

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

September 18, 1984

Pursuant to notice given to the Register-Guard for publication on September 13, 1984 and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Tuesday, September 18, 1984 at 7:20 p.m. in the Eugene City Hall.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Janet Calvert, President, presiding
Janice Eberly, Vice President
Judy Nelson
Larry Parducci, Secretary
Gus Pusateri
Velma Scheve
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: After calling the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m., Ms. Calvert expressed her pleasure at once again having all seven Board positions filled. She welcomed the two new members, Gus Pusateri and Velma Scheve, and said she thought they would find the Board to be a congenial group to work with. They had signed the oath of office just prior to the Budget Committee meeting which had been held at 7:15 that evening. Ms. Calvert also explained that the order of roll call changes each meeting, with the first person at one meeting being last at the next, so that no member has to vote first all the time.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Calvert opened the meeting for public comment. Paul Bonney of 487 Antelope Way, Eugene, said he had talked to Ed Bergeron, Marketing Administrator, about the schedules for the new service being offered at the end of the month, and was very much impressed about the 15-minute service to the Oakway Mall. However, he said there would be no more buses which several people from his church relied on to get to church on Sundays.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Ms. Eberly moved, seconded by Ms. Nelson, that the minutes of the July 17, 1984 regular meeting be approved as mailed. With no additions or corrections, the motion was approved by unanimous vote.

SECTION 18 CAPITAL GRANT APPLICATION: Ms. Loobey introduced this topic by reminding the Board that they had discussed the Section 18 application at their meeting in July. She said those funds are federal funds which are only available through the State for rural programs. Their availability enabled the District to try some different kinds of services in rural communities. Staff first looked at Junction City, which has a large concentration of elderly housing. It was proposed that LTD continue the trunk route between Eugene and Junction City, which is used a lot for work trips and to a small extent for shopping, and add service

on a smaller demand/response vehicle within Junction City itself. That vehicle would be quartered in Junction City and would be used only for service there. Staff had made initial contacts with the Junction City Chamber of Commerce and City Council, and planned to meet with other interested parties, including representatives from housing for the elderly, senior services, and the transportation subcommittee of the Chamber of Commerce. Ms. Loobey stated that staff were bringing this issue to the Board at that time because of the timeline the State had set for distributing the funds.

Two additional projects were investigated in conjunction with the availability of the funds. The first involved discussions with the developer of a shopping area in Veneta regarding setting up a minor transfer station at that site. Ms. Loobey explained that there is money in the grant application which would provide for a shelter and shelter pad in Veneta. The second project is a van pool experiment for the upper McKenzie. The forest service employees now do a "reverse commute"; that is, they go up the river in the mornings and return to Eugene in the afternoons. The van pool would mean that they could drive in the van to work and the van's inbound trip would be used for people who live in McKenzie Bridge and work or go to school in Eugene. Regular bus service would be consolidated in the mid-day, to make work and shopping trips from McKenzie Bridge to Eugene more convenient for those who live in that area. Van pooling has been tried in other areas across the country, where the van is driven and maintained by the group of people who use it. Ms. Loobey introduced Leon Skiles, Service Analyst, as the staff person assigned to this project. Mr. Parducci asked what LTD's responsibilities for the van would be. Mr. Skiles answered that the van would be owned 80% by the federal government and 20% by LTD. A contractual agreement would be set up with the users; LTD will decide which is the most beneficial of several ways in which to set up such an agreement. The van would be used for a specific purpose and its use would be monitored through mileage. Mr. Pusateri asked if the District would be paid per mile. Mr. Skiles said it would not, but van pooling was generally more cost effective than regular service. LTD's only expense would be to incur the capital expenses, and would have close to a 100% farebox to operating cost ratio. Ms. Calvert asked about insurance, to which Mr. Skiles replied that he thought the users would have to be insured, but staff had not investigated some of those details in great depth because they weren't yet sure the District would be receiving the grant.

Mr. Brandt asked if this was the first time the Board had known about the proposed projects for Veneta and McKenzie Bridge. Ms. Loobey said it was; when the Board talked in July, staff were only contemplating the Junction City service, which was still the highest priority. However, since the federal money is available now and the federal funding process is laborious, staff thought this would be an appropriate time to apply for such funds.

