

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 16, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 10, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, June 16, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, President, presiding
Rob Bennett
Patricia Hocken
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Virginia Lauritsen
Hillary Wylie, Secretary
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Dean Kortge

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board President Kirk Bailey. Ms. Lauritsen was not yet present. She arrived at 5:45 p.m., during the work session.

WORK SESSION—PRESENTATION ON ORIGIN & DESTINATION STUDY (ON-BOARD RIDER SURVEY): Mr. Vobora introduced Selena Barlow, the consultant who performed the on-board survey. The draft report had been mailed to the Board, and a final report would be prepared later. Ms. Barlow described the methodology of the survey and how it was different from past surveys. She also discussed some of the key findings and some of the implications of those findings. She explained that the survey had yielded a large amount of information, from questions about the riders and the kinds of trips they made. She had prepared a summary analysis, which summarized the overall sample, ridership, trends, and relationships. The Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) would perform the second step of the analysis, when they geo-coded the specific origin and destination information for travel planning purposes. The third analysis would continue during the next year, with LTD staff studying discrete portions of the sample, such as what happens on a specific route or on weekends versus weekdays.

Ms. Barlow used numerous charts to show the implications and key findings of the survey:

- ◆LTD has a large segment of riders who rely on the service and use it extensively;
- ◆Everyday riders make up 30 percent of LTD's ridership and account for 46 percent of all the trips made in the system;
- ◆LTD riders are younger and lower income than the general population;
- ◆The primary segments are students preparing for the workforce and young workers early in their careers;
- ◆The vast majority of LTD riders, 81 percent, are employed and/or students (50 percent are students and 51 percent are employed);
- ◆Most LTD riders are using the bus to commute to work and school--each week, LTD transports 50,000 people to work and 49,000 to school;
- ◆Commuter trips account for 63 percent of the system ridership, indicating that LTD has a major impact on the business and educational community
- ◆Twenty-nine percent of riders are new to the system within the past year,

indicating a high level of turnover, which calls for ongoing communication and marketing; ♦ If LTD buses were not available, 13 percent of riders would drive alone and 22 percent would get a ride with someone else, so 35 percent would become car trips; 14 percent would ride a bike; and 48 percent would walk or not make the trip at all; ♦ Most riders are satisfied with LTD service--88 percent rated the system as 5 to 7 on a 7-point scale; 26 percent give it the highest rating of "very good," and the very highest ratings are given to interactions with LTD personnel; ♦ The most desired service improvements related to increased frequency and later service; this is consistent with past on-board surveys. However, there is a significant minority who highly value improved amenities, such as shelters and Park & Ride lots; ♦ LTD continues to have an extremely high level of fare prepayment, 80 percent. Only 19 percent of riders continue to pay cash, and 37 percent use a monthly pass (up from 31 percent in 1994); and, ♦ The Rider's Digest is the primary information source for two-thirds of the current riders. The other primary sources are telephone information and the Eugene Station Customer Service Center, although telephone information and information at the Station have been found to be most relevant for potential riders.

After summarizing the data, Ms. Barlow asked for questions from the Board.

Mr. Kleger noticed that in the list of things people like, the second-to-lowest ranking went to speed of travel, but in the list of things people want to change, the second-to-lowest ranking went to speed of travel. He asked Ms. Barlow about that. She said that in transit, particularly with a transit-dependent population, riders generally were appreciative to have service and were more concerned that it would come frequently. Discretionary ridership groups were more concerned about time comparisons with the automobile.

Ms. Hocken said it appeared that a lot of the destinations, because they were to schools, were in Eugene as opposed to Springfield (University of Oregon, Lane Community College, Eugene School District). Given also that the population of Eugene was larger than Springfield, it seemed significant to her that 20 percent of the origins and destinations were in Springfield, which she thought would have been lower. Ms. Barlow said that the origins and destinations included home, which could be the beginning or end of those trips, since approximately 22 percent had said they lived within Springfield zip codes.

