

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Monday, October 16, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 12, 2000, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held special meeting on Monday, October 16, 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
Gerry Gaydos
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Pat Hocken
Virginia Lauritsen
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Annette Speck, Recording Secretary

Absent: Vacancy (Subdistrict 3)

Transcribing Secretary: Susan Hekimoglu

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m. Mr. Gaydos was not yet present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: Ms. Wylie announced that the Governor had appointed a new Board member to fill the Subdistrict 3 vacancy; however, the appointment was not yet confirmed by the Senate. Information about the Governor's appointment was available in the Board packet on page 51.

Ms. Wylie said that the UO Alumni/Springfield Chamber Scholarship Auction would be held at the Hilton on November 17, 2000. LTD would have a table reserved, and Ms. Wylie invited other Board members to call LTD staff to indicate their interest in attending.

Ms. Wylie distributed LTD 30-year anniversary lapel pins to each of the Board members. Mr. Hamm said that LTD's 30th anniversary would occur in November, and a staff committee was planning events to mark the event that would occur after the first of the year. Mr. Hamm applauded everyone who had been involved during the past 30 years and who had a hand in making LTD one of the premier transit properties in the country.

WORK SESSION – COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN ALTERNATIVES:

Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora said that as part of the comprehensive service redesign process (CSR), the Board had asked staff to develop three service plan scenarios.

Scenario 1 included the full build-out of routes as reviewed by the public throughout the redesign process. It addressed the operational issues of running time, while providing a high level of frequency along major corridors. Additionally, new cross-town connections were made through route linking. Scenario 1 would result in a service increase of approximately 14 percent.

Scenario 2 maintained a high level of service coverage while sacrificing frequency and span of service on some routes. Operational issues in terms of running times were addressed through route design; however, there was the potential that lower frequency would change ridership patterns, which could create new running-time issues. Scenario 2 would result in a service increase of approximately 5 percent.

Scenario 3 reallocated service from coverage and restored frequency and span of service lost in Scenario 2. Operational issues were addressed and new cross-town connections were maintained as in the previous scenarios. Scenario 3 resulted in a service increase of approximately 5 percent.

Mr. Vobora discussed the highlights of each scenario. Mr. Gaydos arrived at the meeting at 5:42 p.m.

Mr. Kleger said that a guest had commented to him about the length of time it took to travel from the Amazon area to the Easter Seal area off Willamette Street, and he asked if those types of cross-town issues would be addressed. Mr. Vobora said that staff had not yet gotten to the level of CSR planning that would allow specific transfer questions to be answered, but those types of cross-town issues were being considered and attempts were being made to address those types of trips.

Ms. Hocken asked what assumptions staff had made about bus rapid transit (BRT) in putting the three scenarios together. Mr. Vobora said that everything that was proposed would coordinate with the BRT pilot corridor. Several routes in Scenario 1, for instance, would terminate at the UO, and staff believed there was sufficient service between the UO and downtown to cover the service that the BRT eventually would provide.

Ms. Hocken asked for further clarification about what services were being proposed in the West 18th Avenue area. Mr. Vobora provided an overview of the area that had been considered, but said that detailed information was not yet available. Staff would make revisions and begin more detailed planning following this discussion with the Board.

Mr. Vobora concluded his presentation by stating that service with a 14-percent increase would cost about \$1.8 million to operate annually, which was not a reasonable expectation. However, a 3- to 5-percent increase was realistic. It would allow LTD meet some of the

needs of the growing community, such as providing service to new growth areas, and some services that would benefit riders in terms of neighborhood connectivity in routing.

Staff believed that Scenario 2, which eliminated some mid-day services, was a reasonable proposal. It would have a negative impact on some people, but staff believed the benefits would outweigh those negative impacts.

Staff believed that Scenario 3 went too far in reducing coverage service.

Ms. Hocken said that she was concerned about the Scenario that reduced the frequency of the downtown shuttle. The route would not function as a shuttle if 10- to 15-minute service was not maintained.

Mr. Kleger said that he strongly agreed with the decision to delete the service along Taney Street in West Eugene. He said that he frequently used that route, and it was one trip in three that passengers actually were picked up or dropped off along Taney. Most of the people in that area had a short walk to get to a major route. He did not believe that proposal had been met with much negative feedback.

Mr. Kleger asked about the possible reduction in the span of service on the #40 Royal route and how it might be configured. Mr. Vobora said that because the #40 and the proposed new #42 had connecting loops, they needed to be run in tandem to be effective. They currently were proposed to end after the 9:40 p.m. departure from the Eugene Station. Mr. Kleger said that the late-night #40 route often was loaded. It was too far and too dangerous to walk to Royal from the Barger route that operated later in the evening. Mr. Kleger did not think people in the area would be too concerned if one of the routes dropped off the loop later in the evening and the other continued to operate. Mr. Vobora said that staff would research the opportunities there.

Ms. Wylie said that she was concerned about deletion of service in the City View area. Mr. Vobora said that some routing would be maintained during the commute hours, and people in the area seemed to understand that the all-day service was not productive.

Ms. Wylie asked Mr. Vobora to point out which service changes staff expected to be met with high contention. Under Scenario 2, Mr. Vobora said that there were people in the Game Farm Road area who were reduced fare customers who would lose service. Staff had planned to further research some options in that area.

The proposed service cut on Laura Street in Springfield could generate some testimony as there was a mobile home park in the area, but productivity in the area was very sparse.

