

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, March 21, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 15, 2001, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, March 21, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Rob Bennett, Vice President, Chair Pro Tempore, presiding  
Patricia Hocken  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary  
Robert Melnick  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Gerry Gaydos  
Hillary Wylie, President

**WORK SESSION/CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Chair Pro Tempore Rob Bennett.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:** Ms. Hocken stated how great the employee appreciation banquet was. She thought that the entertainment provided by employee singers and musicians had been especially wonderful. Ms. Lauritsen agreed, and said that the employees who attended had been wonderful, as well.

Ms. Lauritsen asked for a preliminary report on the United Front lobbying trip to Washington, D.C. Mr. Hamm said that Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch had reported that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) would like to see LTD and the Eugene/Springfield area be one of the model BRT projects. The FTA offered to fund some work by Booz, Allen and Hamilton, Inc., a consulting firm that worked with a number of transit properties on different projects, to help LTD position itself for New Start funding. She also had reported that there were good conversations with the Congressional membership, and that the Oregon delegation staff people who bring requests together for the Congressional members were just beginning to work on those requests, so the United Front trip timing was very well planned.

**CHOICES VIDEO:** Connie Bloom Williams, the Commuter Solutions program manager, explained that Commuter Solutions had been LTD's alternative transportation program since 1994. One of its primary elements was the education of different target markets, such as employers, employees, the general public, and the school and youth market. She introduced Robert Lewis, the manager of Metro TV, and explained that the

"Choices" video was a joint project between Metro TV and LTD, with some funding assistance from the City of Eugene. They had produced a video, entitled, "Choices," that focused on transportation choices for local middle and high school audiences. Mr. Lewis had been submitting the video to various awards programs and it had been winning awards. The Oregon Department of Transportation had written a press release about the video, so LTD was beginning to receive more requests for copies.

Mr. Lewis said that about 500 high school students had been interviewed to find out what they would like to see in the video. Hundreds of 4J students had been auditioned and 45 were selected for the music video. School District 4J Superintendent George Russell and others in the school district were so enthusiastic about the project that now the video was being used in a 25-minute curriculum in every 4J middle school, in multiple classes, such as social studies and environmental sciences. Mr. Lewis stated that the Telly award was equivalent to an academy award for video production. The 2000 Telly competition had 11,033 entries, with approximately 7 percent receiving awards. Competition for the awards came from businesses such as Dick Clark Productions, IBM, and Coca-Cola USA. The video also was submitted for competition for the 2000 Communicator Crystal Award and the Aegis Award of Excellence, and won awards in both of these competitions. Mr. Lewis and Ms. Williams showed the video for the Board.

**WORK SESSION ON METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE TRANSPAN RECOMMENDATIONS:** LTD Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner introduced the topic and gave some background information. She introduced Tom Schwetz and Paul Thompson of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG). She said that she would present the remaining issues that MPC had considered as the resolution body for TransPlan unresolved issues. Later in the meeting, the Board would be asked to take action on the issues as a set, rather than one by one. The LTD Board had seen all of these issues before, either in a TransPlan joint work session or at LTD Board work sessions.

Ms. Hocken had attended the MPC meeting where these issues were discussed. She said that except for one issue that was still unresolved, MPC had come to a place that the LTD Board supported the last time they reviewed these various issues. One issue, #14.2, the new finance policy, had been sent back to the City of Eugene for further discussion. MPC had voted to not add the new policy to TransPlan. The feeling was that it was now up to the Eugene City Council to see if they felt strongly enough about it to pursue an amendment. All others were at a place the LTD Board had agreed with during the Board's last discussion.

Ms. Gardner clarified that as currently proposed, all the issues were resolved and the plan was financially constrained. Depending on what the City of Eugene did with the West Eugene Parkway (WEP), it could become unconstrained. If no changers were made, it was possible that this would be the final plan that the Board would be asked to adopt. The Board would have an opportunity to discuss future proposed changes and take action as needed.

Ms. Hocken added that MPC had discussed the new construction piece of financial constraints, but had not really talked about the operations and maintenance piece. There was still some interest in being able to put more money in operations, maintenance, and

preservation, not necessarily among the members of MPC, but in a lot of testimony from the public.

Mr. Thompson further explained that TransPlan was constrained under the federal requirements. Currently, TransPlan specified that for the shortfall in OM&P funding in Eugene and Springfield, a new locally-controlled source of revenue would be identified. Both city councils had directed their staffs to work on those issues. In Eugene, a staff and citizen committee had been working on new revenue sources since September, and would be bringing recommendations for those to the Council's budget committee in April. They were quite far along in that process, which satisfied the federal requirement for fiscal constraint. He said that if the Eugene City Council, under the direction of MPC or their own initiative, brought back a change in the project list because of the West Eugene Parkway (WEP), or chose to pursue the new finance policy further, that could cause some change in the priorities for expenditures, and there could be action that would move the Plan out of constraint. The Eugene Council also could pursue nodal development financing further, following the March 8 MPC addition of \$5 million for nodal development planning. If Eugene chose to pursue further funding for nodal development infrastructure, there might be a need to identify or move funding for that element.

Ms. Gardner said that there appeared to be momentum by MPC to adopt the Plan, and that any further unresolved issues could be dealt with in triennial updates. That was LCOG's staff recommendation. This Plan met the federal requirement for a plan, and there were some issues that were pushing the need to adopt it soon, such as air quality performance, and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the local Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) no longer being current.

