

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, November 19, 2001

page 8 corrected  
per 12/19 Bd mtg  
Benny to sign

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on November 15, 2001, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special meeting on Monday, November 19, 2001, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Rob Bennett, Vice President/President 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

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board Vice President Rob Bennett. Mr. Melnick was not yet present.

**WORK SESSION**

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Mr. Bennett informed the Board that Ms. Wylie was not feeling well and would not be at the meeting.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** Mr. Bennett stated that an executive session needed to be added to the beginning of the work session agenda. Staff had received an opinion letter from District counsel and needed to discuss it with the Board. Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board move into executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(f), to consider records that are exempt by law from public inspection, and pursuant to ORS 40.224, lawyer-client privilege. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kleger and carried by unanimous vote.

**Executive Session:** Mr. Melnick arrived near the beginning the executive session, at 5:43 p.m.

**Return to Regular Session:** Ms. Hocken moved that the Board return to public session. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote. The Board returned to regular session at 6:05 p.m.

**Presentation of Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for Fiscal Year 2000-2001:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson presented the CAFR and introduced the auditors and Assistant Finance Manager Carol James. She handed out a revised Executive Summary for the CAFR, in which one number had been corrected.



Ms. Hellekson discussed the District's current financial situation and the downturn in the local economy. She said that the good news was that LTD was not in a crisis situation; the District had weathered this particular challenge just fine so far and had plans to correct the course for the future. Depending on where the economy bottomed out, LTD could be in very good shape to recover quickly. She encouraged the Board to read the entire Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for additional information about LTD's performance during the year. She explained that the farebox recovery rate remained down because the District's revenues flattened out and expenses continued to increase. However, it was still in the acceptable range for properties of the same size. The last page of the executive summary of the CAFR showed that system productivity had increased for the first time in three years, before the comprehensive service redesign (CSR), which was designed to improve system productivity. Staff were encouraged by the fact that productivity had increased and likely would increase even more with the new service that was in place.

Mr. Melnick asked about the 8 percent increase in fuel prices, and whether LTD was seeing any benefit from the recent drop in fuel prices. Ms. Hellekson said that if current fuel prices remained the same or lower for the rest of the fiscal year, there would be a \$186,000 positive variance in the current-year budget. That was not put on the table as part of the budget balancing exercise because staff did not want to bank on something that could change, given how volatile fuel prices had been in the last few years.

**Monthly Financial Report:** Ms. Hellekson next discussed the financial report on page 60 of the agenda packet. Payroll taxes were ahead of the previous year, primarily due to the Oregon Department of Revenue's aggressive past-due collection effort. Interest income was still down. The corrective actions that had been taken year-to-date on budget would produce a large part of the savings staff were looking for in future years, but personnel services were still too high, so staff would be looking at opportunities to improve efficiency. She said that there was quite a bit of room to move in service efficiency, that there were negative variances in liability insurance coverage, and that any secondary insurance seemed to have double-digit increases after September 11. Mr. Bennett asked what LTD did with its reserve money relative to interest, and whether LTD could buy bonds. Ms. Hellekson said that there was a long list of approved investments that the State Treasurer's office managed. LTD essentially could invest in a large number of things, including government issues. For a long time, the Local Government Investment Pool's (LGIP) interest earnings were so good that it made the most sense to invest there. Mr. Bennett wondered if, because government bonds were guaranteed, that was one of the options. Accounting Supervisor Carol James said that because the LGIP had done so well in the past, LTD had not expanded its investment portfolio as well as it could. LTD was limited by state statute as to what it could invest in and, other than T-bills, LTD was not eligible to go out more than 18 months without a state-approved plan. Ms. Hellekson said that the Board Finance Committee would be meeting on December 4 to review the pricing policy and proposed fare changes, debt issues, and a preliminary Capital Improvements Program (CIP).

Mr. Melnick said that someone high in administration at the UO commented to him that LTD should not be losing any money on the sports shuttle, so staff might want to pursue that issue.