There could be some testimony about the proposed change to neighborhood connector service. People who generally were accustomed to riding one bus into the Eugene Station might be upset when they learned that it could take two buses.

Ms. Hocken asked about the origin of the 5-percent increase and if it was generated from the long-range financial plan or some other strategic goal. One of the key issues was how much LTD could increase service. Mr. Vobora said that the proposed 5-percent increase was an increase over the base number of current service hours. The long-range financial plan assumed a 2- to 3-percent increase in service. It would cost approximately an additional \$650,000 annually to increase service by 5 percent. Mr. Vobora further explained that the service changes for Fiscal Year 2000-01 had not resulted in a service increase, so staff were combining the two years' worth of service increases that were scheduled in the long-range financial plan.

Mr. Bennett asked about overall system ridership statistics. Mr. Vobora said that ridership had been increasing each month since July. Finance Manager Diane Hellekson added that fares also were slightly increased during the first quarter of the Fiscal Year. Overall revenue also had increased by 2 to 3 percent.

Mr. Bennett reiterated his thoughts that the productivity criterion was very important to balance service in the community. He also believed that there could come a time in terms of the significant initiatives that LTD had on the table, where additional revenue might be needed. He did not believe that those additional revenues could be realized with a plan that did not recognize the need to have a productivity criterion that actually meant something. He also said that over time, LTD should move in the direction of operating only the more productive routes rather than focusing on coverage.

There was a growth management policy in the community that suggested that people would live more closely together in a more compact form, which would suggest that people locate near LTD's productive routes. It may seem very unfair in the short run sometimes, as he'd heard since being on the Board listening to public testimony, but over the medium and longer term, it was the only way to argue that LTD was doing everything possible to keep its operating position solid and have the ability to argue for the opportunity to do more things that would benefit the community as a whole. As the community continued to grow, LTD would need to provide more service, and he was a big believer in the shuttle system, which was an important part of the increase in costs that LTD would experience. He favored Scenario 2 with some modifications, such as adding frequency back into the shuttle.

Mr. Kleger said that he would like to be able to provide the service outlined in Scenario 1, but knew that it would be too expensive. However, if LTD did not do more in terms of service, it would fall farther and farther behind the curve, and there also was an age factor in the fleet. If Congress continued to deny equipment authorizations, LTD would end up with no means to provide the promised service. He agreed that a modified Scenario 2 appeared to be the best option. He also agreed with Mr. Bennett that in order for the downtown shuttle to succeed, LTD needed to begin that service with high frequency.

Ms. Lauritsen asked how much a modified Scenario 2 would cost. Mr. Vobora said it would result in a 3- to 5-percent increase in service at a cost of about \$120,000 per percentage increase.

Mr. Bennett asked if the Finance Committee had discussed the service increase costs. Ms. Hocken said that it had not; however, a 4-to 5-percent increase in service was consistent with the long-range financial plan, since there had been no service increase for FY 2000-01. Ms. Hellekson said that the Finance Committee would discuss the issue at its meeting on November 8, 2000.

Ms. Hocken said that along with the cost of service, there also was a cost associated with adding bus stop shelters, and LTD ought to pursue a partnership with businesses along the shuttle route to share the cost of shelters. Mr. Vobora said that the Board had authorized some capital improvements to support the implementation of the shuttle, but staff also would seek opportunities, such as partnering with businesses. There only were a few stops along the proposed shuttle route that would require a bus stop bench or shelter.

Ms. Wylie asked Mr. Vobora to review the process for approval of the CSR. Mr. Vobora said that staff would review the input and direction from the Board to refine and prepare the final CSR proposal for presentation to the Board. If routes were now identified that previously had no changes, staff most likely would provide additional opportunity for input from the residents and businesses in newly affected areas. An open house also would be held at the Eugene Station on November 16, 2000, so people would have that opportunity to provide input. Staff would present the refined proposal to the Board at its December meeting. Public hearings would be held at the Board meetings both in December and in January. If the final revisions were acceptable, approval would be expected by the Board at the January Board meeting.

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION – 2000 OREGON TRANSPORTATION CONFERENCE
TRANSPORTATION PARTNERS OUTSTANDING VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR AWARD:**

Terry Parker of Lane Council of Governments was present to introduce Mr. Ed Necker, who was selected as one of two recipients of the 2000 Oregon Transportation Conference Transportation Partners Outstanding Volunteer of the Year award.

Ms. Parker said that Mr. Necker had served as a community representative of Lane County's Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) since 1996. He also volunteered at the RideSource office handling telephone calls. Originally a RideSource rider, Mr. Necker now utilized LTD's fixed-route services.

Mr. Necker had dedicated many hours in support of transportation for the elderly and people with disabilities. He had taught by example what it was to move beyond perceived limitations. His efforts were inspirational, and he always had a smile or a story or quip to share. Ms. Parker said that Mr. Necker was a remarkable person and an outstanding volunteer.

Mr. Necker said that he joined the STFAC in 1996, and because he was concerned about declining resources, had volunteered at RideSource that same year. Mr. Necker thanked LTD for its support of the RideSource program and recognized LTD for its commitment to accessibility.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Necker and presented him with a Volunteer of the Year award plaque and a certificate for a one-month pass.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – NOVEMBER 2000: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson was present to introduce bus operator Marcie Pope as the November 2000 Employee of the Month.

