

## MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, February 16, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 10, 2000, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District met in regular session on Wednesday, February 16, 2000, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Hillary Wylie, President, presiding  
Rob Bennett, Vice President  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Dean Kortge, Secretary  
Gerry Gaydos  
Pat Hocken  
Virginia Lauritsen  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: None

**CALL TO ORDER:** Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

**WORK SESSION – TransPlan:** Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano introduced Jan Childs and Tom Schwetz, who were present to discuss the TransPlan process. Ms. Childs was the Planning Director with the City of Eugene, and Mr. Schwetz was with Lane Council of Governments.

Mr. Viggiano said that each of the four TransPlan adopting agencies were holding a series of work sessions to review some of the major issues, with the intent of holding a joint work session in May. The next LTD Board work session would be held on Monday, March 13, 2000, at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Viggiano added that staff were recommending that all the adopting agencies discuss the Issues in the order that was listed on Page 1 or the Response Document.

Mr. Kleger noted that several of the questions he had asked had been attributed to Eugene City Councilor David Kelly in error.

Ms. Wylie asked in which category the proposed Valley River Bridge was located. Ms. Childs responded that it was located under Issue Area 4, Transportation System Improvements: Road System.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Viggiano about the LTD review process, and when the Board was expected to take a position on the various issues. Mr. Viggiano said that the other agencies were indicating positions as they reviewed each issue area, which would help facilitate the joint meeting in May. He emphasized that an indication of position was not firm or permanent. Mr. Schwetz added that staff hoped to be able to summarize and communicate the adopting jurisdiction positions throughout the process. Ms. Childs added that there were a number of people who were observing the various work sessions, and to the extent that those people could get a sense of direction from the adopting jurisdictions, it gave them an opportunity to respond during the time that the written comment period remained open.

Mr. Viggiano further stated that staff also were responding to all the public testimony that had been received, and those responses would be available by the end of February. Mr. Viggiano distributed a list of the issues that previously had been identified by the Board for further discussion. He asked the Board to keep in mind that some of the items in TransPlan were to be adopted, while others did not carry the force of law. The policies and projects would be adopted, and those were the most important pieces of TransPlan to focus on. The adopting agencies would need to come to agreement about the policies that would be adopted. It was less important that disagreements be worked out on the implementation strategies. Staff would focus on the policies and projects and the goals and objectives.

Mr. Schwetz said that under General Issue Area 1, both the Springfield and Eugene City Councils had discussed the amendment process. Currently, there was a Metro Plan amendment process in place that allowed more flexibility in allowing local actions to amend the plan. Staff most likely would incorporate that amendment process into the draft TransPlan.

Ms. Childs reviewed the Land Use/Nodal Development memorandum that she had prepared for the Board Agenda packet, which was a summary of both the adopting officials' questions and the public testimony that had been received during the previous public comment period.

With regard to Land Use/Nodal Development, staff were asking the adopting officials to adopt a new definition of nodal development, land use policies in TransPlan that would then be incorporated into the Metro Plan, and a new Metro Plan diagram designation for nodal development, which actually could be applied to specific areas in the Metro Plan diagram itself. Staff were not asking the adopting officials to adopt a map of possible nodal development sites or to enact any specific ordinances, code changes, or implementing measures related to nodal development.

Ms. Childs said that staff were recommending that a single definition of nodal development be adopted that incorporated both the definition of node and nodal development. Mr. Bennett asked if selecting a definition for nodal development suggested that nodal development had a chance of working and how the other adopting officials were viewing nodal development. Ms. Childs said that Eugene had not yet achieved the definition of nodal development. The Eugene City Council did not believe that the density goal of 12 units per net acre was enough. The Springfield City Council was considering a higher residential density. The vision of nodal development had not yet been captured and staff would continue to work on a definition that more clearly captured the vision of what nodal development would achieve.

Ms. Childs said that staff were not at this time asking the jurisdictions to approve a definition of nodal development, but for more time to continue to develop the definition for further consideration in May 2000. Mr. Viggiano added that this also would address a concern of the Board, which was to apply stronger density and mix-of-use requirements to nodes.

Mr. Kleger noted that much had been mentioned about the inclusion of employment within nodal developments, and he stated that he was strongly in favor of that requirement and that it be included in the definition. Ms. Childs said that she had not heard anything about precluding employment opportunities other than commercial, but she had heard that it was critical that there be a minimum density of residential in all nodal development areas.

One subject of further discussion was whether or not there was value in continuing to carry forward three types of nodes as opposed to a general description of nodal development that had a certain set of characteristics. Ms. Childs had clear direction that nodal developments must include a mixture of uses – residential, commercial, and some other kinds of employment opportunities. Mr. Kleger said that he did not want to see a situation where heavy industrial areas were required to have residential opportunities; however, he believed that people ought to be able to live near where they work, and be able to access other necessary services within a short distance in order to cut down on daily driving time to and from errands. He did not believe such a heavy industrial area necessarily needed to fit the definition of a node. Mr. Kleger suggested that a different title be used for a heavy industry center to distinguish that type of development from other types of employment. Ms. Childs noted that there was not an expectation that all of the employment growth would occur in nodes. The modeling projected that 55 percent of the growth in employment during the 20-year planning period would occur in nodal development areas.

