

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 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, March 15, 2000, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Dean Kortge, Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: Ms. Wylie announced that there were several changes to the meeting agenda. Item X.E., the Board Position on Ballot Measure 82, would be deleted from the agenda, and item X.G., regarding an extension of the TransPlan public comment period, would be added to the agenda. Ms. Wylie also stated that she had a letter that she wished to read into the minutes of the meeting, and she would do so immediately following the Employee of the Year item.

WORK SESSION – DRAFT COVERAGE AND PRODUCTIVITY PLAN FOR COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN (CSR): Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora said that this would be the first in a series of work sessions in which the Board would consider results of the CSR work. The purpose of the CSR was to address some operational problems that the District experienced, including running time problems and complexities that resulted from the many years of annual service adjustments.

Mr. Vobora reviewed the CSR design guidelines, which included reducing total travel time along some of the routes, minimizing the inconvenience of transfers to ensure more efficient use, matching the frequency of service to the level of population and employment density, scheduling service to meet peak demands, and simplifying service to make it easier to understand for the customers. The decision factors included the Board's objective of moving toward a system that was based on 75 percent productivity, 20 percent coverage, and 5 percent discretionary services.

Staff also used current available data to design the first draft of the CSR, including the current zoning patterns; the population and employment density; the areas where ridership was the strongest; future projections; and input from riders, non-riders, and employees.

Mr. Vobora displayed the total productivity model map that had been produced by consultant Jarrett Walker of Nelson Nygaard, which focused resources along major travel corridors with frequencies of 7.5 minutes during peak hours. Mr. Vobora then displayed a map produced by staff, which blended aspects of the current system with aspects of the productivity model. A route under this model could have a coverage segment as well as a major corridor segment.

Mr. Vobora said that staff conducted route segment analyses on the entire system to determine which routes were the most productive and where that high productivity occurred. Staff then determined areas that would be best covered as turn-around locations and, in some instances, linked the ends of routes together, which provided some cross-town features. Also, in the coverage category, staff had designed some neighborhood circulator service, which would link to the corridor services.

Ms. Hocken asked if it would be difficult to track the evaluating data on those routes that had both productivity and coverage segments. Mr. Vobora said that, overall, the system would be evaluated on a segment-by-segment basis.

Ms. Hocken said that when Mr. Walker had presented his productivity model, he had started from scratch with the demographics, while staff began the CSR modeling by reviewing existing routes. She asked if it was possible that there were routes that currently did not exist, but that could be productive. Senior Service Planner Paul Zvonkovic said that the staff model included some new routing to new areas. Mr. Vobora added that Mr. Walker had considered segment data and had indexed those segments based on employment and existing trip data. Ms. Hocken said that while an index was helpful, it was a raw number, and there could be other factors that were difficult to quantify.

Mr. Vobora said that staff then considered areas where service had been deleted and had considered service to those areas based on the coverage category. He displayed a map of the coverage options. A model based only upon productivity would miss some key neighborhood services.

Mr. Vobora said that the CSR would result in the major corridors being well serviced, and while some neighborhood service would be lost, some new neighborhood service would be gained. Overall, the CSR would not result in significant changes that would cause an uproar in the community.

Mr. Vobora then reviewed the proposed route frequency map.

Ms. Wylie asked if staff were considering adding additional Park & Ride lots as service continued to be streamlined. Mr. Vobora said that, typically, LTD looked for opportunities to lease parking spaces in areas along routes. Long-term Park & Ride plans were being made in conjunction with the bus rapid transit (BRT) system planning. Staff paid attention to where Park & Ride locations currently were and worked to fill the gaps when necessary.

Ms. Wylie said that if there were whole neighborhoods where there would be very limited or no bus service, staff should consider adding Park & Ride service.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff were considering Park & Ride service in connection with the downtown shuttle service. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that one philosophy with Park & Ride service was called peripheral Park & Rides, in which Park & Rides were located just on the edge of downtown so that people drove most of the way, but remained outside the most congested areas where parking costs were high. A short shuttle service was provided for that type of service. The drawback was in terms of vehicle miles traveled (VMTs). People continued to drive many miles; however, it did preserve downtown land for more intensive uses. One of the obvious locations in Eugene for such a system would be Autzen Stadium.

Mr. Gaydos asked how the staff viewed the relationship between increased corridor frequency and neighborhood connector frequency. Mr. Vobora said that there was a close relationship between the two, which included the consideration of stop spacing. It also had been proven that people were willing to walk a bit further if there were high-speed, frequent service along the corridors.

Mr. Gaydos asked if there was a way to determine whether high-frequency corridor service was being considered near where neighborhood service had been cut. Mr. Vobora said that staff could provide that information.

Ms. Hocken noted that Mr. Walker had made a presentation to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), and that one of the topics he discussed was flex-route neighborhood shuttles. She asked if staff had considered that type of service. Mr. Vobora said that flex-route service basically was a route into a neighborhood that had several deviations built into it. Those deviations only were made if someone called in either directly to the bus operator or to the transit system to request that the deviation be made. Staff did not know enough about the service at this time, but Mr. Vobora thought that this type of service would make the system more complex than was desired. It was thought; however, that flex-route service could achieve more coverage. Staff were learning more about flex-route service and would provide more information to the Board at a later date. Mr. Vobora added that staff were looking at ways to create neighborhood connectors by linking two routes together when possible.