Mr. Johnson said that Ms. Pope had been with the District since July 1990, where she began her employment with LTD as a Farebox Accounting Clerk. She became a bus operator in July 1992. Ms. Pope had earned awards for seven years of correct schedule operation and three years of safe driving. In addition, Ms. Pope had been a temporary system supervisor for two years, and for the past five years had volunteered to be a transportation coordinator for the Oregon Country Fair, Lane County Fair, Joy Ride, men's and women's UO basketball games, and UO football games. Ms. Pope was nominated for Employee of the Month by all of the operators working the September 14, 2000, football game, for her wonderful sense of team spirit and the extra effort she always put forward to make LTD a very special place to work.

Mr. Johnson said that Ms. Pope's goal when she began employment for the District was to become a bus operator, and she was well suited to the task. She was very at home with LTD's guests and always was smiling. It was a pleasure to ride her bus. She had good customer service skills and a thorough knowledge of what LTD was about. Ms. Pope was one of the most involved bus operators at LTD. Her work as a transportation coordinator was exceptional, and it was a pleasure to work with her during the special events.

In between her duties as a bus operator and transportation coordinator, Ms. Pope also found time to help with many LTD special events, such as the picnic and the United Way campaign. She also took it upon herself to decorate the operators' lounge before each UO home game, organized potlucks for the special event operators, and then she ensured that the lounge was cleaned up afterward.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Ms. Pope and presented her with a letter of congratulations, a certificate of achievement, a lapel pin, and a monetary reward.

Ms. Pope said that this was the third time she had been selected as the Employee of the Month, and she was honored once again to have been selected. She loved working for Lane Transit District. In order to work for LTD, one had to be a people person, and Ms. Pope said that she was one. Three years ago, she began organizing potlucks during football games and it had gained popularity. She was nominated for this award by her co-workers who loved to eat. She enjoyed decorating the operators' lounge, which kicked off the football season and was a morale booster.

Ms. Pope then thanked Mr. Hamm and Mr. Johnson for helping and supporting the transportation coordination program at Autzen Stadium.

Mr. Hamm invited Board members to visit the operators' lounge during the game day potluck to get a sense of what the heart of the organization was. There were many great people in the lounge who were focused on serving the people who were attending a game, but also who were having fun.

PRESENTATION OF APTA ADWHEEL AWARD: Mr. Hamm said that the award was a result of the work of the LTD marketing staff and the advertising agency, Capelli, Miles, Wiltz + Kelly. LTD earned the grand prize in the public information campaign category at the American Public Transportation Association National Conference in San Francisco for its yield law informational campaign, which featured print and radio ads encouraging motorists to *Let the Bus Back In!*

Mr. Hamm presented the Adwheel Award to Mr. Vobora.

Mr. Vobora congratulated the marketing staff and the advertising agency staff for the excellent collaborative efforts in this campaign.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: 1) Mr. Rob Zako of Eugene, representing the Friends of Eugene, was present to discuss the performance measures in the Draft TransPlan, which were to be approved at a joint meeting of the jurisdictions on Wednesday, October 18, 2000. He urged the Board to reject the alternative performance measures as they were not in the public interest nor in LTD's interest.

Mr. Zako taught math as a profession, and he was fairly comfortable with figures and statistics. The proposal for alternative performance measures increased the non-auto mode share from 14.1 percent to 15.5 percent and increased the transit mode share from 1.8 percent to 2.7 percent. The Draft TransPlan also projected no change in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs). He explained how the transit mode share could increase while VMTs remained constant. At the same time that some people were driving less and riding transit more, other people would be driving more, canceling out the gains from increasing transit mode share.

Mr. Zako maintained that the goal of LTD and the goal of TransPlan was to reduce reliance on the automobile. By approving the alternative performance measures, the LTD would be approving a goal with no reduction of VMTs, or no reduction of the reliance on the automobile over 20 years. To his mind, that was LTD planning for no progress in 20 years. All that would be accomplished would be to shift the driving from some drivers to others, and not making any progress.

LTD could set its sights higher. The Board could insist on the 5-percent VMT reduction standard, and in doing so, it would significantly reduce reliance on the automobile. Some reduction would come about by increasing walking and bicycling, but much of it would result from increasing transit. In effect, by insisting on a 5-percent VMT reduction, the Board would create the demand for more transit, a demand that LTD was ready to supply. But the Board could do more by insisting on the 5-percent VMT reduction, such as compelling the other jurisdictions to better support transit.

In his October 5, 2000, testimony, Bob Courtright wrote, "BRT and nodal development go hand-in-hand in achieving reduced reliance. Each depends on the other. As much as possible, nodal development should occur along planned BRT lines, especially those to be built first, so that development and transit are put in place together."

Although LTD cannot directly dictate land use policy, it could compel the other three jurisdictions (Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County), to have more transit-friendly development by insisting the VMTs are reduced by 5 percent.

The Board could plan for no real progress in transit by accepting the proposed alternative performance measures. Mr. Zako urged the Board to set its sights higher and enlist the support of the other three jurisdictions by insisting on the 5-percent VMT reduction standard.

2) Kathleen Brandt of Eugene discussed the proposed elimination of the #35 City View. She said that she was a regular rider of the #35 route and other routes downtown. She had lived on 29th Avenue for the past eight years. She thanked the Board for the time and attention.

She spoke to the Board nearly four years ago regarding the same cause. She was committed to keeping the #35 going in some fashion. She was thankful that the Board listened to her several years previously, in which she suggested that LTD cut the multiple runs between 7am and 6pm due to low ridership.

Currently, there were three commuter runs in the morning and evening, and she felt as though the number of riders was down during the past year. She had taken a year off to care for her small children and had not ridden the bus. She said that she and her husband were committed to alternative transportation. Her husband typically rode his bike, and she typically walked and rode the bus.