Mr. Bennett said that he thought the reason for the three separate nodal designations was that different circumstances would require changes to code and regulatory requirements. He asked if the objectives and criteria would be general enough to apply to the different circumstances. Ms. Childs said that two pilot nodal development projects had been completed, and it had become clear that the same zoning tools could not be used in both situations. Staff were not assuming one zoning designation. Springfield had developed a mixed-use zoning district that would apply. Springfield's primary concern was that the definition not preclude any development work that already had been completed.

Ms. Childs said that staff would be reducing the number of nodal development areas in order to make the transit link clearer, and bus rapid transit would have a large role in determining where those nodes would be located.

Land Use Policies in TransPlan were to be adopted. In response to the proposed deletion of Land Use Policy #3, Mr. Kleger thought that deleting the policy statement would result in substantial depressed development where corridor development already was in place. He said that land values were a product of urban development and maintenance. Ms. Hocken said that she had heard concerns that Policy #3, as currently worded, would encourage strip development rather than creating a hub. Ms. Childs said that the other three jurisdictions had not supported deleting Policy #3, and staff did not recommend deleting it. The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had encouraged transit-oriented development along the corridors.

Ms. Wylie asked about the commitment to funding that was mentioned in Land Use Policy #2. Ms. Childs said that there had been extensive public testimony as well as a concern of DLCD calling for a commitment to funding and implementation, and staff had responded with the new Land Use Policy #5. Mr. Schwetz added that the DLCD's concern about what would happen with the areas identified for nodal development had been the driving interest to lock in the concept of nodal development and designate the areas to be developed.

Ms. Hocken asked what the proposed policy would require. Ms. Childs said that at a minimum, the expectation would be to identify the nodal development areas and attempt to protect them from auto-oriented development. Ms. Hocken then asked if more nodes would be named than likely would be developed. Ms. Childs said that she would recommend focusing on the newly developing areas first, because that was where the potential was the greatest and to take more time with the infill and redevelopment areas. She thought that focusing on the newly developing areas first would provide two things: 1) it would seize the opportunities where the impact would be the greatest, and 2) the bus rapid transit (BRT) alignment would have an impact on which infill and redevelopment areas would be focused on.

Mr. Viggiano noted that a stronger commitment to nodal development was one of the issues that the LTD Board and staff had wanted to pursue. The proposed Land Use Policy #5 would address that issue. Mr. Bennett said that the Board was interested in contributing to the commitment with its own initiatives. Ms. Childs said that this was a long-term proposition, and the DLCD's concern about the loss of potential opportunities was very valid. The joint staff recommendation was to have a policy that committed the jurisdictions to aggressive implementation of nodal development and was consistent with what the LTD Board had discussed in the past.

Ms. Lauritsen added that the cities and the county would be the most greatly impacted and would have the burden of funding, so she thought it would be prudent to wait to comment until those jurisdictions had an opportunity to discuss the issues.

Ms. Childs noted that comments received indicated that there was much sentiment for a commitment to implementation, because without it nodal development could not be used as part of performance measures. This was another reason to have a policy in the plan that committed to implementation.

The next work session on the draft TransPlan was scheduled for Monday, March 13.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Wylie introduced Bus Operator Steve Dreyer as the March 2000 Employee of the Month. Mr. Dreyer was hired on August 24, 1995. He had received awards for four years of safe driving and four years of Correct Schedule Operation (CSO). Mr. Dreyer had received numerous nominations for Employee of the Month, both for excellence in service and job accomplishments and for excellence in providing accessible bus service to customers with disabilities. Mr. Dreyer's supervisor said that Mr. Dreyer had always shown a terrific sense of customer service; he had not only developed a wonderful rapport with the customers who rode the bus, but also was an advocate for their safety.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Dreyer with a letter of congratulations, a certificate, and a monetary award. Mr. Dreyer said that he felt honored and appreciated the award. He also said that he loved his job.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** 1) Mr. John Brown of Eugene spoke about a situation at the Eugene Station. He said that he owned property in close proximity to the Eugene Station. When the station was first proposed, there had been a lot of skepticism about how it would impact the environment and the neighborhood. He said that all of those fears, in his opinion, were gone. He thought the station was an excellent thing to have in his neighborhood. The station had a very positive impact, and he wanted to thank the Board and Ms. Loobey for doing a very good job.

Mr. Brown said that in the budget, LTD had proposed eliminating the Community Service Officer (CSO), which LTD had provided during the last two years. Mr. Brown said that the CSO worked very well at the station, and he encouraged the Board to find a way, working with the City of Eugene, to not discontinue the CSO services. He said that eliminating the CSO would not be a move in the right direction.

**ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW (ARR)/FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 SERVICE PLAN:** Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora reviewed the proposed route modifications, additions, and deletions as found in the agenda packet. He said that it was not an aggressive proposal with significant changes because staff also were working on the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR), which would result in major service changes in September 2001. The ARR was a proposal to take care of service fixes and to address a few of the routes that were substandard in areas that may or may not be addressed during the CSR.