Ms. Wylie asked if Ms. Barlow had researched use of the bus system by minorities. Ms. Barlow said that they had not, although survey had been printed both in English and in Spanish. However, only 1.2 percent of the surveys were completed in Spanish. Ms. Wylie also asked about the percentages that did not add up to 100. Ms. Barlow explained that in all of the seven-point scales, the charts showed the people in each category who gave the highest rating, so those numbers were independent of each other. Third, Ms. Wylie said she was somewhat concerned about the rating of excellence of service, which had declined steadily over the last four years. Ms. Barlow said that part of the reason for the big dip in the current survey was that the survey went from a five-point scale in the previous survey to a seven-point scale. She was comparing fives to sevens, so it was harder to look at the very top end of responses, and the scales were not completely comparable. Part of the reason could be that people were becoming more demanding about service, as well.

Mr. Kleger was concerned that Valley River Center had no numbers for origin or destination. Ms. Barlow said that people probably just wrote in "shopping" rather than the destination, because the question was for trip purpose rather than destination.

Mr. Bailey mentioned the trip purposes for current riders, and asked if the market survey determined for what purposes people ordinarily traveled regardless of their choice of mode. Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora replied that the market area survey asked that question of the small portion of the respondents who were riders, but not of the general population. However, he thought that LCOG would have that information.

Mr. Vobora stated that the District had been presented with a lot of information, and staff needed time for additional review. He thought the survey information would be discussed again in preparation for the Board's strategic planning work session in the fall. This information would be valuable as the Board and staff talked about the mission of the District, who the current riders were, and who the District would want to serve in the future.

Mr. Bailey thanked Ms. Barlow for the presentation. He then called a ten-minute break at 6:20 p.m. The Board reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Bailey said that he was excited about this opportunity because the July Employee of the Month was Executive Secretary Jo Sullivan. He read the nomination form from the Board agenda packet, and said he wanted to call attention to her attention to detail and to her commitment to excellence and to add some personal notes. In the time he had been at LTD, he said, Ms. Sullivan had been very patient and committed to making sure that the Board achieved the highest standards it could as a Board, which was not an easy thing to do in terms of keeping the Board on track in a very supportive fashion. He then opened the floor to other Board members, who commented positively about Ms. Sullivan's skills and her interactions with them as Board members.

Mr. Bailey presented Ms. Sullivan with a plaque, a letter of appreciation, and a monetary award. Ms. Sullivan said that she very much appreciated the honor because she knew the quality of the employees who had been selected before. She said that she had been a little embarrassed about being selected because she did not see what she did as being extraordinary in any way, but deeply appreciated the kind words of the Board. She had greatly enjoyed her job for 18-plus years, partly because of the enthusiasm and dedication of LTD's employees, and partly because Ms. Loobey had not only allowed but encouraged the executive secretary position and Ms. Sullivan, both, to grow in terms of responsibility and variety of tasks. She said it had been a wonderful job for all those years, and as much as she would like to retire with Ms. Loobey next year, she would be happy to remain at LTD.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Bailey opened the floor for audience participation, reminding speakers that three minutes were allowed for their individual comments.

- (1) Tom Lester of 1826 Lincoln, Eugene, said that the east downtown Eugene bus rapid transit (BRT) proposal called for a single-lane BRT down east 11th Avenue. He thought it was somewhat misleading to the public to put forward a single lane as the proposal when clearly the ultimate objective was to do two lanes. He thought the public had a right to know what they were in store for as far as where the second lane was going to go. Without the public knowing that, they could not comment on the impact of the project.
- (2) Robert White, business manager for Johnson Brothers Greenhouses, said he was present to appeal to the Board and ask for factfinding information. First, he said,

Johnson Brothers Greenhouses just found out that they were in the boundaries of LTD and were required to pay nine years back taxes. He said they had never been notified and wanted to know who was in charge of notification and what exclusions there were to the LTD tax, noting that agricultural employees were exempt. He said he was in the process of having to reconcile nine years of payroll records to satisfy the Oregon Department of Revenue. He also wanted to know if there were any exclusions to the LTD tax regarding penalties, interest, waivers, anything. He said he understood that the Board did not have any authority in that. Third, he said he was appealing to the Board because a bus did not even go by his place of business, which was a mile away. He said he talked with Mr. Vobora about changing the bus route and was told that it was too expensive but possibly could be done next year. Mr. White said that his company was forced to pay off close to \$3,000, \$4,000, or \$5,000, with no bus service. He said this was a complete discredit to the organization that it did not properly notify the public that they were in the boundaries and at the same time provide the service. He said he would not be upset at having to pay the tax if the service came right to them.

