

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 21, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 15, 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, April 21, 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
Dean Kortge
Virginia Lauritsen
Hillary Wylie, Secretary
Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

I. WORK SESSION

Preparation For May 1 Joint Work Session With Springfield City Council:

Mr. Pangborn stated that a work session was planned with the Springfield City Council on Saturday, May 1, at LTD, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to attempt to come to an understanding with the Springfield Council about their participation in and support of bus rapid transit (BRT). The need for a meeting with the Springfield City Council resulted from a meeting in Washington, D.C., during the United Front lobbying trip, when Mr. Bailey, Ms. Wylie, Ms. Loobey, Ms. Lynch, and Mr. Pangborn met with Springfield Mayor Maureen Maine and Councilor Sid Leiken.

Mr. Pangborn said that the City of Springfield had requested that LTD hire a professional facilitator for the joint meeting. Mr. Pangborn had been in touch with Margot Helphand to facilitate the meeting.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if there was a resume for Ms. Helphand. Mr. Pangborn said that he only had made phone contact with Ms. Helphand, who formerly was the director of training for Lane County and now was a private consultant. The City of Springfield had provided two names, John O'Connor and Ms. Helphand. Mr. O'Connor was not available for May 1, but Ms. Helphand was available. Ms. Lauritsen said that she would have preferred to have a choice of three. Mr. Pangborn added that he had placed a call

to Peter and Susan Glaser, but had not yet heard back about their availability. He stated that he would keep the Board apprised of his progress in this matter.

Mr. Bailey asked if the Board had any objections to the use of a facilitator. There were none.

Mr. Pangborn then reviewed the draft agenda that had been distributed to the Board members, which included a list of resolved and unresolved issues. The value to the Board of talking about the agenda ahead of time was to be clear about and understand the Board's position. Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen, as the Springfield representatives, had met with the mayor of Springfield and Springfield staff to discuss some of those issues.

Ms. Wylie stated that her biggest concern for the May meeting was that attitudes of "we/they" were developing, and she felt that the two groups might be at that point. She said that she had written down many of the City's concerns, and she believed that the agenda would cover many of those concerns.

However, Ms. Wylie said that primarily the City of Springfield did not want to be viewed as obstructionists, nor did they want to feel threatened about being left out of the BRT plan. She said that City Manager Mike Kelly had summarized his thoughts that the City could speed up if LTD could slow down; the City wanted the BRT plan to be data driven rather than concept driven; and the City wanted to look at alternatives. One of the ideas that had come from the Washington, D.C., meeting had been for LTD to fund a traffic engineer who would be put on the City of Springfield staff to study the impacts of BRT on traffic on the preferred and alternate corridors.

Ms. Wylie said that many issues had been discussed, but the strongest issue had been to resolve the issue of the dedicated lane. Currently, the City believed that Main Street and South A Street were the two busiest streets in the community, and they had recently passed a bicycle plan that would add bike lanes to both streets. When they visualized one lane of traffic with a bus going by only once every ten minutes and all the rest of the traffic using another lane, it did not make sense to them. The City believed that BRT did not make sense for the 10 percent of the Springfield residents who currently rode the bus.

Ms. Wylie said that she was verbalizing their positions as elected officials to deal with their population and their concerns. She said it was very important for LTD to hear those concerns. The Council realized that BRT was the number one goal of LTD, and that LTD had excellent staff who used great visual aids to tell them how wonderful BRT would be, but they still did not see BRT as wonderful for their community right now.

The City favored some of the elements of BRT, and they wanted an opportunity to study those elements, such as queue-jumping. They also wanted to study 3rd Street as an alternate corridor with painted lines, not curbs. They favored a "BRT Lite" alternative scenario. One of the possibilities that was discussed was that LTD write the BRT plan in Springfield that addressed their needs and included different elements of BRT on different parts of the corridor. The City needed to see more data and needed to

have a realistic discussion about the impacts on their community. They also felt that they had not had their say, and they saw their transportation and traffic issues nearly in jeopardy at this point.

As a Springfield representative, Ms. Wylie said that she certainly did understand what the City needed, but at the same time, her heart was with BRT as an LTD Board member. She thought that as the structure of the May 1 meeting came together, she believed that the Board should be prepared to discuss and hear the needs of the City of Springfield and to be prepared to meet them in one way or another.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she agreed with Ms. Wylie's summary. It was a long-standing problem. She had attended the last Council meeting where LTD appeared and received a negative impression. She believed that it always came down to the same thing, which was communications. She did not think that the LTD Board could say that the City of Springfield had to "come around." They did not have to do anything.

She noted some of the comments at the meeting. One was that Ms. Loobey had made some agreements and the two staffs were to meet. She thought that was good, but the City was concerned that LTD staff and Board were so keen on and dedicated to BRT that they could not hear any deviation from the full gospel of that text.

Ms. Lauritsen distributed a copy of the 1997 Intergovernmental Agreement Regarding Transit Signal Priority and a letter dated June 9, 1997, from Springfield Council President Greg Shaver that specified studies that LTD would conduct. She said that the City was not satisfied that LTD had done what was specified in the letter or that alternatives had been discussed properly. The City's perspective was that all LTD had to do was get buses up and down the street, while the City had to consider all forms of transportation for its streets, including bicycles, automobiles, and buses. In the meantime, they had to run a city and maintain the roads. LTD needed to back up and determine where it was that the two jurisdictions could come together again to have a shot at changing service in the community. Without the local support, it was unlikely that Congressman DeFazio would be as positive as he might otherwise be.