In the hills, the residents depended on some form of transportation, and walking was not always viable on the steeper terrain, particularly in inclement weather. While the ridership numbers were down during the past year, there had been some changes. Her place of employment, for example, had a very strong transportation policy, so more people had begun riding the bus. If more people were riding, she did not believe this was the time to cut service.

She urged the Board to consider some level of service in her neighborhood.

Ms. Brandt's daughter, Genevieve, asked that the Board please not stop the #35 bus because she wanted to ride it when she got bigger.

Kathleen Brandt added that her family used the bus route to get to medical appointments, shopping, and school, and she just hated to think that LTD might discontinue that service.

Ms. Wylie thanked everyone for their comments and closed the audience participation portion of the meeting.

**MOTION
VOTE**

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for October 16, 2000, is approved as presented." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by acclamation. The October 16, 2000, Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the September 20, 2000, regular Board meeting.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT PILOT CORRIDOR GOALS AND PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that the Board previously had approved the performance objectives for the pilot corridor in the Spring of 1999. Staff were asking the Board to consider a revision to those performance objectives.

The proposed changes included changing the term *market share* to *mode split*. and to add objectives to goal statements 1 and 4 that include a provision for convenient neighborhood connector service that linked neighborhood residents with the BRT line and nearby activity centers.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if there was a cost associated with the proposed additions. Mr. Viggiano said that the policy did not make specific recommendations about how much service the objectives would required. He believed that was a decision that would be considered on a case-by-case basis. In many cases, the neighborhood service already would be in place, but would need minor adjustments.

Mr. Kleger stated that the Board, at every stage of the BRT concept discussions, had recognized the need for neighborhood connector service to make the BRT concept saleable to the average citizen, and he thought it would be a good addition to the policy.

Mr. Bennett asked if the placement of these objectives in the policy would commit LTD to more than previously had been committed too. Mr. Viggiano said that it was consistent with LTD's approach to the BRT system. The actual decision about the extent and cost of those neighborhood connectors was a decision the Board would make as the BRT system implementation proceeded.

Ms. Hocken said that as proposed, the objective statements did not have performance measures associated with them.

**MOTION
VOTE**

Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution, "It is hereby resolved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors adopts the BRT pilot Corridor Goals and Performance Objectives as revised. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by acclamation.

PREPARATION FOR OCTOBER 18 JOINT OFFICIALS' MEETING ON TRANSPLAN: Mr. Viggiano said that the third joint work session of the TransPlan adopting officials would be held on Wednesday, October 18, 2000. The Board would be receiving a separate packet with background information for that meeting.

Previously, the Board had requested that LTD be provided an opportunity to defer a decision to the other organizations of a TransPlan issue if that issue was determined not to be of significant relevance to LTD. At prior joint work sessions, that had not been an option; however, it would be implemented as an option for voting at this third work session.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were recommending that the Board decide at this meeting the issues on which it would use the "opt out" option to ensure that some Board members were not voting differently at the joint work session. The list of currently unresolved issues was included in the agenda packet, which Mr. Viggiano reviewed.

The first six issues were ones that were left unresolved from the first two joint work sessions. Mr. Viggiano said that those issues would be discussed at the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), and a decision to "opt out" of any of those issues would mean that the Board members would not participate in the resolution process at MPC. The last five issues would be discussed at the joint work session on October 18.

Ms. Wylie thought that the Board should maintain the positions that were taken at previous Board work sessions in which these issues all were discussed. If there was an issue that previously had not been discussed or one in which the Board had deferred its decision, the Board would not be prepared to vote on it at the joint work session. Mr. Viggiano said that in some cases, the Board already had taken a position, and those positions should be reaffirmed. It also was an opportunity for the Board to decide if it wanted to "opt out" of any decisions.

The County was suggesting some new language under Definition and Intent of Finance Policy #3: "Local jurisdiction funding sources, including federal payments to the County road fund, are allocated through local agency capital improvements program and are not subject to a regional prioritization process."

Mr. Gaydos asked if other jurisdictions had reviewed the suggested text. Mr. Viggiano said that he did not believe the other jurisdictions had reviewed it, and many of them would be considering the proposal without having had the opportunity to discuss it. There also were some funding sources that were under LTD's control, so this suggested text could influence how LTD planned for capital improvements as well. Mr. Viggiano said that ideally, transportation projects were funded in a regional priority setting through the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC).

Mr. Bennett thought it was very important to review the proposals that would be discussed at the joint work session so that each Board member would recall what discussion had taken place and any position decision the Board had made prior to voting.

Ms. Wylie asked if this would be a precedent, and LTD would need to include a protection statement for its federal funds. Mr. Viggiano said that currently, LTD funding was included in the regional priority setting process and was required to be included in the Statewide Transportation Improvements Program (STIP) and the local Transportation

Improvement Plan (TIP), which was approved by MPC, so to some extent, LTD already was part of the process.

Ms. Hocken asked if the formula funds also were subject to that process. Mr. Viggiano said that those projects had to be included in the STIP and TIP in order for LTD to apply for and use those funds. MPC basically endorsed the expenditure of those funds, but did not make decisions about allocating them.

Mr. Viggiano said that this was not an issue that would be discussed at the joint work session on October 18, but was an unresolved issue that would be discussed at the MPC level. MPC had decided to appoint two subcommittees to address the unresolved issues. One would consider the finance issues, while the other would work on roadway issues. One of the two LTD Board member representatives on MPC, Ms. Hocken, would be on the subcommittee that would discuss this issue, and it would be important for her to know what the Board's position was.