Mr. White said that the main thing was why they paid for the bus when they did not get the bus near their residence or area of business. He wanted to know about ORS regulations in order to address his legislator about this issue. He said this affected a lot of business people in the area. He said his company did not do this fraudulently; it just happened. He said that Fall Creek Nursery had paid the tax for a number of years, but was limited to three years to go back for refunds. The statute of limitations said that now it went indefinitely, which was quite an unfair hardship on businesses if they filed their returns in what they thought was a timely manner, but if it was not in a little category, it did not apply. He said that this was his main concern on this issue, and wondered if he needed a formal request in writing to get this information.

Mr. Bailey said that he thought this constituted his request and that he appreciated Mr. White bringing these issues to the Board's attention. The Board was not equipped to answer at that time, but would have staff work with Mr. White to answer his questions. He said that the Board would be talking about boundary issues later in the meeting, and that it had received requests similar to Mr. White's in terms of boundary and taxation issues. Mr. Bailey said that the staff would get back to Mr. White soon.

Ms. Wylie asked Mr. White how he was notified that he was nine years in arrears. Mr. White said he had been with the Greenhouses only about six months. The Employment Department did an audit and discovered that the company was in the boundary and sent him a notice of taxes due. Mr. White said he had talked with a number of people at the Department of Revenue and LTD's finance person. He thought LTD should provide a certified letter telling people when they are now in the boundaries, for that kind of money, such as for payroll in the nature of \$16,000 for non-agricultural employees, or total payroll of \$40,000 to \$60,000. He was upset because the company had done everything it needed to do, and there was a statute that limited refunds to three years but they (Department of Revenue) could go back indefinitely for taxes, even though Johnson Brothers had been filing every year.

Ms. Hocken said she used to work for the Oregon Department of Revenue. In general, she said, with both the Oregon Department of Revenue and the Internal Revenue Service, if someone did not actually file a return for a specific tax, the statute of

limitations was open forever. Once it was filed, the three-year statute of limitations began. She assumed that whoever he talked with must have been interpreting the fact that there was no information about LTD payroll on the payroll report he was filing as the fact that he did not file a payroll report for LTD. She said that would be her guess.

Mr. White said that his problem was that no one noticed that Johnson Brothers was in the boundary but not paying the tax for nine years, in order to send him a letter notifying him, or when a boundary change was made, no one did a blanket mailing to people.

Ms. Hocken said it probably was the case that this business had been in the boundary for the last 20 years. LTD did not change anything recently. Those affected by recent changes had been sent letters. What may have happened was that when the business was started and sent in the first form, the error was not noted at that point. Mr. White said he understood that there was a boundary change in 1991 and he had no record of being notified, not even to his CPA. Mr. Vobora said that in his records, the rural areas were incorporated into the District in 1974, and he was not aware of any changes to the boundary around Coburg until the one the Board would be considering that evening. That boundary had always gone all the way north of Coburg, eight or ten miles, to the county line.

Mr. Bailey said again that the Board and staff would work with Mr. White to try to clear up any problems or inconsistencies.

ACTION ITEMS FOR THIS MEETING:

MOTION **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board approve the Consent Calendar for June 16, 1999. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. There were no proposed changes, and the
VOTE Consent Calendar was approved by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the May 19, 1999, regular Board meeting.

ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000 BUDGET:

Staff Presentation: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson explained some changes and corrections to the budget. There were two changes to the Capital Fund that were incorporated between Budget Committee approval and what staff were proposing for adoption. Both projects were related to Information Services: (1) \$150,500 was for a piece of a project that was scheduled for the current year that would not be completed by June 30, so would be rolled forward to next fiscal year; and \$140,000 in the Capital Improvement Plan for future years that staff brought forward because the Information Services agenda had intensified, and software that would be important to the efficiency of the District's operations would require higher levels of equipment than currently were available in the general inventory. The third change had not been included in the Board agenda materials. Replacement pages were distributed for pages 21, 22, and 23. This change involved a new Commuter Solutions grant-funded position. Since the grant would begin on October 1, 1999, staff had budgeted the position for nine months. However, in order to accelerate the Commuter Solutions program, it was desirable to fill the position in July. Staff had determined that there would be unexpended funds in the grant-funded portion of Commuter Solutions for Fiscal Year 1998-1999 that could be reprogrammed for FY 1999-2000.