Mr. Vobora provided an overview of the proposed CSR routes by segment, including the Barger, River Road, Ferry Street Bridge, Gateway, Springfield, and South Eugene areas.

Ms. Wylie asked if staff had taken into consideration the relocation of the Springfield Station and if there would be a shuttle in downtown Springfield. Mr. Vobora said that staff had planned routes from the current station that easily could be adjusted to a new location, and there was a loop route that emulated a downtown shuttle. Ms. Wylie added that she thought there was some confusion in the community about a circular downtown Eugene shuttle as opposed to short routes to nearby destinations. She asked staff to address the downtown shuttle plans with the Board in the near future. Mr. Vobora said that staff currently were proposing a downtown shuttle, which also could be considered another route, that connected the train station, UO, and Valley River Center.

Mr. Vobora said that, as proposed, the CSR would result in a 6.3 percent increase in service, 5.1 percent of which was attributed to the downtown shuttle. Staff believed the plan maintained frequency along the major corridors, provided substantial coverage, and maintained rural service. In addition, it addressed many of the operational issues such as route timing. It

was not quite as simplified as staff had hoped, but it was thought that it would become more so as routes were paired, named, and numbered.

Mr. Kleger asked how much of the lack of simplicity was due to the lack of simplicity in the local street network. Mr. Vobora said that was a factor as was the desire to provide coverage.

Ms. Hocken asked if the proposed CSR met the guidelines that the Board had set. Mr. Vobora said that it was very close. As proposed, 73 percent of the service was allocated to productivity routes, 21 percent to coverage routes, and 6 percent was to be allocated to the downtown shuttle route.

Mr. Vobora asked for Board direction in terms of overall service hours. Additional productivity could be achieved in a number of ways. If this proposed plan were approved as the direction the Board desired to take, the next step for staff would be to discuss the public input process. The productivity standard discussion would take place later, after the service was implemented and evaluated.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Board members would receive copies of the maps that were presented. She also wanted staff to provide information about the impact on *RideSource* eligibility and how it would be maintained if regular service were deleted from neighborhoods. Mr. Vobora said that staff would present information about how the *RideSource* boundaries extended out from the LTD service. Ms. Hocken said there was an issue about time of day and day of the week that she did not understand. Mr. Vobora explained that if an LTD route did not operate on a Sunday, then *RideSource* riders in that area were not eligible to use *RideSource* on Sunday. Ms. Hocken asked staff to provide more information in the near future.

Ms. Hocken also said that this proposal was somewhat different than the model that had been presented at MPC.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was a discrepancy in productivity of neighborhood service. Mr. Vobora said that there was, but that it was hard to predict in planning routes. Staff typically looked at zoning designations and nodal development plans in an effort to predict neighborhood routes that would produce well. Mr. Bennett said that construction could slow for some period, so staff frequently needed to review development. Mr. Vobora said that the CSR was the basic set-up of service, and the Annual Route Review (ARR) fixed problems on an annual basis.

Ms. Wylie said that she thought staff were heading in the right direction with the proposed draft CSR plan.

Mr. Bennett recalled that during the discussion that the Board had in the fall about productivity versus coverage, there was agreement to save 5 or 6 percent for coverage or discretionary service because there may be other compelling reasons to consider coverage. Since he was a productivity advocate, he thought it helped his case, because there would be an answer for those very difficult situations that were presented. However, if that 6 percent were used up for the rural service, then it needed to be a conscientious decision. Mr. Vobora said that he had thought that the 6 percent would be included in the 20 percent coverage guideline, and the 5 percent would be allocated for the shuttle route or something else, such as contingencies. The ability to respond to service opportunities needed to be maintained.

Ms. Hocken asked how the service hours were affected by the proposed draft CSR. Mr. Vobora said that there was an increase of 6 percent. Mr. Vobora said that another option would be to review the frequency of the shuttle and neighborhood services to ensure that rural service was included in the coverage guideline in order to establish the discretionary fund that would not be used up by the proposed plan.

Ms. Wylie thanked staff for the proposal, and said that she thought staff were headed in the right direction.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – April 2000: Bus Operator and Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 757 Executive Board Officer Paul Headley was selected as the April 2000 Employee of the Month. Mr. Headley was hired on May 24, 1969, and had earned an award for 27 years of safe driving. Mr. Headley's co-workers nominated him for this award in appreciation of his long-term, continual efforts to help LTD be successful as an organization and to advocate on behalf of LTD's employees. Mr. Headley was described as going way above and beyond the call of duty, being responsive to urgent requests for information, and being a storehouse of information about the early days of LTD.

Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson added that Mr. Headley was an asset to LTD on many levels, and prided himself on being number one in seniority. If anyone needed an historical perspective on LTD, he or she only needed to turn to Paul. Mr. Johnson also said that Mr. Headley had a genuine interest in making sure that LTD was a good place to work, and he had established an excellent relationship with employees.

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Headley with a certificate, letter of appreciation, and monetary award. Mr. Headley said that his years as a bus operator and part of the LTD family had been an honor, and that it had been an honor to have Ms. Loobey as the general manager. He said he had been driving long enough to see four generations of bus passengers. Mr. Headley said that he appreciated that members of the Board had made some difficult decisions throughout the years that had put LTD where it was today. He expected that as he became older and a passenger on the bus, LTD would be a transit system worthy of him as a passenger, and it was up to the Board to ensure that it was. He thanked the Board for the recognition.

EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR – 1999: Ms. Wylie announced that Executive Secretary Jo Sullivan had been honored at the recent Employee Appreciation Banquet as the LTD Employee of the Year for 1999. Ms. Sullivan was hired in 1980 and had been selected for this award as a result of the exceptional quality of her work and knowledge that she willingly shared with others; her commitment to excellence; her leadership of the staff members who reported to her and as a member of the management team; her unqualified support of LTD, her fellow employees, the General Manager and Board of Directors; and the assistance she provided to ATU Executive Board Officer Paul Headley. Ms. Sullivan had received her award at the banquet.

“EMPLOYEE OF THE 20TH CENTURY”: Ms. Wylie announced that Ms. Loobey had been honored at the banquet as the “Employee of the 20th Century.”

Ms. Wylie then read the following letter of commendation that had been signed by each of the seven members of the Board.

Dear Phyllis: It is our pleasure to write you this letter. It has been a wonderful experience for us to serve on this Board of Directors while you have been the general manager. Your vision, leadership skills, and abilities, which have been honed by experience and sharpened to near perfection through years of being on the job, have served as a great example for others.

In the area of staffing, we want to commend you. You have surrounded yourself with competent, capable people who do their jobs well. But more than that, we have been struck with the caliber of the staff. They have vision; they have dedication; they serve LTD with enthusiasm and distinction. We recognize that it is your leadership skills and expectations that has led to a quality staff.

It is with pride that we tour the LTD facilities. From the newest Park & Ride station to the new downtown Eugene Station; to the new office buildings and bus barns; to the projected Springfield Station, Lane Transit District has award-winning buildings, inviting stations, and safe and user-friendly platforms and vehicles, and all of it clean and well maintained.

Operations, planning, development, public relations, community relations, neighborhood workshops, new technology, Board meetings, new routes, new buses, and everything else that happens in a well-run transit agency all resound with excellence. As we have said many times before, under your leadership you have established a culture of excellence at Lane Transit District.

The Board has reason to be pleased with your award-winning financial leadership. The budget process, the well-thought-out annual budget, the careful planning that has created a reserve to be used for capital projects and match, and the annual audit all make our jobs easier. Your leadership has created a sound fiscal picture for LTD.

Finally, we want to commend you not only for your leadership, but also for your vision and the legacy you are leaving us, as we work on the completion of bus rapid transit.

Thank you, Phyllis, for a job well done. As a Board, we have been spoiled by the fine work that you do. You have made it all look so easy--an illusion that a well-run, finely-tuned transit agency just happens. Thankfully, we know that it takes a true leader and a fantastic general manager to make it happen. We wish you much happiness in your retirement and whatever endeavors you choose to pursue. Thank you again for the contribution you have made to the community through building this transit district. And thank you for being the right person at the right time to make LTD what it is today.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Wylie noted that two public hearings would be held during the meeting regarding the pricing plan and the annual route review. She asked that the audience hold their comments regarding those two issues until the public hearings. No one wished to address the Board at this time.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETINGMOTION
VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: The March 15, 2000, Consent Calendar consisted of the Minutes of the February 16, 2000, Regular Board Meeting and a Budget Committee Nomination re-nominating Gino Grimaldi of Springfield to the LTD Budget Committee. Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for March 15, 2000, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 PRICING PLAN AND FIRST READING OF AMENDED FARE ORDINANCE: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that following the preliminary public hearing on the Pricing Plan that had been held in February, staff had made the following changes to the District fare structure. Token prices would be increased from 75 to 85 percent of cash fare; Group pass program prices would increase by 3.2 percent; RideSource and RideSource Escort fares would be increased from \$1.50 to \$1.75 per one-way trip; youth fares would be decreased to match the child fare; day passes would be replaced by a new instrument that would be sold only on the buses; the transfer instrument would be eliminated; and the outlet discount policy would be changed to a flat 10 percent, regardless of quantities purchased.

Public Hearing: (1) Lee Duncan or Eugene, also an LTD bus operator, spoke about changing the age for the youth fare. He asked the Board to reconsider increasing the age for the child fare. He said that it created a problem in that it became an enforcement issue for the bus operators. He recognized that the issue generally was thought of as an operational issue and one that the Board expected staff to handle, but he wanted the Board to have his perspective as a bus operator. It was relatively easy for a bus operator to identify kids who were 12 and under. However, it was more difficult to easily identify those youth who were within the 18 and under age group. He compared it to the sale of cigarettes. He said that stores were required to check identification for people buying cigarettes through the age of 26, which was eight years after the legal age to purchase cigarettes. He was concerned that bus operators would need to check identification of about the same age group in order to enforce fare evasion issues.

Mr. Duncan suggested that youth be required to carry an identification card that would be checked once each month downtown. Some form of that could be very effective for the bus operator. Another suggestion was that if the Board expected the bus operators to enforce the new youth fare, the bus operators also should be given the authority to carry out the enforcement.

Mr. Duncan said that he hoped the Board would implement a system that would balance both LTD's needs and the needs of youth and one that would be respectful and encouraging to the bus operators.