Ms. Lauritsen noted that the *Springfield News* that day had carried five front-page articles, three of which mentioned the Springfield Council. The *Register-Guard* carried six front-page articles, two of national interest, two about the County, and two about the City of Eugene. Springfield received no front-page coverage, and was relegated back to same page that EWEB was covered on. She thought that LTD should drop the BRT issue now or instead consider communicating with the City of Springfield. Ms. Lauritsen said that she did not want to see BRT go down.

Mr. Bailey asked Ms. Lauritsen if she believed that was where the issue currently stood with the City of Springfield. Ms. Lauritsen replied that she did not believe it was that extreme, but she did believe it would get there quickly if LTD did not listen to the City's concerns. Mr. Bailey asked if the Council had expressed any expectations for the meeting on May 1. Ms. Lauritsen said that the City very much wanted to get back on track and was willing to work through the issues. It would be LTD's challenge to determine how to move the City in the right direction. Additionally, whatever was

learned in Springfield would be needed for Eugene when LTD began work on the West 11th Avenue portion of the corridor, and people began to realize that a lane and on-street parking would be lost and that bicycles would not be able to get through West 11th easily. LTD needed to take a broader view if it wanted to be successful in Springfield. She did not believe that the BRT proposal would be dropped soon, but if support just was lukewarm, she did not want to spend that kind of money. On the other hand, if LTD began to listen, BRT could be very successful. It was possible that a phase-in approach during the next five years would be successful.

The two cities had some short-term goals, and if more attention was paid to those short-term goals, LTD would gain more support in total.

Ms. Hocken commented that when LTD first approached the Springfield City Council, the Council members were cautious, but said that BRT sounded like an interesting concept. However, they also said that until LTD had more details about where the BRT route would go, they could not have an intelligent conversation about it. LTD now was at the point where it was attempting to provide those details that the Council had requested, and now LTD was being told that it was forcing the issue. LTD was trying to do what the City had asked it to do, and now the City was saying that LTD needed to do something else. The current feasibility study was being conducted to gather the data and provide options for where the BRT lines would go. This was the City of Springfield's direction to LTD.

Ms. Hocken said that admittedly, there was a different Council then, but that was one of the reasons LTD was conducting the detailed analysis. LTD needed a commitment from the City of Springfield about at what point enough analysis had been done before decisions could be made. She agreed with Ms. Lauritsen's and Ms. Wylie's comments about the we/they attitude and that the City had broader issues to consider. LTD had its vision and the City had its vision, and there was a need to determine where the two jurisdictions agreed in terms of visions and goals. She did not believe that the City of Springfield could accuse LTD of forcing the project, because LTD was, in fact, doing exactly what the City had asked.

Ms. Lauritsen said that one of the things she got from the meeting with the City of Springfield was that the areas of disagreement were not technical, but that the idea or concept needed to be further discussed. She did not believe that the City needed more technical data, but they did need to discuss with the Board what the City would do with the larger picture or the other 90 percent of the population that did not ride the bus. She said that they understood reserving rights-of-way, but if the two boards could discuss concepts together, she believed that was what the City desired.

Mr. Kleger thought that maybe the answers were not what the City wanted, but that maybe LTD had not understood the questions.

Ms. Wylie added that the City actually did want more data. They thought that a traffic engineer could study some of the alternatives. The City wanted to analyze the data, the impact of BRT on Springfield and the 90 percent of the citizens who did not use

transit, where alternative corridors might be, what the alternative choices were other than BRT, and what could be done with less impact.

Ms. Lauritsen quoted from the 1997 letter, "the City must exert enough influence over such a pilot project to ensure that those matters for which the City sets policy will not be adversely impacted by the BRT project." She said that the City was feeling left out. The City felt that suddenly LTD was digging dirt on the City's streets, making lanes, and the City was a little alarmed. One of the concerns was about the 24-hour exclusive right-of-way that would inconvenience the 90 percent of the population that did not use transit. The lane would be empty for nine minutes, then it would be in use for one minute by a bus. The City wanted to know where the need was for that.

The City liked the concept of Park & Ride lots with loop routes to the residents. There also was interest in trying a High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane (BRT lite), before committing to valuable road space.

Mr. Bennett asked if the City actually was trying to say in a nice way that it did not believe that BRT would work. Ms. Lauritsen replied that the City was tapping LTD's shoulder. Mr. Bennett stated that LTD had been seeking input during the past two to three years. LTD was listening, while at the same time moving forward with the planning process. During the two- to three-year period, it appeared that all jurisdictions were close to giving full support of the project. The City talked about phasing in BRT, and there was no evidence that it would work; and in fact, the City thought that there was evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Bennett continued to say that if BRT did not utilize an exclusive lane to be competitive, to carry a larger percentage of the trips, particularly during peak hours, it would not be successful. That was the fundamental basis of BRT. If the Board compromised down to the basic fundamentals of the proposal, where one must consider giving it up, and at that point, one must admit that one no longer believed in it either. BRT would have no chance of working, and simply would be a waste of resources. The community did not have a traffic crisis now, but it would have it sometime in the near future. The community would experience the same kind of congestion that every other growing community in the world had experienced. And, if the community did not begin planning for that now, it would become nearly impossible to do later. Land would become geometrically more expensive; decisions would have been made about where businesses were located on the streets and how the streets were used; and parking would become more and more dear and congested. Then, when there really was gridlock, and the community tried to make the case for rapid transit, the LTD Board believed it would be too late. Was the timing exactly right? Mr. Bennett said that he did not know that for sure, but the preponderance of evidence was that if LTD did not start early, it would not get there, and if LTD did not have a competitive advantage that would get people out of their cars some of the time, then why do it?