Ms. Hocken said that she would appreciate real clear instruction from the Board as she addressed these issues at the MPC level.

Mr. Bennett said that he did not want to dispute the County's recommendation. Mr. Gaydos agreed, and said that apparently, the previous language had stated that local funding sources were not subject to a regional prioritization process. One of those was the County Road Fund, and the County wanted that recognized. The question for the Board then, was if it wanted to recognize the County Road Fund as anything specific it wanted to control, and he did not think that was appropriate. Other Board members agreed.

Ms. Wylie also represented LTD at the MPC, and she would be assigned to the roadway issues subcommittee.

Mr. Viggiano then reviewed the remaining issues that would be discussed at the MPC level or at the joint work session. He explained that there were three finance policy issues that were being proposed by the City of Eugene. The Board had not discussed these issues during work session; however, during the August joint work session, the Board unanimously voted to not add the proposals to the Draft TransPlan. Staff were recommending that the Board remain involved in the resolution of those proposals because the distribution of funds clearly was something that could impact LTD. The Board then discussed each finance policy proposal.

With regard to Finance Issue #1, Mr. Kleger said that he thought that as an individual, he would try to do something in this area, but he thought that doing anything officially was a waste of time and money. It was something that needed changing, but he was concerned about spending the available resources for lobbying on this issue.

Mr. Bennett agreed. He wished there were more flexibility, and Mr. Kleger's point was well taken. The lobbying efforts would need to be made in an individual rather than official capacity. Board members voted individually at the joint work session, and all members had

voted against the proposal. Mr. Bennett thought the Board should collectively maintain that position.

Mr. Viggiano added that this was more of a state issue than a local issue, so a local plan really could not affect that. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch added that policy did not necessarily commit the Board to spending lobbying resources, but it merely stated a position. At this point, the Governor had not made a final decision about what he would propose for a transportation package, but one of the things he had talked about was a proposal to break the trust fund to allow it to be used for transit.

Ms. Hocken said that there should be no prohibition in the draft TransPlan (the Plan) for seeking changes in current restrictions in federal transportation funding, and an affirmative statement in the Plan was not necessary, even if changes would be sought. Other Board members agreed. The Board members would oppose this proposal.

Finance Issue #2 also was proposed by the City of Eugene and would add a new policy statement to support full funding of bicycle project capital and operations and maintenance needs as identified in TransPlan. Mr. Viggiano said that at the August joint work session, the Board members had independently voted to oppose the proposal because it could limit the flexibility in allocating funding.

The Board members agreed to oppose the proposal at the joint work session.

Ms. Wylie said that she thought that in all of the issues, the Board needed to remember that it was in partnership with the other jurisdictions, particularly with BRT coming up, and it needed to be sensitive to the issues that were important to the other jurisdictions.

Mr. Gaydos asked what role LTD had in the full funding of bicycle projects. Mr. Viggiano said that LTD did not have a direct role in that issue; however, full funding of bicycle projects could mean that funds that LTD might be eligible for might not be available. Mr. Gaydos then asked if it would be wise to defer a decision on that issue or wise to oppose it due to the potential economic impact. The staff believed that anything that had an impact on how transportation funds were allocated would be of interest to LTD because it was competing for those funds. Mr. Gaydos agreed that the Board should oppose the proposal.

Mr. Kleger said that the Board ought to be involved in the discussions of all of the finance proposals, and should not take a terribly rigid position at MPC. The issues were not very critical to LTD, but they appeared to be all-or-nothing proposals, which created a difficult position for the Board and possibly was not appropriate in the context of the draft TransPlan. Mr. Bennett and Ms. Wylie agreed.

Finance Issue #3, which was proposed by the City of Eugene, would add a new finance policy statement to maintain transportation performance and improve safety by improving system efficiency and management before adding capacity. Mr. Viggiano said that he believed that most people agreed with the concept, but the concern was that if it were included as a policy statement in the Plan, it also would create a lack of flexibility.

The Board agreed to oppose the proposed policy statement as being too broad as written.

Roadway Issue #4 was a proposal from the City of Eugene to add a new Roadway Policy on Access Management. Mr. Viggiano said that the Board had discussed the issue at a prior work session. At that time, the Board was not necessarily opposed to the proposal, but believed that it was not necessary as there were other policies that related to access management. Staff recommended that the Board participate in the resolution of the issue as the roadway access policy could affect the implementation of BRT.

Ms. Hocken did not believe that the Board should defer its position. She said that she could see the policy affecting BRT because LTD could be seeking new or modified access to the road system as a result of the project, and the proposed policy envisioned adopting regulations to manage access to roadways. There already were new regulations from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Ms. Hocken said that the Springfield City Council was interested in the Plan maintaining a certain level of flexibility for the individual jurisdictions.

Mr. Kleger said that there did not appear to be language in the current draft Plan that would restrict a local jurisdiction from doing more than what the Plan called for, which would allow the City of Eugene to adopt regulations to manage access. Mr. Viggiano said that discussion most likely would occur at the MPC level.

Project Issue #5 was proposed by the City of Eugene and would add an I-5 Interchange study. Staff were recommending that the Board choose to defer this issue to the other adopting jurisdictions, though LTD would want to participate in the study if it was approved. The Board members agreed to "opt out."