The routes that were proposed for deletion included the 4X, 5X, 11X, weekday and Saturday 38 and 39, selected early and late p.m. trips on route 77, and route 83 with the exception of two one-way trips to LCC during the a.m. hours. The routes that would be modified included the 41, 51, 52, 60, 61, and some miscellaneous timepoint adjustments. The routes that would experience additions included altering the 8x to accommodate 11x riders, increasing weekday evening Springfield service on route 11, adding a 7:00 p.m. weekday trip on route 23, and adding or altering trips for route 37 to keep Willow Creek service.

A reduction of 2,347 annual hours of service was proposed, which would result in a \$102,570 reduction in annual service costs or about a 0.75 percent decrease. It was expected that these proposed service modifications would result in an annual ridership increase of 23,280 riders.

Ms. Hocken asked if the deletion of routes 38 and 39 would result in no service in the southwest hills during the middle of the day. Mr. Vobora said that routes 34 and 35 would provide peak-hour service only, with three a.m. trips and three p.m. trips. He thought that additional trips could be added to close the gap. Ms. Hocken said that she was somewhat uncomfortable with not providing at least lifeline service during the day to that area. People who had a car could park near 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue and catch any number of buses, but for those who did not have a car, there would be no alternative except to take a taxi. Mr. Bennett said that was the case in many situations where productivity was low. Mr. Vobora said that this

service had been in place for many years, but had never produced the required ridership, and yet there were other areas of town that had never had any service, but could produce the ridership.

With regard to service fixes, Mr. Bennett asked if routes 41, 51, and 52 were very productive. Mr. Vobora said that they were very productive routes. Routes 60 and 61 were not as productive, but were a pair of routes with each running the same route in opposite directions and would be reviewed during the CSR. Mr. Kleger asked if the fix to routes 60 and 61 would improve the downtown connections. Mr. Vobora said that it would.

Mr. Kortge asked about contingency service and how staff had arrived at the projected ridership increase of 30,960. Senior Transit Planner Paul Zvonkovic said that ridership projections were based on productivity averages, which were close to system averages.

**Public Testimony:** 1) Eileen Beban of Eugene. Ms. Beban was the Board Chair of the Lane County Red Cross. The Red Cross was moving its headquarters out to Bethel Drive, and she was present to request more service to the Bethel/West Eugene area. She said that it had been indicated that service modifications to that area were not expected until the fall of 2001. The Red Cross provided many vital services to the community, including classes, Meals on Wheels, child care, and youth development. Public transportation was essential to what the Red Cross provided, and she asked the Board to consider service to the area sooner than 2001. The entire Bethel area was growing, and the Red Cross was an important part of the community. She realized that the Board entertained many requests for service, and she thanked the Board for considering her request to add service to the Bethel area in September 2000.

2) Fred Simmons of Springfield. Mr. Simmons spoke about the proposed deletion of route 11x. He said that deleting that route created an issue because the predicate for BRT was the desired need for rapid movement along the corridors. There were a number of regular, long-term 11x riders who rode to and from work. It was an important service. Mr. Simmons suggested that route 11x not be eliminated. LTD needed to become more reactive to the changes within the transportation market. Currently, it took 59 minutes to travel from Thurston Station to the Bertelsen area. Mr. Simmons suggested a transitional route that encompassed the needs of the riders of both route 11x and 8x to meet those kinds of needs. The loss of route 11x was a fundamental one. It raised questions in Mr. Simmons' mind that if the 11x was similar to what the BRT was going to do, would LTD miss the current needs of the market? Mr. Simmons thought LTD should respect those needs and educate the riders, through a charette-type process, where the riders would learn about the needs of the District, and the District would learn about the needs of the riders. Then the riders could make informed comments. It was difficult, on a reactive basis, to comment on service proposals. Mr. Simmons asked that the Board take a serious look at the current changes rather than wait until 2001, because he thought LTD would lose a lot of momentum in ridership by eliminating the 11x.

3) Faith and Jason Baker of Eugene. Ms. Baker spoke on behalf of her brother, Jason, who regularly rode route 38 to his job at the Bagel Sphere in downtown Eugene. Mr. Baker, who had a disability, delivered lunches in the downtown area. If route 38 were eliminated, Mr. Baker would lose his lifeline transportation to all his activities. Mr. Baker said that if LTD

eliminated the #38, he would not be able to work. He thanked the Board for considering his request.

4) Scott Whethan of Cottage Grove. Mr. Whethan was a program coordinator for a social service agency based in the Eugene area that provided support services and job development training for people who experienced developmental disabilities. He said that he felt fortunate to be in a community with good transit services that had the quality of service and level of accessibility that LTD had. He said that his agency had a concern about the loss or deletion of route #38. In addition to Mr. Baker (the previous speaker), there were others who worked in the area who would be affected. The deletion of that route would create a transportation issue for several people for whom his agency provided services.

5) Jackie Thomas of Eugene. Ms. Thomas commended LTD on the marvelous transit system it provided and how smoothly the Eugene Station operated. She used route #39, and she was very grateful for the commuter route #35, but the deletion of route #39 would leave a gap from 10:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. with no service in her area. Many people with disabilities and elderly people used the route. She had gathered 24 signatures of people who also were opposed to the deletion of route #39, and she presented the Board with the petition. In addition, she noted that some of the bus stops in the area did not have posted schedules, and she was hopeful that with the service adjustments in September, schedules could be posted on all of the stops.