(2) Ted Stevens of Eugene, the director of Senior and Disabled Services with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), and a member of the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC), spoke about the proposed RideSource fares. He urged the Board to adopt the STFAC proposal for the RideSource fare increases. The STFAC proposal was presented on the unanimous recommendation of the Committee following more than an hour of deliberation. The proposal retained the same features as the LTD staff proposal with the exception of the RideSource Shopper. The STFAC proposal maintained a single fare for all RideSource services, and it provided more of a break for those who purchased the 10-pass booklets. Many of the

RideSource customers were on fixed incomes, and the proposed fare increase for the single user was 17 percent, while the fare increase for the 10-pass booklets was a 7 percent increase.

Mr. Stevens also said that while the STFAC recognized that there was a desire to incrementally move to the maximum fare allowed, there also had been significant changes in the environment during the past few years, primarily the infusion of an additional \$700,000 into Lane County for services for elderly and disabled people.

Mr. Stevens had submitted a letter as part of the supplemental testimony packet that the Board had received, and he encouraged the Board to favor the STFAC proposal rather than the LTD staff proposal.

(3) Ed Necker of Eugene, who was a member of the STFAC and a former RideSource user, said that he now was using the regular system on a regular basis, and he was a volunteer at RideSource.

Mr. Necker said that with the regular LTD system, the lower price for passes was to encourage ridership, while the reduced price for the RideSource ticket booklet was to save money. It saved staff time as well as helped those on fixed and lower incomes. The STFAC had deliberated this issue at great length, and had determined that it would be good for all concerned.

Mr. Necker also said that the Shopper was one of the most efficient services within the RideSource system, and the STFAC also had spent much time deliberating that issue as well. RideSource was trying to encourage ridership on the Shopper, and felt that if that fare were raised, it would have the opposite affect.

He asked the Board to accept the STFAC recommendation. It would result in about \$480 per month, which was what he saved the system by volunteering his time at RideSource. He said that the STFAC was a good representation of interest groups and should be listened to.

(4) Linda Reynolds of Eugene said that she was a RideSource user and a member of the STFAC. The Committee had carefully considered the LTD staff proposal and had put much thought into its own proposal. The STFAC was interested in the people who were on limited budgets, and she also was on a limited budget. Because she had a medical card, however, her rides were paid for, but many others were not that fortunate. The STFAC was interested in raising the RideSource rates incrementally to meet the standards. People were getting use to the idea of those incremental increases.

The Shopper was very efficient because it was a shared ride by several people. It would be sad if the rates went up and people discontinued using it. She encouraged the Board to give the issue serious consideration, and she appreciated the opportunity to voice her opinion with the Board.

(5) Bob Cassidy of Eugene complimented the Board for the proposed change in the youth fare price. He thought it would cut down on the car travel to the schools and other youth activities, which in turn would cut down on the pollution in the area.

Mr. Cassidy also commented about an article that had appeared in *The Register-Guard* regarding the proposed route changes. He thought that changing and reducing the routes provided an excellent opportunity for the Board to solve an age-old problem in the community

about better service and lower fares. Obviously with LTD, the ridership needed to be maintained at a certain level in order to justify keeping a bus route.

Mr. Cassidy thought there might be an opportunity during the next six months to try a pilot program on just those buses that were proposed for deletion in September. The program would consist of offering free fares on those routes to determine if ridership would increase. It would give LTD an opportunity to gather data about the effects on ridership if fares were reduced or free. There would be little income lost and much knowledge could be gained.

Board Discussion and Decision: Mr. Kleger said that he had several concerns about the *RideSource* issue, and he was of a divided mind on the subject. It was likely that in one year, LTD would be addressing an adjustment in the adult cash fare, which would again move the target rate of twice the adult cash fare on *RideSource* further away. He wanted to get the *RideSource* fare brought into linkage with the standard service fares so the Board would no longer need to go through this agonizing process over and over again.

Mr. Kleger said that the STFAC proposal would be easier on many of the users of *RideSource*. The adjustment in price, by virtue of the lower price for ticket booklets, was somewhat more apparent than real because a very high proportion of the ridership purchased tickets in advance. He did not wish to put a squeeze on those people. He also strongly agreed with the STFAC proposal to not increase the Shopper fare. It was a service that encouraged grouped rides, and that lower fare for the Shopper always should be maintained.

The amount of money was relatively small in terms of the overall LTD budget, but the incentive effect on the target population was much bigger than most people realized. Mr. Kleger noted that the ultimate target of twice the regular fare had been charged in the past with a lower price for tickets purchased in advance. The resources to assist people in paying the fares had been enhanced for some and considerably restricted for others. The impact on the population in question had changed and not in a manner that was easy to address by any formula.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger then moved that the Board adopt the STFAC proposal for *RideSource* fare adjustments. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion.

Ms. Hocken said that it was an unusual position for the Board because during the last several years as *RideSource* fares had been raised, the Board always had received strong support from the STFAC. She believed the STFAC continued to support the Board's efforts with regard to *RideSource* fares. She also believed there was a difference of opinion about how fast the *RideSource* fares should be brought into the standard of twice the regular system fare.

Ms. Hocken said that she liked the STFAC proposal because the basic fare would be raised by \$0.25 as staff also had proposed. The deeper discount for the ticket booklet was not a completely incomprehensible suggestion. She did not, however, share the enthusiasm for the *RideSource* Shopper because the fare charged was a round-trip fare, which still was substantially cheaper than the regular *RideSource* fare. She said that she could support the motion on the table, except that she wanted to support an increase in the *RideSource* Shopper fare to \$2.00.

