

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, December 19, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 13, 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, December 19, 2001, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Gerry Gaydos

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT/ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:

•Ms. Wylie stated that this was Rob Bennett's last Board meeting and that there would be a special recognition of Mr. Bennett later in the meeting. •Mr. Kleger noted that his term on the Board officially would end at the end of the month, and he would be continuing in service until an appointment was made for his position. He had applied for reappointment and, although he felt he had had his turn, if no other qualified candidate was found, he would be willing to continue to serve for another term. •Ms. Wylie shared with the Board an invitation from Mayor Torrey to the Eugene State of the City address on Wednesday, January 9, at 4 p.m. at the Hult Center, and an invitation to the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) appreciation dinner on Thursday, January 17.

WORK SESSION—SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM: Special Transportation Program Administrator Terry Parker introduced Fred Stoffer, the general manager of Special Mobility Service (SMS), a regional paratransit service provider with its main offices in Portland. She also introduced David Braunschweiger, the local program manager in the Eugene SMS office, and Jan Aho, a member of the Special Transportation Advisory Committee, who served as the program manager for the Families with Special Needs program at Pearl Buck.

Ms. Parker said that she wanted to provide the Board with an overview, or the "big picture," of the Special Transportation Program, rather than addressing a specific issue or question. She said it was a growing, dynamic program that was affecting the budget because of its growth, so it was timely to provide more information for the Board.

Ms. Parker said that when the program transferred from LCOG to LTD the previous July, she was able to better see the program as a whole, as a family of accessible services, rather than as

individual programs. She used a PowerPoint presentation to describe these services, and provided a history of the services and funding. She explained in-district and out-of-district services, and described the range of services available, from the fixed-route services for the most independent persons with disabilities, to the door-through-door services for the least independent. She stated that since the early 1980s, LTD's Special Transportation Program basically had responded to two needs in the community. One was that there were more people in the community at a more frail level who needed transportation, especially as people became de-institutionalized as a result of a new emphasis on enabling people with disabilities to live in the least-restrictive environment, resulting in more and different housing arrangements. The other was the need to create a range of options for people, in order to create the most independent setting in terms of transportation, similar to changes in the housing environment.

Ms. Parker also discussed the DMN Enterprise Report, *Assessment and Review of the Lane Transit District ADA Mandated Paratransit Services and Associated RideSource Services*, which had been distributed to the Board. It reviewed the things RideSource did well, and what could be done to be even more productive and gain some efficiencies in the system. The report showed that RideSource did not have too many problems, and already did more than most systems in terms of putting many pieces together for a comprehensive package of services and funding. In fact, LTD's RideSource system was a model for other systems. However, Ms. Parker was interested in knowing where to concentrate her efforts next, so received some suggestions from the consultant, David Norstrom. Suggested areas to focus on included demand management, since demand recently had been increasing; reviewing contracts and fares with other agencies to be sure those were not increasing demand; more special routes and coordination of routes, especially to the most frequent destinations; trip reduction; consistent eligibility; better reports and regular analysis; and improved efficiencies, particularly through the operating policies. Ms. Parker was working with SMS on ways to be even more efficient in providing trips.

Ms. Parker currently was working on three projects: Willamalane Senior Center collaboration with RideSource to reduce duplication of service; Oakridge service coordination and a possible vanpool; and the potential for service routes to frequent destinations.

Ms. Wylie asked about costs that had increased by about one-third, versus ridership increases of about 8,000 rides since 1997. Ms. Parker explained that the driver pay rates had been below \$8 an hour and turnover had been high. During a five-year period, the rate had been increased to \$10 per hour, and some benefits had been added. She said that the Board would not see the same kind of increase in the current economy.