Ms. Hocken asked if the plan could be adopted without knowing about the West Eugene Parkway process, or if that would hold up adoption. Mr. Schwetz replied that the issue of the WEP was associated with project development, and a detailed discussion about what parts would be built should be differentiated from what would be done in the course of developing a regional transportation plan. The TransPlan could be adopted without knowing what final process would result from that project. There had been a change in the original project list of a couple of years ago, but staff believed that TransPlan did not have to be held up by not knowing the final configuration of the West Eugene Parkway. It could be specified that a refinement plan would be done, some investment would be made, and those would be worked on during the triennial update. Staff's recommendation was to move forward with TransPlan adoption.

Mr. Bennett asked if, in the absence of anything happening with WEP, something would happen with the W. 11<sup>th</sup> and Beltline intersection. Mr. Schwetz said that there was no doubt that not having something in place would have a tremendous impact on West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue. It was hoped that the decision-making could be done on that project without holding up TransPlan. He described Plan adoption as a snapshot in time as to what the regional bodies could agree to, and said that the federal process envisioned that discussions on the projects would continue. It was important to talk now about the triennial update. He added that a lot of new issues had arisen during the time it had taken to prepare TransPlan for adoption. He thought it was only fair to the process that the community look for ways to

adopt the Plan so that everything else in the Plan could get underway. Mr. Thompson said that it was discussed at MPC that TransPlan could be adopted in June and then MPC could embark on the triennial update. The reconfiguration of the WEP project and changes to the project list could be amended to TransPlan anytime after this adoption.

Mr. Bennett asked if any of the proposals being discussed with respect to the amendments to the WEP plan or alternatives were expected to have a major impact on West 11<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> Avenues, from a transportation technical analysis point of view. Mr. Schwetz said that a number of the options that had been discussed, which came close to the equivalent of Phases 1A and 1B, which basically were a full connection between Highway 99 and Beltline, would have an impact on the stretch of West 11<sup>th</sup> between Garfield and Beltline. Building just that link would cause problems on West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, particularly between Danebo or Willow Creek and Beltline, where a lot of people coming out of the Hyundai area were making a right turn and then a left turn onto Beltline, making that a highly-congested segment. The issue was finding a way to help that traffic move without congesting that segment. A lot depended on the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) figuring out a way to continue its financial commitment.

Mr. Thompson added that ODOT was interested in the project—some form of the WEP—relieving congestion on the state system and providing an additional component to the state system. West 11<sup>th</sup> east of Beltline, between Garfield and Beltline, was not part of the state system. To the extent that the eastern portion of WEP relieved congestion on the eastern portion of West 11<sup>th</sup>, that was not in ODOT's interest as much as addressing the western portion of West 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Schwetz summarized by saying that in addition to that linkage between Highway 99 and Beltline, some of the proposals that were "non-WEP" would involve making that connection and then making improvements to Beltline and then 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue west of Beltline. There actually was a project in TransPlan to do parts of that.

Ms. Gardner asked Mr. Schwetz to talk about alternative performance measures that LTD reviewed. Mr. Schwetz said that materials prepared for the Lane Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) meeting on May 3-4 were available for public review from March 21 through April 9. Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff would prepare recommendations and on May 3 or May 4 would go to LCDC with a request to approve the use of these alternative measures. He thought it was in LCDC's interest to approve the measures and let the local area proceed with some of the things LCDC was interested in.

Mr. Kleger said that there were several major intersection revision projects that had been moved from "constrained" to the "future" list. He wanted to confirm his impression that these could come back onto the constrained list and would have to be dealt with. Mr. Thompson said that those (such as the Franklin/I-5, 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue/I-5, and Main Street/Highway 126 interchanges) could come back to the constrained list; the requirement was that funding be reasonably expected. MPC voted to move them to the future list pending studies that were ongoing or planned, to determine where investments should be made. The TransPlan future projects list was made up of projects waiting for need and/or funding.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Schwetz to comment on proposed bylaws changes to MPC. Mr. Schwetz said that LCOG staff were responding to a request from one of MPC's members. Procedurally, there probably was an opportunity at the meeting for someone to ask to vote on that request, rather than having LCOG respond to one member's request. As background, he explained that Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer had requested that LCOG develop amendments to the MPC bylaws to limit LTD's participation on MPC to "mass transit" issues, rather than "transportation" issues. Mr. Schwetz said that from staff's perspective, mass transit was synonymous with transportation. Ms. Gardner added that the federal requirement was that coordination came under the broader umbrella of transportation issues and was not broken out by mode. Mr. Schwetz said that while the federal government clearly stated that transit needed to be part of the discussion, it did not comment on bylaws and voting privileges as long as the bylaws met federal requirements. Ms. Hocken commented on the process, stating that it had not been her sense that this would happen as a result of only one person's request. MPC would have an opportunity to discuss this issue at its next meeting; however, she thought it was unfortunate that staff work was undertaken before there was any conversation about it.

