

**MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**REGULAR MEETING**

Wednesday, August 18, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on August 13, 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, August 18, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Hillary Wylie, Secretary, presiding  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Pat Hocken  
Virginia Lauritsen  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Rob Bennett, Vice President  
Dean Kortge  
(Board vacancy – Subdistrict 5)

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board Secretary Hillary Wylie.

**WORK SESSION:**

**MOTION**  
**VOTE**  
**ELECTION OF BOARD PRESIDENT:** Ms. Hocken moved the nomination of Hillary Wylie for the position of LTD Board President, to fill an unexpired two-year term, beginning immediately and ending July 1, 2000. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 4-0, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none against.

**MOTION**  
**VOTE**  
**ELECTION OF BOARD SECRETARY:** Ms. Wylie vacated the position of Board Secretary upon her election to the position of Board President. She asked the Board members to make a nomination for her replacement. Ms. Hocken then moved the nomination of Dean Kortge as LTD Board Secretary. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, 4-0, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none against.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Ms. Wylie stated that this was a very important time for Lane Transit District. She said that she would work very hard to meet the goals of the District and to involve all parties in the decision-making processes. The Board members needed to be working and thinking together to support LTD. She mentioned that decisions about TransPlan, BRT, and the Springfield Station projects, as well as the

hiring of a new general manager, would be occurring in the near future. It would be a busy and difficult time, but she expected it to be a team effort of both staff and the Board.

**WORK SESSION – PRESENTATION ON TRANSPAN:** Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano introduced Tom Schwetz of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). Mr. Schwetz had been chief staff on the TransPlan project for several years. Mr. Viggiano stated that the work session was to prepare for the public hearing on TransPlan that was scheduled for September 29, 1999, at 6:00 p.m., at the Lane County Fairgrounds. The public hearing would be held before the LTD Board, the Lane County Board of Commissioners, and the Eugene and Springfield City Councils.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the public comment period for the latest draft would extend to 30 days following the public hearing. Because the public comment period was still open, Mr. Viggiano stated that it was not appropriate for the Board members to begin deliberations on TransPlan, but this work session was an opportunity to ask questions and to comment on the presentation of the information in TransPlan.

Mr. Viggiano alerted the Board to some issues that had been raised about TransPlan, specific to transit. TransPlan included a budget that indicated that 37 percent of the entire TransPlan budget would be directed toward transit. For roads projects, the budget included the capital projects and the costs for road maintenance. For transit, the budget included LTD's operating costs and capital projects for the next 20 years. A comparison would be somewhat difficult because most of the costs of operating a car were borne by the user, whereas LTD's costs included the actual costs of operating each bus as well as capital improvements costs. Some people were noting that 37 percent of the money was being directed toward transit, while only 2 percent of the trips were. This was an issue that Mr. Viggiano believed needed to be clarified.

The other issue that needed to be clarified was that only 2 percent of the trips currently were taken on public transit. The 2-percent figure was based on modeling results and indicated the percentage of all trips taken on transit during a typical day. Staff had developed information that concentrated on the major corridors during congested times, to determine what percentage of trips LTD carried during those times in those locations. Staff believed this to be a more important measure because if LTD were to have a positive impact on the transportation system, that was when it was most important to have that impact. It was during those congested times on those congested corridors that improvements were needed. Along the phase I section of the pilot corridor of the proposed bus rapid transit (BRT), the average peak-hour, peak-direction person trips on transit were projected to be 13.3 percent.

Another comment that staff had heard was that nodal development in the draft TransPlan tended to be too flexible or was not made a strong enough requirement of TransPlan. As stated in TransPlan, nodal development was more of an allowable rather than required implementation strategy.

Mr. Schwetz stated that the world moved forward as a result of decisions, not as a result of plans. The planning process of TransPlan largely was complete and it now was in the

hands of the local jurisdictions to make the decisions that would shape the future of the community. He then reviewed what had taken place to date.

He stated that the adopting agencies would be asked to adopt the goals, policies, and financially-constrained project lists. The financial constraint requirement meant that estimates had been made of the revenues that could reasonably be expected to be available. The needs were constrained to those revenues. There also were operational and maintenance needs on the roadway system that would not be met without additional revenue. However, with respect to transit, the revenues were expected to be available, and there were no additional revenue constraints.

Mr. Schwetz said that TransPlan was a complex document because it interrelated land-use with the transportation system, while taking into consideration such things as air quality and quality of life.