Mr. Bennett said that the executive summary talked about RideSource's lower productivity than the peer group average. Ms. Parker said that RideSource did some grouping of rides, but not enough. Service routes were about that very thing: finding places where a lot of people were going to go on their own time, unlike medical appointments, and grouping those trips; that is, finding frequent destinations that have patterns and providing incentives for people to change their behaviors to use those grouped trips, rather than scheduling individual trips.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Kleger if this all made sense to him. Mr. Kleger said that it did. He said that incremental improvement had been going on for the entire life of the program, and that LTD did much better than the comparators around the country because LTD continued to be vigilant. Ms. Parker added that a decrease in productivity also had to do with mileage, since RideSource now had more destinations in the northern part of the service area and to the west, all

within the last few years. She noted that due to the high use of the fixed-route service by people with disabilities, RideSource served riders with more needs and who were likely to be less capable than riders in similar programs around the country.

The Board thanked Ms. Parker for her presentation and her work. Mr. Melnick commented that the scope of what Ms. Parker was doing was impressive. Mr. Hamm stated that he had worked with a number of organizations and private contractors, and he thought the partnership that LTD had with Special Mobility Services as the RideSource provider was exceptional. He said that SMS was a positive partner. He congratulated them for winning the bid to continue to provide the service, and said that he looked forward to continuing the partnership.

The work session ended at 6:25 p.m. Ms. Wylie called the meeting back to order at 6:38 p.m. after a brief break.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Richard Williams, the January 2002 Employee of the Month. Mr. Williams had come to LTD after 20 years' experience with BTA in San Jose, as an operator, supervisor, and instructor. Mr. Johnson described Mr. Williams as a great driver with compassion for his passengers. Mr. Williams had received several nominations for this award. The most recent nomination was from a rider, who appreciated Mr. Williams' extra efforts in getting off the bus and retrieving a tote bag that she had left at the bus stop,

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Williams with a pin, a monetary award, and a certificate of appreciation. Mr. Williams said it was a real honor to be selected as the Employee of the Month; with so many hardworking people at LTD, he was honored to be nominated among such a great crew.

SPECIAL AWARD: Mr. Johnson also introduced Bus Operator Gary Bennett, whose actions led to the quick arrest of the primary suspect in a murder (stabbing) that had occurred. Officers from the Eugene Police Department presented Mr. Bennett with a Citizen Service Award, which read:

On December 10, 2001, a homicide occurred in the city of Eugene. The suspect was quickly identified but fled the scene to avoid apprehension. Using the suspect's description given to you by the Eugene Police Department, you located the suspect in the area of Roosevelt Blvd and Bethel Drive. You immediately notified police and your observations provided them with the suspect's location. Because of your quick decision to become involved, a dangerous individual was apprehended. In recognition of your outstanding observations and willingness to assist police, we present you with this Citizen's Service Award (signed, Chief James Hill).

The officers said that the man arrested had recently been released from jail where he had been serving time for attempted murder for a previous stabbing. They were very glad to have been able to get him off the streets very quickly, as they believed him to be extremely dangerous.

Ms. Wylie also presented a certificate to Gary Bennett, which read:

Lane Transit District Appreciation Award to Gary Bennett—In appreciation for your attention to duty, outstanding teamwork, and service to the community for your role

in apprehending a suspect wanted by the Eugene Police Department on December 10, 2001.

She congratulated Mr. Bennett and also presented him with a monetary award from LTD. Mr. Bennett thanked the Board and Police Department, stating that while he was appreciative of the recognition, he was just doing his job and that this award really should be a team award since many people were involved in the situation, including supervisors/dispatchers who took the message and request for help from EPD and relayed the information to the bus operators, the arresting officer, and those who were on the scene of the murder. He said he just made a phone call, and asked everyone to join him in applauding the officers who put their lives on the line every day to make the community safer for everyone.

Mr. Hamm added that while he agreed that the team effort in this situation was very good, Mr. Bennett's performance was above the normal duties of a bus operator. He said that for a driver to make the extra effort to pay careful attention to the messages received, remember the details of the description of a suspect, and then watch for this person, with all of the other things that a driver must attend to, was extraordinary. Therefore, the District had wanted to recognize Gary Bennett for his individual efforts in this instance.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF BOARD MEMBER ROB BENNETT: Ms. Wylie noted that this was Rob Bennett's last meeting as an LTD Board member. She said she wanted to celebrate him as a Board member and stated her respect for him. She was pleased and honored to have served with him, and always counted on him and appreciated his input, as well as the fact that he was willing to make telephone calls, go to meetings, or do whatever else was asked of him. She said that the District would miss him terribly, and thanked him on LTD's and her own behalf. She presented him with the traditional wooden bus, and asked Mr. Hamm and the other Board members for comments.

