planned for the Downtown Eugene East segment, beginning on March 30, 1999, at the Eugene Hilton. Mr. Viggiano encouraged the Board members to attend.

FARE POLICY: This item had been carried forward from the March 15, 1999, work session. Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that this item was intended to be an extension of the service policy discussion on March 15, and was separate from the discussion that was scheduled for later in the regular Board meeting.

Ms. Hellekson stated that fare policy was not an easy subject. She presented what research indicated were appropriate components of fare policy: how fare policy interacted with service policy, farebox recovery, and fare differentiation in zones. In addition, she discussed the results of different fare policies at other transit properties.

Ms. Hellekson stated that there were three fundamental questions that drove the development of a fare policy: 1) What were the overall goals of a transportation system in a community; 2) What were the sources of available funding; and 3) What services did it make sense to provide, given the funding sources? After those questions were answered, the final question was what service and fare policies best supported those goals.

Ms. Hellekson stated that LTD was fortunate to have a number of available research sources. Transit was a heavily regulated, heavily researched industry.

According to research, when the service policy and farebox policies were set, and an assessment was made as to what was logical to include in the subsidies, typically there was a gap between what was desired and the available funding resources.

Service and fare policies were driven by financial and economic conditions, operational goals, social goals, and environmental goals. The policy also should preserve flexibility to meet market demands and/or revenue targets, encourage the use of scarce resources, and encourage system productivity.

Farebox recovery ratio was farebox revenue divided by operating expenses and was one measure of performance. An important way to make it valuable was to have it stated within the policy as a goal. LTD's farebox recovery ratio was 21 percent.

Ms. Hocken asked how farebox revenue differed from operating revenue. Ms. Hellekson stated that farebox revenue strictly was revenue from fare instruments. Operating revenues included all other revenues, such as advertising on the buses, rental payments, sale of merchandise, etc. LTD's strategic plan set a farebox recovery goal of greater than 20 percent and an earned operating expense goal of 4 percent. The earned operating expense goal would increase to 5 percent during the two years following the opening of the Eugene Station.

Mr. Bennett stated that the materials indicated that the average farebox revenue percentage was 33 percent, which included all transit properties. He asked if the larger properties had an advantage. Ms. Hellekson stated that none but California, where the farebox recovery was mandated by law. Mr. Bennett then asked if other transit properties were using the same operating expense and farebox definitions. Ms. Hellekson stated that they all used the same farebox recovery definitions, but that operating expenses could include many different components for different properties.

Mr. Bennett then asked if the Board would be discussing the issue in a general sense following Ms. Hellekson's presentation. Ms. Hellekson stated that the issue would be discussed a lot during the coming months.

Mr. Bennett stated that unless each of those components that went into the policy could be quantified, he would be unable to analyze them and make a conscientious decision. Ms. Hellekson stated that farebox recovery goals did not just happen. Decisions had been made after careful analysis and projections were made.

Mr. Bennett further stated that he wanted to understand each of the components and how they applied to the farebox recovery goals. He thought that comparing our farebox recovery ratio with other transit properties that were located in communities that had congestion pricing, for instance, was not a good comparison. Congestion pricing was not a factor at LTD.

In addition, Mr. Bennett stated that there was a serious argument about whether the automobile was subsidized or if it paid for itself. It was not a foregone conclusion that, in the context of operating expenses of the automobile, the automobile paid for itself. Components that should be included in the operating cost of an automobile could include infrastructure and maintenance of the roads to make it a heavily subsidized form of transportation. A balanced transportation system, in comparison, was not heavily subsidized.

It was important in the context that Mr. Bennett would argue to figure out what the fundamentals were of maximizing the farebox recovery. Then, if decisions were made that took away from the farebox recovery ratio, everyone would understand what that was and the effect it would have. Mr. Bennett stated that he would like to see the various alternatives that would increase the farebox ratio, which could include anything from different pricing zones to a variation of pricing based on productivity to increasing the ridership standards. Ms. Hellekson replied that staff had planned to present those very options that Mr. Bennett had discussed.

