

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, April 18, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 12, 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, April 18, 2001, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Hillary Wylie, President
Rob Bennett, Vice President
Gerry Gaydos
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary
Robert Melnick
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Pat Hocken

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

WORK SESSION – STATUS REPORT ON EUGENE TRAIN STATION PROJECT:

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch introduced Tom Larsen, Principle Civil Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works, to provide more detail about the City's plans and possible designs for the Eugene train station project.

Mr. Larsen said that the acquisition and renovation of the Eugene Depot had been authorized \$1.75 million under the federal Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21). Another \$1 million in federal funds that passed through the State had been obtained as well. Amtrak also had pledged up to \$1 million for the project.

Mr. Larsen reviewed schematics of the current station and the history of the funding support for the redesign. He said that while other cities owned their stations, Eugene did not. The original estimate of \$3 million for the redesign did not take into account that the property would need to be purchased, so the available funding would not cover the costs as currently designed.

Based on age and uniqueness, the current depot, built in 1899, would be placed on the national historical registry, once it was in public ownership.

Negotiations were underway to purchase the property, which included a narrow strip of land along the tracks that would be purchased for future expansion, a parking lot west of

Willamette Street, the current station building and parking lot, the building just east of the station building, and a piece of property to connect the station to Oak.

Proposals were being received from potential designers to begin the master plan design for the entire site and to obtain a more accurate cost estimate.

Mr. Larsen showed a schematic drawing that depicted the potential access from Oak Street and a possible pedestrian connection to Skinner Butte. Alternate quarters for the Amtrak operation would be needed in order for work, such as asbestos abatement, to be completed on the existing building.

Ms. Wylie asked if part of the asbestos abatement was the responsibility of the seller. Mr. Larsen said that the City was offering payment based on a clean site, and the seller had agreed to that provision.

City staff anticipated that Phase 1 would include the completion of design work by the end of the year, with construction beginning during the first quarter of 2002. Phase 2 and the completion of the project would depend upon future funding. It recently was learned that there was just under \$200,000 in Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) transportation enhancement funding that likely would be available for this project.

Mr. Melnick asked about an opportunity for Greyhound to share the site with the train station. Mr. Larsen said there had been much discussion about Greyhound moving to a new site, but no decisions had been made. Including Greyhound at the Amtrak Station was not in the original concept, but had grown from Greyhound's need to relocate from its current site. There was much interest, and the depot could be an attractive site; however, the bus staging area could be problematic, as there was not much additional space. There currently was no Greyhound component in the funding, and the impact on the neighborhood and project could be large.

Ms. Wylie asked if there was a possibility that some of the other nearby buildings could be relocated. Mr. Larsen said that it was a possibility. If Greyhound was interested in relocating to the depot site, there were larger issues to be considered, and there had been an ongoing discussion that Greyhound could be nearby on the other side of 5th Avenue. It was likely that the area could be in need of a parking structure.

Mr. Kleger said that during the design phase, he would be willing to provide accessibility consulting services free of charge. He was familiar with the depot building and had used it frequently. Mr. Larsen noted that the platforms would be built to enable level boarding with the train. He thought that the opportunity would be there for the type of involvement Mr. Kleger was suggesting.

Ms. Wylie said LTD was very interested in the multi-modal aspect with LTD's new downtown shuttle system. Mr. Larsen said the city was very interested as well, and would include LTD service in its planning efforts. The bus system and its components, such as Park & Ride and how it could all work together, would be key in the master plan.

Mr. Gaydos asked about the property located to the north of the county jail. Mr. Larsen said that was property that belonged to the same owners as the depot property, and it appeared that, if needed, it also could be included in the sale.

Mr. Gaydos asked if the railroad was willing to waive any right-of-way. Mr. Larsen said that the current plan was to buy an additional strip along the existing tracks with the objective of adding an additional rail in order to move the freight trains onto the main line and away from the passenger rail strip. Amtrak also had a need for a third rail to store a train overnight. Currently, the Amtrak train that spent the night in Eugene had to travel to the rail yards near Roosevelt and return to the depot in the morning.

Mr. Bennett said that he heard from LTD staff that, in terms of the shuttle operation, it would be helpful to have two-way traffic on Pearl Street. Service Planning Manager Andy Vobora said that he had met with City staff about Pearl Street. Mr. Larsen said that the City typically conducted a more comprehensive review when considering changing street traffic patterns; however, an exception criteria had been created for this instance, and the Pearl Street changes should be exempted from the more comprehensive process. Mr. Vobora thought an approval from ODOT on signal changes would be needed, and some design issues would need to be worked out, but he was optimistic that Pearl Street could be changed to two-way traffic by September.

