

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, April 7, 2003

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 4, 2003, 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, April 7, 2003, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Susan Ban  
David Gant  
Gerry Gaydos, Vice President  
Patricia Hocken  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary  
Hillary Wylie, President, presiding  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Kim Young, Recording Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie. Mr. Gant was not yet present.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT:** Ms. Wylie indicated that this meeting was scheduled in lieu of the meeting that was canceled in March.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** Mr. Kleger announced that he was now back at home following his long recovery from surgery. Board members congratulated him.

Mr. Hamm said that staff had an agenda item requiring an executive session and asked for Board approval to add it to the agenda. Ms. Wylie added the executive session to the end of the schedule.

There were no other additions to the agenda.

**PIONEER PARKWAY DESIGN APPROVAL:** Planning and Development Director Stefano Viggiano was present to request Board approval of the Harlow/Gateway segment of the Pioneer Parkway corridor bus rapid transit (BRT) route. He shared a schematic showing the BRT configuration options, including stop placement, which was considered by the stakeholder group for the segment. The options included a curbside option and three median options. Mr. Viggiano pointed out the right-of-way needs associated with the median option.

Mr. Viggiano reported that the stakeholders group quickly had discarded the curbside option and focused on the median options. He said that the stakeholder group recommended a combination of the median options, depending on the section of the route being traveled. He noted that the entire section allowed for exclusive route treatment, with no mixed-traffic operation.

Mr. Viggiano called the Board's attention to the current Gateway Station location on an aerial photograph of the area, and reported that the stakeholders preferred a

station closer to the Gateway Mall food court and closer to the street. The option did not require as much parking removal as other options considered.

Responding to a question from Ms. Wylie, Mr. Viggiano used the aerial photograph to demonstrate egress and ingress to the proposed station. Mr. Kleger noted the difficulty of using the current Gateway station due to the several right-angled turns that buses were required to make entering and exiting the station. Ms. Wylie expressed concern about the distance from the bus station to the entrance to the Mall, specifically noting her concern for seniors and people with disabilities who could be carrying a number of packages onto the bus. Mr. Viggiano estimated the distance between the Mall and station at about 150 to 200 feet. He added that there were trade-offs between providing good access and an acceptable travel time, and a balance must be found between those factors.

Mr. Viggiano emphasized the tentative nature of the proposal and indicated that more public comment and work was to come.

Ms. Hocken reported that several BRT Steering Committee members had expressed concern about access to businesses along the Harlow Road section. Steering committee members did not like the idea of motorists having to go to a signal and then turn around. Mr. Viggiano acknowledged those concerns and indicated further public input would be sought.

**MOTION**

There being no further discussion, Ms. Ban, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved the following resolution, LTD Resolution 2002-014, Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors approves the recommended design for the Pioneer Parkway Harlow/Gateway Segment BRT corridor as the preferred design for the segment. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0, with Ban, Gant, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**VOTE**

**STRATEGIC PLAN WORK SESSION: (A) Draft Strategies.** Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner said that staff had taken the input of the Board from the December Board retreat and revised the goals and strategies as requested. The materials had then undergone review by the leadership council and other staff. Ms. Gardner noted the addition of staff-suggested performance measures. The Board then reviewed the goals, strategies, and performance measures, and offered comments.

**GOAL: Deliver Reliable Public Transportation Service.** Ms. Ban confirmed with Ms. Gardner that many of the items listed in the performance measures already were being measured. Ms. Gardner added that the information was compiled, but not as part of a strategic plan. Mr. Viggiano noted that information was not routinely collected on some of the items, such as the percentage of households within a quarter-mile of a bus stop. Ms. Ban voiced her concern about creating an additional layer of work for staff. Ms. Gardner indicated that the plan could show the source of the measure and the suggested frequency for collecting the information.