**WORK SESSION ON WILLAMETTE VALLEY FUTURES STUDY:** LTD Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano introduced Hillary Deerborn of LCOG, who was working on the Willamette Valley Futures Study. Ms. Deerborn said that the project was very interested in feedback, and asked the Board members to mail or fax comments on a survey sheet she handed out. She explained that the project looked 50 years into the future for transportation issues in a valley-wide, regional approach to transportation. It was anticipated that the population of the valley would almost double in the next 50 years, equivalent to adding three more cities with Portland's current population or 12 or 13 more cities the size of Eugene. She explained the project, which looked at how population growth would affect the livability, mobility, and goals of the area. The purpose of the project was to take a long-range look and identify policy choices that could minimize the impact of population growth on transportation. The study involved intercity transportation and population issues throughout the valley, not local traffic congestion issues. The policy choices that were considered were the urban land available for development, investments in highway and transit, and cost of driving. Ms. Deerborn discussed the seven scenarios that were evaluated for highway and transit development, looking out to the year 2050. The "no action" scenario showed that traffic congestion on the major highways throughout the valley would increase by 81 percent. The "transit only" scenario showed a reduction in congestion levels of 16 percent. A major investment in highways showed a 12 percent reduction. The mileage tax, or the "disincentive" scenario would reduce congestion by 10 percent. However, she said, the hybrid scenarios were much better than any of the single-factor scenarios in reducing congestion. The most effective scenario was the one that was most aggressive about expanding transit as well as highways, and included some form of the mileage tax.

Ms. Deerborn said that there was no magic answer to solve all problems, and the best results for all categories considered, such as travel time and truck freight travel time, were from a hybrid solution that included more transit and more highways. Expansion of public transit tended to concentrate jobs in major urban centers, while pulling population to outlying cities. Expanding highways drew both people and jobs to outlying cities.

Ms. Deerborn said that the study had been completed, although it was still under review. Continuing examination of the data was providing additional information. An important aspect for the Forum was to identify policy choices and be clear about finding policies that would help minimize the future impacts of growth on transportation, and to make public recommendations about those. One of the questions was whether an increase in travel time by a little bit, by a little bit more, or by a lot, would result in respondents making different travel choices. Ms. Deerborn referred the Board to more information available on the Livability Forum Web site, and said that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) was one of the partners in the study and would be publishing a large report.

Ms. Hocken asked why the funding source that was chosen was cents per mile rather than a gas tax or some other source. Ms. Deerborn said that was done to avoid a gasoline tax, to try to get the issue out of the political arena. It became more of a mileage/usage kind of test. Mr. Melnick commented that a toll road could collect by the mile. Ms. Deerborn added that the study was not focused on finding the right mechanism; it was more about what happened if the cost of driving increased.

Mr. Bennett called a five-minute break, from 6:35 to 6:40 p.m.

**REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING** Mr. Bennett called to order the regular business meeting of the District at 6:40 p.m.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced the April 2001 Employee of the Month, Bus Operator George Day, who was hired in May 1995 and had earned awards for four years of safe driving and three years of correct schedule operation. He also recently received an Accessible Service Award as a result of providing excellent accessible bus service to guests with disabilities. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Day was nominated for this award mainly by his passengers, which showed his ongoing service to LTD's guests. Mr. Johnson said that one of the measures of bus operators was how they handled situations on the bus, and that even when things were not going well, Mr. Day handled them very well, made the ride safe and comfortable, and helped his guests feel good about riding.

Mr. Bennett presented Mr. Day with an Employee of the Month pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award, and thanked him for his excellent service. Mr. Day thanked the Board. He described himself as a people person and said that if he could help someone, it made him feel good to do so. He said he liked to drive and that LTD was a good company to work for.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Mr. Bennett opened the meeting for audience participation.

- (1) Rich Coolman, of 335 Storey Blvd in Eugene, said he was a pediatrician and a Eugene Bicycle Coalition board member who was speaking on behalf of the Crest Drive Citizens Neighborhood Group. He said that he appreciated the difficulty of balancing coverage and productivity in the face of increasing congestion and limited budgets. He also recognized that the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR)

process begun last May had offered many opportunities for people to track what LTD was doing. However, he said, he had been aghast to hear on March 1 that LTD was planning to substitute a high school bus for what had been limited commuter service to the Crest Drive neighborhood. He said he had found nothing in writing on the buses or stops, and only a blank area on the maps at the Eugene Station and on the Web site. He had talked several times with LTD staff members and was told that there would be four trips daily—two to downtown and two to South Eugene High School, compared with the six buses that currently ran downtown. The Crest Drive Citizens urged LTD to further address four important issues: (1) Reexamine the policy that decreased neighborhood coverage in order to maintain corridor frequency. If neighborhoods lost access to the corridors, ridership would decline, auto dependence would rise, and alternative mode share would decrease. He said that TransPlan required that LTD do better, and that the balance should favor neighborhood coverage and efforts to increase ridership. (2) Develop a process to ensure that neighborhoods had input, particularly when their only commuter bus service was being terminated. The buses and stops needed to be posted, and neighborhood groups needed to invite affected households to discuss the issues with LTD. He asked LTD to challenge the neighborhood to reasonably increase their ridership, and questioned why LTD would just abandon service without seeing what the neighborhood might accomplish in partnership. He said that riders who had made location decisions based in part on LTD's service and had demonstrated the ability to reduce their vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) deserved better. (3) Keep the school bus route accessible to adults. He asked why the current plan for 22C excluded commuters and shoppers from half their options by not connecting the school route the extra mile to the Eugene Station. He stated that the mile not traveled could increase LTD's productivity significantly, but might make the difference for whether his neighbors rode the bus or drove. (4) Poll current 22C riders regarding the best transit times. Given the severe cuts in the service currently planned, Crest Drive citizens were requesting that LTD planners try to determine what route times would best meet riders' needs. He thought that a business reply postcard handed out by drivers for a week could accomplish this.