Mr. Bailey stated that he wanted to redirect the tenor of the conversation. He thanked Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen for giving the Board a little bit more insight on the Council's position. He did not want to replicate the conversation it was to have with the Council. He thought that the Board instead should talk about its position, and if the

members were comfortable with the position and the information that was available to support where the BRT project stood.

Ms. Wylie stated that everything was valid, and she thought that the Springfield Council would acknowledge that. She asked if that validity balanced with solving the lane problem in downtown Springfield. LTD might have the greatest idea in the world, but it still did not solve the City's problem of 90 percent of the traffic on the road.

Mr. Bailey said that this was a technical issue that the Board was attempting to get the answers to. The LTD Board had to decide on a comfortable answer to that question. Mr. Bailey's sense was that the Board had moved beyond policy and was attempting to get a sense of the technical items. Now the Board was hearing that, in fact, it had to go back to the policy issue.

Ms. Wylie asked if LTD had an answer to the traffic problem in downtown Springfield. Mr. Bailey said that he was not sure LTD had gotten that far yet. Somewhere along the line, the staffs were not having conversations about what the appropriate questions were and what research needed to be done. That process had ground to a halt, because there seemed to be some question about the policy level. The Board needed to understand and agree on its position in terms of the policy level of the BRT proposal. Mr. Bailey thought that the Board already had done that. He thought that the Board was now at a place to figure out the technical feasibility of BRT. The policy only would change if there were a non-disputable issue. For instance, if ODOT were to determine that something absolutely could not be done, that would be a non-disputable issue, or if LTD discovered that there were underground environmental problems that ran through half of the corridor, that also would qualify as a non-disputable issue.

Ms. Hocken said that she thought that what the Board needed to gain from the conversation was that LTD was not trying to tell the City of Springfield it' business, and the Board was not sure that the City should be telling LTD the bus business. Both jurisdictions have expertise in specific areas and need to work together to figure out and respect the expertise, knowledge, and background of each other. The City and LTD had different responsibilities in the same space, and those responsibilities needed to be coordinated. That was a policy decision that needed to be made. Any technical issue could be solved if the will was there to do it, or a decision could be made that a technical issue was not solvable, but LTD and the City had to have the will to do it.

Mr. Bennett said that the LTD Board made projections and set goals. One of those was that in a given period of time, LTD would produce the results. He asked if the goals and projections were believable and if they were believable enough to move people. Mr. Bennett said that he was an advocate for reasonable growth, and if Springfield shared his attitude, it must know that the congestion only was going to get worse; there were projections to back that up. He wondered if Springfield was going to allow that to happen, because that was what other communities had done.

Ms. Wylie said that the City did want to be concerned about transportation, and it wanted to be part of the transportation planning. The City Council was concerned about the same things LTD was. But Ms. Wylie thought that another piece of the concern was

sensitivity to the constituency and how people would react to some of the things LTD was deciding. LTD needed to be sensitive to that as well.

Mr. Bennett said that he was concerned about getting to the meeting on May 1, and discussing those things that were agreed upon, and then talking around the things that fundamentally were not agreed upon. Maybe it was the philosophical part of BRT that was the problem. Ms. Lauritsen agreed that part of the problem was philosophical differences. Mr. Bennett continued to say that he was not sure that he knew how to talk about BRT with the City of Springfield.

Ms. Lauritsen said that what she heard Mr. Bennett say was the same as what the City had been concerned about, and that was LTD staff and Board having a "my way or no way" attitude. Mr. Bennett said that he did feel that way.

Ms. Lauritsen thought it was important to note that the Board had compromised on its policy statement in TransPlan, and she thought it was equally important for the Board to be prepared to compromise with the City of Springfield.

Mr. Bailey stated that the Board needed to discuss the fundamental issues of exclusive rights-of-way and where each member stood on that issue. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure that the Board had a reasonable understanding of each member's position on the key fundamental concepts of BRT.

Mr. Bailey referred to page 5 of the draft packet for the joint meeting, and the policy direction question about the concept of exclusive busways. He asked the Board members to comment on the question.

Ms. Hocken stated that she had never heard anything to indicate that the Board members were not committed to exclusive rights-of-way. If someone disagreed, she believed now was the time to speak up.

Mr. Kleger stated that he would be willing compromise somewhat in order to get a foot in the door. Maybe in the short-term, for a very limited time, he would be willing to give up on exclusive right-of-way west of the Springfield Station. For instance, the distance from the bridge in Glenwood to the downtown station, wherever that ended up, might be worth doing some initial compromise on. That area would be a tough problem, no matter what was done, because of the intense development. He would be a lot less willing to give up on an exclusive lane east of there, simply because it would be a lot easier to implement. He would be extremely reluctant to drop the BRT line somewhere west of the Willamette, because LTD would lose the time advantage to make it work. If that was what it would take, he would be willing to make the compromise. It was expected that Springfield would experience a one-third-population increase on the Thurston corridor, and the City of Springfield should be very concerned about how to accommodate that.

Ms. Lauritsen agreed with Mr. Kleger.

Mr. Kortge said that he was confused. He believed the Board was discussing the vision, and with a vision, work had to begin somewhere. BRT clearly was a way to move people. His sense was that the vision was to have a dedicated way to move people through an ever-increasing traffic congestion problem. He believed that the LTD Board should continue to promote that vision.