6) Chris Phillips of Eugene. Mr. Phillips also spoke in opposition to the deletion of routes #38 and #39. He said that this deletion would leave the City View/Bailey Hill area without bus service outside of rush hour. Until a few years ago, routes #34/35 operated Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m., and those routes carried many people to Westmoreland Student Housing and a few people throughout the rest of the loop. It seemed to have worked fairly well with high ridership. Then, with the introduction of routes #38 and #39 and the deletion of #34/35 during the periods outside rush hour, the #38 and #39 had proved to have quite low ridership. Routes #34/35 were scheduled to leave campus just five minutes after trips of route #37, and ridership would be higher if they had not been scheduled so close behind the #37. The effect of the changes during the past three years had been to simply delete service to the City View and Bailey Hill neighborhoods, except during rush hours. Mr. Phillips did not believe that simply deleting service was the way to build ridership, which he believed to be one of the goals of the Board, as was providing alternatives to automobiles. If the #39 were deleted, there would be no alternative for many but to drive their cars. Mr. Phillips said that he had observed that route #37 did not seem to carry many people beyond Westmoreland Student Housing. There were a few exceptions, but not many. He suggested that the Board bring back routes #34 and #35 during the non-rush hour times. There did not need to be many trips, and he realized that Westmoreland Student Housing was a main destination, but he thought a variety of trips to different locations; i.e., some route #37 and some route #34, etc., would be well utilized.

**Board Deliberations:** Mr. Kleger asked about the #11x and if staff had considered operating the #11X a.m. trips and not the p.m. trips. Mr. Vobora said that staff had considered it, but were not recommending it at this time because it would require maintenance of the infrastructure, such as the skipped stop signage and other information for one trip in the morning. Mr. Kleger had the impression that the morning trip was quite productive. Mr. Vobora said that it was; however, the afternoon trip was not.

Ms. Hocken said that many of the speakers had confirmed her thoughts about deleting routes #38/39. She asked staff to reconsider the deletion based on the comments that were received.

Mr. Bennett said that while LTD would like to accommodate everyone and realized that there were very real needs, LTD could not continue to operate routes with very low ridership and continue to have a future in the community. There were certain exceptions to that, and sometimes he was outvoted. As tough as it was at times, the Board's responsibility had to be to look at the future of the system as a whole and how the Board would represent the community as a whole. His view was that it could not be done in most cases where productivity rates were as low as 6, 9, and 10.

Ms. Wylie thanked the speakers for coming to share their views with the Board. She said that the Board was in a tough position. LTD was heavily criticized for operating empty buses and at the same time, the Board received requests to add more service. Finding the optimum service was difficult. She asked staff to review the route #38/39 service to determine if there was anything that could be done. Mr. Bennett said that he did not think that the ridership numbers would change based upon further research. Mr. Vobora said that it would be a value judgment. Ms. Wylie asked if it were that black and white or if there were any alternatives. Mr. Vobora said that staff were researching other alternatives with the CSR, such as operating a deviation off route #37 to Bailey Hill Loop, which had higher productivity. This deviation was in combination with many other service changes that were being considered for the CSR, such as more service to Westmoreland.

Ms. Hocken noted that LTD would realize a cost savings of about \$75,000 by eliminating routes #38/39. She asked what the cost would be to add two more trips during the midday to routes #34/35. She thought that even though the savings were significant, there could be a way to continue to serve the area on a very limited basis, realizing less of a cost savings, but maintaining some service until the CSR was implemented. It could turn out that the cost was the same, and the Board would decide not to go ahead with her suggestion, but she thought it would be worth reviewing. Mr. Bennett said that if LTD were to do that, and if at the end of the year, the numbers did not change, then the Board never would have made the productivity decision. Mr. Vobora said that the decision could be made as part of a CSR coverage piece. Mr. Bennett said that no matter the route, there were very real needs out there, and it was a very hard decision. The Board could choose to ignore the productivity, but his understanding was that the Board was going to look at the system as a whole and not piece by piece. Ms. Wylie suggested that the Board not back away from the productivity model, but to consider, where possible, some ways to provide some desired service.

Mr. Vobora said that the southwest hills area was an area that staff had struggled with. During the CSR modeling, staff had deleted the service altogether, including commuter service, because the goals of the CSR included simplifying service so that there were not several different routes traveling along a corridor. High productivity along the corridors and coverage were important as well. There were several options that the Board could consider, such as setting different productivity levels based on such things as location of the route. For instance, it would be expected that corridor routes would maintain higher ridership than would neighborhood routes.



Ms. Lauritsen said that she had gained a better understanding of service and needs since she had voted for the productivity model. She thought a more sophisticated model was needed. She said that Mr. Simmons' comments about the #11x being an interim step to BRT were important. The idea of express service might cost something, but it could be considered an investment. A basic charge of the Board members was the overall community service. She said that she would like to see a more sophisticated model than just the straight productivity one.

Ms. Wylie said that the Board had discussed the service model at the previous retreat held in October 1999. She said that the Board was not backing down on its commitment to the productivity model by asking staff to further review the southwest hills service issues. Mr. Vobora said that staff would be presenting the first draft of the CSR plan at the March Board meeting.