Mr. Gant arrived at the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

Mr. Kleger noted that some people did not think LTD should be spending money on the APL/AVC system, but given reductions in the planning staff, the District could not do a good job of planning without the equipment. Ms. Gardner said while that many of the strategies were intended to be efficiencies; there might be a capital cost up-front, but they would realize operating cost savings over the long-term.

**GOAL: Develop Innovative Service That Reduces Dependence on the Automobile.**

Referring to the priority given the strategy "Develop a policy framework for joint development," Ms. Hocken suggested the Board work on the policy first before implementing the Springfield Station. There was general concurrence.

Referring to the strategy "Pursue real-time passenger information to service outside of BRT," Ms. Hocken asked if LTD would have real-time information for the BRT service. Mr. Viggiano said that it was available, and the issue was whether the District wanted to spend the money for it. Mark Pangborn noted that \$125,000 for real-time passenger information currently was budgeted for Phase 1. He added that with the purchase of the APL/AVC system, the District would have the software and capability to do real-time passenger information, but then would need to install the needed infrastructure at the bus stops to implement it. Ms. Hocken suggested real-time

passenger information be added to the strategy "Implement BRT" to indicate it was nondiscretionary for BRT while remaining a lower priority for the rest of the system.

Ms. Hocken referred to the TransPlan performance measures other than BRT and transportation demand management and asked if those were embedded in the plan. Ms. Gardner said that, for example, the percentage of major corridors in ten-minute frequency went beyond the BRT system. Ms. Hocken wanted to ensure that all the performance measures were reflected in the draft Strategic Plan. Mr. Viggiano suggested "Track performance measure for TDM and transit" and assume that included BRT. Ms. Hocken concurred.

Ms. Ban suggested that rather than be specific about the Coburg Road BRT corridor, the strategy "Obtain all environmental and political approvals for Coburg Road BRT corridor," be revised to refer to the next Eugene corridor. Ms. Gardner did not think the revision was a problem and said the same change could be made in reference to Springfield.

Ms. Wylie suggested that the first sentence in the goal statement ("Provide high-quality, convenient, service that attracts 'choice riders' (those who have a car available) in order to help the community meet its current and future transportation needs") be revised so it did not appear to place a higher value on the riders who had a car available but chose to use public transit. She suggested that "those who ride the bus by choice" would be better. Mr. Hamm said that staff would review and revise the text.

Ms. Wylie asked if there was a cost associated to the strategy "Support nodal development and transit land use." Ms. Gardner said that the strategy represented more of a statement than a strategy as it reflected what LTD already was doing. Ms. Wylie questioned whether a dollar amount should be attached to the goals and strategies. Ms. Gardner noted that the item in question fell under current staff responsibilities related to metropolitan planning. Mr. Viggiano said that it was possible to attach a fiscal impact to the goals, however, he noted that the next step in the process was a long-range financial plan identifying those costs.

**GOAL: Maintain LTD's Fiscal Integrity.** Ms. Hocken suggested that the long-term strategy, "Increase the payroll tax" be moved to current strategies as it currently was being pursued. Ms. Gardner concurred. She asked if it was a high priority or a nondiscretionary item. Ms. Ban recommended it be given a high priority. There was general concurrence.

Responding to a question from Mr. Gant, Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch discussed the status of legislation providing for an increase in the payroll tax. She noted that the bill was tied to an economic indicator of job recovery.

Referring to the strategy "Adjust fares to keep pace with inflation," Ms. Ban asked if the Board needed to balance increases in fares with ridership. Mr. Viggiano said that there was a relationship. Traditionally, fare increases were made to keep pace with inflation with no noticeable impact on ridership. In recent years, fares had increased

beyond the rate of inflation, which impacted ridership while increasing revenues. He thought it a mistake for fare increases to lag behind inflation.