In response to a question from Mr. Brandt, Mr. Skiles stated that the grant total for Veneta and McKenzie River was \$56,000, with a local match of \$12,000. Mr. Brandt then wondered why the District would want to spend \$12,000 for service in those two areas. Ms. Loobey replied that it would involve a reduction in the

District's operating expenses and the opportunity to provide a different kind of service, as well as to maximize the Section 18 funds and minimize operating costs. Ms. Calvert commented that the District would be providing better service to areas which pay the payroll tax. In response to a question from Ms. Nelson, Mr. Skiles stated that the \$12,000 was for operating costs, which would be divided by expected ridership to set up an appropriate cost for using the van pool.

Public Hearing on Section 18 Capital Grant Application: Ms. Calvert opened the public hearing on this issue. Hearing no testimony from the audience, she closed the hearing.

MOTION With no further discussion, Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the application for Section 18 capital funds as set forth in the Board packet. After VOTE seconding by Ms. Nelson, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

AUDIT REPORT: Ms. Calvert introduced David Gault and Steven Christiansen, who were present to represent Derickson & Gault, the District's independent auditors. Mr. Gault addressed a few comments to the newer members of the Board. He explained that the firm of Derickson & Gault was hired by the Board to conduct an independent audit required by the State. He called their attention to the 25-page report and the management letter which was included in the agenda packet, and said their independence from the District permits them to "tell it like it is." The audit found that the District's financial statements are a fair presentation, and that the District is substantially in compliance with regulations. Mr. Gault further stated that LTD's accounting function is administered very competently.

Mr. Brandt commented that there was not one negative comment in the report and wondered if things were really that good. Mr. Gault said they would have loved to have found something wrong but did not. Mr. Brandt then wondered how many adjusting journal entries the auditors had to make between the District's records and the final audit report. Mr. Christiansen said there were none. Mr. Gault added that the firm audits 12 local agencies, and the average is about 10 adjusting entries.

MOTION Ms. Nelson moved, seconded by Mr. Parducci, that the Board approve the audit report presented by Derickson & Gault. With no further discussion, the motion VOTE carried by unanimous vote. The Board members thanked Mr. Gault and Mr. Christiansen for their presentation.

BANKING RESOLUTION: Ms. Loobey commented that the notes in the agenda packet were fairly descriptive about why the resolution was being presented to the Board, beginning with the purchase of Bank of the Northwest by First Interstate Bank. Staff did ask for proposals to handle the District's banking, and it appears that First Interstate Bank is the most capable of handling LTD's large amount of coins. Other banks would charge \$35 per hour to count the coins, but by keeping the float at a minimum of \$20,000, the District should be able to escape monthly charges for the most part, averaged out over six months or a year. The District has until November to accomplish the transition to new checks, etc.

The four banks which submitted proposals were First Interstate, Centennial, Pacific Western, and Citizens Valley.

MOTION
VOTE

Ms. Nelson moved that the Board approve the banking resolution found on pages 27 and 28 of the agenda packet. After seconding by Mr. Parducci, the motion carried unanimously.

APPOINTMENT OF FACILITY NEEDS SUBCOMMITTEE: Ms. Loobey stated that staff were suggesting appointment of a Facility Needs Subcommittee to work with the staff and architects on a space needs study for which the District recently approved funds and awarded a contract to the architectural firm of Wilson Bryant Gunderson & Seider. Because of the potential magnitude of this project and because of concerns within the business community, it was being suggested that the subcommittee include members of the Chambers of Commerce of Eugene and Springfield. Ms. Loobey explained that the subcommittee may be a standing subcommittee for 18 to 24 months, and said that the architects and staff had completed a site study of Tri-Met, Olympia, C-Tran in Vancouver, Washington, and Seattle Metro, and the project was underway. Specific issues that concern the District's future for the next 20 years will arise as the District goes through the process, and staff believed it was important to have the subcommittee to work with staff and the architects.