Mr. Hamm, in representing the interests of the staff as a whole, told Mr. Bennett that his vision, commitment, spirit, and staying the course on things he believed in all were invaluable, and part of the reason that LTD had some success as a District. He said that Mr. Bennett had driven LTD to achieve things that it maybe would not have achieved otherwise. He said that Mr. Bennett was appreciated and that the District would miss him, but also would rely on his presence in the community and his continued commitment to the vision he had helped set.

Mr. Kleger wanted to express his personal appreciation for the last eight years. He said it had been a delight to work with Mr. Bennett, and he appreciated the fact that Mr. Bennett could disagree agreeably. He also appreciated Mr. Bennett's constant forward looking, and thanked him very much.

Ms. Hocken thanked Mr. Bennett that for a marvelous job of bringing to the Board an appreciation for good business practices and a community vision.

Mr. Bennett said that he had been in community service a long time and had gotten a lot of value out of it. He believed that people got more out of the process than they gave. He said that the LTD Board was no exception; he had had an opportunity to meet and work with people with many different backgrounds and perspectives, and who had lent him a lot of wisdom. He said that when he first came on the Board he did not think the staff would be as good as they were; he had worked over the years in the private sector and thought staff would be adequate and not

impressive, but he was very glad to be wrong. With the important issues and initiatives that LTD had been trying to make happen, he said, it would not work without a staff who were really good. Also, while doing what he could in the community as a board member, he needed staff backup. He complimented the staff as a whole, and several staff members individually, including Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn, Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano, Finance Manager Diane Hellekson, and Service Planning & Marketing Administrator Andy Vobora. He said that he had been fortunate not only with other Board members, but also with staff who had tried to support him in what he tried to accomplish. He was hopeful that the things the Board believed to be important would carry on and be successful.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Wylie asked for comments from any member of the audience. There were none.

MOTION **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved LTD Resolution No. 2001-043: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for December 19, 2001, is approved as presented." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the November 16-17, 2001, Special Board Meeting/Strategic Planning Work Session; minutes of the November 19, 2001, Special Board Meeting; and the minutes of the November 21, 2001, canceled Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Hocken asked to make one small correction on page 8 of the November 19 Board minutes, in the fourth paragraph. She believed that the sentence, "Mr. Swank said that LTD's financials would change the least of any entity that the District was associated with" should be changed to read ". . . of any entity that the auditors were associated with." Mr. Kleger and

VOTE Mr. Melnick accepted the amendment, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

SPECIAL SERVICE POLICY REVISION: Mr. Vobora noted that at the Board's November strategic planning retreat, they had discussed this change as a possible revenue-generating strategy. Staff then discussed it with the Board Finance Committee, who told Mr. Vobora to move ahead. The recommended language change would allow the District to charge events for the extra costs associated with those events that required a great deal more effort to implement. Ms. Hocken, as Finance Committee chair, said she thought it was a move in the right direction to recover costs for large-scale events, and that this change would affect from five to ten events. Mr. Vobora said that he was working with Finance to develop a rate for each large group on an individual basis. The main four events affected by the change would be the Lane County Fair, the Oregon Country Fair, and University of Oregon (UO) football and basketball. He had talked with each agency about a change. This change did not affect the District's fare ordinance.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved LTD Resolution No. 2001-044: "It is hereby resolved that the Lane Transit District Special Service Policy be amended to reflect a pricing structure that establishes the Community Service rate as a base and that additional costs be charged for events exceeding this

VOTE rate." Ms. Lauritsen seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous voice vote, 6 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

SPRINGFIELD STATION DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE: Ms. Wylie noted that a revised page 29 of the agenda packet had been handed out, with a corrected recommended committee membership list. Springfield Station Project Manager Charlie Simmons explained that at the August meeting, the Board had approved the formation of a Springfield Station Design Review Committee. The Springfield City Council had appointed Councilor Tammy Fitch to the committee, and the Historic Commission had named John Tuttle. He said that an agreement had been

reached with the design team, and it was expected that work would begin on this project after the first of the year.