On September 8, 1999, a TransPlan summary would be inserted into *The Register-Guard*, and on September 29, 1999, the public hearing would be held at the Fairgrounds. Mr. Schwetz reviewed the TransPlan briefings that had occurred at the other adopting agencies. The intent not only was to have a workable plan that was adoptable by all four jurisdictions, but also one that gave each jurisdiction some flexibility in implementation.

Mr. Viggiano noted that the Board members had received a copy of an electronic message (email) that had been received from the Friends of Eugene, that outlined some of their concerns. In addition, background materials were available to each Board member that included minutes of the meetings with the planning commissions as they deliberated toward a recommendation, minutes of the public hearings, and written testimony that had been received.

Mr. Kleger stated it was his understanding that the public testimony presented before the partner agencies may not necessarily have been representative of the general public view on TransPlan. He asked Mr. Schwetz if there was any indication about the general public opinion of TransPlan. Mr. Schwetz stated that aside from the surveys that had been done, there was no information that indicated the current general view of TransPlan. He stated that specific interest groups had made public comment, but not necessarily the broad public.

Ms. Hocken asked when and in what form the LTD Board was expected to provide feedback to the LCOG staff. Mr. Schwetz said that now was the time for the LTD Board to provide feedback, which could be given verbally or in writing. Following the public hearing on September 29, staff would organize another joint meeting of the four jurisdictions to discuss the public hearing and as a forum for those jurisdictions to provide feedback about the TransPlan. Individual work sessions would be held afterwards in an attempt to get TransPlan to a point where each agency was ready to adopt it.

Ms. Hocken then asked if LTD was required to classify transit operations as operations, maintenance, and preservation. If so, she asked who required it. She also asked if another category could be created to better reflect the true cost of road operations. Mr. Schwetz replied that the categories that were developed were the traditional ways of classifying the

various costs. He understood that LTD's definition of operations and maintenance was quite different than the definition of operations and maintenance of roads. Ms. Hocken stated that while she believed there were further explanations of the differences in costs between operating a transit system and maintaining and improving roads within the TransPlan document, but the public might review the chart alone and draw their own conclusions. She was concerned about the public having a misconception about the percentage of the money that was designated for LTD. Ms. Hocken suggested that the chart better reflect the fact that LTD's projected costs included operations, maintenance, and preservation of the bus fleet.

With regard to the modal split, Ms. Hocken asked if there was a way to indicate peak-hour modal split. Mr. Schwetz stated that staff were working on a new measure to capture that information. Ms. Hocken thought this would be a good measure to use as an alternative to the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) measure. A goal of the BRT project was to increase the modal split during the peak hours.

Regarding nodal development, Ms. Hocken suggested that the Board wait until Mr. Bennett was present as he would have expertise to guide the Board through a discussion about what the right approach would be with regard to what would be permissible and what would be required.

Mr. Kleger stated that he thought it might be useful to include some indication of projected expenditures on transit expansion to make a distinction between current and future operating costs. Mr. Schwetz said that 72 percent of the total projected cost of TransPlan was to maintain the existing operations and maintenance of all modes. Of the remaining amount, about one-third was earmarked for urban standards projects, such as bringing existing roadways up to standards by adding sidewalks, etc. A relatively small percentage of the total cost was earmarked for new projects.

Mr. Viggiano stated that because TransPlan did not meet the VMT reduction goals outlined in the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR), it would need to be submitted for an exception process with the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). LCDC will require alternative performance measures and also if TransPlan makes significant efforts in the areas of land use and transit. Staff have discussed the issue with LCDC staff, who indicated that they would consider BRT as a significant effort in transit and nodal development that would qualify TransPlan in the area of land use. The only barriers would be that nodal development is permissive and BRT is conditional. Mr. Schwetz added that if nodal development were stated as a requirement in TransPlan, the decision process would become more of a judicial process in which all affected landowners would need to be notified. As stated, nodal development could be achieved in small increments at the discretion of each jurisdiction.

Mr. Kleger asked if there were an indication of increased willingness on the parts of the partner agencies to consider mandatory transit demand management (TDM) measures. Mr. Schwetz stated that the Eugene City Council had expressed interest in the measure, and was interested in polling the other jurisdictions for level of interest.

Ms. Hocken asked if LCDC had veto power over TransPlan if the alternative measures were not met during the exception review process. Mr. Schwetz said that was a legal matter, but LCDC had to approve the alternative measures and could determine that TransPlan did not meet requirements, at which point it would not matter what alternative measure was presented.