Ms. Hocken stated that she thought the problem was that typically people thought of vision in the long-term, distant future. BRT would be easier to implement now while property was still available and affordable. A compromise already had been made on the Franklin corridor that in some places BRT would not operate on two separate busways, but would operate in both directions on one shared busway. So, LTD was not being uncompromising. One of the things that LTD needed to accomplish at the joint meeting was to convince the Springfield Council that LTD had compromised and was willing to compromise, but that there were limits to those compromises. Each time LTD compromised, the value of the project was jeopardized.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she agreed with Mr. Kortge. LTD should promote the vision, and get as much lane as possible. However, promoting an attitude of 100 percent or nothing would surely put the project in jeopardy.

Mr. Bailey stated that the configuration of BRT could be the issue to compromise on, but still with exclusive busways.

Ms. Wylie said that she thought it was important for the staffs to meet before the joint meeting and to check off some of the tests and findings that had been performed in response to some of the things the City had asked for. She believed that some of the issues could be resolved before the meeting.

Ms. Lauritsen said that the research modeling had addressed the macro, but not the micro issues, such as the impacts on the other road users. She thought it was important to provide answers to the micro issues of the impact of BRT on others.

Ms. Hocken stated that concentrating on the micro level would mask some of the benefits of BRT.

Mr. Bennett was convinced that the opportunity for BRT was one that required all pieces to be in place. The commitment in this community as well as most communities in the country was heavily toward the automobile. So, unless LTD had something that was truly competitive, convenient, and futuristic right from the start, it would not sell and was not worth the investment. If BRT had to merge back into traffic, it would defeat the purpose, and that was one fundamental that he could not compromise on. Anything else was inaccurate and unrealistic, and he did not feel that he could be held accountable for something that did not accomplish the goals that were set. He would rather give up the project entirely if exclusive right-of-way were not possible.

Ms. Wylie said that the City had discussed 3rd Street as an alternative for dedicated lanes, and unless LTD could find a way to deal with Springfield's traffic issues, there would be a problem.

Mr. Bailey summarized that the Board still was committed to exclusive rights-of-way, but was open to the notion of how they were configured, such as what streets they might operate on, whether it was used a single, shared lane or a double lane, etc. He believed the Board was sticking to the notion that exclusive right-of-way would be required.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that she was committed to exclusive right-of-way over the life of the project.

Mr. Bailey stated that he thought it had been a good discussion, and he believed the Board was in agreement. He invited the Board members to provide additional comments throughout the course of the remainder of the meeting.

II. REGULAR MEETING

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – May 1999: Mr. Bailey introduced Diann Sheldon as the May 1999 Employee of the Month. Ms. Sheldon was hired on August 19, 1996. In November 1997, she was selected for the position of bus operator instructor, and currently she taught the Personal Injury Prevention segment of new operator training. In 1998, she achieved excellent attendance, two years of safe driving, and two years of correct schedule operation (CSO).

Ms. Sheldon was nominated by several customers for always being friendly, helpful, and very diplomatic in explaining company policy. One customer noted that Ms. Sheldon was a diplomat even with the most difficult customers and was quite an asset to LTD.

Ms. Sheldon's supervisor added that Ms. Sheldon always had a positive attitude and was helpful and happy. He noted that she also was involved with LTD's Y2K project and added that she recently was chosen as a mentor/coach in a mentoring program for new employees.

Mr. Bailey presented Ms. Sheldon with a certificate, a letter of congratulations, and a monetary award. Ms. Sheldon said that being selected as an Employee of the Month was a great honor. She had been with LTD for three years in August, and the time had flown by. She thought that LTD was a wonderful bus system, and she received feedback from the customers that they were happy with the direction of LTD and the work of the Board. She said it was a privilege to work for LTD and that she really enjoyed her job. She thanked the Board for the honor.

MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION:

- a) Mr. Pangborn introduced new Information Services Manager Steve Parrott. He said that Mr. Parrott came to LTD from Ohio, where he managed the Information Services department for a manufacturing firm. Mr. Bailey welcomed Mr. Parrott to LTD.

- b) Mr. Pangborn reminded the Board members that the Budget Committee meetings would be held on April 28 and 29, 1999, beginning at 6:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: a) Grace Retford of Eugene stated that she knew the Board dealt with a lot of money and big issues, but she wanted to express an everyday story that endeared her to LTD. She worked at Goodwill and was proud of the work done there. Without other agencies, Goodwill could not do what she was so proud of. Several months ago, Goodwill contracted with a company to have clients and a skills trainer work in the McKenzie Bridge area. Three clients were traveling to McKenzie Bridge on a daily basis to work. She said that she was very grateful that LTD had such an interest to assist in transporting the three clients, who were doing productive work and gaining independence, because Goodwill otherwise would not be able to send them.

She commended Bus Operator Paul Headley, who drove the morning McKenzie Bridge route. Mr. Headley was very helpful in putting together the transportation for the clients and the trainer, resulting in a new bus stop location, and personalized service even in the most inclement weather. She reiterated her pride in Goodwill, but said that it could not be successful without the assistance of other agencies like LTD.

MOTION

VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Ms. Hocken moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 21, 1999, is approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the Minutes of the March 15, 1999, special Board meeting, and the Minutes of the March 17, 1999, regular Board meeting.

FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000 PRICING PLAN AND FIRST READING OF AMENDED FARE ORDINANCE: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that following a public hearing that was held at the March 1999 Board meeting, the Board had directed staff to proceed with amending Ordinance No. 35, which set the fares for service for LTD. Those service changes would go into effect on September 1, 1999, and would be in effect during Fiscal Year 1999-2000.