Mr. Bennett asked the other two people who had signed up to speak to wait for the public hearing for their issue. He then closed the public comment period.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the Consent Calendar for March 21, 2001. After seconding, the Consent Calendar was approved unanimously by voice vote, 5 to 0. The Consent Calendar for this meeting consisted of the minutes of the February 21, 2001, regular Board meeting, the March 7, 2001, special Board meeting, and the March 7, 2001, canceled special Board meeting.

**FISCAL YEAR 2001-02 PRICING PLAN AND FIRST READING OF AMENDED FARE ORDINANCE:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson corrected some errors in the agenda materials, including an error on the second page of the draft amended fare ordinance, which listed the current cost for a book of ten RideSource tickets as \$17.50, with a proposed reduction to \$15. She explained that this form of fare had not previously been included in the ordinance, and in an attempt to include it, it was added at the original staff

recommendation of \$17.50. When the staff recommendation was changed to \$15, a strikethrough occurred, making it look like it was reduced. Mr. Kleger called Ms. Hellekson's attention to an error at the top of that same page, where the third sentence referred to a child fare, which should have been changed to "youth." Ms. Hellekson agreed, saying that the intent was to show that there no longer is a difference between a child fare and a youth fare. Those corrections were called to the Board's attention so that the first reading of the ordinance, with these minor changes, could occur that evening.

She stated that another error had occurred the previous month, when only half of the revised Fare Policy had been given to the Board. She offered to bring the entire Fare Policy back to the Board in April and have the Board vote to adopt it at that time.

Ms. Hellekson then discussed the recommended fare changes shown on page 51 of the agenda packet, which also were discussed with the Board the previous month.

Service Planning Manager Andy Vobora presented a related item on the Lane Community College (LCC) term pass, a handout numbered page 54-A. He said this issue was taken to the LTD Finance Committee, and did not appear in the fare ordinance because it was a special fare promotion between LCC and LTD. He explained that LTD had met with LCC student government representatives to discuss the program, and a proposal for next year had resulted. LCC had budgeted the \$135,000 subsidy for next year, and LTD had tried to increase its revenues somewhat to recover the small loss from this year that resulted from how the passes were priced and the number that were made available, while still trying to maximize the number of passes available for students. Staff expected to sell all 7,500 passes during the current year and all 7,200 the following year, and LCC was considering how to make more passes available long-term, especially as summer pass use increased.

Mr. Melnick asked Mr. Vobora to clarify that the student organization at LCC supported this proposal. Mr. Vobora said that it did. He also called the Board's attention to the resolution related to the LCC Term Pass agenda item, requiring separate action.

Mr. Kleger asked to clarify that staff were not proposing changes to the individual pass fares at this time, just the cash fares. Ms. Hellekson said that was correct; however, the Board could make changes to that recommendation. She added that LTD had had good success alternating fare increases, so that the impact was not delivered all at once, without other options for some of the lower-income riders. She explained that LTD had alternated cash fares with pass fares and tokens, so that in each of a three-year cycle, all of them would be addressed. The policy had been revised so that would not necessarily be what LTD would do in the future, but this proposal continued that method of raising fares one more year.

Mr. Melnick asked staff to talk about the discontinuation of the Freedom Pass and how successful that program had been. Mr. Vobora explained that the Freedom Pass had been a very successful program, as a four-month summer pass for youth, during a traditionally low-ridership period for college students. It was a program to add ridership during those months, with the hope of keeping those youth on the buses during the school year. When the Board took action the previous year to reduce the youth fares overall, the



Freedom Pass was discontinued because youth now had the option to buy the discounted monthly pass or a three-month discounted youth pass. Although it was not quite as good a deal for the youth, more youth ridership had carried over into the school year.

**Public Hearing on Fare Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2001-02:** Mr. Bennett opened the public hearing.

- (1) Ed Necker of 173 E. Hatton, Eugene, stated that he was on the Special Transportation Fund (STF) Advisory Committee that had hashed out the recommended RideSource fare increase during three meetings. He said he was thankful that LTD staff had respected the committee's wishes and opinions. He pointed out that the fare had increased on September 1 every year since 1997. This increase would go into effect on July 1, an even shorter period. He said that the term "trying to reach the ADA maximum" was like shooting at a moving target, because as the LTD cash fare increased, so did the maximum. Mr. Necker said that he no longer used the service, but when he first began using it, it cost \$.80. He understood the Board's concerns about revenue and with the service paying for itself in some respects, but he did really appreciate the staff and Board taking the committee's recommendation seriously.

Mr. Bennett asked if there was strong support among the committee members for this recommendation. Mr. Necker said that the recommendation made by staff came second to the committee's decision. The committee made its decision about its recommendation a couple of months before, and then it was brought to their attention that the Board wanted a little higher recovery because it was financially strapped other places, so it was brought up that perhaps one or the other fare could be increased. However, after a long discussion, the committee decided to stay with its original recommendation. He said that somewhere between 60 percent and 80 percent of the current RideSource clientele were over the age of 80. Being on a fixed income and financially limited was an issue for a lot of the RideSource clients. He said that he had been a RideSource volunteer for four years and on the STF committee for five years, ever since he realized that the need was increasing and the funding was decreasing. He repeated that he primarily was there to say thank you.