Ms. Wylie said that she would ask Councilor Fitch if she would be willing to chair the committee.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-045: The LTD Board of Directors hereby approves the recommended list of persons for membership on the Springfield Station Design Review Committee." Mr. Kleger seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous voice vote, 6 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

APPOINTMENT TO BRT STEERING COMMITTEE AND BOARD BRT COMMITTEE:

Mr. Viggiano noted that this had been on the agenda for the November Board meeting but postponed because Ms. Wylie had not been present. Ms. Wylie explained that Mr. Bennett would be leaving the committee, and she and Ms. Hocken would remain. She said she had asked Ms. Hocken to chair both the Steering Committee and the Board BRT Committee. She also planned to talk with Mr. Gaydos to see if he would have the time to serve as the third Board member on these two committees. She stated that frequently the LTD Board committee had to meet with staff, and it was her opinion that the chair of the Steering Committee should be at those meetings, so it made the most sense to her to have a Board member act as chair of both committees. She added that she would miss Mr. Bennett, who had a tremendous amount of passion for bus rapid transit, on these committees.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

Commuter Solutions Program Report: Mr. Hamm noted that the Commuter Solutions program provided the framework for the relationship between LTD and the other partners, including Lane County and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, regarding transportation demand management (TDM) issues. An advisory committee, a subcommittee of the Transportation Planning Committee, oversaw the function, which was funded by a state grant of Section 5307 formula funds. The entire 11 percent local match historically had been paid by LTD. With the District's current budget shortfall, and because LTD did not have total control over the project even though it paid the entire match, Mr. Hamm had asked Commuter Solutions Program Manager Connie Bloom Williams to talk to the partners about dividing the match into fourths. He said that transportation demand management was a big part of the TransPlan. If the three other partners did not contribute a share of the match, LTD would have to decide if it wanted to continue paying the entire match. Staff believed that the partnership was important. LTD historically had housed Ms. Williams and another staff person at the District. Even though her position was funded by the grant, Ms. Williams was an LTD employee for all intents and purposes; for instance, she was part of LTD's benefits program.

Mr. Hamm explained that when the District was making staffing reductions as part of the budget cutting measures, the position that supported Ms. Williams was cut from the budget. The advisory committee had decided that it wanted to fund a second position from the grant, so it could move ahead with its TDM agenda. Therefore, the committee recommended adjusting the grant expenditures in order to add a TDM assistant position.

Mr. Bennett asked who was on the advisory committee. Ms. Williams called the Board's attention to a chart on page 40 of the agenda packet. Each TPC member agency was represented by a staff person on the committee.

Ms. Hocken asked if the subcommittee was recommending that the grant budget be adjusted. Mr. Hamm replied that the former position increased LTD's participation beyond the match amount, and LTD no longer could afford that, so had eliminated that position. The committee now would be reallocating some grant funding to a lower position within its own budget structure. Ms. Hocken asked if the District's general fund subsidy would be eliminated from the budget and not increased again. Mr. Hamm stated that, beginning in FY 2002-03, LTD's commitment would be only its contribution to the match.

In response to a question from Ms. Lauritsen, Ms. Williams explained that the new position would be reclassified to a lower classification, and that the benefits would be included in the grant funding. She added that if the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) cut the STIP funding for TDM, there would be no program and the partners would be responsible for implementing TDM strategies in TransPlan. She had been planning to discuss the local match with the TPC on December 13, but that meeting had been canceled, so they would be discussing this at a later date.