Ms. Hocken asked if LTD would be the first jurisdiction to present alternative measures to the LCDC. Mr. Schwetz said that was correct. LCDC did not have any jurisdiction over the metropolitan policy organizations, such as LCOG; however, LCDC was very interested in TransPlan because of the BRT and nodal development strategies.

Mr. Kieger stated that he appreciated the work that LCOG staff had put into the TransPlan process.

Ms. Hoken asked if the LTD Board should hold a worksession on the latest version of the draft TransPlan prior to the public hearing. All Board members agreed, and LTD staff would organize the worksession.

Ms. Wylie thanked Mr. Schwetz and Mr. Viggiano for the presentation.

### **REGULAR MEETING**

**EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Wylie introduced Bus Operator Richard Auckerman, who had been selected as the August 1999 Employee of the Month. Mr. Auckerman was hired in November 1996 and had received awards for two years of safe driving, two years of correct schedule operation, and excellent attendance. Mr. Auckerman was selected for the award based on his excellent work record, his rapport with his customers, and the professional behavior that made him an excellent ambassador for LTD. He was nominated by a customer who appreciated his attentiveness to both his driving and the needs of his customers. Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Auckerman with a certificate of achievement, a letter of congratulations, and a monetary award. Mr. Auckerman thanked the Board and LTD for the opportunity to receive the recognition.

Ms. Wylie then introduced Instructional Program Coordinator Vern Rogers, the September 1999 Employee of the Month. Mr. Rogers was hired as a bus operator in September 1971 and promoted to his current position in June 1998. He had earned awards for 24 years of safe driving, 16 years of correct schedule operation, and numerous annual awards for excellent attendance. Previously, Mr. Rogers had been selected as the November 1983 Employee of the Month and the 1983 Employee of the Year. He was selected this time following a nomination based on the time, energy, and hard work he put into developing, organizing, and teaching the Service in America class. Ms. Wylie presented a certificate of achievement, a letter of congratulations, and a monetary award. Mr. Rogers stated that working at LTD had been a great experience for him. There were many quality people at the District. He said that he had the pleasure of training many people who had since retired from the District, yet he was still here. In fact, he was employed at LTD when Ms. Loobey began her employment, and he still would be at LTD when she retired. He had made a promise during the Service in America training, which emphasized the importance of

customer service, to another employee whose 11-year-old grandson wanted to be a bus operator when he grew up. Mr. Rogers promised to remain at LTD long enough to train the grandson. Mr. Rogers thanked the Board for the award.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Ms. Wylie asked if there were any members of the audience who wished to speak to the Board.

- a) Mr. Don Nordin of Cottage Grove stated that there would be another election in Cottage Grove on September 21, 1999, regarding annexation into the LTD service district. He said that this campaign had been no easier than the others. The opposition was stressing that LTD was a Eugene service, and it was not meant for the individuals in Cottage Grove. He asked the Board to consider an earlier service start with modified service following a successful election.

There was no further testimony from the audience.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the June 16, 1999, regular Board meeting; the minutes of the June 23, 1999, special Board meeting/work session; the minutes of the July 21, 1999, canceled Board meeting; and approval of the Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Policy and Affirmative Action Program. Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for August 18, 1999, is approved as presented." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, 4-0, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

MOTION  
VOTE

**EUGENE DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE FEASIBILITY STUDY:** Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora was present to review the completed feasibility study of a downtown shuttle. He directed the Board's attention to the feasibility study report that previously had been distributed. Mr. Vobora stated that revisiting the feasibility of a downtown shuttle had been initiated to determine if new opportunities existed that would make the shuttle a good investment at this time. He stated that Transit Planner Will Mueller had been the lead staff on the project, and he introduced Mr. Martin Hull of BRW, Inc., who had been the consultant on the project and was present to answer any questions from the Board members.

Mr. Vobora described the stakeholder process that was used to develop the proposed shuttle route. The stakeholder group developed alternatives and came to consensus on the proposed route.

The proposed pilot project route included Valley River Center, the Country Club Road area, the 5<sup>th</sup> Street Market/Amtrak area, the downtown Eugene Station for transfers, and the Sacred Heart/UO area. In addition, when special events were occurring at the Fairgrounds, that location would be included in a second, separate route intended to meet the needs of those attending the special event.