Ms. Hellekson directed the Board's attention to the first page of the proposed Amended Ordinance No. 35. She stated that there was a typographical error that staff would correct and which would be noted in the Minutes of the Board meeting. Under the Cash Fare section, Evening fare discounts were proposed to be eliminated. The asterisks next to Evenings were to be eliminated, as was the footnote they referred to, "evening fare reduction begins at 7:00 p.m."

Public Hearing: Mr. Bailey opened the meeting to public comment. There was no one in the audience who wished to address the Board about the proposed Pricing Plan, and Mr. Bailey closed the public hearing.

Board Discussion: Ms. Hocken stated that she had reviewed the written comments that had been received, which mostly were positive.

Mr. Kleger stated that he had attended the Special Transportation Fund (STF) Advisory Committee meeting, in which members supported the adjustment to the RideSource fare. The committee members were concerned about the impact upon those who had very limited means. The reality was that RideSource rides were very expensive to produce, and it was generally accepted that if there was not a better farebox recovery ratio, it would be extremely difficult to continue to provide the service. It still was unknown whether or not the state legislature would provide additional funding for special transportation.

Mr. Kleger said that there were a couple of misunderstandings in the letters that were contained in the Board packet. Some people thought that the RideSource Shopper fare was being changed. The Shopper fare was not being changed at this time. In addition, there were some who thought that the attendant who accompanied the customer would now have to pay the fare. That also was not the case. Staff were working to get the correct information out to the RideSource customers.

MOTION**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kortge moved that Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

Mr. Bailey then read the Ordinance by title, "Eighth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services."

ROUTE #26C REVISION: Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated that in addition to the service changes that the Board had approved in March, staff had identified a route, the #26C Willamette, that primarily served high school students, and while the route as a whole was productive, the midday trips were very unproductive. Staff now were recommending elimination of those midday trips. This remainder of the route would function as a school tripper, serving students in the area.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff had received any feedback from postings and flyers about the elimination of the route. Mr. Vobora responded that the feedback had been minimal, with only two callers, who said they would appear at the meeting to testify, and who apparently had not shown up.

Mr. Vobora added that with regard to the recent Board discussions about the Annual Route Review, there were two low-productivity routes, the #4x and 5x, that were in question. Staff had met with Hyundai and as a result would modify the arrival times of those routes to attempt to boost ridership.

MOTION**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution, "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the staff recommendation to eliminate four trips of route 26C Willamette effective with the fall bid in 1999." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT PILOT CORRIDOR GOALS AND PERFORMANCE

OBJECTIVES: Mr. Viggiano reported that the Goals and Objectives had been developed in response to questions regarding what LTD wanted to achieve with BRT. The Steering Committee had reviewed and recommended approval of the Goals and Objectives.

Mr. Bailey stated that his letter to the editor regarding BRT had been published in the *Register-Guard*, and he received a phone call from a gentleman from Eugene, who indicated that he was a retired salesman from Gresham. He had been in this community for approximately seven years, and he called to say that he believed LTD was headed in the right direction.

He also asked if LTD was looking into electric buses, and Mr. Bailey had responded that LTD was considering a variety of vehicles, including electric buses.

Ms. Wylie asked if the Board was expected to adopt the Goals and Objectives. She was concerned that the first three goals seemed self-serving. One of the issues with Springfield was the goal of increasing the transit market share, rather than a goal of reducing congestion. She recommended that the Board not take action on the Goals and Objectives until after the joint meeting with the Springfield City Council. Ms. Lauritsen agreed with Ms. Wylie

Mr. Bennett thought that the Board should wait until everyone was ready to vote on the issue.

Ms. Hocken did not see a reason to delay. She stated that the Goals and Objectives were the Board's visions for BRT, and she did not believe there was anything in the Goals and Objectives that should offend any of the partner agencies. However, if all the Board members were not on board with the Goals and Objectives and a vote was postponed, she thought it would be useful to include a copy of the Goals and Objectives in the agenda packet for the joint meeting.

Ms. Hocken further stated that with all jurisdictions represented on the BRT Steering Committee, the Springfield City Council had an opportunity to provide input into the document.

Mr. Bailey said that he had no objections to holding off on approval of the Goals and Objectives, but the document had been produced in response to requests, specifically from Lane County. He believed that the Board was approving the document as a sign of good faith. The Steering Committee came to a decision on the Goals and Objectives as a response to the community. There might be some accidents of words in the document, because LTD obviously was attempting to reduce congestion, but had made the choice to call it improved bus travel times and carrying capacity. He was equally concerned that the Board not approve the goals prior to the joint meeting, because he believed the Council would question where the goals and objectives were.

Ms. Wylie said that she thought the Board could present the Goals and Objectives in draft form to show that LTD wanted feedback from the Council. She asked what the impact would be of waiting one more month to approve the document.

Mr. Kleger stated that perhaps it would be useful to get specific input from the Springfield Council. He thought that the document looked good, but it needed to be made clear that some of the current wording was specifically written to facilitate tracking and measuring performance, as well as to hold the Board accountable. He thought it could be advantageous to wait until after the joint meeting to approve the Goals and Objectives.

Mr. Bailey polled the Board about deferring a decision until the May 1999 meeting. All agreed, and the item was deferred until the May 1999 regular meeting of the Board.

ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEE BENEFIT AND RETIREMENT CHANGES: The Board Human Resources Committee recommended changes to the administrative employee benefit and retirement package. Mr. Bennett, who chaired the committee, stated that the committee studied the issue very carefully. As the chair, he did not believe that he had the experience and knowledge of this issue that the other committee members had, and he asked them to comment.