Ms. Williams then provided an update of what was occurring with the TDM program. She said that the planning goals for the strategic plan had been refined to parallel what was happening in TransPlan, and discussed the six major goals included on pages 33 through 39 of the agenda packet. The six major regional goals were to increase participation in alternative modes; advocate for use of parking management strategies; implement TDM strategies in congested areas; create a TDM infrastructure supported by regional jurisdictions; effectively use resources to advance the Commuter Solutions program goals, including finding new funding sources; and to put some energy and focus into public involvement, keeping other jurisdictions and special interest groups informed. The planning goals fell into four areas: technical assistance and services; education and awareness; research; and issues around policy, whether local, state, or related to federal tax incentive proposals. Services through the program included carpools, vanpools, bus pass programs, biking and walking promotions, use of transit vouchers, promoting and educating about telecommuting, education and creative work schedules, management and promotion of Park & Rides, guaranteed ride home programs, parking management, marketing, and research. Ms. Williams said that she was very enthusiastic about the possibilities for what could happen when bringing together planning, land use, incentive programs, and smart business practices, all based on philosophies of improving the quality of life. She believed that there was a lot of potential in this program, and that there were some great partners in the community.

Ms. Williams introduced Tom Schwetz of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), who had been involved in TransPlan from the beginning. He discussed LCOG's new TGM grant that will look into how to implement the TDM strategies in TransPlan. He stated that TDM policies had been in TransPlan and earlier plans for a long time, including a former carpooling program. He added that if it were not for the TDM program, the community would not have its current awareness about TDM, nor the TDM policies in TransPlan.

Mr. Bennett said that he had always had questions about the effectiveness of Commuter Solutions and whether it had warranted that sort of budget, but had not spoken out more about it because it was not being funded from LTD's general fund budget, but was being funded by a source who thought it was an important initiative. Even with some success in vanpools and

carpools, he had a hard time determining the cost-benefit. He said that this was the first time he had seen Goal 2 regarding parking management, which he thought was highly controversial. If he were to remain on the Board, he said, he would make a big issue out of that goal. He thought that Springfield had no interest in it at all, and that it probably was low on Lane County's agenda. He was glad that there was more partner involvement now, if that was the direction the community was going to go.

Mr. Schwetz said that Mr. Bennett was correct, and that one of the reasons there was interest in making this truly regional was that the local area needed to anticipate ODOT's dropping some form of the program. He said that if there was policy interest on the part of the partners, they needed to start looking at not only part of the match, but some substantive funding. He said he would guess that there would be controversy associated with many of these goals, but particularly the second one, and that Mr. Bennett probably was right that there was not a lot of interest in parking management in Springfield.

Ms. Lauritsen said that maybe someone should ask Springfield. She thought that they would be very interested because they were talking about putting in extra parking and the City Council was interested in attracting people, not penalizing them. Mr. Schwetz replied that his comments were related to the TransPlan discussion regarding the proposal for the goal related to parking prices, and there was vociferous opposition on the Springfield Council. He said that this was meant to be broader than that pricing category, but that, at a general level, the region needed to be ready to take on more responsibility both in terms of policy guidance and actual funding of the program for the next couple of years.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Schwetz if he thought the policy could be effective enough so that LTD and others should get behind it. Mr. Schwetz said that it had potential. Unfortunately, he said, there had been a lot of efforts across the country and it was difficult to sort out what was working and what was not. Staff needed to better assess the performance of what the local area would get out of this goal. He said that this was the information they would need in order to encourage ODOT to maintain its level of support.

Ms. Hocken asked if it was anticipated that the results of the TDM study would be the basis for more specific TDM strategy updates as part of TransPlan. Mr. Schwetz said that was correct. Ms. Hocken then wanted to clarify that it would have to go through the community process and get agreement by the adopting agencies. Mr. Schwetz said that the project needed to be completed over the next two fiscal years and it was anticipated that a review of TransPlan policies would be a year later, but this was meant to feed into that process. Most of the information about the TDM program was in the STIP request, which was a four-year plan, and TransPlan had a 20-year plan, so they were trying to look at a more detailed plan. Ms. Hocken said she thought it would be exciting if someone could figure out what TDM strategies would get more people to ride bus rapid transit (BRT).

