

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING/WORK SESSION

Monday, January 11, 2010

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on January 7, 2010, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special Board meeting/work session on Monday, January 11, 2010, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Mike Eyster, President, presiding  
Greg Evans, Vice President  
Ed Necker, Treasurer  
Michael Dubick  
Doris Towery  
Gary Gillespie  
Mark Pangborn, General Manager  
Jeanne Schapper, Clerk of the Board  
Lynn Taylor, Minutes Recorder

Absent: Dean Kortge, Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL** – Mr. Eyster convened the meeting and called the roll at 5:36 p.m.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT** – Mr. Eyster announced that the awards ceremony at the Employee Celebration the previous evening had been exceptional.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA** – There were no announcements or additions to the agenda.

**WORK SESSION**

**EWEB Riverfront Master Plan** – Director of Transit Operations Mark Johnson stated that he was a member of the Citizen Advisory Team (CAT) formed by the Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) and the Eugene City Council to oversee development of a master plan for EWEB's property located along the Willamette River. Mr. Johnson described the public participation at design meetings and believed that the meetings had provided good information regarding the community's vision for the site. He introduced John Rowell and Lorri Nelson of Rowell Brokaw Architects, P.C., who were working with the CAT on the master plan design options.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the following guiding principles for the master planning process:

- Sustainable Urbanism
- Balance of Uses

- Ecology
- Identity
- Connection
- Economics
- Feasibility

In response to a question from Mr. Evans, Mr. Johnson said that the intent of the master planning process was to enhance downtown Eugene, not to shift the center of downtown to the riverfront site.

Mr. Rowell described the site, the current constraints, and the uses. He then reviewed three master plan design options that were presented to the public: City Green, Organic Plazas and River Bow. He noted that each design showed a continuous connection between the river and the Great Street pattern in downtown; however, each were different enough to provide choices. He said that based on the feedback on the design options, it was clear that the community wanted a loop that connected downtown through the riverfront site using a multi-modal pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented Great Street with slow traffic. The design team recommended that 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue be the crossing. He then illustrated other aspects of the proposed design that would be refined by the CAT and presented to the public for feedback.

Mr. Eyster asked if the buyer of the site would need to comply with the master plan. Mr. Rowell replied that a buyer would need to comply with certain aspects of the plan, such as street locations and riparian setbacks.

In response to Mr. Eyster's question regarding the implications for LTD, Mr. Johnson replied that it was unlikely that buses would travel through the site because of the access to service adjacent to the site. He added that there could possibly be future opportunity for trolley service.

Mr. Gillespie asked if the site was within an urban renewal district. Mr. Rowell answered that the site was located in the Riverfront Research Park Urban Renewal District.

**Board Draft Vision Statements** – Director of Human Resources and Risk Management Mary Adams reported that the development of a 20-year vision for LTD began in October 2009, and a broad range of ideas had been generated by Board members, Leadership Council members, and community leaders. Ms. Adams briefly reviewed the list of ideas and themes and explained the process used to define a set of overarching competencies. Those ideas would be developed into a draft of visions for LTD and a set of core leadership competencies to guide the District's work. She then asked for feedback from the Board regarding the themes around which the ideas had been organized and how well they expressed progressive leadership for the community's transportation needs, including:

- Pursue public and private partnerships for funding projects and operations

Mr. Pangborn said that a Park and Ride facility that included commercial space for other types of businesses was an example of a private partnership.

Mr. Eyster said that the common issue was the need for sustainable funding and perhaps the statement should be stated more broadly. Mr. Pangborn suggested revising the statement to indicate the District would "pursue all options for sustainable funding."

- Implement green technology in facilities, vehicles, and operations

Mr. Eyster suggested adding the word "practices" to the statement.

- Pursue new types of services that improve the transportation experience and provide better services to outlying areas

Mr. Eyster suggested leaving the statement open-ended by deleting the phrase "to outlying areas." Other Board members concurred with the suggestion.

- Improve access and ease of use through enhancements such as cashless fare system and real-time customer information

Mr. Necker said that the statement was a good long-term part of the vision but not financially feasible at this time.

Mr. Eyster approved of the statement but suggested eliminating examples.

Mr. Evans suggested replacing the "such as" clause with "to the system." Mr. Eyster and Mr. Dubick concurred.

Ms. Adams noted that it appeared that the draft statements as modified were consistent with the Board's direction and invited any other suggestions.