Ms. Hocken questioned whether the Board should revisit the strategy "Develop a public outreach program for debt financing," questioning the cost in light of the limited public interest. Mr. Gaydos, who initially raised the issue, noted that LTD had never borrowed money in the past, and he thought its decision to borrow would be a change that he feared the public might relate to the District's decision to embark on BRT. Ms. Gardner suggested that staff develop a public outreach strategy rather than a program. Mr. Gaydos suggested that LTD merely be ready to respond to the public. Ms. Gardner suggested the item be deleted with that understanding. There was general concurrence.

**GOAL: Provide Progressive Leadership for the Community's Transportation Needs.** Ms. Ban referred to the strategy "Evaluate Board structure and development" and suggested that the Board conduct an annual self-evaluation with regard to the Strategic Plan. Mr. Viggiano agreed that was a good idea; he noted that the item was proposed in response to periodic calls for an elected Board. Ms. Gardner clarified that the item also was intended to broaden the nature of candidates for Board vacancies. Mr. Viggiano thought Ms. Ban's suggestion was a different issue. Ms. Ban agreed.

Ms. Wylie observed that all Board members represented a constituency but that was not mentioned in the plan. She did not think Board members checked in with those



constituents to determine if they were being representing as they preferred to be represented. Mr. Kleger noted that he frequently checked in with his constituents, both formally and informally, in venues such as neighborhood association meetings. He was recognized and frequently received feedback. For example, his comments regarding the West Eugene Parkway were a result of constituent contacts. Ms. Wylie believed that as appointed officials, the Board members had the same responsibility to their constituents as elected officials.

Mr. Viggiano called attention to page 14, which addressed Board member activities, and noted the ideas listed on that page, which included ideas related to community outreach, would be discussed later in the meeting.

Mr. Kleger referred to the strategy "Create a more visible role for Board in the community," and brought up the Metro Television broadcasting of Eugene City Council meetings. He suggested the Board consider utilizing that service to broadcast its meetings if it could be done in a cost-effective manner. He said that would raise the District and Board's profiles and keep the public informed. Ms. Lauritsen noted that previously, LTD had a monthly half-hour show on Metro TV that was not widely viewed. She believed that those familiar with Metro TV also were familiar with the Board and its activities. Mr. Kleger emphasized his interest in broadcasting Board meetings, not scripted programs. He termed the approach a "public meeting made more public." He thought the fixed costs involved would not be large.

Ms. Wylie believed the strategy was aimed at placing the Board members in key community roles and at eliciting input from the public.

Ms. Ban suggested the Board consider what it wished to accomplish in this area first. She believed that given the complexity of the topic, a subcommittee might want to take a closer look at the issue and return with a recommendation to the full Board.

Mr. Hamm perceived the strategy as the Board wanting to be more participatory in terms of its presence in the community and working to build a different kind of coalition with the business community and greater public. He thought there were opportunities for the Board to put together coalitions in support of transit and future transit initiatives as planned growth occurred. Mr. Hamm did not think the Board discussion was about spending money to market transit, but rather about seeking opportunities for Board members to connect personally with the community in a different way.

Ms. Gardner suggested that the Board return to the strategy when it discussed the action plan. There was general agreement.

**GOAL: Develop a Team Environment.** Ms. Hocken noted two labor-related strategies, "Negotiate an appropriate contract" and "Build a more positive relationship with the ATU," and asked why the second was given a priority status of medium while the first was considered nondiscretionary. Mr. Hamm responded that an appropriate labor contract had fiscal implications, and given the current fiscal environment, it would be a difficult

objective to meet. He anticipated a long and difficult contract negotiation, and said that was different from building the ongoing internal relationship that the Board desired with the ATU.

Mr. Kleger suggested the second labor-related strategy be given a high priority to communicate the Board's seriousness about the strategy to the District's employees. Mr. Gaydos concurred.

Mr. Gaydos referred to the strategy "Define and build TEAM LTD" and suggested that the Board should be a part of the team environment, and the strategy did not speak to that. There was general concurrence. Mr. Hamm defined TEAM LTD as the Board, the administration, employees, and union all partnered together.