- (2) Christina Drumm of 3319 Coralee, Eugene, said she was a science teacher at South Eugene High School and a long-time, enthusiastic supporter of public transportation, and would like to continue to be an active supporter, not just a philosophical supporter. She said she rode the bus regularly, although infrequently. She and her husband had made a conscious decision not to purchase a second car because they could make the bus their second form of transportation. She said that they carpooled except for two or three times a week when she took the bus home, which was a one-way trip for her, and also used the bus sometimes as weekend transportation. This had worked out very well, with minor inconveniences now and then. In September, the elimination of the transfer program effectively doubled her fare. It took her two buses to get home from the high school, and she now had to pay twice to get home. Using a day pass did not work for her because she did not ride the bus to get to work. She said that she may be in a minority in using the bus one way only, but she

thought that people in her situation disproportionately took the burden of solving the transfer problem. The rate increase, so soon after that, had concerned her, because people who used the bus by choice rather than as a necessity, who would like to reduce their dependence on a car and the number of miles they have a car on the road, would be pushed back to getting a car. She said she tried to keep a supply of tokens on hand, so she realized that her fare would not increase this year, but knew that it would increase eventually. She said she wanted to keep supporting public transportation and that she liked to be a good model for other people in the community and her students by riding the bus. She asked the Board to consider people in her situation who used the bus by choice, maybe infrequently, and asked that LTD come up with some alternatives for those riders, and perhaps even consider bringing back the transfer.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Vobora to respond. Mr. Vobora said that the information staff had last year was that the number of people who rode round trips who would be penalized by the new day pass system, or who made one-way trips with a transfer, were in the range of 2 percent to 3 percent of the daily rides. It was a small percentage, but when talking about thousands of riders, this number became hundreds of people who could be affected on a daily basis. He said that there were alternatives that staff could look at, such as single-ride transfers. There were some hybrid systems where LTD would not have to go back to the old time-based transfer system, because to rectify this problem, it could be a question of a transfer for the next bus only. Staff would just need to weigh the cost of administration and the benefits of such a change; for instance, whether it would be another instrument the driver would have to issue, or whether it could be the same one modified in some way. He said that there were some districts that did both on one ticket. For the most part, the new system had benefited the District with positive results in increased ridership and the positive response to the use of the day pass.

Mr. Kleger wondered if there currently were arguments about when a day pass expired, compared with the former arguments about when a transfer expired. Mr. Vobora said that there were not. Mr. Kleger said he had noticed the old system being a terrible time-eater for drivers.

Mr. Bennett and other members of the Board asked staff to review this issue and come back to the Board with a recommendation.

- (3) A gentleman in the audience said he would agree with Mr. Necker about how good the bus is. He said about 85 percent to 95 percent of his transportation was by bus. He had two ways of getting places, by foot or by bus, and the bus was a lot better for him than walking.
- (4) Al Good of Jasper said that he received the Board agenda mailings each month. Jasper did not have bus service, but one day he had business in River Road and Eugene, so he decided to try the bus. He drove to the Thurston Station, and thought it was a really good deal to ride all day for a dollar for seniors. An added benefit was that Mr. Day had been one of his drivers.

There was no further comment, so Mr. Bennett closed the public hearing on fares.

**Board Discussion and Decision:** Mr. Kleger observed that there had been a significant increase in operating costs for several different reasons, and LTD needed to find a way to pay for those. The District was at the maximum tax level and could not increase taxes without changing the law at the state level.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger then moved that Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only.  
**VOTE** Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 5 to 0. Mr. Bennett then read the title: "Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services." Extra copies of the ordinance were available for members of the audience.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-011: It is hereby resolved that the Lane Community College Term Bus Pass be priced at \$43 for the 2001-02 school year and that a total of 7,200 passes be made available for sale to students, faculty, and staff." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the  
**VOTE** resolution was adopted unanimously, 5 to 0.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Vobora to respond to the public input regarding route No. 22C. Mr. Vobora replied that the 22C was a commuter route running in the Crest Drive neighborhood, with three commuter trips in the morning and three in the afternoon. It was a coverage-type route with fairly low usage. A couple of the trips had been timed for meets at South Eugene High School, so staff decided to trim back the service to meet high school times plus two commuter trips going to downtown. He thought that the suggestion about running all the trips in and out of the Eugene Station was possible, so staff would review that. Mr. Vobora added that Mr. Coolman's comments about notification were correct in some respects. In some areas, staff did place postings on bus stops and sent direct mail, but this was not comprehensive in all neighborhoods, so he thought the Crest area was something that staff missed. LTD did send information to all neighborhood association presidents so they could be updated on the process throughout, and they were invited to the public open houses. However, because the Crest Drive route was changing, this segment did not show up on the map, so the information was not very clear. Mr. Vobora said that staff could have done a better job of notifying this neighborhood.

Ms. Hocken thought that Mr. Coolman's suggestion to survey the neighborhood or the bus riders seemed like a reasonable suggestion. Mr. Vobora agreed that staff could do this, and said that he would be speaking to the neighborhood association in May about current and future service. He said it was staff's intent to find out which trips were most useful for the neighborhood and try to time that correctly.

Mr. Bennett asked how low the ridership was. Mr. Vobora said that there probably were eight to ten riders on Mr. Coolman's trip. Mr. Coolman said that he rode his bike to work and caught the bus intermittently on the way home. However, his sons both rode to South, and one of his big concerns about the South bus was if it just took them home after school, it might mean that he would have to drive to work in order to pick them up after activities after school. The 5:20 p.m. bus that he rode intermittently usually had at least eight to ten, if not 15, people on that bus. His sons' buses to school were quite full. Mr. Vobora

stated that the high school trips were well used. The commuter routes, on a rides per revenue hour basis, looked pretty good, but that was because they were in service only for a short period while they were taking people home. However, after adding in deadhead time and the fact that these were peak buses, the costs became fairly high, and that is what staff were concerned about, in trying to balance the whole mix.