Ms. Hocken asked about the Special Transportation Fund (STF) monies from the Lane Council of Governments that were higher than LTD expected to receive. Ms. Hellekson said that staff were waiting until all the out-of-district special transportation services contracts had been transferred to LTD and then would take a supplemental budget to the Board for approval in December or January. Ms. Hocken asked if all those extra funds were for service outside the District. Ms. James explained that the funds that had been accumulated from the cigarette tax (Special Transportation Fund revenues) were pass-through funds that had gone through LTD to LCOG. LCOG then distributed them to programs. These extra funds were carryovers and some were dedicated to capital, with specific plans as matches for capital, and some were for operating programs. It was about the same split as the in-district money (80/20). Ms. Hellekson said that the transition had been challenging and that LTD had not had any idea what some of those contracts had entailed but now had the opportunity to professionalize the program, clean up all of the contracts, and know exactly what the service cost, where it was going, and what it was doing.

Mr. Kleger commented that when the Special Transportation Fund was first established, the first year's amount of STF money arrived in Lane County and did not get spent right away. The Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee (STFAC) established that money as a capital sinking fund for capital match. Most of that original money was gone. Because of the way the State required things to be done, some was in an out-of-district pot, some was in-district, and some in the last year was moving between the two for South Lane Wheels. The committee strongly recommended that additional local resources be added to the capital match fund and it looked like that would continue.

**Items for Information:** This concluded the scheduled work session items. The Board began discussing the items for information for this meeting.

**Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):** Ms. Hocken reported that Region 2 (the southern Willamette Valley) was expected to receive modernization (new construction) money of about \$68 million. Of that amount, the Eugene/Springfield area would receive \$18 million, subject to approval by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The local area's project for partial funding with this money would be the I-5/Beltline interchange revisions. MPC also was asked to approve the prioritization of projects in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for 2004-07. Ms. Hocken commented that a lot of the budget numbers in that list were placeholders because they were so far out into the future. **Bus Rapid Transit Steering Committee:** Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano reported on the November 6 BRT Steering Committee meeting. He provided an update on LTD's intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) with the local governments. Eugene and Springfield IGAs were ready to be signed. The Steering Committee also had discussed the next BRT corridor, and the Board would be asked that evening to select the next corridor in Springfield. At the last meeting, the Board had requested some information on the Eugene corridor, which was included in the agenda packet, in response to the direction of the City Council to focus on two alternatives—Highway 99 and Coburg Road—eliminating the West 11<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup> option. Those issues were discussed at the last Steering Committee meeting, but most of the time at was spent discussing the BRT vehicle issue. It seemed best to bring that discussion to the full Board after Mr. Hamm and Maintenance Manager Ron Berkshire viewed vehicles in Europe, so staff were considering a possible January Board work session on vehicles. Mr. Bennett said he had been the chair of the Steering



Committee and his term on the Board was expiring, so the Board needed to select a new member and a new chair. This was scheduled as an action item for that evening, including the question whether the chair of the committee should be a Board member or a community representative. Board Finance Committee: Ms. Hocken reported that at the November 6 Finance Committee meeting, the committee discussed mostly the issues discussed by the Board at the November 16-17 work session/retreat. The Committee did spend a little time with the format of the monthly financial statements. Statewide Livability Forum: No meeting was held. Oregon Transportation Conference: Ms. Lauritsen reported that it was an excellent conference and asked Mr. Hamm to report in more detail. He stated that LTD received the award for Transit System of the Year. He participated on a panel with Congressman Earl Blumenauer, ODOT Director Bruce Warner, and Salem Area Transit General Manager Jeff Hamm, who was the chair of the Oregon Transit Association (OTA) strategic planning committee. Representative Blumenauer had been the advocate at the capitol not only for bicycles but for growth management and nodal development, as well, and talked about his perspective on those issues. Overall, there were a number of tracks and sessions for both rural and larger systems. Tri-Met's General Manager Fred Hansen participated and said that the larger bus systems had the resources to be an incubator for technology and training, and that there may be opportunities to participate with Tri-Met in these kinds of things, to provide an economy of scale and a partnership.

