

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 15, 2002

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 9, 2002, 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, May 15, 2002, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Susan Ban
Gerry Gaydos, Vice President, presiding
Patricia Hocken
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Robert Melnick
Hillary Wylie, President

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board Treasurer Dave Kleger. Board Vice President Gerry Gaydos was not yet present.

MOTION **EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Ms. Lauritsen moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed, and pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege, to hear an opinion of counsel. Ms. Hocken seconded, and the VOTE motion passed by unanimous vote, 4 to 0, with Ban, Hocken, Kleger, and Lauritsen voting in favor and none opposed. District Counsel Roger Saydack was present for this discussion with the Board, and Mr. Gaydos arrived at 5:42 p.m. during the Executive Session.

MOTION **RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:** Following a motion to return to regular session made VOTE by Ms. Hocken and seconded by Ms. Lauritsen, the Board unanimously returned to regular session at 6:25 p.m. and took a break until 6:30 p.m.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Nat Brown, the June 2002 Employee of the Month. Mr. Brown had worked for the District since November 1977 and had a 22-year safe driving record. This was the third time he had been selected as Employee of the Month, and in 1993 he was the LTD Employee of the Year. Mr. Johnson described Mr. Brown as "the nicest guy you'd ever want to know," and said that Mr. Brown treated people the way people wanted to be treated. He did a very professional job, and would be greatly missed when he retired later in the year.

Mr. Gaydos presented Mr. Brown with a pin, a certificate, and a monetary award. Mr. Brown said that he truly appreciated the award. He said that he was told 24 years ago that he would not always have the same attitude about the public, but he told them he would never change. Mr. Hamm added that Mr. Brown personified the team concept, as anyone who worked with him would know.

MOTION **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Ms. Hocken moved LTD: Resolution No. 16: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 15, 2002, be approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded, and the resolution passed by unanimous vote, 5 to 0, with Ban, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, and Lauritsen voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the April 17, 2002, regular Board meeting and the April 25, 2002, special Board meeting.

VOTE

WEST EUGENE PARKWAY (WEP) TRANSPLAN AMENDMENTS: Director of Development Services Stefano Viggiano introduced Eugene Planning Director Jan Childs. He noted that a large packet of information had been distributed to the Board members that evening, and that the discussion would focus on the process for the May 29, hearing on WEP amendments to the TransPlan. The Board was scheduled to take action on the amendments on July 17, after the City of Eugene. Ms. Childs first explained some logistical issues, including the procedures for the public hearing. She explained the sections of the packet, including supplemental information that came in after the advisory committees had completed their work; draft minutes from various committee meetings; a record of advisory committee meetings and their packets; supplemental information requested by advisory committee members; agenda item summaries and attachments from advisory committee work sessions; written testimony received by the advisory committees; and the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). Those sections were listed in an April 29, 2002, Eugene Planning & Development memorandum included in the agenda packet for the May 15 Board meeting. Ms. Childs said she expected that additional evidence would be submitted at the public hearing.

Ms. Childs explained that LTD's issue in the amendment discussion was the WEP transportation issue. The LTD Board would not have to adopt the other portions. She explained that a complicating factor in the TransPlan amendment discussion was the potential second round of OTIA funding, involving additional money for the local region. Without that funding, more projects would have to be moved to the "futures" list. She stated that if the amendments were not approved, no part of the West Eugene Parkway project would move forward. The response from ODOT would be available at the hearing and at the LTD meeting in July, and there would be clarity on whether the Oregon Transportation Commission was interested in providing additional funding for the Beltline project. Ms. Childs also stated that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) did not want to start the project without knowing that the entire project would be funded. She said that there was an assumption that all four phases would be built in 20 years, with the assumption that the funding for the other three phases would come later.

APC/AVL STATUS REPORT: Information Technology Manager Steve Parrott explained the District's Automated Passenger Counter (APC) and Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) project. He used a PowerPoint presentation to explain components of the project. He first discussed intelligent vehicles, also known as smart bus technology, which included passenger counters, onboard video displays, traffic signal priorities, farebox equipment interface, and vehicle maintenance monitoring. He described an Infrared Motion Analyzer (IRMA), which detected body heat moving in a direction in order to count passengers and was tied to time and location. In discussing why LTD was moving to this system, he listed the measurement of planning effectiveness, monitoring of operations performance, and information for strategic planning. It would improve the effectiveness of staff time, allowing staff to spend more time on results rather than on data collection and input.