Public Hearing on FY 1999-2000 LTD Budget: Mr. Bailey opened the public hearing on the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 proposed budget. There was no public testimony, and Mr. Bailey closed the hearing.

MOTION Board Deliberation: Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 budget and appropriating \$53,388,329 as represented in the Resolution. Ms. Wylie seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, and the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 budget was approved by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE

DOWNTOWN EUGENE EAST DESIGN ALTERNATIVE FOR BRT PILOT CORRIDOR:
BRT Steering Committee Chair Rob Bennett explained that the Steering Committee held a lengthy discussion of the alternatives in this segment, and essentially agreed with the staff recommendation and what the Committee believed were the results of the public discussions, testimony, and input for the Alternative A-1. He said a lot of information was included in the agenda packet, but asked BRT Project Engineer Graham Carey to summarize the pertinent issues. Mr. Carey stated that this was the third section of the pilot corridor to go before the Board. It covered from Franklin Boulevard around the Dad's Gate area to the Eugene Station. He discussed the three alternatives, A-1, A-2, and B, which were discussed in the agenda materials; the public involvement process; and the results of the workshops that were held to discuss the alternatives with the public. The public liked alternatives A-1 and A-2 because they were more direct than alternative B, which seemed to bypass an important service area. Alternative A-1 was most favorably received, with the largest drawback seen as the loss of parking on East 11th Avenue.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Carey to discuss mitigation of the parking issue in alternative A-1. Mr. Carey explained that there were 72 parking bays along the section through 10th & Mill and 11th Avenue. Staff had spoken with all the property owners, and there were two proprietors who were most concerned (the Minit Market on 11th near Ferry Street, and the Alder Street Market). Loss of on-street parking was not a key concern for the other property owners such as Sacred Heart, the University of Oregon, and Northwest Christian College. Both markets were happy with the solutions developed by staff. The public was more concerned about losing parking on 11th near the downtown area, which would be required by alternative A-2, and proposed using a traffic lane instead, but that was not seen as a viable solution. Mr. Carey referred to a more complete analysis discussed in the agenda packet.

Ms. Hocken expressed concern about a proposed jog at 12th and Alder, which moved a left-turn movement back to Kincaid. Mr. Carey explained the reasons for that jog, which had been developed following discussions with Northwest Christian College about their use of the property at that location, and which improved the safety of the intersection. This change had been well received by the City.

Mr. Kleger referred to Mr. Lester's comments, made earlier in the meeting, about a two-way lane, and asked how many passing points there were along the two-way lane. Mr. Carey replied that there were a few passing lanes and that the one-lane sections were at most about three blocks long. He said that, ideally, LTD would like a lane in each direction, and if the headways were reduced to below four minutes, delays would occur. However, staff believed that the proposed system would work for the next twenty years. He was not sure what would happen after that.

Mr. Bennett added that the Steering Committee was making this recommendation to the Board. Ideally, he said, the Committee would like to have two lanes everywhere, if there were enough right-of-way and if it were not so expensive. He said the Committee members were not under the illusion that two lanes would be available during their lifetimes, if ever. They were basing the recommendation on the fact that they could get enough efficiency out of one lane, especially if four- or five-minute headways would work. He did not believe that anyone was expecting two lanes, ever. He said that fifty years out there may be such a dense population that it might be necessary to buy some property in order to have two lanes, but the Committee was accepting that it may be one lane for ever. Mr. Kleger thought that if there were passing points every three blocks, there was a lot of capacity before LTD would run out of room.

Mr. Carey said that the proposed alternative should reduce LTD's travel time by half in the eastbound (p.m. peak) direction. Westbound travel time would not improve significantly, since the single-lane would mean that there were times when a bus would have to wait. However, current westbound travel time was fairly good.