Mr. Kortge thanked Human Resources Manager Dave Dickman for providing him additional material and information. He stated that the summary in the Board packet was very clear. Basically, the changes were to make some trade-offs in benefits in order to improve the pension plan. There were two benefits to improving the pension plan. One was to give the pension plan some convertibility, so that new people could convert into it and people who left the organization could take some of the benefit with them. The other benefit was with the defined benefit account portion. Employees would have direct control and responsibility to manage their investment dollars. Mr. Kortge said that he believed it was a good proposal.

Ms. Wylie reminded the Board that during the last year, the administrative employees had formed an informal employee association rather than joining a formal union. The employee association had worked with employees and management to improve the pension plan by taking reductions in other areas of the benefits package. Staff felt that improvements to the retirement plan were the most important and, therefore, were willing to take cuts in other areas, which Ms. Wylie thought was very admirable. She believed that LTD had a quality administrative staff, and in order to keep those employees, they would want to make sure they had what they needed when they retired. As a Board, it was the members' responsibility to assist staff in this area. She thought that staff had done a good job in preparing the changes, and it was a good proposal.

Mr. Bailey thanked the Human Resources Committee for its work on this issue.

Ms. Hocken stated that she was concerned that the Oregon Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) was given fairly minimal treatment, and the reason for rejection of that plan, as stated in the agenda packet memo, did not seem adequate. She had discussed her concern with Mr. Pangborn, and he had explained that the PERS plan would be more expensive to the District than what was proposed.

Ms. Hocken stated that she also had expressed a concern about feedback from the Amalgamated Transit Union, and she was told that there was none that staff was aware of.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors accepts the recommendation of the Board's Human Resources Committee and approves the benefit reductions and retirement plan improvements as contained in the LTD Employee Association Proposal on Realignment of Benefits, and, further, that the amendments to the Salaried Trust Plan necessary to implement the features dealing with retirement are hereby approved and the President of the Board of Directors, sitting as the President of the Salaried Trust, is authorized to implement the Plan amendments." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

GENERAL MANAGER SUCCESSION PLAN: Mr. Bennett reported that the Human Resources Committee also discussed the draft succession plan, which was included in the Board packet. The Committee recommended the plan for full Board approval. The committee discussed the level of community involvement and how to treat that aspect of the succession plan.

Mr. Bennett said that Mr. Bailey needed to be very much involved in the succession plan, since he was involved in appointing the Board members who would serve as the Executive Search Committee.

The other Human Resource Committee members, Mr. Kortge and Ms. Wylie, thought that the plan was well thought out.

Mr. Bailey said that he thought the succession plan was the right approach, particularly in light of the broad scope of involvement LTD had in both Eugene and Springfield. He thought it was important to obtain feedback from the community about its expectations for a new general manager for LTD.

Ms. Hocken asked if the timeline was too ambitious. Mr. Dickman said that it was an ambitious plan, but that LTD already was behind the timetable. He thought that if the plan was adopted and Mr. Bailey appointed the Executive Search Committee, one of the first things the committee should discuss was how the timetable needed to be addressed and how much of the timetable needed to be extended.

Mr. Kleger asked about the absolute end date for Ms. Loobey's employment and if there was a fallback plan if the schedule were not met. Mr. Dickman said that he believed the date was irrevocable, but he also believed that the date largely was irrelevant to the plan. There most likely would be alternatives that existed within the District's current management for interim service.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adopts the proposed General

VOTE

Manager Succession Plan." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

Mr. Bailey then appointed himself, Ms. Wylie, and Ms. Hocken to the Executive Search Committee. Mr. Bailey would chair the first meeting of that committee.

ENDORSEMENT OF SPRINGFIELD TGM GRANT APPLICATION: Transit Planner Micki Kaplan stated that the City of Springfield had planned to apply for a State of Oregon Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant to develop a market-feasible redevelopment plan for a three-block area at and around the proposed Springfield Station. The grant would be managed by City staff, but would be a collaborative effort with LTD and the Springfield Renaissance Development Corporation (SRDC).

Ms. Kaplan introduced Mark Metzger, planner for the City of Springfield. Mr. Metzger said that primarily he worked in long-range planning for the City of Springfield. The City was excited about the plan for the new transit station in Springfield. When construction began, it likely would be the first new construction in downtown Springfield since 1974. City staff was committed to a rebirth of the downtown area. That vision was shared with a number of Springfield City Council members and with the SRDC, which was a relatively new community group.

Mr. Metzger said that he believed that the new Springfield station would be a catalytic kind of development that could spur redevelopment in the downtown core area. He was sold on mixed-use development in the downtown area. The benefit to the District from that type of development would be more people attracted to and working and living in the downtown area. Those people would be the ones who would take advantage of bus rapid transit and transit services in general.

Mr. Metzger said the City would request \$60,000 in state TGM money to help develop a redevelopment plan for the downtown area using the transit station as the central attraction. The City was interested in focusing on a three-block area surrounding the downtown station and developing something that was transit-oriented and pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. Metzger stated that LTD would provide a soft match for the grant, primarily in staff time. TGM staff feedback had been favorable. The application was due prior to the May 1999 LTD Board meeting, and staff were requesting a letter of support to the City for the grant application.

Mr. Kleger stated that the SRDC had been helpful to the Springfield Station Committee. He strongly supported the grant application.