Mr. Parrott explained that LTD had issued a request for proposals (RFP) that focused on APC functions, with the ability to make announcements required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) as an option. Staff were conducting site visits with the primary contender, in order to

determine if that vendor would be the proper partner for this project. Notice of contract award was expected in mid-June.

Mr. Parrott explained what was involved in product evaluation, such as the ability to integrate with existing systems. He also discussed estimated purchase costs, and explained that the project was included in the budgets for the current year and the next fiscal year.

Mr. Parrott discussed an additional opportunity to include a computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system, which had been included in the long-term goals but had not been expected with this project. CAD would allow real-time reporting to operations. It would mean realigning capital projects for Fiscal Year 2002-03 to allow approximately \$110,000 additional for this project. Staff anticipated asking the Board in June for approval to enter into a contract, and intended to have the system in place for bus rapid transit.

Mr. Kleger expressed concern about the inconsistent reliability of the current radio system, and wondered if the new system would be able to work well with the radio system. Mr. Parrott explained that there actually was very little failure with the radios, but that a combination of hardware and software that controlled communications between LTD dispatch and buses failed regularly. The new system would replace those components of the communications system.

Ms. Hocken wanted to clarify what LTD would be getting in the base package and as alternatives. Mr. Parrott explained that the base system would include automated passenger counting, automated vehicle location, and automated passenger announcements. Staff recommended purchasing the base system and the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) option. Ms. Lauritsen asked how the system would recognize whether people were in wheelchairs. Staff explained that bus operators would have to press a manual button to record the number of riders in wheelchairs, but those numbers then would be electronically recorded, with reference to location and time.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Board Member Reports: **Board BRT Committee**—The committee had a briefing from staff regarding the Coburg Road work plan and a proposal for a joint planning process with the City of Eugene. The BRT Steering Committee would discuss the proposal the following week, and then it was scheduled to go to the Board in June. **Board HR Committee**—The committee was scheduled to discuss the general manager evaluations the following week, and then the Board would discuss them in June.

Springfield Station Design and Budget: LTD Facilities Maintenance Manager Charlie Simmons and Springfield City Executive Development Manager John Tamulonis were present for this discussion with the Board.

Ms. Lauritsen commented about public restrooms and joint development. She suggested that the District go forward with what it could afford, and that one way or another the station would have public restrooms. Mr. Kleger said that the entire committee formally committed that joint development had to go forward, and no one wanted to delay building the station. He said he did not really want to phase the station, but practicality would have to prevail.

Mr. Simmons discussed three development scenarios with the Board. He said that the committee recommended that the District move forward with option number 3 and with joint development as soon as possible. Ms. Lauritsen thought the third option was the best plan, and

was counting on staff to find the extra money needed for that option. Mr. Simmons explained that there could be a gap of \$500,000 for the additional square footage. The project was on a tight timeline in order to open in the spring of 2004. That would require the design to be ready in the fall of 2002 in order to go out to bid and break ground in the spring of 2003. He said it might not be realistic that joint development would be completed at the same time as the main platform. The District could select option 3 and move ahead with the platform but hold the rest. This would mean that the station could be operational, but not with everyone's preferred elements at that point. A design charrette was scheduled for the following month, then different options within design option number 3 could be considered and costs could start being penciled out.

Mr. Tamulonis explained that one of the aspects of his job was to look for whether there were any reasons not to do a project, as a rough analysis rather than a detailed one. He said that a commercial developer would build to a little lower standard than LTD facilities, which were built for long-term use. He discussed the cost per square foot for different types of development and the requirements of different types of tenants. Other constraints included the fact that there were not enough parking spaces for the 10,000 to 12,000 square feet required for medical offices—they would want a minimum of 50 spaces, so the District probably would be limited to 7,000 or 8,000 square feet of joint development.