The Board took a short break, from 6:32 p.m. to 6:39 p.m.

**EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH – NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2001**: Mr. Bennett said that the Board was fortunate to meet two Employees of the Month that evening. November Employee of the Month – Finance Manager Diane Hellekson introduced Payroll Specialist Jeff Hoss. She said that he was an outstanding employee who worked very hard and was very giving and did his job really, really well. She was thrilled that he was nominated by a bus operator, and said that he had received commendation letters from LTD's deferred compensation providers and members of the public. Mr. Bennett presented a letter, plaque, and pin to Mr. Hoss, who had received his monetary award earlier. Mr. Hoss said that it was a great honor to be given an award like this when he considered the company he was in: He said he worked with some of the brightest people he had ever known. He added that as a company, LTD employees strove for excellence in everything they did and that he had always wanted to be part of a group like that.

December Employee of the Month – Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Roxi Moore, who had been an LTD employee since 1995. He said that her safety and on-time performance records were excellent and that she recently became an instructor, and that only the best, in both skills and attitudes, got to be instructors. He said that she had the best attitude and lots of enthusiasm, and that she cared about the job and the welfare of LTD and its guests, which showed in the kind of service she provided. Ms. Moore would be taking vacation in order to drive buses the entire three weeks of the Olympics. Mr. Bennett presented Ms. Moore with her letter, plaque, pin, and monetary award. Ms. Moore stated that she really never dreamed that driving public transportation would make her become a better person inside, but she had grown in dealing with the public every day, and had learned to understand, respect, and care about people. She stated, "Just solving a transportation or communication problem gets me misty





sometimes. We all are a big community and family out there and it's a big part of my heart. It's a blast and, like I tell my riders, "If you can't go to a party, be one."

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Mr. Bennett opened the meeting for audience participation. (1) Dan Fromhertz of Springfield spoke first. He said he was trying to make the bus service better. He was a veteran of Viet Nam and Desert Storm and had ridden public transportation in all parts of the world. He started riding LTD and had not missed one month since 1994. He said that he pretty much knew all the drivers and they knew him, and that Ms. Moore did make a party on her bus. He said that his issue was trying to get around town faster and better. For example, traveling from Thurston Station to Bailey Hill used to take three hours, and now it took 1.5 hours on a good day. He stated that a huge retirement community was starting in the Thurston area, and that several multiplex condominiums were being built. He thought that there should be a bus traveling on Highway 105, leaving the Thurston station and going to Mohawk, where people could go to Wal-Mart, Winco, and Albertsons, then traveling down Olympic to Fred Meyer and Safeway, then on I-105 to Coburg Road and somehow to Greenhill. He commented on the policy to reimburse guests for taxi rides when bus service is down completely and said that to go from his home on 15<sup>th</sup> Street to where he worked cost \$13 with a 10 percent discount, and he would have to do that twice on Thanksgiving. He said that his cost would be \$26 out of his pocket. He was grateful that LTD would reimburse him \$10, but it seemed that it would be helpful if he were reimbursed for a two-way trip with a bus pass. He added that on Sunday nights he had to go to work two hours early because LTD was closed down.

(2) The second speaker was Laura Jack of Eugene. She said that she worked for Peace Health in the business office, and was at the meeting to ask the transit system of the year to reinstate service way out W 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Eugene. She took her job because there was bus service and she didn't want to drive a car. She wanted to know what she needed to do to get bus service back. She offered to supply staff with numbers of people who had taken the bus from other businesses, and said that a new telemarketing business was going in, which she described as a lower-wage business that would generate a lot of riders. She wondered if an existing route could add a loop out there, and what kind of ridership that would require. Mr. Bennett said that the Board could not really have that kind of discussion with her that evening, but that staff could get back to her. He explained that normally the Board heard testimony and then later got back to the person testifying. He said that LTD had just gone through a comprehensive service redesign and that a lot of effort went into which routes were established. He said that LTD would run routes that could generate the minimum amount necessary to help the District with its budgeting. Ms. Jack said that she had been e-mailing with staff and was not sure where to go as the next recourse. She added that before Hyundai buses used to turn around at Molecular Probes. Mr. Bennett asked staff to help respond.