Mr. Melnick said he was intrigued by the positive challenge to LTD to say what level of ridership would make the route acceptable to LTD's needs, and whether the neighborhood could get to that level within a certain period, such as three or six months. He liked the idea of cooperating with the neighborhood, as well as making it clear that it was not just LTD acting in a certain way, but also the neighborhood's responsibility. Mr. Vobora said that this had been done with routes before, such as the Laurel Hill Valley, which had been very active in door-to-door contact about keeping the ridership at a certain level. He said he felt bad because in some instances, such as the 22C, where staff were trying to provide some skeleton level of coverage, such a low level of service almost doomed the service before it started. He said there had to be some level of frequency to give people the flexibility to stay after school or stay after work, etc., to make it a viable route. That was why staff decided to maintain the school routes, which were the best-used pieces of this service, but it was a difficult decision.

Mr. Hamm added that this was an historical struggle for transit, especially on the outskirts of the urban area. There initially would be big excitement about a route, but when considering what the density of the area could support and the diversity of needs, it became a marginal service application that typically dropped below productivity levels. It became a struggle of how to keep those areas in the mix. By spreading service out, more of the neighborhood may be able to ride, but it still was a poor performer in terms of the investment. It was a difficult decision because staff knew that the need was there, but also had to consider the budget.

Mr. Melnick said he understood this struggle but was wondering if there was any way to revisit this issue. Ms. Hocken said she would support extending the routes to downtown.

**APPROVAL OF MPC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN:** Ms. Gardner called the Board's attention to page 55 of the agenda packet, for the action item relating to the Board's discussion earlier that evening.

**MOTION**

Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-07: Resolved, that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves policy changes for TransPlan as proposed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, and the resolution passed by unanimous vote, 5 to 0.

**VOTE**

Ms. Lauritsen noted that the number of minutes that were allotted to the work session agenda items were listed on the agenda packet, and suggested adding timelines for the regular business portion of the minutes. Mr. Hamm said that staff would take this suggestion under advisement for future meetings.

**LONG-RANGE FINANCIAL PLAN:** Ms. Hellekson said that this material, found on page 56 of the agenda packet, had been reviewed by the Board Finance Committee on

March 7. Essentially, the committee agreed with the approach taken in the agenda materials. A lot of this material was covered in the Board's strategic planning work session in January. The purpose of the Long-range Financial Plan (LRFP) was to identify funding for short- and long-term District plans, to identify circumstances and trends that affect funding, and to affirm the financial goals that support the strategic plan. Ms. Hellekson emphasized that the LRFP focused on the big picture and was subject to change. The Board was being asked to approve a plan as a direction to staff in preparation for adopting a budget for the next fiscal year.

Ms. Hellekson discussed the goals of the LRFP and the assumptions regarding bus rapid transit. The biggest assumption was that of improved, cost-effective, attractive, and productive fixed-route service. As part of this effort, LTD was very involved in the TransPlan update process.

Ms. Hellekson explained that for state planning purposes and for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations, the LRFP had to be a 20-year plan. However, she said she never got into the details after about year 3.5, and because LTD reviewed the LRFP each year, it was pro-forma after five years, and the Finance Committee only looked at the five-year rolling window.

Ms. Hellekson said that staff were assuming that service requirements and capital projects would continue to form the plan framework, that population growth and ridership increases would result in fare revenue increases, and that the preservation of assets would continue to be a high priority for LTD. Staff also were assuming that TEA-21 would be reauthorized and funded. With the most recent census data, LTD would be changing categories from under 200,000 to over 200,000 in population. Staff assumed that this would mean at least \$1 million more in LTD's formula funds. Another assumption was that tax revenue would be stable, but growth would be slow.

Ms. Hellekson said that for the first half of the rolling five-year window, LTD was locked into a labor agreement, with expenses that would be increasing faster than the major source of subsidy. The local capital set-aside would continue one more year, and then would have to be discontinued for awhile in order to avoid damaging the District's core operations. Debt financing was discussed by the Finance Committee, and the Board would be discussing this issue at the April Board meeting. As LTD spent down its reserves in the future, the District's ability to prepay for projects that ultimately would be grant funded could be reduced.

Ms. Hellekson briefly listed the projects in the plan, as well as the sources of funding, and stated that it was certain that LTD would be looking at debt.

The most important BRT assumption was that BRT would not increase operating costs, even though there were a lot of unknowns that would be reviewed carefully as the project progressed. Staff also were assuming that BRT would increase ridership. Those two assumptions meant that staff were assuming that BRT would increase productivity and efficiency and decrease the cost per ride, which was an essential part of positioning LTD for the future.

Ms. Hellekson next discussed the history of operating fund revenues and total revenue and expense. She explained that \$3 million had been appropriated in the current operating fund budget to transfer to the capital fund, but only \$1.3 would be transferred, to help reduce the impact of a slowdown in revenues and an increase in personnel expenses. Ms. Hellekson handed out a chart showing operating and capital five-year projections, showing that the transfer to the capital fund disappeared after the following year. She said she was presenting the plan this way to show the Board what the problems and challenges were and where the District would have to look to find solutions, as well as to show that the District was fine for the current and following year. The plan showed that the District would run out of money in year five, but staff would be working hard to ensure that the District did not run out of money.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she knew the reasons for concern, but when she looked for things to cut, she did not find anything. She said she did not want to get into micromanaging, and thought that LTD should charge forward with this plan and stay very optimistic. She said she had a lot of confidence in the debt service that the Finance Committee had discussed, especially when keeping that under tight control and always having repayment financing sources. She thought that the most important thing LTD could do was keep a positive attitude, because she thought BRT would have a positive impact.