Ms. Ban suggested that the word "more" be deleted from the second strategy, and proposed that it be given a nondiscretionary status.

Referring to the performance measure associated with the goal that read "Percentage of negative (unwanted) employee turnover," Ms. Hocken suggested that all employee turnover was negative given the fiscal cost of training and the reflection of such dismissals on LTD's hiring process. Mr. Gant suggested that those employees who were hired away by other employers because of their professional growth and expertise should be considered in a positive light. He said that many organizations consider such movement to be positive. Ms. Hocken acknowledged Mr. Gant's point.

Ms. Ban suggested the strategy be reworded "Percentage of employee turnover," and that LTD monitor the number over the time.

**(B) Board Action Plan.** Mr. Viggiano asked for input on what should be included in the action plan, particularly in the category of activities for individual Board members. He reviewed the items listed in a document entitled "LTD Strategic Plan Board Member Activities, on page 14 of the agenda packet."

Ms. Ban asked for more information about the activity regarding the Board's annual meetings with partner agencies. Mr. Hamm described examples of how those meetings happened, which included both formal joint meetings and opportunities for individual Board members to be present at a meeting to answer questions from partner agency representatives. Ms. Ban suggested that the activity be revised to read "Periodic meetings with partner agencies" to more accurately reflect the frequency that such meetings occurred. Ms. Wylie observed that the Board already was doing many things on the list. Mr. Gaydos supported annual Board visits to neighborhood association meetings.

Mr. Gant suggested that what was missing from the list was the commitment to ride the system occasionally. Board members agreed. Mr. Gaydos noted that he had been asked how often management staff and Board members rode the bus.

Ms. Lauritsen noted the large number of nondiscretionary items in the strategic plan and suggested that the items be prioritized somehow. Ms. Gardner indicated staff would recirculate the matrix the Board viewed at the December retreat, which prioritized the items. She added that the strategic plan was intended to be very short-term and there were many nondiscretionary items, which was by design. Items that could be accomplished were included, and if an item was not in the budget already, it was a high priority item to be funded.

Ms. Gardner asked if the Board had interest in forming the subcommittee suggested by Ms. Ban. There was general Board support for the suggestion. Ms. Ban, Ms. Wylie, and Mr. Gaydos volunteered to serve on the subcommittee, and Ms. Gardner agreed to arrange for the first meeting.

Ms. Wylie suggested that a handbook of Board duties might be useful. Ms. Ban agreed that such a handbook would be a useful evaluation tool.

Board members thanked Ms. Gardner and Mr. Viggiano for their work.

**PIONEER PARKWAY DESIGN APPROVAL (revisited)**: Because the resolution number was incorrectly stated on the agenda for this item, the Board restated the resolution it had passed earlier in the meeting.

**MOTION**

Ms. Ban, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved the following resolution, LTD Resolution 2003-014, Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors approves the recommended design for the Pioneer Parkway Harlow/Gateway

**VOTE**

Segment BRT corridor as the preferred design for the segment. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0, with Ban, Gant, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**BRT VEHICLE WORK SESSION:** Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn provided an update on the status of the bus rapid transit (BRT) vehicle selection. He reminded the Board of the three options: Option A: Purchase five Phileas vehicles; Option B: Purchase five domestic articulated buses; Option C: Combination of three domestic articulated buses and two Phileas vehicles.

Mr. Pangborn reported on staff conversations with representatives of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), saying that the FTA was still very positive that it could find a way to provide research and demonstration funds to the District. He emphasized that there were many other demands for the funds. LTD staff had assembled a demonstration proposal requesting the initial \$3.5 million and adding several hundred thousand to extend the project out for some years. The FTA wanted a quick decision and he anticipated the agency would move very fast. He thought the Board needed more information before making a final decision, and he anticipated it would have that before its meeting on May 1.