Ms. Calvert said that normally it didn't take Board action to establish a subcommittee, but staff thought it was appropriate to ask the Board if it wished to include members of the local Chambers of Commerce on the subcommittee. Ms. Nelson asked if it would serve any purpose to include someone from the Downtown Commission or other active groups. Ms. Calvert stated that it was hoped that having members from the Chambers would encompass that aspect of active downtown groups, as well. Mr. Brandt was concerned that if the District involved people from the Chambers, everyone else would want to be involved, too. He said he did not particularly relish working with people from the community when dealing with some rather confidential materials, and said the District had the capabilities to make its own decisions. He said he was not saying the Board shouldn't ask for some community input toward the end, but he saw a potential for problems if that involvement began too soon.

Ms. Nelson asked about the scope of the project. Ms. Loobey replied that it would involve making projections regarding the District's size for fleet, etc. Some considerations will be the T-2000 Plan, the present site, looking at a vacant site somewhere, using a split site, and other issues to decide what is best for the District based on what needs are foreseen for the next 10 to 20 years. It is thought that by the time construction would begin, it would be a \$6 to \$8 million project, which would have a substantial impact on the community. Ms. Loobey stated that she understood Mr. Brandt's concerns, but that any aspect of the study would be public record, and the results of subcommittee meetings would not be confidential after they went to the full Board. Mr. Brandt thought that the process of finding a location, if the District were to move or expand, would need to be kept confidential, and added that if the District was talking about spending \$6-8 million, a lot of people would want to be involved. He

thought the Board would be "jumping the gun" to ask people to get involved before the process got further along and that it would slow down the process; he anticipated a lot of problems with it.

Ms. Nelson wondered about the Board going ahead to get the initial work done and then at some point in the future involving members from the Chambers. It was Mr. Brandt's opinion that Ms. Loobey and staff were involving community members in, and informing them of, LTD's activities all the time, through their memberships in various community and business groups. He thought that would be more appropriate than asking outsiders to come in and help make a decision. He asked if staff had made a commitment to the Chambers to involve those members, to which Ms. Loobey replied that they had not, but had inquired whether there would be interest in being involved. Mr. Brandt then wanted to know if there would be a problem if the Chamber members were not included. Ms. Loobey stated that in virtually any construction project done by any local unit of government, there has been a great deal of conflict about it, whether it is deserved or not. Her concern regarding not involving Chamber of Commerce members was that the District might be setting itself up for more conflict from the community when the project begins to unfold. She said she did not know of any construction project in the last eight to 10 years where that has not happened. The purpose of inviting members of the business community to participate is to let them be involved in a more intimate way, not because the District doesn't know what it is doing and needs outside help.

Ms. Nelson proposed that, if the purpose is to avoid controversy, having Chamber of Commerce members on the subcommittee would not make any difference. Mr. Brandt thought it could avoid controversy, but he agreed that it wouldn't, and thought it could lead to further problems. He wondered whether the Chamber representatives would be non-voting members; Ms. Looby stated that they would. Ms. Eberly wondered if the Chamber members could be involved in the subcommittee during specific stages of the project. She said she understood Mr. Brandt's concerns and thought there was probably no way to "plug up all the holes," but that there was some possibility for improvement. She suggested that the Board members could reach out and talk to the transportation committees of the two Chambers. She reminded the Board that when the Special Committee on Transportation was active, there was a lot of good, positive feedback; the meetings were open and sometimes members of the public came to give input. Ms. Eberly stated that she did not have a problem with the idea of Chamber members on the subcommittee, but she was suggesting a compromise. Because certain things would have to be kept confidential, she was suggesting that input from the Chamber members could be used in the early stages, and the second stage could continue with the Board subcommittee.

Mr. Parducci suggested that, since the Chamber members would be non-voting members of the subcommittee, confidential issues could still be discussed solely by the three-member Board subcommittee. He said he agreed with Ms. Eberly, although he understood what Mr. Brandt was saying. Ms. Nelson said she thought it could be useful to have the input from the community, but thought it would be naive of the Board to expect it to avoid controversy. Mr. Parducci added that

he agreed with Mr. Brandt that this issue had to be handled carefully so it didn't get out of hand.