Ms. Hocken stated that this plan was a little more optimistic than the one the Finance Committee saw the previous month. She thought that part of the optimism was that the Board knew that staff were looking hard for anyplace where operating costs could be cut, as well as at some new strategies in terms of operating procedures. She thought LTD was in a good enough position for the next two or three years, and at the end of three years would still have \$7.5 million. Ms. Hellekson said that this plan was staff's best attempt to take the Board's message to not cut either capital or operations, and to explain how they were integrated and how they would be expected to be integrated over the next few years. The LRFP maintained the capital list as it was discussed with the Board in January, which meant that it did not compromise any of those priorities.

Ms. Hellekson added that if LTD found alternative funding for Phase 2 of BRT, there would be no budgetary problem. The current scenario assumed that LTD would be paying 50 percent of the cost of Phase 2. If LTD received New Start money or some kind of full-funding agreement, that would make several million dollars available for other local capital projects, or to retain in operations to support expansion of service or other projects. Ms. Lauritsen said it was important to keep looking for ways to tighten the budget, but she thought it already was very good. The real breakthroughs would be in achieving another grant or developing another source of funding.

Mr. Hamm said that every member of the leadership council had spent a significant amount of time looking at every detail of the budget, to justify the expense on every line item and to define the outcome for each investment. Ms. Hellekson added that staff had pared \$800,000 from the budget through this process. Mr. Hamm continued by saying that staff had not just considered this to be this year's walk; it was a long-term walk and staff's responsibility to be good stewards of the public's trust. There were some things occurring with the implementation of new software that had the potential to improve how work

schedules were developed and assigned, with a potential positive impact of several hundred thousand dollars. Staff planned to keep working with the Board to continue to achieve those higher standards.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-008: It is hereby resolved that the proposed Long-range Financial Plan for fiscal years 2001-02 through 2020-21 is approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Melnick said he was impressed by a couple of things. One was the understanding that this was a multi-faceted set of issues and would not be addressed in only one way, and that this was, in the life of LTD, a relatively short-term set of issues that could be overcome. He said he was struck by Ms. Hellekson's comment about BRT, and assumed that the pursuit of funding for Phase 2 was actively underway, because that would allow LTD to not only resolve some serious budget issues, but also to move ahead with BRT in a significant way. Mr. Bennett said that these points were well taken.

**VOTE** There was no further discussion. The resolution was approved unanimously, 5 to 0. Mr. Melnick thanked Ms. Hellekson and the rest of the staff for the clarity of the information.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Ms. Hellekson said that that Board had spent quite a bit of time on this topic at its January strategic planning work session and the list had not changed substantially since that time. She said that more information would be coming about the possible land acquisition for a RideSource facility. The Finance Committee had requested that staff prepare a detailed investment return analysis and distribute that to the committee before the April meeting. The land had been appraised, including demolition of the buildings that were unacceptable for future use, at \$1.3 million. The \$2 million included in this plan would cover both the land acquisition and a facility or the remodeling of the existing office facilities for RideSource. The Special Transportation service at LCOG was applying for an \$800,000 grant from the State of Oregon for the facility. If that grant were successful, LTD's investment could be substantially less than budgeted. LTD also already had \$144,000 in state matching funds, so she thought there was a very good case for the grant. That information would go back to the Finance Committee and would be shared with the full Board after that. Again, she said, the Board would not be adopting anything that evening; rather, it would be approving a plan that would roll into the capital portion of the budget.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-009: It is hereby resolved that the proposed Capital Improvements Program for fiscal years 2001-2001 through 2005-2006 is approved as presented." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. There was no further discussion, and the motion carried unanimously, 5 to 0. Mr. Bennett thanked Ms. Hellekson for a very good job.

**VOTE**

**BOARD HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** Mr. Bennett called the Board's attention to page 68 of the agenda packet. Mr. Kleger said that the committee reviewed the matter of an increase to the general manager's salary in some detail, and their proposal was in the agenda packet. He observed that the general manager

was the Board's one employee, and that the committee thought that Mr. Hamm had done an outstanding job during the past year, as the Board concluded in its recent evaluation. The committee believed that the positive evaluation needed to be responded to in the conventional way. Mr. Bennett thought that the recommendation was a strong one that should have the Board's support, and asked if it was unanimous among the committee. Mr. Kleger said that it was.

**MOTION**

Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-010: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves a 4 percent merit increase to the general manager's base pay, effective March 27, 2001." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. Mr. Melnick stated that the committee also spent a considerable amount of time on other issues, and urged the Board to read the agenda item. The committee also wanted to look generally at comparative salaries for the District's leadership and other issues that the Committee could help with.

**VOTE**

The resolution was then adopted by unanimous vote, 5 to 0.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Board Member Reports:** The Board already had discussed the topics in this report.

**General Manager's Report:** Mr. Hamm informed the Board that Bus Operator Marcie Pope had been accorded the honor of the Year 2000 Employee of the Year at the Employee Appreciation Banquet on March 18. She was overwhelmed with the support from her fellow employees and the pats on the back. He also commented that the banquet was an exceptional team activity and very well received.