Mr. Hamm said he had talked with Ms. Williams about how to measure the success of this program and determine the outcomes for the investment, such as knowing how many people were making the change to ride the bus.

Ms. Williams then discussed various reports and other aspects of the program. She said that performance measures would be a big part of the program, in coordination with LCOG and ODOT. She noted that the Corvallis-to Eugene, Eugene-to-Corvallis, and Eugene-to-Salem vanpools had

saved 1,027,956 vehicle miles traveled on an annual basis. The challenges facing the program were state funding reductions and the reduced staffing available to meet the strategic plan objectives.

In response to Mr. Bennett's comments about Goal 2, Ms. Hocken said that it did not appear that the recommendation was to get into areas that were real controversial. Overall, she said, the TransPlan goal was to go with incentives rather than disincentives for TDM, and she said that she did not know that the LTD Board had said it was supportive of disincentives (as listed in the goals). She thought that maybe someone from LTD should review the goals to make sure LTD was not agreeing to something that the Board had not approved. Ms. Williams said that her perspective was that listing parking strategies meant that conversations would occur about what worked and did not work, what the conflicts were, etc. She thought the role of education and enabling conversations to occur on a regional basis was an important one, even if each entity had a different strategy. However, Ms. Hocken thought that the goal was to advocate for the use of parking management strategies, which was different than educating. Ms. Williams said that the program advocated for the positive ones, such as preferential carpool parking.

Ms. Hocken repeated her request that, since the Board was not asked to adopt the goals but was asked to review them, someone should go back and review the language in that goal to see if it made sense in terms of what the organization had committed to.

Mr. Melnick said he thought the Board should walk through all the goals, even if just to affirm them. Ms. Wylie said that if the Board was supporting them, it needed to approve them, and thought that the Board should compare these with what was in the TransPlan. Ms. Lauritsen asked if the parking management goals were required; Ms. Williams replied that they were not.

BRT PHASE 1 AND SPRINGFIELD STATION: Mr. Pangborn used a PowerPoint presentation to discuss Phase 1 construction, including the design process and team, project scope, project schedule, and project budget. Parsons Brinkerhoff would act as the project engineer, with three main subcontractors: Harriet Cherry of WBGs as the lead architect; Chris Hemmer for civil and street design; and Jim Hanks for traffic engineering. There also was an internal "BRT strategy" team of LTD staff, as well as the BRT Steering Committee and the Board BRT Committee. There would be phased design and construction in four corridor sectors: Eugene Station to East 11th/Franklin (in cooperation with the City of Eugene), East 11th/Franklin to Interstate 5 (in cooperation with the City of Eugene and ODOT), I-5 to the Willamette River bridge in Glenwood, and the Willamette River bridge to the Springfield Station (both in cooperation with ODOT, the City of Springfield). Mr. Pangborn stated that working with different jurisdictions required different standards for signal control, etc., so LTD and those jurisdictions were working toward common standards. This became more difficult with ODOT's requirements for metric measurements and Eugene's requirements to use English measurements.

The scope of the project was four miles and would include two miles of exclusive busways, one mile of mixed, and one mile of intersections along the corridor. There would be seven to eight stations; a bus signal priority system, including 19 existing traffic signals and 4 to 6 new ones; and six BRT vehicles.

Mr. Bennett wondered about the political aspect of saying that when LTD had signal prioritization, that intersection was considered to be essentially under LTD's control. Otherwise, it appeared that LTD had only 50 percent exclusive busways, and he did not think that told the whole

story. Mr. Viggiano said that this definition would result in 65 percent exclusive busways (not 75 percent, because the intersections in Glenwood would be in mixed traffic).

Mr. Bennett said he thought the provision of exclusive busways in Glenwood was extremely important, and that commitment for future busways had been made to LTD. He did not know how legally enforceable this was, but he said it was very important not to forget about that, and he did not want LTD to go to the next phase without this aspect. Mr. Pangborn said that part of the requirement was to design the station with exclusive busways as a precursor to the rest. Mr. Bennett said that north of the junction with Harlow and Pioneer Parkway it would be very difficult to get exclusive right-of-way, so he would talk about that as a strategy and not give it up. He thought that was the key to the future of BRT. Mr. Pangborn agreed that it was the key to the system running effectively over time.