Service Planning & Marketing Administrator Andy Vobora stated that he had received copies of some of the e-mail messages Ms. Jack referred to. He mentioned other routes that also fell below the standards and did not meet the criteria for the CSR. He acknowledged that the area she referred to was one where things continued to happen and said that new companies had contacted LTD. However, 70 people per shift were not enough to support bus service. Those employees might have to form a partnership with bigger businesses and share in the costs, so LTD could design service for them. He explained that



deviating other routes was not as simple as it seemed. Staff were trying to keep the lines of communication open with other companies, similar to Gateway Street and Coburg Road. Ms. Jack asked if 21 riders per trip would be a good starting point, and Mr. Vobora replied that it would.

(3) Mamie Arnold of Eugene explained that she had been in a *Register-Guard* article about LTD's former holiday lights tour service (JoyRide) over the weekend. She talked about calls she received from others and explained the importance of the JoyRide. She said that it was a tradition for many families, and that LTD needed to realize that the older people in the community enjoyed this so much because they did not drive and some did not have families. The JoyRide was an avenue for them to get out and enjoy the songs and festivities on the bus. She said that with the current world of turmoil and people feeling very tense, it was a time to bring peace and tranquility in our community. She stated that people who go to all the work to trim their homes liked to share what they did. Just to watch the faces of the people going by made her realize that this was a wonderful season of the year. She enjoyed being out on the porch watching the buses go by completely filled. She recommended raising prices if LTD did not break even on the costs; she thought that people would pay more. She said that she could help get volunteers to help with the singing and in other capacities and offered to go to firms and help do whatever was necessary. She asked the Board to really consider this—to make Eugene a community that could stand for the people and give them the joy and friendship and fun during this holiday season.

Mr. Bennett thanked Ms. Arnold for addressing the Board. He explained that the fare portion of bus service was a very small part of the cost, and amounted to somewhere in the 20 percent range for all of LTD's service. He said that even a significant increase in fares would not make a significant dent in the substantial cost for this service. He said that the corporate sponsorships were the key to successful service in the past, and if LTD had those back, it would provide the service because LTD loved doing it. However, the District was faced with declining revenue and the Board and staff were working really hard to hang onto the main service. The Board did not want to offer anything extra at the expense of regular service. Ms. Arnold said that if LTD would give her a list of sponsors, she would be willing to go out and see if she could get them back. Ms. Hocken said that there obviously wasn't time to do that this year so any efforts would have to be for the next year. Mr. Vobora explained that there were a number of issues. A year ago, LTD had decided not to offer the JoyRide because staff resources were needed on the CSR. This year there were budget restraints. If LTD were offering the JoyRide, tickets would have been printed, there would be a place to operate from, etc. There were a number of logistical problems, especially since the District just lost three of its marketing staff during the budget cutbacks. Basketball shuttles, requiring 10 buses, typically conflicted with JoyRide service. He said he was not sure that offering JoyRide service was LTD's highest priority at that time.

Mr. Bennett stated that Ms. Arnold had made a strong case for JoyRide service, but that he had a hard time with anything even as popular as this when LTD was not meeting its regular service needs. Mr. Vobora said that two years ago, the JoyRide required 60 hours of staff time and \$15,000 to \$16,000. Last year Laidlaw stepped up to provide some of this service, and LTD had printed the route for people to drive. Ms. Arnold asked if LTD would run JoyRide if she were to get \$15,000. Mr. Bennett replied that he could not tell her at that point because of the organizational effort that would have to be substituted for other duties.