**February Financial Statements:** Ms. Hellekson said that staff were slightly more optimistic about the District's year-end position. It appeared that the District would be on budget for payroll tax receipts for the current year, which was very good news. The drop in gas prices also was good news. There was a delay in the implementation of utility cost increases, which could mean a short-term smaller increase and then a much larger increase. She said that staff still were concerned about fares, but were seeing some savings opportunities from the transfer to special transportation services that would help position the District better at year-end, as well. She reminded the Board that the budget meetings would be held in April.

**Bus Rapid Transit Update:** Mr. Viggiano stated that the Springfield Planning Commission had met to discuss BRT the previous evening, and had recommended approval of the Springfield portions of BRT, which included Glenwood, to the Springfield City Council. This meant that the project was one step farther along. BRT was scheduled to be discussed by the Eugene Planning Commission on April 3.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Eugene Planning Commission's public hearing already had occurred. Mr. Viggiano said that it occurred on March 13. He was not present, but he understood that 14 people had testified, providing mixed testimony. Some of the concerns were about compromising too much and not providing enough exclusive treatment



throughout, and that the Phase 1 corridor was not long enough. There was a desire by those people to move ahead with future phases quickly. Four of the seven planning commissioners were present, and they heard the testimony without discussion.

**Springfield Station Update:** Mr. Viggiano said that it appeared that this project was close enough to environmental approval to go ahead with the steps for approval. The FTA had told LTD staff that it had all the information it needed, and staff basically were waiting for a letter giving permission to go ahead with the project. Because of that, staff were suggesting that when discussing BRT Phase 1 with the Springfield City Council, the Council also be asked to approve the Springfield Station site. The Springfield Station Steering Committee had approved the site on the south side of South A between what would be extensions of Pioneer Parkway East and 4<sup>th</sup> Street. After approval by the Springfield City Council, it would come back to the LTD Board for final approval, possibly in May. LTD had some funding but did not have complete funding for the station. The Board would have to decide whether to proceed with land acquisition and design with the funding it had, or to wait until money for the entire project had been allocated.

Mr. Melnick asked about the source of that funding. Mr. Viggiano said that federal funds had been requested, and this had been the highest-priority request on LTD's United Front list of requests. There was strong support from Springfield for this funding.

**Correspondence:** Mr. Hamm pointed out the Downtown Eugene, Inc. (DEI) letter that commended staff for their effort on the BRT project and talked about DEI's support for a BRT project that contributed to the vitality of downtown. The letter made five points that DEI would like to see as part of the objectives: private property should be enhanced and not negatively impacted to the extent possible; pedestrian and vehicle access should be improved by the project; streetscape, landscape, and lighting improvements should be a major part of the project; two-way streets should be encouraged and access to the parking structures on 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue should be improved; and the High Street station should remain on the east side of High Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Hamm said that staff had worked significantly with the 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue group and had an understanding of their interests. He did not think there were any major problems, but had wanted to bring this to the Board's attention and enter it into the record for DEI.

**Monthly Performance Reports:** Mr. Hamm reported that person trips on the bus had increased 7.5 percent from the same year-to-date figures the previous year. There was some improvement in the football and basketball service. Total passenger revenues were just about even, while farebox revenue had increased 12.6 percent. The average passenger fare was down 6.7 percent, so staff were reviewing those issues. Special Transportation Service rides were about even, although the split between providers, SMS and RideSource, was a little different. Another important factor was that fuel costs were up 36 percent. That was a volatile part of the budget that had a huge impact on the bottom line. Staff were looking forward to decreasing some of the District's vulnerability with the possibility of other alternative-powered vehicles in the future.

Ms. Lauritsen thanked staff for the performance report. She asked about ridership for basketball service. Mr. Vobora said that football ridership was different because of the sheer

number of spectators. The modal split was higher because of the lack of parking at Autzen Stadium, the cost of parking, the priority lane to exit the stadium, etc. Staff were pleased that basketball ridership was growing, with a significant increase in ridership to women's basketball games, where the modal split was higher than for men's games. He said that staff would have a full report on basketball service following the end of the season.

**Monthly Performance Group Reports:** Mr. Vobora said that there was a shuttle stakeholder meeting the following day. Issues such as the name and color scheme would be determined within the next month. Staff were looking at shelter design and placement, as well. A new business on Country Club Road that probably would be a group pass participant by fall planned to have 300 employees by fall, but only 150 parking spaces. They asked if a Park & Ride could be set up at Valley River Center so their employees could catch the shuttle. Staff were working with the UO regarding the opportunity to run the shuttle through the campus in the evenings, to take people from one side to the other, as well as have better access to the dorm area. The request to make Pearl Street two-way was taking some time. Staff had requested that the State allow a stop on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if commuters would be using the Valley River Center parking spaces on a daily basis, and how VRC felt about that. Mr. Vobora said that the benefit to the shopping center was that there was a great likelihood that people would go into the center to make purchases or get something to eat. Mr. Vobora planned to meet with VRC's new general manager about this in the near future.

Mr. Bennett asked Facilities Services Manager Charlie Simmons if he had anything to report. Mr. Simmons said that his group was focusing on the shuttle project and the shelters. They also were looking at the Thurston Station as part of the capital plan for the next year, so were working with the City of Springfield, ODOT, and Lane County on changes at the Thurston Station.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion. Mr. Bennett adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

---

Board Secretary