MOTION

Mr. Brandt then moved that the Board establish a Facility Needs Subcommittee to include one member from the Eugene Chamber of Commerce and one member from the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, and that no additional representatives of other groups be allowed to become members of said subcommittee without approval by 100% of the Board members. Mr. Parducci seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

VOTE

Ms. Calvert then said that, because there were two new members on the Board, she would be making a reassignment of subcommittee memberships. She then made the following appointments to Board subcommittees:

Budget Subcommittee: Velma Scheve, Peter Brandt, and herself as ex officio member

Salary Subcommittee: Gus Pusateri, Judy Nelson, and herself as ex officio member

Facilities Needs Subcommittee: Larry Parducci, Janice Eberly, and herself as ex officio member

Ms. Calvert then stated that the action items for the evening were concluded, but there were several informational items for which presentations were planned.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Employee of the Month: In an effort to familiarize the Board with employees and the Employee of the Month program, Ms. Calvert said a new feature of the agenda packet would be a short description of the employee chosen for each month. It is also hoped that the Employee of the Month will be able to attend the meeting to meet the Board members.

Maintenance Presentation: Chuck Beever, Maintenance Manager, was present to discuss the role and functions of the Maintenance division. He used a chart which showed the organization of the division, which operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He explained the functions of the Clerical Specialist, the tire specialist, the three leadmen, five journeymen, four mechanics, general service workers, lead cleaner, partskeeper, and parts clerks. Another chart showed the operating functions for each shift, which are from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m., 3:00-11:30 p.m., and 11:00 p.m. to 7:30 a.m. A third chart showed the maintenance facilities in relation to the rest of the property. Mr. Beever also talked about performance measures used in Maintenance, including road calls (calls from drivers for maintenance work on buses that are out on the road), down time (the amount of time a bus is out of service for maintenance work), and attendance, which runs from 98% to 100% in that division. The percentage rate for available vehicles is also at 98%. Fuel mileage at LTD is at 5+ miles per gallon, which is the top in the nation.

Mr. Beever also discussed the training and incentive programs in the Maintenance division, and listed the variety and ages of District vehicles for which Maintenance is responsible. Ms. Calvert asked Mr. Beever how he would like to change the physical working arrangement. He replied that one of the problems with the facilities occurs on the third shift, when buses are being moved all over the property for different reasons because functions are not consolidated. Mr. Brandt wondered if the City would let LTD close 8th Avenue by the property. Ms. Loobey replied that the City had talked to District staff about the possibility when they were talking about the Chambers connector, so people would not continue to use 8th Avenue. The Board showed some interest in the ability to wash so many buses each night, to which Mr. Beever responded by saying that the employee who does that is a very dedicated employee. Mr. Parducci asked if the new buses would get better gas mileage, but because of their larger size and heavier weight, Mr. Beever estimated that they would also get 5 miles to the gallon.

The Board members thanked Mr. Beever for his interesting presentation.

Planning Report on Special Service: Mr. Skiles first talked about the Lane County Fair. He said it was not quite as successful as last year, but it was still successful, with a 22% increase over Sunday of last year, and the District carrying well over double what it would carry on normal summer days. The differences, he said, were beyond the capabilities of the District to influence. The Fair service was seen as a way to introduce new people to the system, and staff had tried to emphasize use of the existing system rather than setting up special park and ride locations. A very successful shuttle was provided between the fairgrounds and River Road Transit Station; this emphasized the availability of that facility to the public.

In discussing the summer Route Segment Analysis (RSA), Mr. Skiles stated that RSAs are done quarterly, with counts being taken on a Wednesday, Saturday, and Sunday. A person is there to record the count on the bus each time it enters the mall, which shows ridership for each trip on each route. This is the major data which Planning uses in evaluating service and making changes. This summer, the RSA showed increases in weekdays on the routes to Valley River Center, the Springfield Mall, and the 5th Street area. The increase in Valley River Center ridership, he said, was due in part to the success of the Totally Transit program, with Valley River Center being a major destination point for that age group (12-17). The increase to 5th Street follows a trend apparent through the past year, which shows that there is a large demand for circulation in the downtown area, and which should help sustain the new shuttle service being offered this year. Another highlight was increased productivity on weekends, which followed a decrease in fares on weekends. Again, the ridership gain was the highest on the Valley River Center routes.

Mr. Skiles stated that the new service implemented last winter--the additional service to Valley River Center, the West 11th and the #19 Main Street routes--are all meeting expected ridership levels. The #19 Main Street follows a

trend to provide more service in the middle of the day to make service consistent throughout the day; riders place a high value on this mid-day service, and productivity for the whole day increases as a result. This trend played a large part in adding additional service in the Thurston corridor, which increased frequency to every 15 minutes.