WORK SESSION – SPRINGFIELD STATION LAND ACQUISITION: Mr. Hamm said that the final environmental approval had been received, and the site now was ready for final review and approval by the Springfield City Council and the LTD Board.

Mr. Hamm said that Springfield Station remained a priority for LTD, and it was staff's intent to keep moving forward even though construction funding was not yet realized. The Oregon congressional delegation and the LTD government relations manager were pushing forward on the issue. A copy of a letter from Governor Kitzhaber to Congressman Peter DeFazio and a letter from the Oregon delegation to the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, both encouraging the funding of the station, were distributed to the Board members.

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that the letter from Governor Kitzhaber was part of the lobbying effort for Springfield Station. The letter from the Oregon delegation to the House Appropriations Committee was a formal request for a number of appropriations projects for Oregon. Staff continued to work on other lobbying strategies.

Mr. Hamm said that LTD currently had secured \$850,000 in federal funds from the Surface Transportation Program to purchase the property and begin the design. If additional federal funds were not secured, the recommendation would be to reprioritize LTD's capital projects in order to move forward with this project as the highest priority to get it completed.

Ms. Wylie asked if the land purchase had been finalized. Mr. Hamm said that the site first had to be approved by the Springfield City Council. The Board would be discussing the issue with the Council at a joint meeting on May 14. LTD expected to receive approval from the Council, and then it would be a matter of the LTD Board taking action to proceed.

Mr. Melnick asked about the internal process for selecting a designer. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano responded that a request for proposals would be issued, and based on the responses, staff would conduct interviews and select a firm. Mr. Hamm added that staff intended to include some participation from the City of Springfield.

WORK SESSION – BOARD POSITION ON REOPENING BROADWAY STREET:

Mr. Gaydos had requested that the Board discuss and take a position on the reopening of Broadway Street and its impact on LTD and the community.

Mr. Bennett said that he had participated as an LTD representative on the downtown visioning committee. At the April 16 Eugene City Council meeting, there was a point in the discussion of the visioning committee's report where Councilor Gary Rayor, in trying to make the case for stronger language with respect to the bicycle path along the river and in making comments about why he was so concerned, had evoked Mr. Bennett's name. Councilor Rayor had suggested that Mr. Bennett was someone who might support building parking right on the river, which could intercept the bike path. Mr. Bennett said that he could not let the issue pass. He thought the Councilor's comments were well out of line and contrary to what Mr. Bennett would ever suggest or recommend. Mr. Bennett requested copies of the minutes of visioning committee to determine if something he had said could have been construed as support for such a project. Upon review of those minutes, Mr. Bennett did not believe that he had said anything of that nature. He then called City Manager Jim Johnson discuss it. He did not think it was an appropriate comment by the Councilor, particularly since Mr. Bennett was not present at the meeting to defend himself. Mr. Bennett was planning to write to the Council; however, in the meantime, Councilor Rayor had telephoned Mr. Bennett and apologized for the comments. Councilor Rayor said that he had become flustered in trying to make his case as strongly as possible and had made the comments in error. The Councilor said that he would apologize on the record at a later meeting. Mr. Bennett thought that if those statements were left uncorrected, it would reflect negatively on his involvement with the visioning committee and on his representation of LTD.

With respect to reopening Broadway, Mr. Bennett said that he had been an advocate for nearly 20 years. He was very involved in downtown business issues, and even though there was not a direct legal conflict of interest, the perception existed that there was a conflict of interest because of his downtown business ownership. He believed he needed to be careful, with respect to any appointed group that he was a member of, if the group was poised to take a formal position on the issue. He did not think it was a problem to be part of the discussion, but believed that it was not appropriate for him to take part in a vote on the position.

Ms. Wylie said that Mr. Bennett had a fine reputation in the community for preserving and restoring buildings, and was an admirable member of the downtown community.