Ms. Wylie also asked the Bakers to talk with planning staff to determine if other services might be available to Mr. Baker, such as *RideSource*.

**FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 PRICING PLAN AND FARE POLICY:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that last year during the pricing plan discussion, the Board had provided clear direction to staff about a new fare structure, pricing plan, and fare policy. Staff were committed to the restructure, but without the CSR, there was no basis for restructuring the fares in accordance with a service policy that did not yet exist. The Board Finance Committee had reviewed the various components of the recommendation and, in most cases, the Committee had not taken a position on any of the pieces, with the possible exception of the LCC Term Pass. The pricing proposal summary was listed on page 48 of the agenda packet.

Ms. Hellekson said that it was a status quo recommendation with one exception. In previous years, there were recommendations about how often and at what level the various fare instruments should be increased. Staff were recommending no change to the cash fares except to reduce the youth fare to \$0.50. In connection with public sentiment expressed at the TransPlan public hearing, community youth programs, and the Mayor's State of the City Address, in which there was much emphasis on providing services to area youth, staff were recommending a decrease in the youth cash fare and all other youth fare instruments accordingly. This would be a pilot program to test the effect of a lower fare on ridership productivity.

Staff also were proposing to reduce the youth pass prices effective on June 1, 2000, to coincide with the elimination of the summer Freedom Pass, which typically was effective as of June 1 each year. All other pricing proposals would be effective September 1, 2000.

Ms. Wylie asked what had been the experience with the summer Freedom Pass. Mr. Vobora said that 2,800 Freedom Passes had been sold during the summer of 1999, and an average of 1,400 youth passes were sold each month.

Ms. Hellekson said that staff were proposing to reduce the price of the Day Pass to \$2.00 each, which was double the cash fare, and to discontinue the use of transfers. This proposal would facilitate the prepaid BRT fare structure. The Day Pass would be available only on the bus. Riders could pay the \$2.00 fare upon entering their first bus of the day and

be issued a Day Pass, which would allow them unlimited riding throughout the day. One of the main sources of conflict between bus operators and riders had been the validity of transfers. Staff believed this change would be successful.

RideSource fares also were proposed to increase by \$0.25. The Special Transportation Advisory Committee (STF) had recommended the increases to the Regular and Escort services, but had recommended leaving the Shopper fare at \$1.75, which was a round-trip fare and was very costly service to the District. The Committee also recommended a deeper reduction in the cost of a book of 10 RideSource tickets, so that riders would continue to pay the \$1.50 fare if they purchased tickets in advance. Staff were proposing \$1.65 per ticket when purchased in books of 10.

Staff were proposing to standardize and simplify the discounts given to sales outlets so that all outlets, regardless of the number of passes sold, received the same discounted price.

Mr. Vobora discussed the proposal for the Lane Community College (LCC) Term Pass. The LCC Term Pass was in its second year and had been a very positive and successful program. Mr. Vobora handed out a summary of the LCC Term Pass proposal. The college was making an attempt to institutionalize the Term Pass and budget the subsidy on a regular basis. Staff were ready to begin offering the Term Pass for the summer term. LCC had proposed reducing the price because it had been very successful and offering it to the students at a lower rate. Staff were recommending two options: 1) to make 2,500 passes available at a price of \$40, with LCC subsidizing \$20 and the students paying \$20, which would generate nearly the same amount of revenue as currently was being generated, or 2) to make 3,000 passes available at a price of \$30 each, with LCC subsidizing \$16.67 and the students paying \$16.75, which also would generate nearly the same amount of revenue as current levels. The Board Finance Committee had reviewed the two options and had favored testing the market with option 1, which was to offer 2,500 passes at a price of \$40 each. Mr. Bennett asked what the level of staff confidence was that 500 more term passes could be sold. Mr. Vobora said that pass sales had grown each term. One of the factors that could increase sales in the fall was the loss of grant funding for the LCC Women's Program, which currently was a group pass member. There were 180 people in the program, and by dropping the price to \$20 per term per student, and with the commute distances and the price of fuel, staff were confident that pass sales would continue to rise. Ms. Hocken added that the current system could absorb 500 more riders.

Mr. Bennett asked if it did not work for some reason, the price could be adjusted back up and if the Board could commit to a specific period of time, after which time the term pass could be renegotiated. Mr. Vobora said that the program had been successful enough that LCC most likely would be willing to continue with the project.

Lloyd Rain of LCC, who had worked on the term pass task team, said that LCC was delighted with the program, and working with LTD had been a joy. LTD's objective was ridership and cost recovery, and LCC's objective was lowest possible price for students. It appeared that those objectives were being met. He was very pleased with the proposals. Enrollment at LCC had remained stable at nearly 13,000 full-time enrolled students. This proposal would further saturate the market, and would prove whether the market had been penetrated to its fullest extent. The market was stable in terms of enrollment, people seemed to be stable in the types of courses they were taking, and many people were riding

the bus. Mr. Rain said that LCC was facing a budget reduction with a projected shortfall of \$1.3 million for the next school year. The staff recently had completed its first round of budget cuts, and it appeared that the \$1.3 million cut would be achieved without too much pain. There were only four additions being proposed for next year's budget; two were academic, one was a diversity issue, and the fourth was the subsidy of the bus pass, which indicated how important the bus pass program was to LCC.