Mr. Pangborn explained that the project scope did not include all Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) software and hardware. The intent was to build the capability into the system, with the opportunity for build-out later.

Design issues included the issue of English versus metric measurement systems and separate design standards in the two cities and the state; a vehicle selection and guidance system; preparation for ITS enhancement; historic trees; and the use of existing or replacement pavement. He said that given what was known currently, the total budget for Phase 1 was \$13.8 million. Mr. Kleger mentioned in comparison that the Portland streetcar project published budget figures of \$42 million to \$68 million. Mr. Pangborn added that the schedule was to build Phase 1 in 2002-04 and to test the system in the summer of 2004.

Mr. Bennett asked if LTD would be responsible for automobile traffic management during construction. Mr. Pangborn said that it would be. There were other issues to coordinate as well, such as ODOT's resurfacing of two bridges to Springfield in the summer of 2003. Mr. Melnick said that LTD should try to avoid even perceived pain from inconvenience to auto drivers, which could affect the success of future segments and phases.

Mr. Melnick commented that the project timeline showed several segments occurring at one time, and he thought there was some argument that those should be overlapping. Mr. Pangborn agreed, stating that one argument for bringing the contractor on board early was to ask how to phase the project segments.

Mr. Pangborn said that the timeline showed a Board decision on buses by the middle of the next year. When building light rail, he said, there was a six-month testing period, so staff had scheduled that at the end of BRT construction, sometime in the spring or summer of 2004.

Ms. Hocken said that with the Eugene Station construction, the Board Eugene Station Committee met once a month to discuss the project, budget, etc. She wondered if that was planned for this project, and if the BRT Steering Committee or the Board BRT Committee would be used for this purpose. Mr. Pangborn said that this was under consideration.

Facilities Maintenance Administrator Charlie Simmons next discussed the Springfield Station construction project. The current station had been at 5th and "B" Streets since 1980, with four bus bays and a current need for six. Mr. Bennett asked what would happen to the current station when the new one was completed. Mr. Simmons said that LTD would bring it back to its original design

and it would be up to the City to use it however it wanted to, since it was the City's right-of-way. Mr. Hamm wanted to be sure that LTD protected an interest there because that site might be needed with the future system.

Mr. Simmons discussed the site for the new station, on the south side of "A" Street, which he described as the perfect site for the future BRT segment on Pioneer Parkway. He showed the current conceptual design for the station, and discussed the design and project schedule and the project scope and budget. The potential project budget was \$6.8 million. The project budget had been divided into three scenarios: basic needs; basic needs plus a guest services center (GSC); and basic needs, a GSC, and joint development. He discussed the costs for those three options. Design issues included whether or not to include public restrooms, a Park & Ride, joint development, and/or a Millrace Park and bridge (which were not included in any budget estimates).

Mr. Simmons also discussed the decision-making process, which would include the staff technical advisory committee (TAC), the Design Review Committee (DRC), and the LTD Board. He asked the Board if they wanted to put parameters on the decision-making process. Mr. Hamm clarified that Mr. Simmons was asking if the Board wanted to dialog with staff on the design issues in particular, such as whether they felt strongly one way or another about having amenities such as public restrooms or a Park & Ride in the initial design. Staff did not want to spend design money if certain aspects would not be included. He said that staff wanted to introduce those ideas that evening for a future discussion with the Board.

Mr. Melnick said he was not convinced that those were the only design issues. He said that the District had hired a design team, and would rather have them work with the TAC and DRC to work through those issues and bring back an informed opinion to the Board, so that the Board had good information before making decisions. Ms. Hocken said, however, that she did not want the DRC to make recommendations to the Board and have the Board respond negatively because the DRC had started from the wrong assumptions. She did not know if the Board was ready to give a full charge to the Design Review Committee yet. She suggested a range for budget discussions.