Mr. Gaydos distributed a memo of support for the reopening of Broadway. He did not have an economic interest, but he was the president of the Downtown Eugene, Inc., Board of Directors, and thus was interested in ensuring that downtown Eugene functioned well. He also had an interest, and had for many years, in LTD being the transportation leader in the community, which was one of the reasons he wanted to serve on the LTD Board. LTD needed to be recognized as being about more than just mass transit, and the community

needed to recognize that the need to move people was extremely important. Mr. Gaydos believed that the reopening of Broadway fell within that category, and LTD should be involved. West Broadway currently was part of a closed mall, and it was an issue of opening that portion of the street. The issue would be included on the City Council agenda, as well as on the November ballot.

Jenny Ulum, of Ulum and Associates, was collecting petitions to form a broad coalition, and a copy of the petition was attached to the memorandum from Mr. Gaydos. LTD would be investing money in a shuttle that would cross Broadway, and the more accessibility for the shuttle, the better it would work.

Mr. Gaydos highlighted the reasons he thought reopening Broadway was important. The community was or should be proud of LTD's investment in the transfer station and the shuttle service. The city was dedicating a lot of money for the library, which was relatively near the area. If the area could be redeveloped in a more positive way, it would be more helpful for the library, the LTD transfer station, Broadway Place, and much of the public investment in the immediate area. Mr. Gaydos' encouragement for the LTD Board was to collectively take a position supporting the reopening of Broadway. He requested that the Board take the collective position to support the reopening of Broadway.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she was a Springfield representative, and Broadway was a Eugene street. While she was not against the reopening, she felt that unless she heard a more compelling reason than LTD wanting to maybe someday run a bus on Broadway, she could not formally support the issue. LTD's interest in mass transit was a clear issue. She asked if the Springfield representatives should abstain from voting on this issue. Mr. Gaydos said that he was seeking full Board support of the issue as a regional transportation issue. Both downtown Eugene and downtown Springfield needed to be successful. LTD invested significantly in downtown Eugene and soon would in downtown Springfield. If the Board chose not to support it as a group, he would ask that the individual members support it. Ms. Lauritsen said that was a more compelling argument in support of the proposal.

Mr. Kleger said that in the past, he would have been reluctant to support measures to put cars back in the area of the downtown mall. Now, however, he was satisfied that nothing could happen to turn around the extremely depressed situation that currently existed without making the change to Broadway Street. He noted that he did not believe reopening Broadway alone would fix the problem. It may take not only the funding for construction, but also enough funding to put a police officer on every corner and in every alley for a period of time, which he thought should have been done long ago. The city still faced the budgetary limitations, but no further private investment would be made in the area until cars were allowed on the street.

Mr. Melnick said that he appreciated Mr. Gaydos bringing the issue to the Board. He believed that whether or not buses operated on Broadway, LTD had an interest in a healthy downtown. He took exception with Mr. Kleger's comments about the additional police presence. Studies had shown in many communities that additional eyes on the street, via automobile traffic, were a natural deterrent to crime and bad behaviors. Those results already had been achieved with the reopening of Olive and Willamette Streets. Mr. Melnick was very much in favor.

Ms. Wylie said that she was deeply conflicted. Her husband was an artist and was the designer for the complex brick pattern that covered the entire plaza. He and the artists who produced the sculptures on the plaza were very upset that their artwork may be destroyed or removed in the process of reopening Broadway. It was unknown what the design of the reopened street would be. Ms. Wylie did support a healthy downtown, but she also was supportive of the work of local artists. She did not think that the benches could remain, but the sculptures could be repositioned. She also did not know if the brick pattern would need to be torn up. Whatever happened, she hoped that some concern for the artists and artwork would be shown.

Mr. Hamm said that staff had researched with the Government Standards and Practices Commission, and found that Mr. Bennett would not have a legal conflict of interest in this situation, but perception would be a more accurate way to describe the situation.

One of the visions that the City staff had for Broadway was a great street or boulevard concept. A second shuttle had been discussed that would serve the courthouse and downtown. Broadway could be the street on which that vehicle could operate. Staff recognized that transit was a piece of the transportation puzzle and should be interested in anything that improved the livability.

Mr. Gaydos said that he appreciated Ms. Wylie's comments on artwork. He knew the existing artwork would be considered, and part of it would go into the design.

Mr. Bennett asked if an amendment could be made to the motion to include a statement of respect for the artists and artwork. Ms. Wylie said that the motion would be made later in the meeting.

Mr. Bennett left the meeting.