Ms. Hellekson continued her presentation. She stated that it was her belief that LTD would continue to raise adult cash fares, and if LTD did not continue to make small incremental increases in the RideSource fares, it would never hit the target of charging two times the regular system adult cash fare. For that reason, Ms. Hellekson believed that LTD should continue to push for increases, which was why the staff proposal was for more than the STF committee recommendation.

Ms. Wylie asked about the cost of the shopper. Ms. Hellekson said that the shopper trip price was \$1.75 per round trip. The reason it was priced lower than the other RideSource services was because the shopper trips were grouped trips rather than the customized service for one person.

**Public Testimony:** 1) Fred Simmons of Springfield. Mr. Simmons said that he was in favor of a universal bus pass. It would meet BRT needs, it would help expedite movement of people on the buses, and it would decrease the actual participation costs that people had in the system. It would serve LTD well in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

Mr. Simmons said that the problem with eliminating the transfers was that what was gained would be lost. The mother on her way home with two kids in the stroller who was going to get off to shop at a grocery store would be required to pay another dollar in bus fare just for making that one short stop. It would create real dynamic "gut" things for LTD customers who were out there in the street.

The Springfield City Council and the Mayor had forwarded a letter that was supportive of the reduced youth fare. As a bus operator, Mr. Simmons thought it was wonderful, but it also would make life good for the kids out there because it would acclimatize them to more transit-friendly processes.

With regard to eliminating the Freedom Pass, Mr. Simmons said it would not take much for someone to figure out that a four-month pass at \$33 to a three-month pass at \$32.50 was a price increase, but people would have to live with it.

Mr. Simmons further added that the issue of taking the Day Pass away from the general fare instrument sales was difficult because it fettered some of the public agencies that handled parole and probation people, family service agencies, and other agencies that provided some sort of transportation assistance to their clients. He encouraged the Board to carefully consider those services to ensure that what LTD did fit into the social service umbrella needs in the community.

In general, Mr. Simmons thought it was a good process, but he thought the Board needed to carefully consider the Day Pass sales other than just on the buses. Many of those agencies purchased bundles of day passes to give to people who were in transition from

Oregon State Prison or the mental institution to go out and work in the community. They needed every able bit of assistance they could get to get plugged back in to participation.

He asked the Board to carefully consider taking away the transfer and shifting the Day Pass to the only alternate instrument. The modality within which those were procured must be carefully protected so that it got out into the best part of the community life.

2) Russ Matthews of Eugene. Mr. Matthews said that he was a member of the STF Advisory Committee, which periodically reviewed RideSource fares. What the Committee was attempting to do was to incrementally reach the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) maximum. Recently, the Oregon Legislature had approved more money for special transportation, and it did not seem an appropriate time to hit the ridership with a big fare increase. The STF Advisory Committee did review RideSource fares, and it was not insensitive to all the needs. The Committee knew it had to push forward to the ADA maximum fare, which was a goal of the Committee. The Committee also realized that LTD would be increasing its cash fare and that RideSource fares had been increased yearly for the past several years. The Committee wanted to get to the maximum ADA fare allowable, but in a more gentle manner.

**Board Deliberations:** Mr. Bennett said that he had read the information about the Day Pass and had listened to the comments, but he wanted to hear the staff recommendation and the issues again. Mr. Vobora said that the Day Passes were not widely used, except primarily by the social service agencies. Staff believed that LTD could accommodate the needs of the social service agencies through monthly passes and tokens. It would take two tokens to be issued a Day Pass, so staff did not see this as a major stumbling block.

Other transit districts had used this process of charging for a day pass for round-trip rides since their inception, while other transit agencies had introduced the concept much later. The person who would be penalized was the person who was traveling only in one direction but needed to take two or more buses to arrive at his/her destination. Staff had reviewed the Origin and Destination information that had been gathered last year and it appeared that fewer than 3 percent of LTD riders would be affected in this way. For the rest of the system, riders would pay for the entire round trip at the beginning, then would not have to pay again for the return trip. Other transit agencies had reported good experience with this system, and staff believed it would work at LTD as well, once people became accustomed to it.

Mr. Kleger said that there were a few other customers who would be adversely affected by this. Those were people of rather limited means, who, since the two-way transfer was instituted, would get on the bus and ride to a shopping area on the same route, do their shopping, then use the transfer to get home. This would effectively double the cost of their trip. For those who took the trouble to do their shopping within the transfer time frame, it mattered very much to them. It happened that there were many on Mr. Kleger's route who did this type of bus travel.

Secondly, Mr. Kleger said that there were a number of people who rode in the evenings, and they constituted a significant part of that one-way ridership. Some of them were working graveyard shifts. The present structure of the day pass did not allow it to carry overnight, and this proposal would double the cost of riding for those folks. There were not many, and

most used passes, but there was a group that Mr. Kleger knew of who lived in Springfield and worked an average of two nights each week out in the Barger area as security guards.