LTD had just eliminated 13 administrative staff positions, and its revenue numbers were not very good at that point because LTD's success depended on everyone else doing well. He said he would listen to other members of the Board and they would talk about this with staff.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Consent Calendar:** The consent calendar consisted of the minutes of the September 17, 2001, special Board meeting; minutes of the September 19, 2001, canceled regular Board meeting; minutes of the October 17, 2001, canceled regular Board meeting; and Special Transportation Advisory Committee name and bylaws changes.

**MOTION**

Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt LTD Resolution No. 2001-039: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for November 19, 2001, is approved as presented." Mr. Melnick seconded. Ms. Hocken asked about inconsistencies in some of the sections of the special transportation bylaws. Mr. Hamm explained that the only changes made so far were to reflect the integration of RideSource into the LTD structure and Special Transportation Program Administrator Terry Parker's move from the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) to LTD. A subcommittee was scheduled to meet to go through the bylaws more thoroughly. The current update was only to reflect the transition to LTD and change the committee name. The committee would ask the Board to adopt the bylaws again after a review in more detail. Mr. Kleger stated that the bylaws had been evolving for just under 20 years and that the committee was well aware that the bylaws needed a major review. Ms. Hocken said she was comfortable with that explanation and leaving the item on the consent calendar.

**VOTE**

Mr. Bennett asked for a show of hands in favor of the motion to approve the consent calendar. The motion carried by unanimous vote, 5 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Melnick voting in favor and none opposed.

**ACCEPTANCE OF INDEPENDENT AUDIT REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2001:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that LTD was required by law to have an independent audit annually, and that the results of the audit were reported to the State. For the past several years, LTD had submitted its Comprehensive Annual Financial Report to the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada as part of a competition for awards of excellence. She informed the Board that LTD received its fifth-in-a-row award the previous spring. The City of Eugene held the state record, with 22 or so in a row.

Ms. Hellekson reminded the Board that it had three direct reports: the general manager, the District's attorney, and the District's independent auditor. She then introduced Chuck Swank of Grove, Mueller & Swank, P.C. Mr. Swank said that Ms. Hellekson had covered most of this topic already that evening. He told the Board that they had a financial report they could be proud of, that Ms. James did an excellent job of putting the financial statements together, and that the audit procedures went very well. In explaining why there was no management letter, he said that the auditors had not found a point that they felt they needed to bring to the Board's attention. They had discussed some smaller issues with Ms. James and Ms. Hellekson.



Mr. Swank said that governments were facing a whole new realm of accounting pronouncements, in GASB 34. Ms. James already was working to make sure LTD was prepared to implement GASB 34 in June 2003. He said it would be a lot different for the accounting staff to put together the first time, but should result in a more useful document.

Mr. Swank told the Board that they had a staff they could be proud of, and that he was giving LTD a clean report. The independent auditor's report was unqualified; there were no findings in the federal requirements under the single audit act; and the State of Oregon reporting requirements also resulted in a clean report. He thanked the Board and said he appreciated the opportunity to work for them.

Mr. Kleger asked if there was anything that needed or would be beneficial to be done at the Board level to make the record keeping and reporting more effective. Mr. Swank replied that there was nothing that he was aware of that they had discussed. He said that LTD's accounting system was an evolving system, like any other system. The auditors looked fairly hard at the changes each year. Because LTD was a recipient of federal funds, the auditors were required to look at how the District processed financial information, both from the financial side and the federal requirements side. He said that they had given LTD management letter points in the past and those had been addressed expediently.

Ms. Lauritsen asked about the reason for GASB 34. Mr. Swank said that LTD's financials would change least of any entity that the auditors were associated with. LTD already reported in a single column, which allowed the reader a better idea of how to compare a public entity to a business. The idea was to have a set of financials that more closely resembled the business world. He said that this was a tough objective, because often what the governmental sector used financial statements for was quite different than what they were used for in the business sector.

MOTION Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-040:  
VOTE Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors accepts the Independent Audit Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2001." Ms. Hocken seconded, and the passed unanimously on a roll call vote, 5 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Melnick voting in favor and no one opposed.