JACKETS FOR BOARD MEMBERS: Mr. Hamm displayed for the members a potential jacket that could be provided to the Board members to wear while representing LTD. Ms. Wylie said that the jacket clearly represented LTD. It matched the operator jackets and hats, etc. She asked if a lighter and longer version could be made available. Ms. Wylie said that she would be representing LTD at several community outdoor events, and she would appreciate having the jacket. The Board members liked the jacket, and asked that staff explore sizes and lengths.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – MAY 2001: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Steve Hoisington, who had been selected as the May 2001 Employee of the Month. Mr. Hoisington was hired on October 18, 1978, and had earned awards for 20 years of safe driving, 22 years of correct schedule operation (CSO), and exceptional attendance. In 2000, he also earned an accessible service award for excellence in service to persons with disabilities. Mr. Hoisington previously had been selected as the May 1984 Employee of the Month.

Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Hoisington was a long-term employee and was a dream employee to supervise. He did everything right, and he always provided excellent service. LTD received many positive comments from customers about Mr. Hoisington. He added that

Mr. Hoisington had not missed time, and was a safe and courteous bus operator.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Hoisington and presented him with an Employee of the Month pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award. She thanked him for his excellent service to LTD and its guests. Mr. Hoisington thanked the Board for the recognition and said that he appreciated his supervisor's support. He said that it was a pleasure to work at LTD and with staff, and it was exciting to see the growth in LTD.

EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 2000: Mr. Johnson then introduced Bus Operator Marcie Pope as LTD's 2000 Employee of the Year, an award that was announced at the March 18 Employee Appreciation Banquet. Ms. Pope was selected for this award in recognition of her dedication to providing excellent service to LTD's guests, her team-oriented efforts with her co-workers, and the extra effort she always put forward to make LTD a very special place to work. Ms. Pope was selected as the November 2000 Employee of the Month after being nominated by many of her co-workers, who appreciated her wonderful sense of team spirit and the extra effort she always put forth.

Mr. Johnson said that Ms. Pope performed many functions at LTD and was like the "mom" of the Operations Department. She was in tune with the rest of the operators and knew how they were feeling. Mr. Hamm added that Ms. Pope oversaw the football shuttle service, and he had participated with Ms. Pope at three UO home football games. As a result of working with Ms. Pope, he better understood what worked. Ms. Pope also organized the operator potlucks that occurred during football games. There was camaraderie and team spirit that had developed around the football service, and right in the middle of all of it was Ms. Pope. Mr. Hamm said that Ms. Pope was an exceptional and energetic member of the team.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Ms. Pope and presented her with a plaque and a lapel pin. Ms. Pope said that she was thrilled to have her own front and center parking spot at LTD for a whole year (a new EOY designated parking space). She thanked everyone who voted for her. This coming fall would be her fourth season of football and potlucks, and there would be new instructors, who would be on-the-road trainers. Those trainers recently held a meeting and included a potluck, so it was catching on, and was one way to have fun while working.

Ms. Pope thanked the Board and said that she was very honored. She added that she was grateful that the Employee of the Month sweaters were v-necked to go over her "swollen head" after receiving this award.

EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 1999: Ms. Wylie surprised Executive Assistant and Clerk of the Board Jo Sullivan by announcing that she had a presentation for her as well for having been selected as the 1999 Employee of the Year. She presented Ms. Sullivan with a lapel pin, which had not been available the previous year, and thanked her for her support of the Board of Directors.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: 1). Rob Zako of Eugene and the president of Friends of Eugene (FoE) said that the FoE had been talking to LTD for several years regarding the bus

rapid transit (BRT) project, and he was discouraged because the FoE did not feel that it was being heard by LTD. He was present at the Board meeting to inform the Board of the FoE's plan of action in opposition to the proposed BRT pilot corridor project.

The FoE BRT committee met to discuss its position on BRT and had voted 8-0 to not endorse the BRT project as currently proposed, as it would damage neighborhoods and environmental quality, and it would fail to improve transit service.

Mr. Zako said that the FoE was a group of volunteers all who agreed to not support BRT. He thought that was pretty amazing coming from a group of transit supporters, but said that LTD must have done something to turn the group against BRT.

The FoE also voted to take some further action. They planned to publish an Op-Ed piece against BRT in *The Register-Guard* opposite LTD's piece in support of BRT. The group also would be lobbying local and state officials and other community groups. In addition, the FoE already had been talking to Representative Peter DeFazio and with officials from the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA). The FoE thought it was unfortunate that there was a funding deadline and thought there should be some flexibility in that area. Lastly, the FoE was looking into a possible appeal of the Environmental Assessment (EA). Mr. Zako said that he had not reviewed many EAs, but the "Tree Huggers" were a group that had reviewed many EAs, and had been truly astounded at the inadequacy of the EA.