LTD would need to improve its ability to serve the graveyard shift over time, and eventually would be getting into 24-hour service. It would be prudent to begin thinking now of how to address that issue.

Mr. Kleger said that he liked the idea as a basic idea.

**MOTION** Mr. Bennett moved that the Board direct staff to prepare amendments to Ordinance #35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services, consistent with the recommendations of the Draft FY 2000-2001 Pricing Plan included in the February 16, 2000, agenda packet. Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed.

**VOTE**

Ms. Wylie said that she was excited and encouraged about the reduced youth fare. She thought it accomplished many things. It encouraged the next generation's use of transit, addressed some of the TransPlan suggestions, and improved public relations.

**MOTION** With regard to the LCC Term Pass, which was not part of Ordinance #35, Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: "The LTD Board of Directors hereby directs staff to negotiate an agreement with Lane Community College to continue the term bus pass program. Staff are authorized to set the pass price at \$40 per pass and make available 2,500 passes per term for fall, winter, and spring terms, and 1,000 passes for summer term, for the 2000-2001 school year. Staff may, based on the success of the 2000-2001 pass sales, continue the program during the 2001-2002 school year. The price per pass and quantity made available for 2001-2002 will be determined by the LTD-LCC bus pass committee and shall not exceed 3,000 passes per term at a price of \$30 per pass. Lower numbers of passes will require a higher per-pass cost." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed.

**VOTE**

**MOTION** CONSENT CALENDAR: Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for February 16, 2000, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the January 19, 2000, regular Board meeting, the January 21, 2000, special Board meeting, the January 22, 2000, special Board meeting, and the January 25, 2000, adjourned Board meeting as well as Budget Committee nominations for Russ Brink and George Rode.

**VOTE**

**1999 SECTION 5309 FEDERAL GRANT AMENDMENT:** Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner said that Section 5309 funds were Congressional Earmark funds. LTD was requesting a grant amendment to the 1999 grant that allocated funds to begin BRT planning and engineering work (FTA Grant No. OR-03-0070). The amendment required an additional \$800,000 to complete planning and engineering work on Phase 1 of the BRT pilot project, including the environmental assessment, and to begin Phase 2 planning and engineering work. The requested funds were a portion of the FY 1999 Section 5309 Bus Allocation.

Administratively, Ms. Gardner said, it was easier to amend a grant than to complete a new application.

**Public Hearing:** Ms. Wylie opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak on this issue, and Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing.

**MOTION**            **Board Deliberations:** Mr. Kortge moved the following resolution: “It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed 1999 Section 5309 federal grant application amendment for \$800,000 in federal funds and authorizes the General Manager to submit this application to the Federal Transit Administration for approval.” Mr. Kleger  
**VOTE**                seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed.

**2000 SECTION 5307 FEDERAL GRANT APPLICATION:** Ms. Gardner said that these were funds that were appropriated annually by Congress and were released as part of the Federal Register that was issued in November. The Federal Register listed the funds appropriated to LTD. This request would fund the balance of the 1999-2000 Capital Improvements Program that included spare parts for bus maintenance, passenger boarding improvements, computer hardware and software, facility improvements, and the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. In addition to the TDM program, State Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds were being requested to continue Springfield Station site selection and property acquisition. The total request was for \$2,127,601.

**Public Hearing:** Ms. Wylie opened the public hearing. No one wished to speak on this issue, and Ms. Wylie closed the public hearing.

**MOTION**            **Board Deliberations:** Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: “It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed 2000 Section 5307 federal grant application for \$2,127,601 in federal funds and authorizes the general manager to submit this application to the Federal Transit Administration for approval.” Ms. Hocken asked if LTD  
**VOTE**                expected to receive all of the funding that was outlined in this request. Ms. Gardner said that the funds already were approved, and the application was a formality. All of the projects were approved by the Board in the 1999-2000 Capital Improvements Program. Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Ms. Hellekson said that the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) was a rolling five-year plan. This year, the Board Finance Committee reviewed two versions of the CIP. One version was a best-case scenario (Plan A) that assumed full funding, and the second version was a more conservative plan. There were funding uncertainties related to discretionary federal funds. In response to that uncertainty, staff had prepared a worst-case scenario (Plan B) version of the CIP. Ms. Hellekson distributed a copy of Plan B to the Board members. Plan A had been included in the agenda packet.

Plan B allowed LTD to keep all of its projects on schedule to meet the needs of the long-term agenda and to meet the needs of BRT, although it would not show LTD’s ability to move as aggressively, should it be able to do so at the end of the year. It also would give staff one

year to put together a comprehensive financing plan that would include the debt options and leveraging of various other kinds of funds, such as joint development options around the new Springfield Station.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff had considered getting more payroll tax money. Ms. Hellekson said that LTD currently was at the statutory maximum. Mr. Bennett asked if it was being considered for the next Legislative session to attempt to raise the statutory maximum. Ms. Hellekson said that it certainly was an option, and LTD needed to be very bold and aggressive in seeking additional funding.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Board were to adopt Plan B, and LTD later learned that it had received more funding than expected, would LTD need to go through a large budget change. Ms. Hellekson said that it would depend on when LTD thought it would use the funding. Also if it appeared that the District would use any funds that were more than 10 percent more than what was budgeted, then the budget would need to be reopened and the Budget Committee would be reconvened. If the increase were less than 10 percent, the Board could amend the budget by resolution without calling the Budget Committee back into session.