Mr. Tamulonis also mentioned other ways to reduce costs, such as reducing the interest rate on construction costs and long-term financing, and said that the City might be able to help find long-term tenants. There was discussion about the value of having a tenant who would be at the station in the evening, and the fact that there could be operational costs for LTD in the first years in order to do this.

Ms. Hocken asked about community reinvestment lending in order to reduce interest rates. Mr. Tamulonis said that four or five years ago would have been a good time for that. One bank was interested in a drive-through window, but that would create conflicts at the site. Wells Fargo Bank had done some community financing, but not many banks did. He knew of some people who were interested in doing some reinvestment downtown, so he was looking into that possibility. He said that LTD should look for fairly long-term tenants, so a restaurant was an unlikely candidate.

Ms. Hocken noted that one of the challenges was to have something there that bus riders would like to use. Mr. Tamulonis noted that there had been discussions about food to go, newspapers, etc.

Ms. Ban asked about grant funding or enterprise or incentive funding. Mr. Tamulonis said that there might be block grant funds through the City. That would mean that LTD could use the money it received this year and borrow against it in the next year for construction, to bring down the costs. However, he was not sure whether those funds could be used for this project.

Ms. Hocken asked about the potential of additional parking in the east. Mr. Simmons explained that this property belonged to Les' Canopies. They had talked about access and how to increase parking, and the design team had been instructed to look for more parking potential in order to increase the potential for a larger joint development. Ms. Hocken thought that visibility would be a design challenge if a larger building were built. Mr. Simmons said that staff could bring design ideas back to the Board at another meeting. Mr. Kleger noted that activity associated with joint development would accomplish some of the visibility purpose. Mr. Tamulonis said that there was a possibility of building a two-section first floor and a larger second floor, which would result in a sheltered space under the second floor and the ability to see through at street level.

Mr. Simmons said that operational efficiency with joint use was the key in this site after hours. On June 4, the Design Review Committee would visit the site to see how big of a challenge the site was. He added that he had talked with some other transit systems and would be receiving site plans for one station in Watsonville, California. This station had a McDonald's restaurant and a station grocery store. In return for not paying for its lease, the store cleaned the restrooms and took care of the site, which actually saved the transit system money. He said that these were the kinds of questions staff were asking because the cost of maintaining public restrooms is a significant operational cost year after year.

Mr. Simmons said that he appreciated the City of Springfield for working with LTD on this project, because it was crucial to the city and to LTD's success with the project.

General Manager's Report: Mr. Hamm mentioned the City of Eugene Human Rights Commission agreement on accessibility, on which LTD had been a joint signer, and an article in the newspaper about a 2002 barrier awareness leadership award, which had been presented to the person coordinating an LTD program to provide help for persons with disabilities when transferring at the Eugene Station. He passed around an APTA brochure on "America Rides the Bus," which included a small photo of the Breeze bus. He reminded the Board that they would need to elect officers to two-year terms the following month. He also called attention to an article in *Passenger Transport*, published by APTA, regarding national safety awards, and acknowledged Director of Operations Mark Johnson and his staff, as well as other departments, for LTD's certificate of achievement in safety. The publication also contained an article on LTD's "toolbox" approach to services. Mr. Hamm also noted that he had received a letter from the Amalgamated Transit Union leadership in Portland containing a list of efficiency suggestions, and that staff would be responding to each suggestion.

Monthly Financial Report: Director of Finance Diane Hellekson had handed out the monthly report at the beginning of the meeting. She said that LTD had lost a little ground on payroll tax receipts, which were down approximately 2.3 percent compared with the previous year. The District had been managing to a 2 percent reduction, so no course correction was needed at that time. The Board Finance Committee would be meeting on May 16, and the Board would be asked to adopt the FY 2002-03 budget on June 19.

Bus Rapid Transit Update: Mr. Viggiano called the Board's attention to the staff summary in the agenda packet. Mr. Kleger said that there would be a meeting the next day, and there had been one that afternoon, about accessibility issues at the Springfield Station and BRT. He said he would be attending.

Department Reports: Ms. Lauritsen noted that she liked the monthly department reports.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.



Board Secretary