Ms. Hocken stated that she thought it would be beneficial to have a discussion about how other alternatives influenced the operating expense, such as productivity and coverage. Ms. Hellekson explained that her presentation was meant as an example of what influenced farebox recovery goal setting. Ms. Hocken stated that another issue was that the model used service to drive the farebox recovery, but it might be valuable to look at how the farebox recovery influenced service.

Mr. Bennett stated that maybe this model was the correct one, but he believed the Board ought to flesh that out for themselves. If the current farebox recovery was 21 percent, then what would it mean if the Board set a goal of 25 to 30 percent, and could the Board do that?

Ms. Hellekson stated that staff presentations were headed in that direction; however, staff believed that it would be important to lay a foundation with the Board about what components went into setting farebox policy.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that it was her observation that with federal operating funds dwindling, state funding also would dwindle.

Mr. Bailey stated that he believed the Board had an understanding of the fundamentals, and it was now time to get to the scenarios, what the options were, and what they meant.

Ms. Hellekson stated that there was extensive and valuable research that staff could draw on to present information about the various scenarios, such as use of zone pricing. Staff would get that information to the Board as soon as possible. She was concerned that the Board might hold that discussion too soon, and embark on a scenario that might not work well in this community.

Ms. Hocken stated that this conversation was related to the service discussion, and while the intent was not to slow down the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) process, the Board did need to have an in-depth discussion. She thought the conversation could take place during the next three to four months before the Board might have a good understanding about how the different scenarios might affect the service and fare policy.

Ms. Hellekson stated that there were pieces of the fare policy development that could trail the CSR decisions. She believed the Board discussion could be interactive with the CSR process.

Mr. Kleger thought it might be appropriate for the Board to hold a special meeting in addition to its regular meetings for the purpose of holding this discussion. There was a lot of information, and the Board members needed to make sure they knew what they were dealing with before they made major structural differences.

Ms. Hellekson reiterated that this was not an easy issue. If it were easy, more than 6 percent of the transit properties would have written fare policy with specific guidelines about when and how fares were adjusted. Research indicated that the vast majority of transit properties had no specific fare policy written, no regular review of fare policy, and service policies were by default. LTD was way ahead of the curve in some respects on this issue.

The Board members had no objections to holding a special meeting for a major review of service and fare policy. Ms. Loobey stated that staff currently were very busy with the budget preparations and planning work sessions with both city councils. She suggested that a special session be planned for sometime after May 1.

ADDITIONAL WORK SESSION AGENDA ITEMS: Mr. Bailey noted that it was time to begin the regular meeting agenda. Ms. Loobey stated that the other items on the agenda for the work session were included in the packet, and if the Board members had questions about any of the additional items, staff would be available to answer them.

II. REGULAR MEETING – ITEMS FOR ACTION

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Bailey introduced the April 1999 Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Larry Harmon. Mr. Harmon was hired on August 24, 1992. In 1998, he earned awards for three years of safe driving and six years of correct schedule operation (CSO). A member of the community, who wanted to say thank you to Larry for his patience and help one afternoon, nominated him for this award. Mr. Harmon, having seen a disabled car blocking traffic, stopped to assist. He was able to help get the person's car started and out of the way.

Mr. Harmon's supervisor described Mr. Harmon as being dependable and friendly, someone who treats his customers with respect, and a person who has a genuine concern for making sure that the job gets done, and gets done right.

Mr. Harmon was presented with a letter of appreciation, a certificate, and a monetary award. Mr. Harmon said that he appreciated the award and the acknowledgement of his work ethic.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Bailey invited members of the audience to address the Board.

(1) David Duemlar of Eugene stated that he was a teacher at Lane Community College and also was a coordinator of Citizens for Animal Rights in Eugene and the secretary of Eugene PeaceWorks. He showed a poster regarding animal rights that he had attempted to have placed on the inside of the buses. The poster was produced by the Coalition for Non-violent Food, a project of Animal Rights, International. He had contacted the advertising firm of Obie Media and had been told that there was a non-profit rate. The Citizens for Animal Rights had agreed to the rate to place the poster, but were later told that LTD did not want something of that nature on the side of its buses. He was not given a reason for this decision, and he was at this meeting to get an answer.