Ms. Hocken asked for more discussion about the funding for services in Lane County that had been passed by the last session of the Legislature. She said that as she understood the

rules associated with the spending of that funding, it would not do much to enhance existing program operations. She believed it was to be spent for new programs and services. It did not address the basic question of funding the ongoing service. In spite of the increased funding from the Legislature, she believed LTD should move forward with planned increases.

**AMENDED
MOTION**

Ms. Hocken then moved to amend the motion to support the STFAC proposal on all RideSource fares except the Shopper service, which she moved to be raised to \$2.00. Mr. Kleger accepted the amended motion.

Ms. Lauritsen asked for further clarification about why Ms. Hocken favored the increase in the Shopper service. Ms. Hocken said that she supported the staff recommendation to increase the Shopper fare because the \$2.00 charge represented a round-trip charge, which was less than the regular RideSource service round-trip fare. The Shopper was curb-to-curb service for an elderly or disabled person to go grocery shopping. The only other option for this trip for many people would be taxi service, which would be considerably more expensive. Mr. Kleger said that, technically, the Shopper fare could be raised to \$4.00 to meet the twice-the-regular-fare standard.

Mr. Bennett asked if Mr. Kleger was accepting of the motion as amended. Mr. Kleger said that he could accept the amended motion, and he thought it was a very practical way to address the issue.

VOTE

The motion, as amended, had been made to accept the staff Pricing Plan recommendations with the exception of the STFAC recommendation to increase the RideSource Ticket Books by \$1.00 to \$15.00 for ten tickets. Ms. Wylie called for a vote on the motion, which carried unanimously, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed. The Board directed that these changes be made to Ninth Amended Ordinance #35.

**MOTION
VOTE**

Mr. Kleger then moved that Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35 as amended be read by title only. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Wylie then read the Ordinance by title: "Ninth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services."

Ms. Loobey said that the Ordinance would be presented for a second reading and adoption at the April Board meeting.

ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW – FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 SERVICE PLAN: Mr. Vobora presented a revised summary of the staff recommendations for the Annual Route Review (ARR) as a result of public testimony and input from the Board at the February 2000 Board meeting. He presented three alternatives to the proposed deletion of routes 38 and 39. The revised summary resulted in a further reduction in service of 0.70 percent.

Ms. Hocken said that it appeared that each year there were minutes added to routes 60 and 61, particularly during peak-hour service. She asked if those two routes would ever reach an optimal operating time. Mr. Vobora said that typically when staff added timing to a peak-hour route, it was done on an incremental basis and only on those trips that had been proven to be unable to meet running times. Mr. Vobora added that staff were proposing to add time to all trips

of the 60 and 61. Ms. Loobey added that the environment had a great impact on those routes. One of the amendments that was being forwarded from the LTD Board in TransPlan was that instead of adding very expensive, non-productive time to schedules, the entire Opticon system (signal priority) would be reviewed to ensure efficient operation of the public transportation system. Ms. Hocken added that the additional time added to routes also was unproductive for the riders, as they would be traveling for longer periods of time to arrive at their destinations. Mr. Vobora said that signal priority was one piece of a discussion that had occurred at the recent MPC meeting. Other considerations were queue jumpers and the use of right turn lanes as priority lanes for buses.

Public Testimony: (1) Windy Kent of Eugene, who worked at the Northwest Youth Corp located in the Laurel Valley area, said that the Youth Corp was expanding and adding new programs for youth, but was located in an isolated area. The Corp recently began an after-school program and 75 percent of the youth who attended the program were using the Corp transportation or LTD. As the number of youth in the program increased, so would the demand for transportation alternatives.

There also was an alternative school campus that currently enrolled 44 students. More than one-third of those students utilized LTD, and the bus schedule worked well for them, for which the Youth Corp was grateful.

The Youth Corp program would continue to grow and more youth would be served. There currently was only one bus pickup in the afternoon, so the Corp staff were shuttling the participants to the Eugene Station.

Ms. Kent had sent a letter to Mr. Zvonkovic that provided her description of what an ideal bus schedule would be for the Laurel Valley area. In addition to the Corp program, the Corp staff had surveyed youth who lived in the Laurel Valley area and found a need existed there as well.

In addition, there was a large staff at the Youth Corp, and the bus schedules did not accommodate the staff at all. She hoped that the letter she had written would be shared with the Board.

(2) Christopher Phillips of Eugene discussed his concerns about the proposed deletion of routes 38 and 39 in the ARR and the proposed deletion of route 35 in the CSR plan. If route 39 were deleted without replacement, Mr. Phillips would have no service outside of rush hours. If route 35 were deleted in the CSR, Mr. Phillips would have no bus service at all. According to the plan, the nearest stop to his home would be at 22nd and City View, which was 0.8 miles and 350 vertical feet away from his home.

Some of the comments made during the CSR suggested that it was hoped that people affected by these deletions would utilize a Park & Ride lot. Mr. Phillips said that in order for him to utilize a Park & Ride lot, he would require another automobile. If he had another car, it would not be that much more expensive for him to drive it all the way to the University rather than leaving it in a parking lot somewhere else. The main costs associated with a car were purchase price, insurance, and maintenance.

Mr. Phillips said that service to the outlying areas, such as the City View neighborhood also brought passengers to the rest of the system. Since he used the bus to travel to work on a daily basis, and if he needed to do errands during the day, he also rode the bus for those.