Project Issue #6 was a proposal to move the Division Avenue Bridge to the "Future List," with an option to modify the project description. Staff were recommending that the Board "opt out" of this decision. The particular project would have no significant impact on LTD operations.

The remaining five issues would be discussed at the joint work session on October 18.

TDM Issue #7 was a proposal from the City of Eugene to change the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Policy #1 to establish performance benchmarks, with mandatory TDM programs to be implemented if the benchmarks were not achieved. In previous Board discussion, the Board had agreed by consensus to not change the TDM policy. Staff were recommending that the LTD Board participate in the resolution of this issue since LTD had a primary role in the implementation of TDM. Mr. Viggiano said that this would be a very controversial policy because mandatory TDM was something that there were very strong opinions about on both sides of the issue. He believed that Springfield would be very opposed to the proposal, the City of Eugene would be in support, and he was not sure what the County's position might be.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she would oppose the issue. Mr. Gaydos also would be against it because he thought that benchmarks were difficult to define, which was why alternative performance measures were being proposed. He thought the TDM policy should remain more flexible.

Ms. Hocken said that she would be supportive of trying to determine appropriate benchmarks or performance measures without the requirement that if those were not met, mandatory TDM programs would be implemented.

The Board members agreed to no change to the TDM Policy #1, but to support Ms. Hocken's statement as a compromise position.

Nodal Development Issue #8 included proposed changes to the various nodal development issues that had resulted from a joint meeting of the Eugene and Springfield City Councils. Staff were recommending that the Board endorse the proposals. Board members agreed.

General Issue #9 was a request to add a goal relating to the area's status as a major regional center and developing a transportation system that addressed the needs of visitors to the area. While all four adopting agencies agreed to amend Goal 2, Eugene chose to add some language about visitors to the Definition/Intent of the goal, while the other three agencies preferred to add a statement to the goal itself, as well as an additional statement in the Definition/Intent. Since the differences in the positions taken did not appear to be major and essentially accomplished the same result, staff suggested that the Board agree that either position would be acceptable. Board members agreed.

Bicycle Issue #10 was a proposal from the City of Eugene to amend TSI Bicycle Policy #1 to add both new and existing development to the existing policy. Staff recommended that the Board "opt out" of the decision. Board members agreed.

Pedestrian Issue #11 was a proposal from the City of Eugene to amend TSI Pedestrian Policy #2 to strike the term "reasonably" from the policy statement. Staff recommended that the Board participate in the resolution of this issue. Pedestrian access was an important issue for transit users. Mr. Viggiano said that there were problems with removing the term "reasonably" because it was not always possible to provide direct travel routes for pedestrians. It would be in LTD's interest to maintain pedestrian connections. Board members agreed.

Mr. Kleger said that an example would be where there was a relatively short distance between two points, but an industrial site was situated in between those two points, the pedestrian access would be routed around the industrial site. The term "reasonable" was included because there were situations where safety would be an issue. He thought that dropping any reference to reasonability or practicability would take away the flexibility of the policy.

Ms. Hocken asked if the language was left alone, and the City of Eugene wanted to acquire property to make more direct pedestrian routing happen, it would have the right to do so. The Board members agreed to oppose this proposal.

Mr. Viggiano said that the other issue to be discussed at the joint work session was alternative performance measures that were being proposed because the Plan did not meet the 5 percent VMT reduction standard. There were four being recommended by staff. The transit measure that was being recommended was the number of households with access to 10-minute transit service. The current estimate was approximately 16 percent of households in the urban growth area that had access to 10-minute transit service during the day. The goal would be to double that number during the next 20 years.

Mr. Viggiano said that the Board had discussed the issue at its August 9, 2000, special meeting. At that time, the Plan projects indicated that 50 percent of the households would have access to 10-minute transit service, and one of the comments from the Board was to scale it down a bit to make it more likely to be accomplished. The 32 percent goal was a scaled down version of the earlier proposal. It was an attractive proposal because it was both a transit measure and a land use measure. It could be accomplished both by implementing more service and by locating more intense development around main corridors where the high transit service was located.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was another community in the state that was meeting the 5-percent VMT reduction mandate. Mr. Viggiano said there were none. Mr. Bennett asked if there were recent figures of what was happening in the state. Mr. Viggiano said that there was no recent data, but the trend was that automobile use was increasing. He believed that was still the case, although transit ridership nationwide actually had increased fairly significantly during recent years. Mr. Viggiano said that the modeling in the Plan was good modeling and was fairly complex. It was based on an analysis of data and was generated on a scientific method. If the policies in the Plan were implemented, the projected model would be achieved.

Ms. Wylie asked if special event transportation was considered. Mr. Viggiano said that he did not believe it was considered in the model. The modeling was based on typical weekday travel and predicted the typical use of a street.

Mr. Kleger asked if there was a reasonable way to include a VMT factor in the alternative measures without going all the way to a 5-percent reduction. Mr. Viggiano said an alternative VMT measure could be included that would keep VMTs even with no increase. He thought it would be important to acknowledge that VMTs were being tracked.

Mr. Viggiano said that any number of performance measures could be tracked. It was a different issue than which measures actually would be submitted to demonstrate compliance with the state rule. There could be a number of things that could be tracked locally to assist in decision making processes.

Ms. Hocken asked about the previous performance scenario that had been modeled in an attempt to determine what would work to reduce the VMT reduction figures, such as increasing the gas tax, charging a bridge toll, etc. She asked what the actual VMT reduction was under the scenario. Mr. Viggiano said that the scenario came very close to the 10-percent reduction, but it included some things, such as parking pricing, that most people believed could not be achieved. The modeling was not performed to determine what would be needed to achieve the 5-percent reduction.