Ms. Loobey stated that she was completely unaware of the transaction, and she would need to discuss the issue with Obie Media and get back to Mr. Duemlar.

In addition, Mr. Duemlar asked if LTD received federal funds. Ms. Loobey stated that it did. Mr. Duemlar said that he only asked that in case there was content-based discrimination going on. Mr. Bailey thanked Mr. Duemlar for his comments and said that someone from LTD would contact him.

No one else in the audience wished to address the Board.

MOTION

VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for March 17, 1999, is approved as presented." Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. The consent calendar consisted of the Minutes of the February 17, 1999, regular Board meeting. Ms. Loobey called the roll, and the motion carried unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

APPROVAL OF FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000 SERVICE RECOMMENDATIONS: Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated that in response to input from the public and the Board, staff had prepared a revised service recommendation. A previous service recommendation had been presented and a public hearing had been held during the February 17, 1999, regular Board meeting. Mr. Vobora reviewed the revisions.

The service recommendation would result in an additional 2,955 hours of service at a cost of $84,600, which was an increase of 0.96 percent.

Ms. Hocken asked about routes 38 and 39, and the concern that a customer had testified about in February. Mr. Vobora stated that only four of the least-productive trips in the late afternoon were being eliminated, which would maintain service throughout the day, but would alter the evening service.

Public Hearing on Service Recommendations: Mr. Bailey opened the public hearing. No one from the audience wished to address the Board, and Mr. Bailey closed the public hearing.

MOTION

VOTE

Board Deliberations: There being no further discussion, Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 service recommendations as presented on March 17, 1999." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

FY 1999-2000 PRICING PLAN AND FARE POLICY: Ms. Hellekson stated that as she mentioned earlier, the fare policy discussion was to occur in conjunction with the CSR, and for the moment staff were requesting Board approval of a continuation of the application of the current fare policy and allowing an adjustment of certain fare rates as proposed.

There were two revisions following the March Board deliberation and public hearing. Staff no longer were requesting to eliminate the day pass, and the senior/reduced pass price was reduced from $33.00 to $32.50.

The RideSource fares were included; however, because notification was not sent to the RideSource riders, staff agreed to hold an additional public hearing in April so that Lane Council of Governments could have an opportunity to notify the RideSource riders.

Public Hearing on Pricing Plan and Fare Policy: Mr. Bailey opened the public hearing and invited members of the audience to address the Board.

(1) James Creith, Jr., of Eugene, asked when the senior/reduced fare would be increased. Mr. Bailey stated that, if approved, the new fare would not be effective until September 1, 1999. Ms. Hellekson stated that all the fare changes would be effective on September 1, 1999, with the exception of the cost of the Freedom Pass, which would not be changed until the spring of 2000.

No one else wished to address the Board, and Mr. Bailey closed the public hearing.

MOTION

Board Deliberations: There being no further discussion, Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Board direct staff to prepare amendments to Ordinance #35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services, consistent with the recommendations of the Draft FY 1999-2000 Pricing Plan included in the March 17, 1999, agenda packet." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion.

Ms. Wylie asked what the age requirement was for the senior fare. Ms. Hellekson replied that it was age 62. Ms. Hocken asked about the first reading of Ordinance #35. Ms. Hellekson stated that the first reading would be held in April 1999.

Mr. Kleger stated that the Special Transportation Fund Committee had thoroughly discussed the issue of raising the fare for RideSource. An effort had been made to talk to the RideSource riders and explain the increase. Mr. Kleger noted that there had been an increase in RideSource users using the fixed-route service that was not entirely due to the increased fares, but also due to training. It was all part of a policy to encourage people to use the less-expensive, fixed-route service whenever possible.

Mr. Bennett asked if there were many RideSource riders who could use the fixed-route service. Mr. Kleger replied that there were fewer now than last year, and the number was steadily decreasing. Applications were carefully screened, and anyone who appeared to be trainable for fixed-route was trained as soon as possible. The fixed-route service also was more convenient, since rides did not need to be planned 24-hours in advance.

Ms. Hellekson added that statistics showed that the policy was working. Lift rides on the fixed-route service were increasing, while RideSource demand had remained steady. The re-certification process of all RideSource riders had been successful in checking eligibility.