Mr. Eyster stated that partnerships should be a stand alone theme, rather than a means to achieve another goal. Collaboration and connections among jurisdictions are essential and LTD is often the catalyst for these relationships. Ms. Adams said that a statement regarding progressive leadership in the community's transportation needs could be expanded to include partnerships.

Mr. Necker questioned whether any of the themes addressed operations and maintaining services as a priority. He said that removing people from their cars and creating more choice riders would be a successful outcome.

Mr. Gillespie asked if safety was considered part of an improved transportation experience. Ms. Adams replied that safety was one of the District's four core values.

Mr. Eyster suggested that safety could be a bulleted item under that statement, along with reliability and efficiency.

Mr. Gillespie cautioned that private partnerships should be clearly defined so that employees did not perceive it to be outsourcing of jobs.

Mr. Evans stated that partnerships should include deepening, expanding, and empowering the District's riders as partners, not just as users of the system. This might make them more engaged in defining the services they received.

Ms. Adams thanked Board members for their input and said that there would be more opportunities to refine the vision statements.

**2010 Annual Route Review** – Mr. Pangborn stated that while there could be additional federal funds available at some point, the service and budget reduction plan did not make that assumption and was based on reducing costs by \$3 million in Fiscal Year 2010-11.

Director of Service Planning, Accessibility and Marketing Andy Vobora provided an overview of ridership statistics and referred to a decrease in operating funds due to a significant drop in payroll tax revenues. He said that the tentative decision by local jurisdictions to allocate some State Transportation Program-Urban funds to LTD meant that service reductions would not need to be as severe; however, cuts were still necessary. Goals for redesign of the service package included:

- Strong corridor service
- Maintain a minimum urban route frequency of 60 minutes
- Meet Title VI requirements, avoid disproportionate impact
- Achieve the budget goal

Mr. Vobora referred to the 2010 Service Reduction/Redesign Proposal, January 2010 to illustrate the proposed service changes. He said that the changes represented a 17.8 percent reduction in services for a savings of \$2.3 million. Additional Tier 2 cuts, combined with other budget reductions, would bring that figure closer to \$3 million but would require additional work to determine if they were feasible and in compliance with labor contracts. He reviewed the public outreach activities and timelines for engaging the community in a discussion of the proposed changes.

Mr. Evans asked how the media would be engaged in informing the public. Mr. Vobora replied that staff planned to take the same approach that had been used last year. Even though federal dollars had ultimately allowed the District to postpone FY 2009-2010 service reductions, it had been very beneficial to engage the media at the beginning of the process.

Mr. Vobora noted that some of the service cuts could be implemented with the 2010 summer bid and thereby save an additional \$150,000. He said that a summer bid implementation would involve 12-15 layoffs and would require an expedited public process.

Mr. Gillespie asked when the District would know if additional federal funds would be coming. Assistant General Manager Stefano Viggiano said that the District should know by the end of February if it would receive funds.

Mr. Vobora asked the Board if it thought any services should be off limits from consideration.

Mr. Eyster suggested that EmX should not be subjected to any cuts beyond those reflected in Tier 2.

Mr. Evans commented that the University of Oregon and Lane Community College service demands were growing, and it was often standing room only on buses. He added that while nothing should be untouchable, those routes should be preserved to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Eyster said that he was inclined to agree with a summer bid implementation.

Mr. Necker asked if the intent was to let summer service reductions remain even if additional federal funds become available. Mr. Vobora replied that would be the Board's decision. Service Planning Manager Will Mueller added that in order to prepare for the summer bid, staff would need to know before February 19 whether to implement the cuts, even though the District might not know the status of federal funding.

Mr. Pangborn remarked that the Board was scheduled to meet on February 17, and it could make a decision on summer implementation with the information that was available at that time.

Mr. Evans inquired about the union's general mood with respect to the potential service cuts and the impacts on the workforce. Mr. Pangborn believed that the union would probably make every attempt to retain current benefits; however, union leaders were currently focused on negotiations with Portland and Salem transit districts and had not yet discussed anything with LTD. Ms. Adams added that the union was well aware of the business environment faced by LTD and that the District would have a better sense of how negotiations were likely to proceed by watching the Portland and Salem outcomes.

Mr. Vobora stated that staff would look at dates for scheduling a public hearing on summer bid implementation prior to the February 17 Board meeting. He also invited Board members to ride routes with service planners if they wished to gain a clearer picture of any of the potential service reductions.

**ADJOURNMENT** - Mr. Eyster adjourned the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2010\02\Regular Mtg 02-17-10\BDMIN\_1-11-10.docx