Mr. Pangborn reported on the discussion the BRT Steering Committee had on the subject, saying it also was split between options. Member Dave Jewett had suggested that if LTD could get the NABI option to meet its needs, that might be acceptable because of its price and new look. Steering committee members expressed interest in the suggestion. Mr. Gaydos, a member of the steering committee, concurred, and noted that committee members generally were less concerned about the guidance system than the appearance and cost of the vehicle selected. Mr. Pangborn noted that the steering committee lacked time to get into all the nuances of the options.

Mr. Pangborn reported on a video conference that LTD staff had with representatives of the Phileas manufacturer APTS, during which APTS staff stated that the company was not interested in selling LTD fewer than five vehicles. Mr. Pangborn said that a collective purchase with another agency was an option that was discussed by LTD staff, but he was unsure that APTS would be interested given it would have to support different sets of vehicles in different locations. He said that staff would continue to work on Option C, the combination option, but otherwise LTD was back to options A and B.

Ms. Hocken noted her concern about the timing of the receipt of the vehicles as it related to the start of BRT operations and suggested that the NABI vehicle not be taken off the table. Mr. Pangborn indicated it was not off the table, and LTD was still exploring the option.

Mr. Hamm reported on a conversation he had with the chief executive officer of bus manufacturer NABI, who indicated he felt there was a flaw in the way the transit industry approached vehicle manufacturers. The transit industry had been unwilling to develop any uniformity in BRT vehicle specifications, which created a problem for the manufacturers. The chief executive officer had specifically mentioned the difficulty of dealing with the manufacturers' suppliers in terms of consistency of volume. Mr. Hamm added that the company was also less interested in small orders given the large volume it was currently handling.

At this time, NABI was fully engaged in filling orders for vehicles for transit agencies in Chicago and Los Angeles. Mr. Hamm said that NABI suggested that LTD form a consortium of transit companies to develop standard BRT specifications and create a sufficient volume of orders to ensure that it got what it wanted. However, NABI also indicated it could not deliver vehicles until late 2006, and also that it could not include left-hand doors on vehicles until 2006 at the earliest. He believed that removed NABI from any consideration for at least six years.

Mr. Hamm suggested that for future corridors, one option for the District was that the consortium originally formed by LTD get back together to discuss how to build the needed volume.

Ms. Wylie suggested that LTD needed to consider the CiVis again. Mr. Pangborn said that staff had re-considered the CiVis. He deferred to Fleet and Facilities Services



Director Ron Berkshire for more comments. Mr. Berkshire pointed out that CiVis vehicles also did not include left-hand doors, requiring a complete development program with the company at an unknown price. He said that the CiVis vehicles would be heavier and noisier than most North American buses, and they burned more fuel and issued more emissions.

Mr. Gant asked if staff analyzed the impact of a delay for Phase 1 BRT and what downside existed to waiting for some period of time for newer hybrid technology. Mr. Pangborn said that staff were in the process of analyzing the overall cost of the vehicles to be purchased, the delivery schedule, and the risks of the various options as they were known. Then staff would analyze the impact on the construction schedule and on the image that LTD presented to the community, as well as the cost of realizing that image.

Mr. Hamm noted that LTD had worked extensively to assemble the committed right-of-way needed for BRT and that was the most important element of the system. He suggested there was some logic to getting the acquisition of right-of-way accomplished first and as early as possible because of increasing land costs and changing political and economic environments.

Mr. Gant questioned the risk that existed with delaying the project, saying he believed it would be useful if the Board had a sense of what had been committed to at this point.

Referring to the acquisition of right-of-way, Mr. Kleger expressed concern about LTD finding itself in a situation similar to that faced by the County Commissioners when the Northwest Expressway had been built. It had been underused and was considered by some to be a waste of money until it was connected to the Chambers/River Road Connector.

Mr. Gant said that he did not want to risk what had been done, but he also did not want to overreact because of a potential delay.