Ms. Hocken asked which plan the Board would be adopting. Ms. Hellekson said that staff were recommending that the Board adopt Plan A, or the fully-funded plan. The CIP also would be presented to the Budget Committee in April. Ms. Hocken then asked if more information would be available in April to present a more likely scenario during the budget presentations. Ms. Hellekson said that the only additional information would be anecdotal information from the federal United Front funding request trip to Washington, D.C., planned for the end of February.

**MOTION**

**VOTE**

Ms. Hocken moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the proposed Capital Improvements Program for fiscal years 2000-2001 through 2003-2004 is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed.

**DRUG AND ALCOHOL PROGRAM POLICY:** Human Resources Specialist Joyce Ziemiak said that this policy replaced both the current Drug and Alcohol Policy that was adopted in September 1995 and the Drug/Alcohol Policy, which addressed a drug-free work place, that was adopted in October 1983. It addressed corrective actions that were specified in the Draft Report of the FY 1999 Triennial Review. It incorporated changes in and interpretations of federal regulations regarding Drug and Alcohol Testing and Drug Free Workplace Programs.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if the policy had been reviewed by District Counsel. Mr. Kortge said that the Board HR Committee had reviewed the policy with Counsel. Human Resources Manager Dave Dickman added that the policy changed the administrative process while not changing anything about the process with employees.

**MOTION**

Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adopts the proposed Drug and Alcohol Program Policy, replacing policies III-I-A, Drug-Free Work Place, and III-I-B, Drug and Alcohol Testing, as presented on February 16,

**VOTE** 000.” Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed.

**RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES TO REQUIRE, PROCESS, AND MANAGE CRIMINAL RECORDS CHECKS FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY OR WORKING UNDER CONTRACT WITH LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT:** Mr. Dickman said that Senate Bill 1334, which was enacted in 1999, required the Board to adopt a resolution to implement applicable provisions that afforded mass transit and transportation districts access to State Police and FBI criminal history information and required districts to check criminal histories of operators in order to protect vulnerable Oregonians. This resolution complied with Senate Bill 1334 and delegated specific authority to the general manager in order to retain the flexibility to make appropriate changes to the District’s internal administrative policies as appear warranted.

Mr. Kortge said that the Board HR Committee had discussions about the Resolution with Counsel. This was a required resolution that would allow the general manager to adopt specific policies implementing the resolution and Senate Bill 1334.

Ms. Hocken asked if LTD was required to test all providers, including the Paratransit operators. Mr. Dickman said that all providers would be subject to this resolution, including volunteers who rode along as assistants to people who had disabilities. It was a very comprehensive plan.

Ms. Lauritsen added that volunteers in youth programs would be subject to this level of background checking as well, and she thought it was very reasonable. She supported the initiative, but it would be a burden.

Mr. Dickman said that from a public policy standpoint, it was LTD’s responsibility to provide the highest level of security for those people who were in LTD’s care and trust. He wholeheartedly supported the initiative.

**MOTION** Mr. Gaydos moved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors adopt the Resolution Establishing Procedures to Require, Process, and Manage Criminal Records Checks for Certain Individuals Employed By or Working Under Contract with Lane Transit District.  
**VOTE** Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Bennett voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Wylie said that this piece of legislation was well intentioned, but had far-reaching ramifications.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:**

**Board Member Reports:** 1) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Wylie noted that Mr. Bennett would remain the LTD representative to MPC through April, then Ms. Wylie would take his place on the Committee. Ms. Wylie noted that she would not be available during the month of April, and Mr. Bennett, as Vice President of the Board, would be the acting President of the Board during the month of April. 2) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken had nothing to report. 3) BRT Steering Committee/Public Design Workshops/Walkabout Input. Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron attended the recent BRT



Consortium meetings in Honolulu, Hawaii. He said that he was happy to report that the federal enthusiasm and support for bus rapid transit (BRT) continued to be strong. There was federal money set aside, and LTD was among the chosen few cities in the United States that were preparing a BRT program. The federal government wanted to know what the plans were and to have the confidence that LTD had community support for BRT. LTD remained on the front edge of the project. LTD had presented the recently produced BRT video that showed simulations of BRT in the Eugene/Springfield area, and it had been very well received. Ms. Wylie asked the Board members to remain after the meeting to view the video.

**OTHER ITEMS FOR INFORMATION:** Due to the late hour, Ms. Wylie asked the Board members if there were any questions about any of the remaining items in the agenda packet. There were none. She reminded the Board members that the LTD Employee Appreciation Banquet would be held on Sunday, February 27, at the Hilton. She encouraged Board members to attend.

Ms. Wylie announced that she and Mr. Gaydos would accompany area officials to Washington, D.C., from February 26 to March 2 to lobby for federal funding for local high-priority projects. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch distributed the Federal Priorities Booklet to the Board members. The booklet contained a listing of those projects.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Following the BRT video, there was no further discussion regarding any other informational items in the Board packet, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

---

Board Secretary