VOTE

There being no further discussion, a vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM (CIP): Ms. Hellekson stated that the CIP was reviewed and revised each year as part of the budget development process. The five-year plan formed the foundation for the proposed Long-range Financial Plan. The first year of the rolling CIP became the proposed capital budget for the next fiscal year.

The proposed capital budget for FY 1999-2000 totaled $10,204,396. More than half of this total represented the grant-supported bus rapid transit project. Ms. Hellekson reviewed the elements of the capital plan.

Ms. Hocken asked about the Springfield Station project. Ms. Hellekson stated that funds were assumed that were not yet obtained, either through grant funding or some other type of partnership agreement. It was the only project in the next year's capital plan for which LTD did not have full funding already identified.

Mr. Bailey asked if the figure for the Springfield Station was based on the cost of the Eugene Station. Ms. Hellekson stated that it was, but that it was a big assumption that the Springfield Station would be on the same scale as the Eugene Station.

Ms. Hocken asked when the site was selected for the Springfield Station, what Board action normally would be taken to select the site, adopt a budget, and select the plans. Because the Springfield Station was in the budget, it did not mean that LTD meant to spend that amount at this time. Ms. Hellekson stated that often items were included as a placeholder in the capital budget, while staff researched their feasibility, such as the Coburg Park & Ride that was never built. Transit Planner Micki Kaplan commented that the Springfield Station was a placeholder at this point, and staff would present recommendations for Board approval once a site was selected and plans were drawn.

MOTION

VOTE

Ms. Hocken moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the proposed Capital Improvements Program for fiscal years 1999-2000 through 2003-2004 is approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

BOARD HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Mr. Bennett, Chair of the Board Human Resources Committee, reported that the committee recently had met to review the general manager's compensation and the general manager succession plan.

Mr. Bennett said that Human Resources Manager David Dickman had done an outstanding job of researching and putting together information to compare and review the compensation package of the general manager. It was clear that a significant adjustment needed to be made. This review had not occurred for a number of years. The Board had been caught up in other issues, such as the bargaining unit, the legislation around the general manager's salary, and the administrative staff compensation review. The committee unanimously agreed that it was time to make a reasonable adjustment to the general manager's compensation.

Ms. Wylie, also a member of the Human Resources Committee, agreed with Mr. Bennett that the Board now was playing catch up. Mr. Dickman had provided good comparative data, and she agreed with the recommendation. The current compensation was not a competitive package. The general manager's salary had not been adjusted for a number of years, and out of respect and gratitude to the current general manager and to ensure competition for the general manager succession, she highly recommended that the Board approve the recommendation.

Mr. Kleger expressed his appreciation to the Human Resources Committee for addressing this issue. He had served on other boards that had to recruit high-level executives with insufficient resources to match the market.

Ms. Lauritsen thanked Ms. Loobey for the good job she did as general manager and stated that she supported the proposed recommendation.

Mr. Bailey thanked the committee and Mr. Dickman. Since he had become a member of the LTD Board, the Board had attempted to promote fairness in terms of compensation for all employees of the District. The general manager compensation review was overdue.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adjusts the general manager's compensation for Fiscal Years 1998-1999 and 1999-2000 as set forth below:

Effective July 1, 1998

- 1998-1999 base salary increase to $91,000
- 1998-1999 base salary adjustment of 1.7 percent
  (action results in final 1998-1999 base salary of $92,547)
- These changes to be made retroactively

Effective July 1, 1999

- 1999-2000 base salary increase to $98,500
- Adjust base salary the same amount as administration employees effective July 1, 1999

and, furthermore, that the Board reaffirms its employment agreement with the current general manager, with the inclusion of the recommended compensation changes."

VOTE

Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

In the matter of the General Manager Succession Plan, Mr. Dickman stated that the plan had been distributed to the members of the Board. The plan envisioned three phases. Phase One would include the formation of a Board executive search committee and an ad-hoc executive committee that would have the authority to act and be delegated certain authorities.

Phase Two would involve the gathering of information from stakeholders within the community about the future of LTD's leadership.