Ms. Hocken asked about the timeline for TransPlan. Mr. Viggiano said that once the Plan was adopted, it would need to be updated every three to five years. Mr. Gaydos noted that there were many things happening, such as improvements to passenger rail service and BRT, and he thought it would be more interesting in the future to see the impact of those things. He thought it would be easier to react to those impacts rather than attempting to make projections to create the ultimate.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were recommending that the Board support the four alternative performance measures as presented in the TransPlan packet.

The Board members agreed to support the four alternative performance measures.

SCHEDULE BOARD STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION: The Board members selected January 19 and 20, 2001, as the dates for the annual two-day strategic planning work session.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: 1) MPC. Ms. Hocken said that MPC had discussed the process for resolving the TransPlan issues, which resulted in the two subcommittees.

2) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Lauritsen reported that the next meeting would be held on November 7, 2000.

3) BRT Steering Committee. Mr. Bennett said that an important part of the meeting was a discussion about the treatment of the tree removal issue on Franklin Boulevard. The discussion centered around the entire segment being held up because of 17 trees, most of which might not have been selected for the area had they been selected today. The general consensus was to recommend to the Board to try to move the issue to a vote and to implement the plan based on the fundamental principles and criteria that BRT otherwise would have. Ms. Wylie added that it was time for the Board to reaffirm its goals for BRT. Mr. Bennett said that based on the criteria, the Board should emphasize the landscaping being planned with the BRT implementation in order to make a strong case about the trees.

Mr. Bennett reported that the Glenwood alignment also was discussed and was a tough issue. Because future projections showed that the area between Franklin Boulevard and the river would become more intensely developed and because of cost issues, the Committee wanted to keep the alignment on Franklin Boulevard. The Franklin alignment would create another lane, but without guideways or barriers, and the Committee was willing to allow for turning access into and out of the businesses along Franklin. The business owners were

concerned that allowing BRT on Franklin eventually would lead to having ODOT or another agency coming in and restricting access and turning movements at a later date. Mr. Bennett said that while the Committee continued to work on the alignment, it was difficult.

The 14th Street alignment currently had more support than the Franklin alignment. However, a letter was received from Tammy Fitch, the Springfield Council representative on the Steering Committee, that suggested that the Committee continue to consider operating in mixed traffic on Franklin Boulevard in Glenwood. Not all of the Committee members agreed with that. Mr. Bennett was very discouraged by that suggestion coming in after all the work the Committee had done.

Ms. Hocken added that she also was discouraged by the letter from Ms. Fitch. She thought that a compromise needed to be made that would be more acceptable to the partner agencies and to find a way to move forward with the project. She thought that staff were working on ways to take the suggestion and make it work. She looked forward to more information from staff and an opportunity to discuss the suggestion with Ms. Fitch. The Board still had much work to do to get to approval of the pilot corridor through the partner agencies.

Ms. Wylie said that she had been counting on Ms. Fitch's support and participation to assist with the Springfield City Council approval process. She thought it was important to find a way to compromise on the Glenwood alignment. Staff had assured the Board that the important thing was to get the route established and then to work on the concepts.

Ms. Hocken said that the 14th Avenue alignment alternative would increase the cost of the project by 15 to 20 percent. Since the grant assistance was not what had been hoped for, it was important to look at the costs very seriously as well as to work out a compromise.

Ms. Hocken said that she did not think as a District, LTD should shy away from a vote on the trees. Mr. Gaydos agreed. If the City's attorney determined that a vote was necessary, Ms. Hocken thought LTD needed a design that would work for the long term that would include landscaping to be presented to the public. There were many positive aspects to removal of the trees, such as avoiding taking an existing lane of traffic.

The Board directed staff to prepare a Glenwood design alternative that would be presented for consideration to the LTD Board BRT Advisory Committee prior to being presented to the full Steering Committee.

Mr. Hamm said that staff believed that the Franklin alignment from I-5 west was important to go to the vote and to not compromise that segment of BRT. If that piece were in place along with the right vehicle application, it would generate momentum to further the BRT project in the community.

Mr. Viggiano added that the letter from Ms. Finch was included in the Board packet on page 73.

4) Springfield Station Steering Committee. Mr. Kleger reported that the Committee continued to await the Environmental Assessment.

5) Eugene Downtown Visioning. Mr. Bennett reported that the Committee would meet on Thursday, October 19. A draft summary of prior discussions had been received, and Mr. Bennett briefly reviewed the summary. The draft would be edited by the Committee members, and the Board members would be provided with copies.

Mr. Bennett said that the downtown shuttle had yet to be proven, but from LTD's perspective, was very important.

Ms. Wylie noted that the Springfield Renaissance Committee also was conducting the same type of study, and LTD's proposed Springfield Station would be very important to that planning. She asked that the Board be kept apprised of the progress made from that Committee.

6) Board Finance Committee. Ms. Hocken reported that the Finance Committee met on October 4, 2000, to discuss the financing of the BRT vehicles. Staff would make a presentation about BRT vehicles later in the meeting. In addition, the Finance Committee discussed the LTD Investment Policy, which also would be presented to the entire Board at a later meeting.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Hamm said that during the recent American Public Transportation Association (APTA) conference in San Francisco, Ms. Wylie and other staff members had met with other BRT consortium members to discuss the reauthorization process. Mr. Hamm was the Region VI Director for the western states on the APTA Board of Directors. He hoped to get involved at the committee level with reauthorization.