Mr. Melnick suggested possibly having an in-depth review at every Board meeting, so issues could be reworked at that point and the Board would be woven into the process all along.

Mr. Kleger said that the project was the Board's primary responsibility, whether through the Board Committee or full Board, and that prioritization within the budget needed to be said up-front to the DRC, as well as the statement that the Board would exercise its responsibility to do that.

Mr. Melnick thought that the Board's responsibility to complete an excellent project within the budget. Mr. Kleger said he just wanted to make it clear that the budget and an excellent project were equally important.

Mr. Simmons said that there was only about a two-month period for master planning, and he was a little concerned about having time to come back to the Board with every step.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff had a position on including public restrooms. Mr. Simmons said that facilities managers didn't like public restrooms, but from a community standpoint, he was concerned with the problems caused by not having them, especially when the site would be fairly isolated from other public services. In Santa Cruz, California, joint development with McDonald's

had provided restrooms at McDonald's. Mr. Bennett thought that joint development in Springfield might come later. Mr. Simmons suggested that the station might be able to open with a small GSC and restrooms with a key, in order to maintain control over use. He added that public restrooms probably were a good thing, but added operational costs.

Board Member Reports: Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC): Ms. Hocken reported that as a result of adding the West Eugene Parkway Project, TransPlan had to include \$88 million that had not been included originally. Programming had to be revised and other projects had to be moved from a 20-year period to the futures list. She said that the constrained list and futures list could be adjusted every three years. BRT Steering Committee: Ms. Hocken said that the committee would meet on January 8.

Monthly Financial Report: Ms. Hellekson said that as written in the report, there was nothing unexpected to report. Passenger fares were down, but when cash fares were raised, a certain decline was expected. Ridership was up 4 percent, but revenue was down somewhat. Football special services had not yet been billed. The payroll tax revenue essentially was flat from the previous year. Ms. Hellekson said that if it did not go down further, LTD was positioned to survive the recession. Administrative salaries were slightly over budget, but the November termination of ten administrative employees meant that this category should recover quickly. Wages for union employees were more of a concern, so staff were looking carefully at opportunities to improve efficiencies and reduce overtime. This work would carry over into the budget development process.

Mr. Bennett asked if there were comprehensive service redesign (CSR) changes that were not budgeted. Ms. Hellekson said that they were budgeted but the issue involved more than that. Staff were trying to make better assumptions of the average number of hours an operator would drive for the number of hours of service on the road to come up with the correct number of operators. She said that the true inefficiencies in the system were about 20 percent. Mr. Bennett asked how she rated the odds of going lower. Mr. Hamm shared that this percentage was below (better than) the industry standard, and that inefficiencies could be from report time, stand time, deadhead time, and a number of other elements. Staff thought they could reduce expenses by \$100,000 with certain improvements, especially through run-cutting efficiencies and managing operator time better. He explained that the District did not make major changes in the winter and summer operator bids, so major savings would occur after the fall bid in 2002. He had asked LTD's operators to share their ideas about finding efficiencies in the system. Mr. Kleger commented that the drivers he had talked with were very much in favor of this.

Ms. Hellekson said that the good news was the savings of about \$250,000 in fuel costs. The bottom line was that, because the District had deferred most of the capital transfer and eliminated administrative positions, there would not be a budget problem in the current year. However, the long-term projections showed that there would be problems, and the operating fund would have to contribute to the capital plan if LTD wanted to continue its current capital plan.

Board Correspondence: In referring to a letter to the Board, Ms. Hocken asked why the flags had been removed from the buses. Mr. Hamm said that the District originally had just used the paper flags reproduced in *The Register-Guard*, and when they became tattered they were pulled off the buses. Staff had talked about using flag deals, but that might open the door for other kinds of things, and LTD did not want to get involved in adding a lot of decals or symbols for

different groups. Mr. Kleger thought that some of the original paper copies had blocked some drivers' views.

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Wylie again thanked Mr. Bennett for his service on the LTD Board. There was no further business, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.



Board Secretary

M:\WPDATA\BOARD\MINUTES\BDMIN 12-19-01.doc