Mr. Phillips also said that LTD wanted to be seen as reliable in the community. He had purchased a house in a location specifically to be on a bus route. He realized that there were many places with bus routes where he could have bought a house, but he did not consider buying a house in a location where there was no bus service. He bought a house on a bus route because he had intended to ride the bus. It would be cheaper and more convenient for him to go ahead and buy another car than to sell his house. If LTD withdrew from neighborhoods such as his, the message it was sending was that people who bought houses could not plan in such a way as to reliably use the bus system. He thought the Board should seriously consider this information for all the route changes.

(3) Jenny Phillips: Ms. Phillips asked if her dad would keep his bus. She said that LTD should keep her father's bus forever. She said that she sometimes rode her dad's bus, too.

(4) Mr. Frank Lulidge of Eugene said that he agreed with everything that Mr. Phillips had said. He said that he currently did not ride the bus, as he had determined that the bus ride was too long to fit his schedule. He would ride if that were to change. He said that he appreciated LTD and the LTD Board. He thought that eliminating service completely from the City View area would affect the way most of the southwest community would feel about LTD. By eliminating service, LTD basically was amputating that entire section of town from service. He thought it was important not to cut off parts of the community.

Board Discussion and Decision: Ms. Hocken said that whatever was decided by the Board with regard to the ARR was a one-year commitment. Mr. Bennett said that the reality was that the Board now had the same decision to make that it would have in one year. The productivity numbers were single digits for routes 38 and 39, and the routes needed to meet at least the minimum standard. If the Board were not addressing the issue now, one could argue that a decision could be put off until next year. The Board and staff knew that things like this would happen when the decision was made to move toward a more productive system. Mr. Bennett said that he believed that the general ridership of LTD had to keep pace with the people who supported the system. He supported the deletion of the City View area routes both because of what he believed and because of what the Board had decided in earlier discussions.

Mr. Kleger asked if the productivity on routes 38 and 39 was attributed to the loop segments, where previously those areas were linked with service along 18th Avenue. Mr. Vobora said that was correct. Mr. Kleger then noted that when the loops were removed, the 18th Avenue routes would remain in service. The 38/39 represented a minority market segment that never had met the minimum productivity levels. Mr. Vobora said that the 34/35 loop routes were kept as commuter trips in response to testimony that had been received. A few of those trips generated the majority of the entire ridership for the route. It clearly was a lifeline-type coverage service. These routes were not meeting the minimum standard even for lifeline-type services.

Mr. Kleger said that he was frustrated with getting used to a product only to have it disappear. This was the nature of anything that attempted to survive by serving large numbers of people and was not economically viable any other way. Before the age of public subsidies, bus services were based on coverage, and it did not work. He thought it was necessary to face the fact that these routes were not producing.

Mr. Kleger said that he was concerned about the deletion of the 11X express route, and he asked how staff were planning to combine the 11X with the 8X route. Mr. Vobora said that analysis of the loop portion of the 11X, which also was served by the 8X, showed that approximately 75 percent of the passengers from the 11X boarded on that loop segment. Traveling west along Main Street, there were a number of the 11X riders who lived within a mile of the Thurston Station, and those people would be able to catch an outbound 11 Thurston to the Thurston Station to transfer to the 8X. Staff believed that the majority of the 11X passengers could easily make the switch to the 8X.

Mr. Kleger said that he was inclined to go along with the proposal alternative 1, which eliminated routes 38 and 39, as proposed in the February service proposal. This proposal would result in a reduction of 1,338 annual service hours, a loss in ridership of 20,447 rides, and approximate savings of \$91,196.

Ms. Hocken said that she believed routes 38 and 39 should be eliminated. There had been constant change with routes 34 and 35 throughout the past few years, and she was not sure if those routes had been given a chance to mature.

Ms. Wylie said that she had enjoyed listening to Mr. Phillips' description of how he used the bus service; it was the ideal type of bus client that LTD wanted. She regretted having to delete the 38 and 39 routes. She asked the Board to further discuss the three alternatives that had been presented to determine which of the three the Board might select.

Ms. Hocken favored Alternative 2, which eliminated routes 38 and 39 and added additional commuter trips to routes 34 and 35. It would slightly reduce the mid-day gap in service. The cost was estimated to be \$35,717, and annual ridership was estimated to be 5,934 rides. Ms. Wylie said that she also favored Alternative 2.

Mr. Gaydos, Ms. Lauritsen, Mr. Kleger, and Mr. Bennett supported Alternative 1. None of the Board members supported Alternative 3, which would leave all 38 and 39 service as it currently stood until the CSR was implemented in September 2001. Under Alternative 3, LTD would maintain the current level of ridership at an annual cost of \$91,196.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt Alternative 1, which eliminated routes 38 and 39, as proposed in the February service proposal. This proposal would result in a reduction of 1,338 annual service hours, a loss in ridership of 20,447, and approximate savings of \$91,196. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Mr. Bennett said that there would be many meetings such as this where agonizing decisions had to be made unless things were done differently. Either the productivity would need to be adjusted or something else needed to happen, because 5 or 6 percent was needed for what the Board thought might be in the best interest of the community without regard to productivity. That flexibility needed to be factored into the service equation.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the Fiscal Year 2000-2001 service recommendations as presented on March 15, 2000, not including the supplementary service to routes 34 and 35 shown on the Summary Table for Annual Route Review 2000 Service

VOTE

Changes.” Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Hocken thanked the staff for preparing alternatives as requested at the February meeting. Ms. Wylie added that she thought it was important for the Board to reiterate its intent to increase ridership and reduce costs, and noted that it was difficult to reach those plateaus.

LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLAN: Ms. Hellekson said that the Long-Range Financial Plan (LRFP) served several purposes. It identified funding for short- and long-term District plans, identified circumstances in transit that could affect funding, and affirmed that the financial goals supported the Strategic Plan. It was based on the Capital Improvements Program (CIP), which the Board discussed in February.

Ms. Hellekson said that the long-term agenda included three big goals: provide public transportation to people who did not have transportation alternatives, provide services that were attractive alternatives to private automobile use to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) use, and to maintain a long-term vision of the community's needs in order to assure and enhance the quality of life. To accomplish those goals, the District needed to maintain its fixed-route service, maintain the demand-response service, and develop and implement cost-effective service enhancements to increase ridership and modal split. Service enhancements included vehicle improvements, system improvements, and bus rapid transit (BRT). The quality of life issues were addressed by the draft TransPlan Update. Community outreach and education programs were ongoing both for the BRT project and for LTD's image in general. The Commuter Solutions program was strong, and the Board received periodic updates about that program.

Ms. Hellekson reviewed the LRFP assumptions. The service requirements and capital projects formed the LRFP framework. The population growth and ridership increases would result in fare revenue increases. The District wanted to continue to preserve its assets and maintain its facilities.

The LRFP assumed that the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) would be reauthorized and the new state support of special transportation services would be continued. Those were big assumptions.

The single largest component of operating costs was personnel services, and in order to control operating costs, personnel costs needed to be controlled. Those issues would be addressed during the budget process in April 2000.

Ms. Hellekson said that local capital set-aside funds would need to be maximized. The local set-aside funds were funds that were removed from the capital budget and held aside for such things as grant match funding and outright capital purchases. Local funds could be used at the discretion of the District. Ms. Hellekson said that BRT would require broad-based funding, including debt, and local funds would be used to help leverage that debt.

Mr. Bennett asked about the future of the payroll tax. Ms. Hellekson said that LTD could push for a tax rate increase at some time in the future, but the order of magnitude by itself might not be enough. There could be other tax mechanisms or other local sources that could be instituted. Mr. Bennett said that he hoped to position the District for a tax-rate increase, and there were many different ways to do that, and specific capital needs often were the easiest way

to increase taxes. Also, Mr. Bennett asked if staff were making the assumption that federal support would be reduced, including the funding of the BRT program. Ms. Hellekson said that, based on preliminary feedback from the recent United Front trip to Washington, D.C., LTD had a very good chance of having funds earmarked in the near future. She did not think, at this point, that there was a realistic chance to receive all of the money from one source. LTD projects would be competing with light-rail projects for money. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch would provide a further review of federal funds for the Board.

Ms. Wylie said that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) had said that LTD could compete with light-rail for funding. There would be enormous competition for New Start funds and a long waiting period, which would put LTD behind schedule. If there were some possibility that LTD could get into the New Start Program, it would pay for everything. That could take several years, and LTD would need to compete with many other projects. There also was the possibility of developing a BRT New Start category, but it would need to be approved through legislation. At some point, the Board would need to have more discussion or direction about continuing with the TEA-21 programs and getting in line for the New Start programs. The District needed to be very clever about applying for everything that was available.

Ms. Wylie asked Ms. Hellekson to further explain what she meant by incurring debt. Ms. Hellekson said that the most common way to incur debt was through lease purchasing. There also were other ways to develop debt, such as joint development and the selling of various types of paper. Staff were looking at all of the options and would report back to the Board Finance Committee.

Ms. Hellekson said that the District would need to put together a plan that would combine the use of the local, state, debt financing, and federal funds to accomplish its goals. She also believed that at some point in the near future, LTD would no longer be able to purchase buses at 80 percent grant funding. Even if 80 percent grant funding were available, the District most likely would not want to spend it only on buses, because there were so many other uses for the money.

Ms. Hellekson said that the projects in the LRFPP included BRT, fleet expansion and replacement, passenger boarding improvements, and technological improvements. Staff were assuming that BRT would not increase operating costs, but would increase ridership. Staff would monitor the validity of the assumptions as the BRT project progressed.

The LRFPP indicated that LTD somehow had to manage its expenditures over time to be less than or equal to revenue projections and to continue to do everything that the plan called for, including covering the basic service requirements.

LTD could be seeking ways to generate, from some source other than grants, nearly \$2 million in the next few years, and the LRFPP needed to set the stage to do that. Staff already were seeking other long-term funding opportunities.

Ms. Hellekson distributed a General Fund Summary that provided the proposed budget funding for fiscal year 2000-2001. The Board Finance Committee recently had met and reviewed the General Fund Summary. The General Fund Summary assumed that a new General Fund Reserve Policy was in place. Ms. Hellekson explained that the Finance Committee had recommended the policy to staff in which prudent General Fund reserve funds would be maintained and all additional reserve funds would be shifted to the Capital Fund, where they most likely would be used. This would have no impact on the balance sheet because LTD

reported a consolidated balance sheet, and it would have no impact on interest earnings because the General Fund kept the interest earnings on behalf of the Capital Fund. Mr. Gaydos added that those shifted funds could be returned to the General Fund at any time.