The study also considered several different types of unique buses and alternative fuels, and might include different bus shelter and bus stop designs to create a distinctive look to the system.

Staff were requesting approval from the Board to prepare a detailed operating and capital cost analysis for Board review.

Ms. Lauritsen asked Mr. Vobora to review the ridership, cost, and fare figures. Initially, the annual operating costs for the proposed route would be approximately \$600,000. Ridership was conservatively projected at 2,000 to 4,500 per week; however, Mr. Vobora explained that ridership of 2,000 or more per day would be needed to make the route successful. Ms. Lauritsen asked why staff were proposing a \$.25 fare on the shuttle. Mr. Vobora stated that in comparisons of other transit systems that operated a shuttle of this type, the fare varied from free to \$1.00. If a person were a regular system rider, then the fare already would have been paid, and LTD had a high pass ridership, so the amount of revenue from fares would be fairly nominal. Ms. Lauritsen then asked what the final cost might be after it was determine which routes would be discontinued because of shuttle coverage, such as along Country Club Road. Mr. Vobora thought the cost might drop to about \$500,000. Mr. Hull added that the study had identified approximately \$125,000 to \$135,000 in savings.

Ms. Wylie asked if the availability of the shuttle would increase total system ridership. Mr. Vobora thought it would, by tapping into the tourist and student markets as well as the Country Club Road market, where service would be more frequent.

Ms. Wylie asked why the Salem area downtown shuttle had not been successful. Mr. Vobora stated that it was a lunchtime shuttle with low ridership. Mr. Hull said that those specific shuttles, such as a lunchtime shuttle, typically were not successful. Ms. Wylie also asked who had served on the stakeholder committee for the downtown shuttle. Mr. Vobora said that he could provide a list to the Board, but that there were representatives from the train station area; the Valley River Center; the Downtown Eugene, Inc.; the City of Eugene; the University of Oregon; Symantec; the Fairgrounds; the Convention and Visitor's Association of Lane County (CVALCO); 5<sup>th</sup> Street Market; and the Sacred Heart Hospital.

Ms. Hocken stated that she was excited about the proposal, particularly since her employer was located on Country Club Road. She thought that staff would need to be very innovative to attract ridership along Country Club Road since there was ample free parking in the area. In addition, Ms. Hocken stated that she would be interested to see more information about what existing service would be overlapped and what could be eliminated.

Ms. Hocken asked when implementation would occur. Mr. Vobora replied that staff were projecting to implement service in September 2001.

Mr. Kleger stated that he liked the concept and wanted to see staff pursue the effort. He had several suggestions as staff continued to research the downtown shuttle concept. He recommended that staff ensure, at the time of adoption, that the Board was aware of what LTD was foregoing to pay for the downtown shuttle. He also suggested that staff select an accessible vehicle in which the wheelchair boarding and debarking process did not cause

delays on the route. He said that a different fare structure might cause confusion for many LTD customers. He asked staff to have a strategy in mind to address that confusion. Lastly, Mr. Kleger stated that he noted in the feasibility study the possible use of property taxes as a revenue source. He asked staff to review the Measure 5 impacts before making a decision to seek property taxes as a revenue.

Ms. Lauritsen asked how much it would cost to prepare the detailed operating and capital analysis of a downtown shuttle. Mr. Vobora stated that staff would do most of the work. Staff also were looking into grant possibilities, but there should be no additional cost.

**MOTION**  
**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken moved that the LTD Board direct staff to prepare a detailed operating and capital cost analysis for the recommended downtown shuttle route to include information on routes that would be eliminated due to duplicated service. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, 4-0, with Kleger, Hocken, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

**LTD SALARIED EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT PLAN REVISIONS:** Human Resources Manager David Dickman was present to discuss this topic with the Board. Mr. Dickman also introduced Everett Moreland of Hershner, Hunter, Neill, & Smith, L.L.P., who was counsel to the Pension Trustees.

Mr. Dickman said that staff and Mr. Moreland had memorialized the changes to the Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan that already had been approved by the Board. Mr. Dickman then provided a brief review of those changes, as listed on page 89 of the Board agenda packet.

Ms. Hocken asked if the change in vesting credits (page 89, item 6.1.2) applied both to the defined benefit and the defined contribution. Mr. Dickman responded that the change applied only to the defined benefit. The defined contribution would vest immediately.