Mr. Zako said that he normally liked to build bridges and work issues out. The people in the FoE were anxious to take these actions, because it would feel as though something were being done, and it was easier to be against something than for something.

For the record, Mr. Zako said that there were some things the FoE was willing to discuss. The FoE wanted a BRT that they believed would be successful and would enhance transit service in the community. In order to get that, Mr. Zako provided a list of actions the FoE believed LTD should do:

a) LTD should join with the FoE in lobbying Representative DeFazio and the FTA to extend the funding for BRT, to allow more time for more design work.

b) LTD should redo the EA. The "Purpose and Need" section needed to be much more specific to actually define objectively what it was that BRT would attempt to accomplish and that would consider real alternatives. It also should thoroughly evaluate those alternatives, according to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements.

c) LTD should design a longer BRT pilot route so time savings actually could make a difference. No one would care about a four-mile route that saves only a couple of minutes in travel time.

d) LTD should connect the nodes and integrate BRT with nodal development. Bob Cortright of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) had stated in his TransPlan work that BRT and nodal development had to be integrated. Mr. Zako said that, currently, he did not see where the nodes were along the proposed BRT pilot route. Maybe they were not there, and LTD needed to be pushing Eugene and Springfield to get their nodal development acts together and then build BRT to go through those nodes and have the stations where the nodes were.

e) LTD should insist on a TransPlan that did not subsidize cars, but actually leveled the playing field. LTD had an opportunity, with its two Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) representatives at a recent MPC meeting, to endorse having cars pay for the cost of maintaining roads. That initiative failed. By not doing that, cars were not paying their full cost, and they ended up being subsidized and less expensive relative to riding buses. The playing field needed to be leveled in order to make buses more competitive.

f) The FoE wanted the Board to work with them to build consensus in the community to actually have the community be behind BRT rather than feeling like it was being railroaded into having to accept BRT because the funding would disappear.

g) Finally, the FoE thought it would be to the Board's benefit to ask to be elected rather than appointed by the Governor. Mr. Zako said that he realized the Board did not have that power, but he thought the Board could pass a resolution stating that it believed being elected to be a good idea. The Board could direct Ms. Lynch to lobby the state legislature to make LTD's Board locally elected.

Mr. Zako said that the FoE would move forward with its plan of action, but told the Board not to worry, as the FoE was made up of a few volunteers and did not have a paid staff. There was much support for BRT from the community, and LTD had a lot of money. LTD probably would get BRT, but it would make the FoE feel good to do the things planned in opposition of the current proposed pilot corridor plan. However, if LTD wanted to talk to the FoE and to consider the issues as presented, and if LTD wanted BRT to work, the FoE wanted to talk to LTD.

2) Sally Nunn of Eugene said that she was one of the tree huggers that Mr. Zako had referred to. She truly believed that LTD needed to go back to drawing board with the proposed BRT pilot corridor. As envisioned, the pilot project would disrupt neighborhoods, compromise existing businesses, adversely impact efficient traffic flow, and destroy the aesthetics and environmental function of Eugene's best and most beloved meridian.

Ms. Nunn said that the current EA had many problems. For instance, mitigating storm water of newly planted trees after removing 20 or more mature trees would take 60 plus years to accomplish. A case in point was the Ferry Street Bridge area. Did those trees keep rain from washing pollutants from the streets into the storm drains and into our rivers and streams? It was unsound science, unless LTD was confusing Eugene's streets with old growth forest, where this theory might actually work.

In addition, as a small business owner, Ms. Nunn said that she found the bottleneck depicted in the after picture of the 11th and Hilyard streets redo completely unacceptable. Her vehicle time significantly would increase as she attempted to access clients in the university area. With the need to carry equipment and to keep a tight time schedule, the bus was not an option for her. She would find her vehicle miles traveled much longer as a result of BRT as proposed.

Ms. Nunn said that, furthermore, as a long-time member of the Oregon Natural Resources Council, she had learned that while the Council had once supported the initial concept of BRT, it now had withdrawn that support and had decided to condition future support on a plan it expected to succeed.