Ms. Hocken said that when the Steering Committee approved the Franklin routing, she had some concerns because some of that was only one lane. The sense of the Committee at that point was that, given the need to accommodate motorists and other reasons, one lane probably was the best that could be accomplished. They had conversations about how it could operate efficiently for a while. However, at the point at which it would become necessary to have two lanes, it also would be the case that the congestion would be a lot worse and the community might be more accepting of expanding the system by adding the lane. It was hoped that by that point LTD would have shown the community the benefits of the BRT system in alleviating congestion. She said that this was one of the reasons that the Committee was not as concerned about a one-lane segment. Mr. Carey added that either the modal split would be so great that it would justify two lanes, or the modal split would be the same but traffic would be much more congested.

Mr. Bennett said he wanted to be very clear that in the Steering Committee recommendation there was no sense that it was being made with the idea that more than one lane would be requested sometime soon. He stated that the current recommendation was the solution. He thought that Ms. Hocken's and Mr. Lester's points were important, but it was not the case that the Committee was going to change to ask for two lanes.

Mr. Lester said that his concern was not that LTD was going to drop the second lane on the public anytime soon, but that the one lane might not be one of the two lanes eventually needed, so LTD would have thrown resources into a scenario that it might have to throw away in 15 to 20 years. He thought LTD should plan for two lanes, and if it had to build one at this time, then go ahead and build one, rather than wasting resources at this time.

Mr. Kleger said that this was a legitimate issue, and that there were well-tried strategies for adding a second lane elsewhere if that location would not work, as in the rail industry, for example, where a second track sometimes was as far as five miles away, but worked well. He thought it technically would be possible to add a second lane, possibly along the alternative B routing, where there was considerably more room. The off-peak travel could be run there, with the peak travel handled through the primary corridor along A-1. He thought this kind of addition could be made at a later date without forfeiting any existing resources. This might not be the most desirable solution, but since the public and political support were not present to build two lanes now in the desired location, this could be a solution in the future.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: That the LTD Board of Directors hereby selects Alternative A-1 as the preferred BRT alignment for the Downtown Eugene East segment of the bus rapid transit pilot corridor. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mr. Bailey commented for the record, since this section was in his Board subdistrict. He thought that there had been good discussion about this particular alignment during the open houses, and it was clear that the public in those sessions believed that this was the preferred alternative, that this was what was going to work for the downtown area. He thought this was the best compromise for the corridor, and it was one that seemed to have the support of the members of the public who participated. He thought LTD had a pretty clear direction for this particular segment.

VOTE The resolution to select Alternative A-1 passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed.

REVISION OF ORDINANCE 24 GOVERNING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES: Mr. Bailey noted that LTD had received some commentary during the public participation section, as well as some correspondence from Fall Creek Farm and Nursery. His understanding was that the timeline for this was fairly lengthy, since the boundary change would not go into effect until January 2000. He wondered if LTD needed time for more research and discussion at a later Board meeting. Mr. Vobora agreed that Mr. Bailey's suggestion would be the staff recommendation. He said that this item had been prepared for the time of the year when the Board normally would reaffirm the District's boundaries, but there was time to review this issue before any changes would take effect. The recommendation addressed two issues where the boundary was outside the 2.5-mile limit. The Fall Creek issue was that they were outside the town of Lowell, which used to receive service on the #92 route, but no longer did. Their request was to be removed from the boundary because they were not receiving service. Mr. Vobora said that this was a concern of businesses, as Mr. White had expressed, especially in the rural areas, where service often was not frequent and did not match the needs of particular businesses. He thought there was an opportunity to reconsider those particular areas and what opportunities there might be to refine service along the rural routes.

Ms. Hocken asked where Johnson Brothers Greenhouses was located. Mr. Vobora said that it was 1.2 miles outside of downtown Coburg and from the route itself. It was within the 2.5-mile limit being recommended, but he said it was valid to consider whether the 2.5-mile standard was appropriate for the rural areas or for areas with natural boundaries, such as the Willamette River in the Lowell area.