**BUS RAPID TRANSIT: SPRINGFIELD CORRIDOR SELECTION:** Mr. Viggiano said that the recommendation was to select the Pioneer Parkway corridor in Springfield. In the agenda packet was material that went to the BRT Steering Committee in September. The Steering Committee unanimously supported this recommendation, as did the Springfield City Council. He said that there was considerable enthusiasm on the part of Springfield for this particular corridor.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved LTD Resolution No. 2001-041: "Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors selects the Pioneer Parkway corridor as the next bus rapid transit corridor to be developed in Springfield." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken commented that even though the City of Springfield and the Steering Committee were very enthusiastic about this, she did not think the Board should therefore feel that it would be a "slam dunk" to get the whole corridor in the form LTD wanted it to be in, because LTD still did not have complete commitment from the City of Springfield for as much exclusive right-of-way as the





District might want to have. The Pioneer Parkway extension basically was a new development so there was an opportunity for lots of exclusive right-of-way, but there were some troublesome spots where LTD may need more than the City was currently thinking that it might need to give.

VOTE

The motion then passed unanimously on a roll call vote, 5 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Melnick voting in favor and no one opposed.

**FISCAL YEARS 2004-07 STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) PRIORITY SETTING:** Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner called the Board's attention to the materials in the agenda packet, which included materials reviewed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) on October 11. She said that it was very early in the priority-setting process. Because MPC took action to approve it as a preliminary priority list, staff wanted to take it to the Board for consideration and to take action to endorse what MPC had approved. She said that there would be other opportunities to discuss priority projects and make any changes, and it would be 2003 before the list was finalized. She thought that the TDM project list would come up for discussion by the Board as a result of the budget constraints being considered at LTD. Ms. Hocken said that the Board had talked about some of this at the Board retreat, regarding trying to get support from partner agencies for TDM and the fact that this was a TransPlan goal, and the area was expecting some increased STP money, which was federal money that flowed through the State, and whether it would be appropriate to earmark some of that increased funding for TransPlan proposals. She also wanted to point out that she had been told that this list of TDM proposals was fairly tentative. For several years, LTD had received on the order of \$200,000, and had requested around \$500,00 this time. This time, the State was saying that LTD may receive about \$100,000 of that, so appeared that there would be a real shortfall between what had been done in the past and what the District hoped to do in the future, based on the money that would be available. Ms. Gardner said that it was worth pointing out that Tom Schwetz's memo to MPC stated that with the update of the census and the transportation management area, this region would receive more money, and that would be reflected in the 2004-07 STIP for the first time. It was not yet known how much those funds would be, so the project list was not being based on an assumed amount of money. She said that the TDM program had not been optimistic of an increase in funding, but LTD never had a sense in advance what the funding would be. Still it made sense to generate the list of projects. The key would be how the projects were prioritized and how the top priorities were funded. Ms. Lauritsen asked if Ms. Hocken, as one of LTD's MPC representatives, was in favor of the way the priorities were listed on pages 49-51 of the packet. Ms. Hocken said that what she understood in conversations with LTD staff was that the list was not necessarily in priority order. If LTD received the requested \$500,000, these would be things that LTD would consider doing; however, it was hard to predict things that were so far out, because what was going on in the local economy affected what was done for TDM. However, she said that she would support this list and the fact that these projects were included even though they might not be in the final approved priority list.

MOTION

Ms. Lauritsen moved LTD Resolution No. 2001-042: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors recommends to the Metropolitan Policy Committee the proposed project priority list for inclusion in the 2004-2007 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program." Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. There were no further comments, and the



VOTE motion carried unanimously, 5 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Melnick voting in favor and no one opposed.