Ms. Wylie said that she wanted to provide her feedback from the conference, but would do so at a later meeting.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson said that the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2000-01 was complete, and to date, the finances were in good shape. Fare revenue was of some concern, and personnel costs were in line with the budget. Capital costs were of concern because federal funding came in much lower than expected. Phase 1 of the pilot corridor of BRT was fully funded, but staff would be reviewing and revising the other major capital items, such as the Springfield Station and fleet replacement. Ms. Hellekson also said that the audit had been completed and would be reported to the Board in November.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT VEHICLE UPDATE: Mr. Viggiano said that Fleet Services Manager Ron Berkshire was present to discuss some of the vehicles that were being considered. It was hoped that a decision on the vehicles would be made within the next few months. Staff wanted to involve other groups in the decision process, such as the BRT Steering Committee, the various planning commissions, City Councils, and the County Commissioners.

Mr. Hamm reiterated that Phase 1 of the pilot corridor for BRT was fully funded, and the Board members should take the opportunity to let people know that Phase 1 was funded. The other issue that should be discussed in the community was the vehicles and the commitment to clean vehicles that the Board made at the September Board meeting.

Mr. Bennett asked about the federal funding for all LTD requests. Ms. Lynch said that all approved project requests were funded through the same congressional discretionary fund, and in a sense, LTD's project requests competed against one another as well as against hundreds of requests from all across America. The Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) no longer had a role in the disbursement of those funds. Oregon had no representation on the congressional appropriations committee.

Mr. Bennett said that LTD had a relatively new approach with BRT and was in the lead for communities this size in doing something to make a difference that had not been done before, and the FTA had recognized that. The FTA was working to find ways to fund the new technologies, such as BRT, which would compete with the rail funding that historically had been given priority status for funding.

Mr. Gaydos said that when discussing the funding in the community, the Board needed to have answers for questions about how the rest of the BRT project would be funded and about the possibility that phase 1 of the pilot corridor would be all LTD would get. Mr. Viggiano said that even if phase 1 was as far as the project went, it still would be a valuable service. As LTD used up reserves and federal funding continued to be low, Mr. Gaydos said that the sense of selling to the community would become a more difficult.

Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn said that Tri-Met had put in part of a bus mall through downtown Portland. People could drive through part of the area, and the other part included an exclusive bus lane. At the time, Tri-Met had said that if it never was expanded, it still would be an improvement over what had been there previously. Now, several years later, the citizenry of Portland were supportive of expanding the bus mall.

Mr. Berkshire then provided photographs and a description of the vehicles that were being considered. Staff were considering a Gillig low-floor standard diesel bus at a cost of \$280,000 per unit; a Transportation Techniques (Trans Tech) hybrid-electric bus at a cost of \$450,000 per unit; and a French-made Civis diesel-electric bus at a cost of \$1,100,000 per unit. Mr. Berkshire also compared the specifications on each style of bus.

Mr. Bennett asked if it was possible that Trans Tech could pick up some of the positive design elements of the Civis bus. Mr. Berkshire said that Trans Tech was quite flexible, and the basic structural design of the vehicle lent itself to modification without too much trouble.

Mr. Berkshire said that he would be visiting the Trans Tech plant in November, and he would discuss those issues with the Trans Tech staff.

Mr. Bennett said that while he fully supported a sleek-design vehicle and thought it was vital to the success of BRT, he was hopeful that the Trans Tech company would be able to come up with a design that looked more like the Civis.

Ms. Wylie said that the FTA was sponsoring a vehicle design competition among the manufacturers. It was unknown what impact the competition would have in the manufacturing industry. Mr. Viggiano thought that the looks of the Civis vehicle had created a lot of interest in the United States. He believed that eventually, the U.S. market would respond to that interest. How long that would be was unknown, but eventually, as U.S. manufacturers caught on, the price of that type of vehicle would come down.

Mr. Berkshire said that it was unknown whether the Civis bus could be delivered on time and the Trans Tech bus could be delivered within a much shorter time frame. The Trans Tech company was familiar with the Civis and appeared to be very interested in adopting some of those design features.

Mr. Bennett did not think that the Trans Tech bus, as presented, came close to the vision for the BRT project. He said that he would continue to argue for the sleeker looking bus, and would do so even if the project was begun with regular buses, knowing that the sleeker looking buses were coming.

Mr. Viggiano and BRT Engineer Graham Carey would be visiting the Civis plant in France as part of a BRT consortium trip, and they would be able to provide more information following that visit.

Mr. Gaydos said that he was concerned about the cost of the Civis bus, and he wanted to have quiet, clean running buses. He was not comfortable putting money into existing engine technology if there were plans to transition the entire fleet to something else.

Ms. Hocken asked about the engine technology, and if it would be more efficient to have BRT vehicles with the same engine type, such as those that were being ordered for the downtown shuttle with the Capstone hybrid-electric engine. Mr. Berkshire said that it would be more efficient as far as fleet maintenance was concerned.

BRT Marketing Representative Dan Tutt added that the Civis was designed to ultimately operate with the fuel-cell technology. Mr. Berkshire noted that the fuel-cell technology was not advanced to the point that it should be considered at this time; however, he believed it was the fuel of the future.

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Wylie asked if Board members had any comments or questions about the remaining agenda items, which included a bus rapid transit update, board correspondence, and the monthly staff report. There being none, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 9:38 p.m.