Ms. Hellekson said that instead of basing reserves in the General Fund at 25 to 40 percent of the total operating expense, the new policy would assume that the range would be 7 to 13 percent and would not be on total operating expense. It would be comprised of the total operating expense less the capital. In the future, LTD may want to do the same thing with the Special Transportation funds.

Ms. Hellekson said that overall, LTD was well positioned for the future; operating income was stable and increasing; and the balance sheets were strong. The success of the LRFP would depend on several things: community support, new funding sources for BRT, careful expenditure control, and meeting performance goals.

Mr. Bennett asked about the management of the reserve funds. Ms. Hellekson said that the Board had an adopted investment policy that stipulated that up to the legal limit allowed would be invested in the Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP) that was managed by the State of Oregon. The return on the investment was approximately 6 percent.

Mr. Bennett said that he would appreciate having the Finance Committee review the investment policy. Ms. Hellekson said that the LGIP was a very safe and low-risk investment. Ms. Hocken, who chaired the Finance Committee, assured Mr. Bennett that the Committee would review the investment policy.

Ms. Hocken noted that the reserves left in the General Fund would be used as working capital, self-insurance, and contingency. She thought that the new policy would provide more detail about those reserves.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the proposed Long-Range Financial Plan for fiscal years 2000-01 through 2019-20 is approved as presented." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor and none opposed.

MOTION

VOTE

BOARD POSITION ON BALLOT MEASURE 82: This item was removed from the agenda.

RESOLUTION APPOINTING KENNETH P. HAMM AS PENSION TRUSTEE:**MOTION**

Ms. Hocken moved that the Board adopt the Resolution naming Kenneth P. Hamm as successor trustee for the LTD Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan and the LTD/ATU Pension Trust. Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor, and none against.

VOTE

TRANSPLAN – EXTENSION OF PUBLIC HEARING: This item had been added to the agenda, and Mr. Viggiano distributed information to the Board members. Mr. Viggiano said that this item had been discussed in February and now needed to be approved by the Board. He added that the Springfield City Council and the Lane County Board of Commissioners also had discussed the issue. The Springfield City Council was not interested in extending the public comment period, but thought that perhaps it could be reopened later if there were some significant changes in the draft TransPlan. The Lane County Commissioners were interested in extending the comment period, and it was thought that the Eugene City Council would be interested in extending the comment period as well. Staff recommended extending the public comment period until June 30, 2000.

MOTION

There was no further discussion, and Mr. Gaydos moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors agrees to extend the public record to accept written testimony on the TransPlan update/Metro Plan amendments through June 30, 2000." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, and Gaydos voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING**

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: (1) Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC). Ms. Hocken reported that the topic of discussion at the last MPC meeting was how the local jurisdictions could more effectively provide input to the State of Oregon planning processes in the selection of projects to be funded. Staff had presented several proposals, and the proposal that was adopted by MPC was the simplest one and did not involve creating any new governmental agencies or structures. Once the metropolitan area list of transportation and transit priorities was completed and approved by MPC, it would be sent to the County Commissioners to be combined with the rural projects list. In the past, there was no feedback to MPC in terms of how Lane County blended the rural and metropolitan lists together prior to forwarding the list to the State. Under the adopted procedure, Lane County would draft a blended list that would be forwarded for review back to MPC so the metropolitan jurisdictions could comment on the order of priority set by the County. It was suggested that once the system was functioning, a presentation be made to the Oregon Transportation Commission to inform them that Lane County did have a formal process in place that ensured that each jurisdiction was represented. The Oregon Transportation Commission then could regard recommendations from Lane County as having broad support in Lane County.

The other issue was a proposal to add Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) as a member of MPC. This proposal was rejected primarily because LRAPA already was an intergovernmental agency and not a primary government agency such as were the other members of MPC.

(2) Springfield Station. Mr. Kleger reported that the Springfield Station Steering Committee had met once more and had agreed to have staff review Site I-West. A supplementary briefing was held for several members who could not attend the Steering

Committee meeting. The feedback on the site at the political level so far was favorable. Additional information was available in the agenda packet.

(3) United Front – Washington, D.C., Trip. Ms. Wylie reported that there was a written report of the trip in the agenda packet. Ms. Wylie said that the participants had met with the acting administrator of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the BRT simulation video was shown, and the FTA continued to be very excited and supportive about what LTD was doing with its BRT plans. She thought it had been a very worthwhile trip.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) UPDATE: Mr. Bennett asked if staff had conversations with the property owners with regard to mitigating parking on Main Street for a dedicated BRT lane. Mr. Viggiano said that discussions had gone well to date, and there were two business owners who had not yet been contacted.

SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE: Mr. Viggiano said that staff had learned that Greyhound was not interested in relocating to Springfield.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Government Relations. Ms. Lynch said that Senators Wyden and Smith had submitted their appropriations request, and she had been told that LTD was included in the list. The list typically was not shared.

Eugene Substation. Ms. Hocken asked about the status of the Eugene Police Substation. The Board had received written materials from the public about the substation, and she asked staff to provide an update. Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson said that when the initial agreement was made, it was for a two-year period. LTD was not planning to continue funding of the Community Service Officer (CSO); however, LTD would continue to provide the space for the substation at no charge. Previously, LTD was contributing \$54,000 for the CSO, free space, and \$27,000 or 1/3 share of a Police Officer. LTD was restructuring security issues related to service, which it was believed would be a more effective use of funds. The City of Eugene was not planning to close the substation. Negotiations were continuing.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.



Board Secretary