Mr. Kleger said he had received a communication from Fall Creek Market, similar to the one from Fall Creek Farm and Nursery, and had given that to Ms. Sullivan for the District's records.

Mr. Bennett said that the position the Board had taken during the time he had been on the Board was that the idea of having public transit service for the community, whether rural or urban, had to do with how it benefited the community as a whole—how people could reasonably get around; whether there was more than one alternative, etc. A lot of people who lived in rural communities worked in metropolitan communities and needed to be able to get to work in a reasonable way, in terms of either a Park & Ride or other means. While LTD would like to be able

to serve every employment center or business, it was not possible to do that and still operate under some reasonable criteria.

Ms. Lauritsen said she understood that LTD's boundaries were set "as the crow flies," and wanted to clarify that Mr. Vobora was saying that in some of the rural areas, since people had to take roads to get to a bus, they might be five miles out even though they might be right across the river. She wondered if this occurred only in that one area or in other areas, also. Mr. Vobora replied that the original boundaries followed the geography of the McKenzie River rather than going 2.5 miles from service. This meant that on the north side of Springfield and on the way out to Coburg, the boundary was right up against the urban growth boundary because it did not go on the other side of the river.

Ms. Hocken said she did not want LTD to be in the position of having to change boundaries every time it wanted to modify a bus route. She was not sure how to fit that into special circumstances, but it did not seem to be good public policy.

Mr. Kleger asked about the prospects of returning service to that portion of the old Lowell route. Mr. Vobora said the District's analysis of service had not changed since that time, and he was not aware of anything that would produce a change in the near future, other than along the Highway 58 corridor or in the town of Lowell.

Ms. Loobey said that this issue went back to the role of public transit in the community and people not understanding what that was. She agreed with Mr. Bennett's comments about being part of the total transportation infrastructure of the community and being for the good of the community. She said there was a comment in one letter to the District that the bus service was too far away from Fall Creek for its residents to benefit from the service, but that simply was not the case. Someone could be 2.75 miles away from service, but that did not mean that he/she could not get to the service. She stated that she was on the committee that had written these standards, and the idea had been to use them as a guide, not as an absolute. This was one of the reasons that the District had decided to add the census tract data to the LTD boundaries, because the Secretary of State's office did not like it when census tracts were split, making it more difficult for them to draw the subdistrict boundaries. She suggested that the District needed to be careful about the choices it made regarding the boundaries, so it would be good to take the time to go through another review of how this issue was to be approached. She said that staff were prepared to review the two requests before the Board and provide additional analysis. In the meantime, the District had an obligation under ORS 267 to annually affirm its boundaries. This did not mean that the boundaries could not be changed later on. A new resolution reaffirming the boundaries was distributed to the Board members. Mr. Bailey said this resolution needed to be adopted that evening, and he directed staff to conduct further analysis of the boundary requests and staff proposal and return to the Board with a recommendation for changes.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the Resolution Reaffirming the Territory in the District within which the Transit System will Operate in Accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes 267.207(3)(a), for 1999-2000. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken noted that the version of the LTD Ordinance No. 24 that was referred to in the resolution was the 1998 Revision, which went into effect in January of 1999.

VOTE

The resolution was adopted by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken commented about the Johnson Brothers issue. She wanted to clarify that the District contracted with the Oregon Department of Revenue to administer the payroll and self-employment tax. She thought that meant that as a general rule the District did not become involved in any specific cases in terms of whether it waived the law or penalties, etc. She wanted to make it clear on the record that the District turned over the implementation of the law to the Oregon Department of Revenue, so it would not be appropriate for the LTD Board to take action on any specific appeal. Ms. Hellekson added that the delegation of the administration of this program to the Oregon Department of Revenue was included in the ordinance that created the tax, so it was part of the law.