**APPOINTMENT TO BUS RAPID TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND BOARD**

**BRT COMMITTEE:** Mr. Bennett said it would be inappropriate for him to make this appointment, since he was the one who was retiring. This issue was deferred to the Board Chair. Mr. Bennett asked if Ms. Hocken was willing to continue on the BRT Steering Committee. She said that she was, and that she and Ms. Wylie had discussed briefly the fact that, up to this point, the chair of the Board BRT committee had been the chair of the BRT Steering Committee. Ms. Wylie was not sure that this model should be continued; there were pros and cons. There were non-LTD Board members on the Steering Committee who would be good chairs, but there was a continuity question, because when Board committee met separately from the Steering Committee, it was good to have the chair of the BRT Steering Committee as part of the conversation. Ms. Hocken was not sure what Ms. Wylie decided. Mr. Kleger said that the Board had a precedent with Springfield Station Steering Committee: When Mary Murphy went off the Board, she continued as chair of the Steering Committee. He was not aware that there were any problems as a result. Mr. Bennett said he thought there was an argument for having someone on the larger BRT steering committee who that committee feels will be most effective as the chair, as opposed to having to be an LTD Board member. There was some argument for changing the chair representation a little. He thought that the continued presence and active participation by the three elected officials was extremely important. The liaison between their bodies and LTD and how that was orchestrated was fairly important. He thought that it could be an LTD Board member but may not necessarily have to be. The Board BRT committee was internal and it was not necessary to have anyone there who was not very close to LTD.

This action was deferred to December when Ms. Wylie would be present.

**Breeze Service Issues:** Mr. Hamm brought up another issue as a follow-up from the Board workshop. He wanted to be sure that staff and the Board were on the same page regarding the Breeze shuttle service, to give staff some guidance for the winter bid that would occur in February. Staff wanted to be sure they understood the Board's priorities. Staff were planning to put the AVS buses into service, and thought that they had heard a clear message about getting the graphics done and packaging and promoting that service. He also understood that the Board understood the issue of overcrowding between the University of Oregon (UO) and downtown, and that staff would look at when those peaks occurred to determine the cost of increasing service with a different frequency or capacity on the Breeze or on Route 28.

Mr. Melnick thought that the issue was to keep the Breeze intact as originally planned, and that if the piece from the UO to downtown was where the heavy load was, add extra service for that piece only, and to not add it as a shuttle that only went part-way on the Breeze route. Mr. Hamm said that LTD had 30-foot Gillig buses on that route; those could be packaged with AVS buses so that there was more wheelchair capacity on some trips. He thought that was an important piece of the quality of service. He thought that Ms. Wylie had made a good point that as part of the branding exercise that the Board talked about, the Board had identified in her words a different mode, although it was not really a different mode. LTD had created a package of service that it wanted to market differently, to clearly



and visually communicate that and operate it that way. Mr. Kleger felt strongly that the 250-series buses (the Gillig 30-foot buses) should be kept in that rotation for the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements purpose, but he also thought the District needed to keep the Breeze brand identity on vehicles in that service, so that there was no brand confusion.

Mr. Hamm said he was suggesting that the Gillig buses be painted in the package and rotated through the Breeze service, in order to maintain ADA capacity. Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Kleger why that helped people who needed the ADA protection, and how that would fit into anyone's schedule on a regular basis. Mr. Kleger said people very quickly would pick up on what the rotation would be. Mr. Hamm said that the schedule would indicate that every so many trips, the Gillig bus would come through. Mr. Bennett said that he deferred to them on the ADA issues, but that this was the wrong reason to be running those buses. LTD should be using only buses that were acceptable. Mr. Kleger said he also would like it to be that way, but it wasn't, and it would be awhile before it was. He had no doubt that LTD would make progress to bring the AVS buses up to the District's standards. He thought that there were some expensive things that could be done, such as replacing the ramp with a lift and modifying the entryway accordingly. He did not want to have to do that, and suggested that maybe there was a chance to modify the floor at the front to reduce the pitch of the ramp. Mr. Bennett asked if the newer buses met the federal standards, but not in the same way LTD expected. Mr. Kleger that there was some argument about whether they met the standard or not. The federal ADA regulations did not specify the maximum pitch of a ramp. The only specification was in architectural standards, where it was 1 in 12; the bus ramp was a little over 1 in 4. Mr. Hamm said that the buses met the specifications in door width, etc., but LTD had set a culture of high standards for its disabled community. Mr. Bennett thought it was a shame that LTD spent a lot of time putting together something that had great potential for the community, in broadening LTD's base, reaching a broader market, and making the District more competitive, but could not get the right vehicle. He said he wanted to be on the record as saying that the 250-series Gilligs were not the answer.