Ms. Nunn said that it was not for her to say where a superior route might occur, but if the Eugene train station to the Springfield bus station route with shuttles to key substations had not been explored, she implored LTD to do so and soon. Ms. Nunn said that considering the stated effect that LTD expected its ridership to walk to fewer stations as a trade-off for speed, the train corridor route had acceptable proximity. This route would encompass important major employers, including the Waterfront Research Park, University of Oregon, Fifth Street Market, EWEB, and the new federal building. The increased speed and desired efficiency also could be attained along the rail corridor, and without adversely impacting traffic on Franklin Boulevard. It would create a win-win situation, and in doing so, would avoid removing historic trees, a loss of "Dad's Gate," or the enmity of Glenwood citizens.

She asked LTD to please go back to drawing board and try again. The risk was that without an acceptable plan, as increasing public and private support eroded, LTD stood to lose the funding. She urged LTD to make significant progress in seeking solutions, so the important transit options would be available in the future.

Ms. Wylie noted that the current BRT pilot corridor plan did not remove the 20 trees. Mr. Viggiano confirmed that only two historic trees would be removed for the Agate Street station, but the other 20 trees would not be removed.

**MOTION
VOTE**

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved adoption of the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for April 18, 2001, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote. The April 18, 2001, Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the March 21, 2001, regular Board meeting.

FY 2001-02 FARE POLICY: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson said that at the February 21 work session, staff reviewed a revised fare policy with Board members. While the material presented was correct, it was later learned that the policy document that had been included in the Board agenda packet was incomplete. In order to ensure that the public record was accurate and complete, the entire fare policy document was included in the current agenda packet, and staff were seeking the Board's approval of the correct and complete version of the policy.

In addition, the Board had requested a review of the day pass/transfer program, and Ms. Hellekson provided that review in the agenda packet.

**MOTION
VOTE**

Mr. Gaydos moved approval of the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-013: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adopts the Fare Policy as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

SECOND READING AND ADOPTION OF TENTH AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35, SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES: Ms. Hellekson distributed an amended Ordinance 35 to the Board members. She said that a previous edition that did not include some corrections to the Ordinance had been included in the agenda packet.

Ms. Hellekson said that public hearings had been held on the proposed fare structure for FY 2001-02 at the February and March 2001 Board meetings. In February, staff were directed to make the following changes to the District's fare structure:

1. Increase the adult cash fare from \$1.00 to \$1.25, effective July 1, 2001
2. Increase the youth cash fare and reduced price cash fare from \$.50 to \$.60, effective July 1, 2001
3. Increase the day pass price from \$2.00 to \$2.50, effective July 1, 2001
4. Increase the price charged for group pass programs by 4.1 percent, effective January 1, 2002
5. Increase the price of the RideSource and RideSource Escort fares from \$1.75 to \$2.00 per one-way trip, effective July 1, 2001

The fare changes needed to be implemented by ordinance.

MOTION Ms. Lauritsen moved that Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only.
VOTE Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

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

MOTION Mr. Kleger then moved approval of LTD Resolution No. 2001-014: "Be it resolved that the LTD Board of Directors hereby adopts Lane Transit District Tenth Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.
VOTE

MISSION STATEMENT AND VISION: Mr. Hamm said that the vision statement was discussed at the January 2001 work session and staff had made revisions according to discussions that had been held both with employees and with the Board.

This vision statement gave LTD a foundation to build the team philosophy from the core values. Guiding principles were imperative for employees to guide and judge themselves by. It was important that the mission be easily understood by staff and the community. Mr. Hamm then read the mission: "LTD Your Partner for a Livable Community. We enhance the community's quality of life by delivering reliable public transit service; offering innovative service that reduces dependency on the automobile; and providing progressive leadership for the community's transportation needs."

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved approval of LTD Resolution No. 2001-015: "Be it resolved that the LTD Board of Directors hereby adopts the revised LTD Mission and Vision Statement as presented by staff on April 18, 2001." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion.

Mr. Melnick said that he was concerned that the Mission Statement and Vision did not include a reference to energy efficiency or sustainability, etc., as a value that was held by LTD. Part of what was discussed at the work session was that by reducing dependence on the automobile, one also would accomplish a reduction in the dependence upon certain types of fuels, etc. He thought it would be appropriate to have something along those lines

in a vision statement. Implementation was another issue, but to be a mass transit-focused agency, he thought not having it as part of the vision could be seen as lacking. Mr. Hamm said that sustainability was discussed in the development of each of the sections in the statement, it was assumed as part of the efficiency.

Mr. Melnick asked that the record indicate that when the District referred to sustainability of the communities, it included environmental efficiency as part of that term. Other members agreed.