REVISED SPECIAL SERVICE POLICY: Mr. Vobora explained that this was clarification of a Board discussion on policy language under the definition of certain community events. The original language had a threshold of 1,000 participants and the Board had not wanted to lock into that number. Staff had drafted language to leave it wide open for LTD to work with a group of any size where that group's impact on the transportation infrastructure of the neighborhood would be significant. The new language would give the District greater flexibility.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: The LTD Board of Directors hereby approves the Lane Transit District's Special Service Policy as presented on June 16, 1999. Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion. The motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Anticipated Anarchists' Gathering at Eugene Station: Mr. Vobora noted an article in that day's *Register-Guard* regarding a group of people who were going to gather in downtown Eugene to march and demonstrate in the downtown area. The march route was undisclosed at that time, but the group had chosen the clock tower at the LTD Eugene Station as a meeting place to begin its activities. LTD's operations staff had been meeting with City of Eugene staff and police to discuss what might occur and how to respond should the crowd size become too large and cause bus detours or other impacts on the Station. LTD's goal was to ensure that bus operations continue as smoothly as possible.

Board Member Reports: **MPC:** The June Metropolitan Policy Committee meeting was canceled. **Statewide Livability Forum:** Ms. Hocken reported that no meeting had been held since the May meeting. **BRT Steering Committee:** Mr. Bennett had nothing to add to the evening's BRT discussion. **Springfield Station Steering Committee:** Mr. Kleger reported that the Springfield Station Steering Committee would meet the following evening to review the environmental assessment process and hear a report from the Springfield Renaissance Development Corporation. **North End Scoping Group:** Mr. Kortge was not present to provide a report. **FTA Conference Call:** Mr. Bailey reported that this call was related to the announcement of the BRT demonstration project, as explained in the letter from FTA Administrator Gordon Linton in the Board packet. LTD was selected to be one among ten demonstration sites. In addition to Mr. Bailey, Ms. Wylie, and Ms. Hocken, also present during the call were representatives from the union, Congressman DeFazio's office, Senator Wyden's office, and Senator Smith's office, as well as Eugene Councilor Scott Meisner, Springfield Mayor Maureen Maine, and an Oregon Department of Transportation representative. Most of the other demonstration project sites around the country also participated in the call, and Administrator Linton again recognized LTD for coining the term "BRT." There was a

larger consortium involving all the cities that would be sharing information about the projects and various operational issues. Overall, Mr. Bailey thought it was a successful beginning to the demonstration project. Ms. Wylie wanted to publicly commend the staff and Ms. Loobey for bringing LTD to that point. She thought it was a tremendous accomplishment and should be recognized that because of Ms. Loobey's guidance and leadership that the staff had taken the District to being one of the top ten in the country and ready to embark on that journey. She thought it might be a whole new form of transportation across the country, and LTD was a major player in that. She said she was very proud of the District's leadership and staff. Ms. Lauritsen noted that the other demonstration project participants were large properties, including Dulles Airport in Washington, D.C. Ms. Loobey thanked the Board for their kind comments and said that the credit really should go to staff, and noted that Mr. Carey was working on bus rapid transit in Johannesburg, South Africa, long before LTD, so she wanted to note his contribution, especially.

Monthly Financial Report: Ms. Hellekson provided a brief update to the monthly financial report included in the agenda packet.

Review of Bus Designs: Fleet Services Manager Ron Berkshire provided an overview of current bus designs and their suitability to LTD service, in order to provide the Board with some information to help them make decisions regarding future purchases. He reviewed six basic types of service, either current or anticipated: current fixed-route service (the system as currently known); special service (such as the University of Oregon football shuttles); accessible services; downtown shuttle service; BRT mainline service; and BRT neighborhood connector or feeder routes. Bus size and design, type of fuel, and life-cycle costing all were important considerations for those services.

Mr. Berkshire provided a snapshot in time regarding the bus industry's view of fuel and energy for buses; the parameters LTD works within when using federal funds; and current bus designs available from both American and European manufacturers.

Government Relations Report—Legislative Update: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch provided an update regarding state legislative and federal congressional activities to date.

Bus Rapid Transit Update: Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron provided a brief update on the Glenwood segment of the bus rapid transit (BRT) pilot corridor project, based on feedback received at a public workshop the previous evening.

Fall Board Strategic Planning Work Session: After some discussion of Board schedules, it was decided to hold the Board's annual strategic planning work session on October 29, all day, and October 30, in the morning, in the Eugene/Springfield area.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion, and Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.



Board Secretary