Mr. Pangborn noted the political implications of a delay and suggested that the Board could be more effective than staff in communicating LTD's reasons for such a delay to the elected officials. He said that the District already had received criticism from one city councilor because of delays in the project, but he was unsure what position other councilors would take. The Springfield council probably would be more accepting of a delay in Phase 1 because of the work going on around the Springfield Station and Pioneer Parkway.

Mr. Gant believed that LTD had good, legitimate reasons for the delay. Ms. Ban did not think that would matter to some elected officials.

Mr. Hamm noted that there were other systems that were moving ahead with the acquisition of right-of-way and other incremental improvements with the knowledge the

technology was yet ready. Those systems were able to realize efficiencies in the number of buses using major corridors by employing the right-of-way and using articulated buses. He suggested the potential of using a similar approach in Eugene. When LTD had the opportunity to move forward with the appropriate technology, it would do so.

Responding to a question from Ms. Wylie regarding whether LTD could “piggyback” on the Los Angeles order for the CNG vehicles, Mr. Pangborn said yes, but not until 2005 at the earliest. That vehicle cost \$630,000. However, the problem with that vehicle was that it required LTD to redesign many of the bus stations. Ms. Wylie pointed out that there were tradeoffs for every selection. Mr. Pangborn concurred, and said staff would follow up. Mr. Hamm noted associated bus barn improvements as well.

Responding to a question from Ms. Hocken, Mr. Pangborn diagramed the timeline for the acquisition of the New Flyer articulated buses.

Ms. Wylie asked if there were operational safety issues related to the installation of left-hand doors. Mr. Pangborn indicated that LTD would have to do a structural analysis of the vehicle prior to installing the doors. Mr. Hamm said that the company doing the retrofitting would go through the analysis before it attempted to do the work to ensure the design was structurally sound.

Mr. Berkshire, in response to a question from Mr. Gant, indicated the manufacturer would stand behind the retrofitting. Mr. Pangborn added that staff continued to explore the issue and believed that it could develop a warranty assurance with the manufacturer. Ms. Hellekson indicated that the issue could affect LTD's bond rating as well.

Mr. Pangborn said that left-hand doors could be considered new technology. He noted that Mr. Gant had been present at staff discussions with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Mr. Gant believed that the FTA's focus and interest was on a Phileas-type system, and it was trying to motivate the domestic manufacturers to move forward with the desired technology through what he termed "competitive fear."

Responding to a question from Mr. Kleger, Mr. Pangborn did not know how much time would be required to redesign the stations to accommodate right-side only doors. He added that he asked staff to develop an estimate of the time required. Mr. Viggiano reported that each year's delay in construction would cost the District \$500,000.

Responding to a question from Ms. Wylie regarding next steps, Mr. Pangborn anticipated further staff cost analysis of each option.

Mr. Gaydos believed it would be worthwhile if another Board subcommittee was formed to discuss the political issues involved and determine how to approach each city council. The Board agreed to employ the BRT Board Committee in that effort.

Ms. Lauritsen said that she had heard concerns from Springfield residents regarding the potential that LTD would go into debt to purchase the vehicles. She preferred not to get into debt even if the \$3.5 million was received, noting the increase in the cost of the vehicles. Ms. Lauritsen did not want to burden the District with the heavy debt that would be required. She did not think that the desired image was so desirable that the District should go into debt.

Ms. Wylie postponed discussion of item VIII, Items for Information at this Meeting, to Wednesday, April 16, and suggested that the Board move into Executive Session.

**MOTION**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Ms. Ban, seconded by Mr. Gaydos, moved that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to Oregon Revised Statutes 192.660(1)(a), to consider the employment of a public officer, employee, staff member, or individual agent. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0, with Gant, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Wylie, and Ban voting in favor, and none opposed.

**VOTE**

Pursuant to Oregon Revised Statute 192.660(1)(a), the Board entered into Executive Session.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the Executive Session and the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

---

---

Board Secretary