VOTE There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie called for a vote on the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote.

MOTION **BOARD POSITION ON OPENING OF BROADWAY STREET:** Mr. Gaydos moved approval of LTD Resolution #2001-016: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors supports the reopening of Broadway between Oak and Charnelton in Eugene and encourages the Eugene City Council to place the matter before the voters, and in doing so, that there be respect and preservation, to the extent possible, of the existing artwork."
VOTE Mr. Melnick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by acclamation.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: 1) **Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):** Ms. Wylie provided a review of the MPC meeting of April 12, 2001. There was a motion before MPC that LTD participation in MPC be limited to issues of mass transit only as opposed to the current level of participation in general transportation issues. The issue was brought by Lane County Commissioner Bill Dwyer. LTD had presented federal policy that required transit agencies to be at the table for planning, etc. The motion did not pass.

There also was a long list of activities that were requested to be changed in TransPlan that were generated by a letter from Lane County Commissioner Peter Sorenson. Mr. Viggiano said that three issues were brought forward by the Eugene City Council in response to Commissioner Sorenson's letter. One issue was to set more funding aside for nodal development. That measure failed at MPC. It actually had the majority of the vote, but MPC bylaws require at least one vote from every jurisdiction. The second issue was a change to the BRT policy. Ms. Hocken had recommended wording changes to the definition and intent in order to strengthen the policy. The measure appeared to be supported, but the County raised a concern, and the issue was tabled. Staff believed the concern could be addressed and that at the next MPC meeting, MPC would endorse that change. The third issue that was brought up in response to Commissioner Sorenson's letter had to do with setting priorities for operations, maintenance, and preservation funding, and that measure failed as well.

Mr. Viggiano noted that another measure was requested to set priority for funding within the bike program for priority bike miles, and that measure passed. The measure was not directly related to Commissioner Sorenson's letter.

Mr. Viggiano said that another issue at the MPC meeting was the addition of a new chapter in TransPlan addressing issues that would be addressed as part of the next

TransPlan review in three years, and that MPC decided that a new chapter was not needed at this time.

The next MPC meeting was scheduled for May 10, 2001.

2) **BRT Steering Committee**: The meeting scheduled for April 3, 2001, had been canceled. The next meeting was scheduled for May 1, 2001.

3) **Statewide Livability Forum**: Ms. Lauritsen would attend during the month of April and would report back to the Board in May.

4) **United Front Trip to Washington, D.C.**: Ms. Wylie and Mr. Gaydos provided a review of the recent lobbying trip. Mr. Gaydos thought the effort was worthwhile. He got to know some of LTD's partners better and established some personal relations that would assist in future undertakings. He praised Ms. Lynch for organizing the effort and for ensuring that everyone got to the right places at the right time. The schedule was rigorous, and there was an opportunity to talk to legislative staff people. The legislators did an excellent job spending time with and listening to the delegation. The legislators and staff were appreciative that Lane County had a United Front that was well organized in presenting information. It also had been a good experience to talk to people at the FTA, and Mr. Gaydos was impressed with the amount of time the FTA spent with the group. The FTA staff spent a lot of time talking about BRT and the concept and how it fit in federal programs. Mr. Gaydos said that Ms. Wylie also had done an excellent job in talking with FTA Administrator Edward Thomas. LTD was successful at being supportive of partner projects. Collectively, it was an effective effort, and the jurisdictions were supportive of each other.

Ms. Wylie added that the group worked very hard and established some good relationships. She believed it had been a very worthwhile trip.

5) **Eugene City Council**: Mr. Melnick reported on the April 9, 2001, City Council meeting in which the BRT project was discussed. Mr. Melnick said that Ms. Hocken made a brief presentation about BRT, and the Council discussed the project, but there was no vote. The Council recognized that the Planning Commission had voted in favor of the project.

6) **Springfield City Council**: Ms. Wylie and Ms. Lauritsen attended the April 16, 2001, Springfield City Council meeting in which the BRT project was discussed. Ms. Lauritsen said that she thought it had been a very positive meeting. The Springfield technical staff made the presentation, and there was not much opposition. The Council would discuss the project again at a later date as well as at the joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council meeting on May 14.