Mr. Bennett commented that one of the most important decisions the City would make would be the selection of a marketing consultant. He asked if Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen were supportive of the grant application. Ms. Wylie stated that the

Springfield Station Committee was very supportive of the grant application. It fit in with everything the steering committee was doing.

Ms. Lauritsen stated that there was a great desire to have a core use of the downtown area that was both historic and picturesque. She supported the grant application.

Mr. Bailey stated that he thought it was a great idea and a wonderful project. When the Board worked on the plan for the Eugene Station, there were many discussions about the issue of creating some space for mixed-use opportunities. It appeared that some of those things would be more realistic with the Springfield Station. However, Mr. Bailey did believe that this item and the Springfield Station needed to be a part of the discussion at the joint meeting with the Springfield City Council on May 1. He suggested that the Board not move on the motion, and in fact, he did not think a motion was needed in order to forward a letter of support to the City on this project. He suggested that the Board wait until after the joint meeting to move on this item.

Mr. Metzger stated that the application for the grant was due on May 17, 1999, and he thought a decision could wait until after the joint meeting.

Mr. Kleger suggested that the Board take the action at this meeting, then wait until after May 1 to write the letter.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Springfield City Council supported the grant application. Mr. Metzger stated that the Council was in support of the project. Many of the Council members were involved with the SRDC, and there was a real interest in redevelopment of the downtown area. Because the Springfield Station would be the centerpiece, he believed it was appropriate to work closely together with LTD.

Ms. Hocken stated that she could not foresee anything in the May 1 discussion with the City Council that would influence the LTD Board not to support the proposed grant application. She believed it was an entirely separate issue from BRT.

Mr. Bailey stated that he would not sign a letter of support of the grant application prior to the May 1 joint meeting. He believed that all the issues were intertwined and that planning for one could not be divorced from planning for the other. He agreed with Ms. Hocken, and said that regardless of the May 1 discussion, he was willing to express to the state that projects like this one were a good thing to do, but he needed to be clear that he would not sign a letter prior to May 1.

MOTION

Mr. Bennett thought that the Board could go ahead and approve the motion even if the letter was not sent until after the joint meeting. He moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors will submit a letter of support to the City of Springfield for Springfield's TGM grant application to develop a Springfield Station Specific Area Plan." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

VOTE

VIII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:**

- a) MPC. No meeting had been held this month.
- b) b) Statewide Livability Forum. The next meeting was scheduled for May 11, 1999.
- c) c) BRT Steering Committee. There was nothing new to report.
- d) d) Springfield Station Steering Committee. There was nothing new to report.
- e) e) North End Scoping Group. Mr. Kortge stated that it was a fascinating committee. The entire north end would change with the new courthouse. There was a movement to make the railroad station publicly owned. The one thing that would affect the LTD Board was the large interest in having an affordable small bus circulator route downtown.

Ms. Hocken stated that she thought it would be important for a downtown circulator to travel past motels that were farther away from the train station. Mr. Kortge stated that the focus was concentrated on the north end of downtown.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Vobora to comment on the shuttle study. Mr. Vobora stated that the downtown shuttle advisory group, made up of stakeholders representing many different interests in downtown, had held its first meeting. The group discussed destinations and user groups. There would be three more advisory group meetings throughout the study. The train station, the university, and the hotels, were considered important links for the shuttle.

Mr. Kortge said that one focus of the Scoping Group discussion was how to have a place in the destination. High-powered streets, such as 6th and 7th Avenues in Eugene, did not attract business and did not create much of a place to go to. Typically, people used those two streets to travel quickly between east and west Eugene. The group discussed designing something that actually would slow traffic. They used a Danish model in which streets were designed for mixed-use, such as bicycles, cars, and pedestrians.

Ms. Wylie asked if sample shuttle routes had been designed. Mr. Vobora replied that sample designs were in progress. Ms. Wylie suggested that the shuttle bus be yellow and be called "ducks."

- d) Joint Meeting with the Eugene City Council: Mr. Kortge mentioned that both Councilor Nathansan and Councilor Meisner were members of the North End Scoping Group and had commented to him that they had been pleased with the joint meeting with LTD. Mr. Kleger stated that he heard similar feedback on the bus ride downtown after the joint meeting. Mr. Bailey stated that he thought it had been very effective.

- e) Fundraiser at Thurston High School. Ms. Lauritsen brought this subject up, and asked if LTD could sponsor a table at the dinner and silent auction. She and Ms. Wylie had planned to attend. The fundraiser would be held on May 15. Mr. Pangborn stated that staff would poll the other Board members for interest. Ms. Lauritsen said that this fundraiser was for needy students and not part of the victim fund.

Ms. Lauritsen added that when the Board held its annual retreat/work session, she would be interested in discussing the possibility of setting up a separate fund to assist needy students with transportation to and from school. She understood that LTD did have a fund that non-profit organizations were using for needy persons. This would help all of the schools in the area. Very often, fundraiser money was used to purchase bus passes. School counselors were very much in favor of keeping a child in his or her school of choice following such events as a divorce. LTD had nothing formally set up to assist in this matter, and it was her understanding that teachers often were covering some or all of the cost for bus passes out of their own salaries. There was not a mechanism set up for this, but it might be a good community service activity for LTD to be involved in.

MARCH FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson stated that LTD was three-quarters of the way through the fiscal year and was on-track with the budget. This was a time of year when attention was focused forward to the next fiscal year's budget. The budget hearings were to begin on April 28. The citizen members of the Budget Committee had met earlier in the month for budget briefings.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch reported that a list of current legislative issues that could affect LTD were included in the Board packet. She stated that with regard to Senate Bill 1090, which would substitute elected for appointed members for both Tri-Met and LTD, Portland Metro had submitted an amendment requesting that the law apply only to LTD and not to Tri-Met. That bill had been heard at the committee level, and Ms. Lynch expected it to be passed to the floor.