Ms. Hocken said she was hearing that Mr. Melnick was supporting the idea of adding non-Breeze service on an existing UO route segment to handle existing overloads. That would be one strategy. In addition, the Board also was talking about running 30-foot buses as part of the Breeze service, possibly two 30-footers and three AVS buses. Any buses in Breeze service would be painted to carry out the Breeze appearance. Mr. Kleger said that this was where he was. However, he noted that the access issue extended to the entire length of the Breeze route, because LTD dropped off some regular service between downtown Eugene and Valley River Center (VRC) with the advent of Breeze, so that without the Breeze service there was a substantial reduction in wheelchair capacity out to VRC. It was important to keep that service accessible. He said that LTD had not been reducing capacity in planning the Breeze service, because it was increasing frequency. However, between two-thirds and three-fourths of the wheelchair users would have difficulty boarding, so LTD needed to do something to offset that, and he wanted to do that in a way that took the least possible away from branding the service.

Mr. Melnick asked if the AVS buses were ADA-compliant. Mr. Vobora said that this was Maintenance Manager Ron Berkshire's question after looking at this issue again and talking with the manufacturer. Mr. Kleger said that the manufacturer insisted that they were, but he did not think that they were. Mr. Melnick then asked if there was an independent



audit that LTD could do. The buses had been accepted on the basis that they were ADA-compliant, and LTD could not and should not legally run a vehicle that was not ADA-compliant, and if LTD was sold something that was not ADA-complaint, there should be some recourse. Mr. Hamm said that Mr. Berkshire had measured those spaces and that they met the minimum standards; however, in reality, the larger, more automated chairs presented more of a challenge. They were longer, wider, and heavier, and the original standards did not address that. LTD tried to move the chairs that the regular service could not accommodate onto RideSource, but would like to accommodate them all. With the bigger buses in the fleet, the District was able to accommodate almost all of the larger chairs. Mr. Vobora added that both of the segments from the UO to downtown and from downtown to VRC were covered by regular buses; the part that was not covered by regular buses was Country Club Road.

Mr. Melnick asked Mr. Vobora what he thought was the best way to handle this problem. Mr. Vobora replied that the plan that made sense to staff at that point was to cover the capacity issues, not only for the people in wheelchairs but for other riders, as well. It was not acceptable for someone to be passed by more than once. The current logistics on the Country Club segment were that the driver of the second bus to pass someone in a wheelchair by would have to call in for someone to pick up that person, so that was why staff thought it would be good to alternate in buses with higher capacity. Mr. Melnick said he would have less trouble with that as long as the District stuck by the Breeze branding and did not run those buses on other routes. That was not his first choice but, given the circumstances, he thought it might need to be done. He also thought it would be worth it at some point for the general manager to write a letter to the manufacturer to say that the buses may meet letter of the law, but not spirit, based on the ramp alone, and that LTD would not buy any more of those buses unless the problem was rectified.

Mr. Bennett said he did not buy the capacity problem at all. He said that LTD knew the AVS buses would be this size and have only one bay. He would rather run regular buses that were not painted instead of trying to make them look like Breeze buses, because they were not. Mr. Vobora said that the other alternative was to put the whole package out and monitor it to see how many issues came up, and address the overload issues at the UO. He said that the District needed to have a plan prepared to avoid playing catch-up later. Ms. Lauritsen said she agreed with Mr. Kleger, to do what needed to be done operationally to fix the overload problem. She said that LTD has to meet its own standards for people in wheelchairs and not leave them out in the rain, so that sounded like alternating 30-foot buses.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no other discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