Phase Three would be the ad-hoc committee, acting on behalf of the Board of Directors to hire an executive search firm that would conduct a nationwide search for replacement of the general manager.

There was another phase relative to the types of narrowing that the search firm would conduct. This phase would be developed in conjunction with discussion from the Board.

The plan envisioned that the Board would make a decision relative to replacement with a goal date of March 31, 2000, to allow a comfort zone for the new general manager to make the transition.

Mr. Kleger thought that the draft plan was very well put together. Mr. Dickman added that the stakeholder input was included to identify qualities and not to surrender the Board's responsibilities in this matter.

Mr. Bennett stated his concern about Phase Two and the level of community involvement. While he believed that stakeholder input was important, he also believed that the Board members were most familiar with the level of skills and the level of internal and external responsibility that the current general manager possessed. He thought that the Board should remain at the core of this decision-making process.

Mr. Dickman stated that the plan was a set of goals, enumerated in a chronological order. The plan would be controlled by the Board and the Board committees. The plan would provide a basis by which the Board would operate in this matter, but it was not binding.

Ms. Hocken stated that several years ago, when the Board was forced to accept bids for legal services, after many years with the same firm, the Board discovered through that process that there were many different perspectives that it had not considered. She believed that by talking to stakeholders, the Board might discover different perspectives, and would not be giving away its responsibility.

Mr. Bailey stated that his reaction to the ad-hoc group was that it would be a working group and should not grow so large that it could not work. Ms. Hocken added that the ad-hoc group could develop an instrument to receive feedback.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that she was concerned with the time and efficiency. She thought the Board should comprise the ad-hoc committee before going out to the community. Mr. Kleger stated that when he first joined the Board, he learned that committees should have no more than three members, because four would make a quorum of the Board.

Ms. Loobey stated that it would be important for the Board to elicit information and advice from strategic groups of clients or customers of the District. She thought it would be important to have communication in an organized way from the Employee Council, a unit of the Amalgamated Transit Union, the Chambers of Commerce, and the major group pass holders: Sacred Heart, UO, and LCC. These groups had an image and opinion of LTD. She believed that given the District's agenda for the future and its mission, it was important for the District to remember the significance that this transition of leadership had not only for the organization, but also for the community.

The BRT process is a door-to-door process, and she did not believe that this process should be applied to the general manager transition process. However, she believed that key community leaders had an opinion about what they would like to see and they had some sense about what LTD's vision was for the future. LTD was an important part of the transportation infrastructure, and choosing a new general manager was part of the transition from a little bus company to a bigger bus company.

Mr. Bailey stated that he thought there was general support from the Board members for the transition plan, but that some further details of the ad-hoc committee needed to be worked out. The Board Human Resources Committee would meet again on April 12, and the full Board would revisit the issue at its April meeting.

BUDGET COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS: Board members Hillary Wylie, Dave Kleger, and Pat Hocken nominated community members to new three-year terms on the Budget Committee, beginning immediately and ending January 1, 2002, to replace Budget Committee members whose terms expired on January 1, 1999.

Ms. Wylie recommended Michael Bean, Executive Director of ACES, a drug and alcohol treatment program, and a Springfield resident. He was familiar with budgets and government projects.

Ms. Hocken nominated Pamela A. Papp, a management consultant.

Mr. Kleger nominated Elaine Guard, Area Vice President for Barrett Business Services, Inc. He said that she had experience in dealing with substantial budgetary matters.

MOTION

VOTE

Ms. Wylie moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that Michael Bean, Pamela Papp, and Elaine Guard are appointed to the LTD Budget Committee for a three-year term beginning immediately and ending January 1, 2002. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 6-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

III. REGULAR BOARD MEETING – ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC): Ms. Hocken reported that Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had changed the allocation of Surface Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) allocations, of which LTD typically received a portion. As a result, LTD would experience a severe drop in revenues from this source. MPC sent a letter of comments to ODOT covering this and other issues, but requesting that the transit district be given further consideration comparable with what had been given in the past. The other item discussed at MPC involved issues related to TransPlan, which were more serious for the cities and county than for LTD, because LTD had a stable source of funding.