Ms. Hocken asked if Board members could assist Ms. Lynch's lobbying efforts. Ms. Lynch replied that she would contact Board members individually when appropriate.

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN: Mr. Vobora stated that staff wanted direction from the Board in identifying issues and concerns. A new timeline had been developed after a careful review of issues that were brought up previously. The biggest issue was the competing needs within the District.

The second issue was that the Board had not reached consensus on the fundamental issues of service and fare policy. This issue prompted staff to attempt to organize a Board work session in June. Mr. Vobora said that until the Board held that discussion, staff could not move forward very effectively with the CSR. The timeline reflected the June work session as a starting point for the CSR process.

Mr. Vobora said that he was wrong to have pushed for a decision from the Board about productivity versus coverage without having had a public input process following

the Board discussion in June. The timeline would be extended somewhat resulting in implementation in September of 2001.

Ms. Hocken stated that she appreciated the staff response to the Board's concerns. This new timeline would remove much of the Board's frustration with the process.

Mr. Bennett asked if there had been a public process when the initial fare and service policies were set. Mr. Vobora stated that, while there were annual public hearings for fare and service changes, the initial policy was set when the District was formed as a response to a desire for a system that could provide a basic level of mobility in the community. It had grown to become much more than that, but it was one consideration for why LTDs formation in the 1970s.

Mr. Vobora stated that a Nelson Nygaard consultant would attend the work session in June. He had a learning tool for the Board to use to better get at the productivity versus coverage issue, and he would facilitate the discussion. It would be valuable to clarify some of the issues. Staff could prepare some scenarios that would model a higher productivity system and a coverage system.

Ms. Hocken stated that she thought it would be very important to develop some LTD-specific scenarios rather than general ones, so she hoped that staff could provide those for the June work session. Mr. Vobora added that the Nelson Nygaard planning tool actually would use the Eugene/Springfield map.

Mr. Kleger stated that he liked the new schedule. He thought that staff were heading in the right direction.

Mr. Bailey asked if there were any objections to the revised timeline. Mr. Bennett stated his concern about whether the Board could fully discuss the issue in one work session. Mr. Vobora stated that he believed it could be done, particularly with Nelson Nygaard's assistance. Staff were planning to schedule the work session for late June.

YIELD LAW IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE: Mr. Vobora stated that he had no further information than what was written in the agenda item summary, but would answer any questions. Mr. Bailey asked how local law enforcement felt about enforcing the new law. Mr. Vobora stated there had been a group that included law enforcement officials from all three jurisdictions that met when the law had first passed. At that time, the feeling was that it was a straight-forward law to be enforced. They would not go out of their way to go find people who might violate the law, but would enforce it upon observations, just as with other violations. Staff had requested a grace period to give the public education campaign an opportunity to work.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE: In addition to the information contained in the agenda item summary, Mr. Viggiano reported that Mr. Bailey had given a presentation about BRT to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The presentation went well, was well received, and the OTC pledged support for the project.

Mr. Bennett called to the Board's attention the articles that were attached to the agenda. Mr. Kleger added that he and Community Relations Manager Ed Bergeron had a discussion with the Association of Oregon Railway and Transit Advocates (AORTA) about a recent article it had published that indicated that BRT was anti-rail. He believed it was a good discussion. Mr. Bergeron added that he would be making the same presentation to the Portland Railway Passenger's group on May 20. The Portland group was the source of the newsletter for the entire state.

SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE: There was nothing to add to the agenda item summary.

PILOT TRAVEL TRAINING AND TRANSIT ATTENDANT PROGRAM UPDATE: Mr. Bailey stated that a celebration had been planned to acknowledge the success of seven people from the Alternative Work Concepts who had successfully transitioned from riding the bus with an attendant to independent riding on LTD buses. The celebration would be held on April 27, 1999, at 3:00 p.m., at the Hilyard Community Center, and Mr. Bailey would attend to present certificates to the seven people. Mr. Kleger added that he also would attend. He said that the participants were very excited to have participated in this program.

EUGENE STATION ANNIVERSARY UPDATE: Mr. Bailey reminded the Board that a one-year anniversary celebration would be held at the Eugene Station at 1:00 p.m., on May 8, 1999.

EXECUTIVE TRAINING - PACIFIC PROGRAM AND APTA BOARD TRAINING: Mr. Pangborn asked Board members to contact the executive secretary if they were interested in attending either of the training opportunities. Mr. Bailey stated that he previously had attended the Pacific Program, and it was an excellent opportunity to expand one's executive skills and knowledge of Oregon.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Ms Wylie asked about the number of accidents and how it compared to last year. Mr. Dickman stated that the number of accidents in February was higher than expected, but was typical for a month. He reminded the Board that accidents were any incident that occurred on or near a bus and actually could involve anything from someone falling on the bus to a multi-vehicular accident. The average was 15 to 18 accidents per month. In December 1998, there had been 7 accidents, and in January 1999, there had been 4 accidents. According to the American Public Transit Association (APTA), LTD had the second lowest accident rate of North American transit properties of LTD's size. Mr. Dickman added that Reliance Underwriters had sent a loss control specialist to LTD. One of the other improvements that would contribute to a lower accident rate in the future was the new operator training program. Ms. Wylie asked staff to please include comparative data with the monthly accident report.

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