LTD GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Hamm said that the biggest issue was a change in the oversight of contracted services for RideSource. Historically, LTD had an agreement with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), who then contracted on LTD's behalf with a private operator to operate RideSource. The operation of that was not changing, but the person who administered the program at LCOG, Terry Parker, would be joining the LTD

staff rather than having LTD fund the position at LCOG. There had been much discussion with the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) and with the LCOG board, and it appeared to make sense to everyone. Ms. Parker would be joining LTD on July 1, 2001, and her position would become part of the General Management Performance Group. Her office would be located in the administrative area near reception. Staff were very excited, and Ms. Parker would bring to LTD a better connection to rural communities and special-needs members of the community at large. LTD would provide planning resource assistance to the Special Transportation Program that previously had not been available. Ms. Parker was excited about it as well. The contract with Special Mobility Services would come due later this year, and LTD would put out the request for proposals. Staff would make a selection based on proposals received. The operation of the RideSource service would not be brought in-house, but only the administrative oversight.

With regard to the shuttle buses, the delivery date was pushed back to late June, which still gave LTD sufficient time to program the buses into the maintenance function and to introduce them to the community.

MARCH 2001 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Ms. Hellekson said that at this point in the fiscal year, staff remained somewhat concerned about the local economy. After two fairly strong months of payroll tax revenue, it had shown signs of weakening. Staff were cautiously optimistic that payroll tax revenues would meet budget by fiscal year end. Staff also were equally, if not more so, focused on the budget proposal for next year (FY 2001-2002). The first budget hearing was scheduled for Wednesday, April 25, at 6:30 p.m. Staff had changed the presentation format this year as there were no new members on the Budget Committee. Staff would present a big-picture view of LTD's business plan, rather than the typical department-by-department budget presentation, which would put a greater burden on the committee members to carefully review the budget notebooks.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT UPDATE: Mr. Viggiano explained the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. He said that when the draft EA was released, the public was given an opportunity to provide comments to the District. Comments were to be addressed in the final EA. It should be expected that changes are made in the draft EA in response to comments and concerns. The final EA that reflects those changes becomes the legally binding document for the project.

Mr. Viggiano also responded to a comment at the meeting regarding mitigation for increased impervious surface. The EA recommended mitigation by planting additional trees, which would intercept rainwater before it reached the ground. The rainwater would evaporate from the leaves of the trees. One could determine the age and type of tree and the size of the tree, and make a calculation of the overall quantity as a way to mitigate an increase in the impervious service. Some people believed that to be a good approach, but it had not been scientifically proven. This approach, however, is fairly new and still needs some testing and analysis. Consequently, the recommendation in the EA will be to use more traditional methods of mitigating storm water.

CORRESPONDENCE: Ms. Wylie said that copies of the correspondence to and from the Board were included in the packet for review.

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE GROUP REPORT: Ms. Wylie asked if Ms. Lynch had anything to add to her monthly report. Ms. Lynch said that she had nothing to add. She was following about 150 bills at the State Legislature. There was no transportation funding package before the Legislature at this session, so there was less work. It currently was a tense time at the Legislature, because they were at a crucial point where they needed to decide what actions they would take.

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT (March 2001): Mr. Kleger referred to the ridership figures in the performance report and said that when he joined the Board about seven years ago, LTD was carrying just more than 4 million rides per year, but he noticed that currently, LTD was carrying more than 6 million rides. This was an incredible rate of growth. The only thing wrong with it was the LTD was not keeping up with the growth of the community. He was disappointed and discouraged that those who most wanted LTD to go faster were not willing to support BRT unless it met all of their expectations. They were willing to "make the perfect the enemy of the good." He believed that LTD needed to make compromises with its partner governments, or LTD would get nowhere at all. The very compromises that LTD made were looked upon by some as reasons to completely shoot down the project.

Mr. Gaydos said that there was a 2050 group that LCOG was coordinating. LCOG had asked Mr. Gaydos to facilitate a recent meeting; however, since he was an LTD Board member, he later was asked just to participate and not facilitate. The group was charged with taking a 50-year look at governments around the metro area and at the Eugene and Springfield areas in general. He believed LTD should be involved. For instance, A Westfir City Councilor was interested in having LTD provide service to Westfir, and perhaps sometime within the next 50 years that would make sense. Mr. Gaydos said that he was not participating as an official representative of LTD, and he thought LTD staff should be involved with the group. Ms. Wylie said that in the future, LTD could be providing commuter vans, or some other such service, to outlying areas such as Westfir.

ADJOURNMENT: There were no further discussions, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 7:23 p.m.



Board Secretary