Ms. Hocken asked if the COLA increases were required to be in the Plan document. Mr. Moreland responded that it was consistent with past practices to include COLA increases in the Plan. If the Trustees were given authority to periodically amend the Plan by adding COLA increases without having to obtain the approval of the full Board of Directors, those COLA increases were required to be stated in the Plan.

Paragraphs 1.4.3 and 15.4 authorized the General Manager to amend the Plan to give retirement benefits for compensation for which retirement benefits ordinarily were not given. Ms. Hocken asked under what circumstance that authorization might be used. Mr. Dickman stated that it would give the general manager maximum flexibility to settle or come to terms with an exiting employee. Ms. Wylie asked if policy and procedures had been written for this provision. Mr. Dickman replied that this provision was for special circumstances, and would be implemented at the discretion of the general manager. Ms. Hocken suggested that the general manager provide a report to the Board of an occurrence when and how this provision was implemented. If the Board believed this provision was inappropriate, the Plan then could be amended. Mr. Moreland stated that this provision was adequately stated to address the concern of other employees having any rights to this provision.



Ms. Hocken asked if the employee account was limited in the types of investments that could be made. Mr. Dickman replied that staff had selected an investment manager, VALIC, which had provided 28 options ranging from conservative to aggressive investments. Employees were given investment advice by VALIC.

Mr. Dickman stated that he would be bringing one or more final changes to the Plan, related to the extended illness bank, back to the Board for approval in October.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors adopts the Restated Lane Transit District Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan and Restated Lane Transit District Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan Trust Agreement. Upon adoption of this motion, the Board of Directors authorizes the General Manager to sign and implement the restated retirement plan.

Ms. Hocken asked if all the Trustees needed to be directed to sign and implement the Plan. Mr. Dickman replied that the Trustees already had taken action on this restatement of the Plan, and had authorized Ms. Loobey to act on their behalf.

**VOTE**

Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, 4-0, with Kleger, Hocken, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none against.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:** Ms. Lauritsen said that the Filbert Festival, which was to be held during the weekend of August 28 and 29, was a good opportunity for Board members and staff to network with Springfield City officials and VIPs. Mr. Vobora stated that LTD was sponsoring the Mayor's Ice Cream Social on August 28 and would be providing shuttle service from Booth Kelly. In addition, the BRT display bus would be at the festival and in the parade.

Metropolitan Policy Committee: Ms. Hocken had no report at this time.

Statewide Livability Forum: The last meeting was held in May, and Ms. Hocken had no further information to report.

BRT Steering Committee: The next meeting was to be held on September 7, 1999.

Springfield Station Steering Committee: Mr. Kleger reported that the next meeting was to be held on August 19, 1999.

North End Scoping Group: Mr. Kortge was not present to provide a final report.

APTA Board Member's Seminar: Ms. Lauritsen and Ms. Wylie had attended the recent seminar. Ms. Lauritsen said that it was a great seminar, and it was refreshing to know that transit Boards tended to share reasonably similar problems. Ms. Wylie stated that she enjoyed the seminar as well. There were many good presentations that would be shared in the coming months.

Executive Search Committee: Ms. Hocken stated that the committee was impressed with the Oldani Group, which had been selected as the executive search consulting firm. Phase II of the formal executive search plan would be presented to the Board in September. Ms. Wylie suggested that the Board consider executive director and general manager title differences for a discussion at a future meeting.

PRELIMINARY JUNE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that this was a preliminary report because staff still were performing year-end closing. She said that anytime a company can end a fiscal year with more revenues than planned, spend less than expected, and have personnel services come in almost exactly as planned, it has had a very good year.

Ms. Hellekson stated that the auditors had begun the audit work. The firm of Grove, Mueller, Hall, and Swank would again conduct the audit. In addition, Ms. Hellekson stated that LTD again would submit the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report to the Government Finance Officer's Association excellence in financial reporting program.

LEGISLATIVE REPORT: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch provided a preliminary final report of the Oregon legislative session. Mr. Kleger asked if the Governor's veto threats would affect any of the transit legislation. Ms. Lynch replied that none of the threatened legislation would directly affect operations or funding.

In September, Ms. Lynch would provide an update to the Board about federal legislation relating to the LTD federal agenda.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE: Mr. Viggiano reported that the newly formed consortium of cities that had been selected to participate in the Federal Transit Administration's Demonstration Program had met on August 3 and 4, 1999. The meetings were very productive, and several staff members had attended.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion regarding any other informational items in the Board packet, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:12 p.m.



---

Board Secretary