Statewide Livability Forum: The next meeting was scheduled for May 11, 1999, and Ms. Hocken would attend.

BRT Steering Committee: Mr. Bennett reported that the committee spent time discussing the goals and objectives. An attempt would be made to set a realistic performance standard. No firm recommendation had been made on the Springfield segment and alternatives.

Ms. Hocken added that several Board members and staff had attended a recent County Commissioners meeting. The Commissioners had asked what the goals of the BRT project were and what LTD was hoping to accomplish. That conversation prompted the re-writing of the goals and objectives for the BRT project.

Springfield Station Steering Committee: Mr. Kleger reported that the committee had reviewed five sites and removed one (Site D) because of public input and the fact that there would be serious traffic problems for that site. The next meeting was to be held on March 18, 1999, and the committee would review the remaining sites and make recommendations about environmental assessments on those sites. Mr. Kleger noted that the steering committee was made up of very good people, who came to the meetings prepared and ready to work.

Update On Meetings With Local Area's Congressional Delegation: Mr. Bailey reported that he and Ms. Wylie had traveled with staff to Washington, D.C. LTD was joined by the cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, and the Springfield Public Schools to present a "united front" on local federal priorities. Mr. Bailey reported that the meetings had gone well, and all the members of the delegation had been met with, including some from Oregon's delegation who did not represent the Eugene/Springfield area. There was some encouragement and some discouragement, particularly concerning this year's bus purchase.

The comprehensive agenda included juvenile justice, transportation issues, the federal courthouse, wastewater management, and a wide array of natural resource issues.

Ms. Wylie added that she believed LTD had gained support from the delegation just for being with the United Front group. The delegation was impressed with the joint presentation. She thought the process was very effective. There was a problem in that Oregon had a very small delegation with very little seniority. The United Front group spent an afternoon with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and it appeared that there would be some money for retooling American bus manufacturing companies to generate a new, innovative bus design. There was general excitement at the FTA for LTD's BRT project.

North End Scoping Group: Mr. Bennett reported that he had attended the introductory meeting in Mr. Kortge's place, and Mr. Vobora had made a presentation that was effective in providing a more comprehensive look at the 5th Avenue area. Meetings would be held every other week for 10 weeks, and it was expected that Mr. Kortge would attend.

Ms. Loobey added that the North End Scoping Group was a committee that had been put together by Mayor Torrey to study the issues around the train station and the development that would be going on there, including the new federal courthouse, which would remove much of the available parking. The Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) appropriated funds for the remodeling of the train station, and Governor Kitzhaber had presented his ideas for thruway buses from all areas to connect to the trains in Eugene. Those were two of the issues that prompted formation of the committee. She was pleased that LTD had been included in the group.

TRANSPLAN UPDATE: Mr. Viggiano reported that June 30, 1999, had been selected as the date for the joint public hearing before the LTD Board, Eugene and Springfield City Councils, and the Lane County Board of Commissioners.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: Mr. Bailey thanked Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch for her hard work in making the United Front trip a success. She had been a part of the Lane County delegation for some time, and it was a success because she was involved with it.

Ms. Lynch provided a brief update of the legislative events in Salem. She stated that most of what she had to say was included in the summary that was distributed at the meeting as Handout / Page 128 of the Board packet.

LTD ACCIDENT RECORD: Mr. Bailey directed the Board's attention to the agenda item summary on page 83 of the Board packet. The Board had asked for more information about how accidents were tracked, and the information was provided by staff.

OREGON PUBLIC PURCHASING AWARD: Mr. Bailey recognized Purchasing Administrator Jeanette Bailor, who received the "Partnership in Public Purchasing Hero" award from the Oregon Public Purchasing Association. Ms. Bailor was honored for her outstanding and innovative work on the Eugene Station. Mr. Bailey added that he had been told that the FTA Region X, located in Seattle, Washington, often called on Ms. Bailor to act in a consultant manner in transit purchasing matters. Mr. Bailey recognized Ms. Bailor as an asset to the District.

Adjournment: Mr. Bailey pointed out other items of interest on the agenda, and there being no further business, Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 8:25 p.m.

Hillary Wylie

Board Secretary