Marketing Report on Summer Promotions and Activities: Ms. Calvert commented that she was pleased to see the number of Totally Transit passes which had been sold over the summer. Ms. Loobey introduced Bruce Cappelli and Kathy Wiltz, from Cappelli Miles & Wiltz, the District's ad agency which worked on the campaigns over the summer. Mr. Cappelli said he would take the next few minutes to show the Board the District's advertising over the last few months and what direction the advertising would take for the next year or so. He said it was nice to be able to come to the Board on the heels of very successful promotions; as a whole, he said, the District has been successful in impacting its public image and marketing which has a direct impact on ridership. He complimented the Marketing staff for their efforts in this area, as well, and said that his agency acts as a sounding Board for marketing concepts. He said the Totally Transit campaign was incredibly successful, and showed samples of the Totally Transit advertising materials and the television commercials. He added that the campaign was based upon the jargon at the time, and may have to be changed somewhat if offered next summer.

Mr. Cappelli then talked about the new overall advertising concept for the District, which captures a new orientation based on the new kinds of service developed in the last couple of years, the new colors, logo, and buses, and the new convenience of the system and caters more to the mentality of the riders. The new theme is "Express Yourself," which also applies to the personalities of the riders and shows that riding the bus is part of a good lifestyle and that successful people can ride the bus and enjoy it. He showed an example of a newspaper ad for the football shuttles, now using photographs of real people in real situations, rather than illustrations.

This year, he said, the District has the ability to use a mixture of media types, to reinforce the ability to reach into the community. Mr. Cappelli and Ms. Wiltz then played a music package based around the "Express Yourself" theme, and showed new advertising using the words "Transportation Innovation" to explain new materials in a mailer to people in the Ferry Street Bridge sector. "Transportation Innovation" stickers will be used to call attention to new service. Mr. Cappelli stated that the agency is paying attention to what other APTA members are doing in their broadcasting and advertising, as well.

Update on Dial-A-Ride: Ms. Calvert stated that staff would be bringing this issue to the Board again in November. Ms. Loobey reminded the Board that they discussed funding for Dial-A-Ride in July, and said that staff have continued to work on some areas of concern. It had been anticipated that the District would be able to examine the overhead, scope of the project, and fixed route availability in order to move people from Dial-A-Ride to fixed route service. Those examinations have occurred, she said, but the move to fixed route service has not

happened, due to an unanticipated trip demand on the part of the frail elderly. Wheelchair and other physically limited younger people have made the change to fixed route service; as space became available, the frail elderly increased their trip-making, thus using the service more. As a result, the Board had increased the funding by \$9,000 until the end of the calendar year. Ms. Loobey stated that this portion of the Dial-A-Ride ridership has caused more use of the service than was anticipated, and staff did not see any feasible way to reduce the costs of Dial-A-Ride without denying trips to those who need them. She explained that staff were giving the Board this progress report as they continued to examine the issues, and would come back to the Board in November with a full report.

Downtown Plan Schedule and Update: Ms. Loobey stated that the Downtown Plan, especially the opening of Willamette between 10th and 11th, was still of concern to the District. The Eugene Planning Commission was at that time conducting sessions on the Downtown Plan; the day before, the aspect of opening Willamette between 10th and 11th was brought back to the table. The Planning Commission has instructed that their concerns regarding a cost benefit analysis, how useful the opening would be, and what happens to the concerns expressed by LTD and Lane Community College be inserted back into the process of the Downtown Plan. Ms. Loobey said staff would keep the Board posted on this issue.

Payroll Tax: Ms. Calvert stated that she was interested in knowing how the payroll tax had been coming in. Karen Rivenburg, Accountant, stated that a 2.9% increase in the tax base was projected, and that at that point in the quarter, receipts were 3-4% above the same time last year. She said staff would have a better idea when the next quarter's receipts come in, considering what may happen to the wood products industry as a result of the quarantine recently imposed.

MOTION **EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Ms. Nelson moved that the Board adjourn to Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(i), for the purpose of reviewing and evaluating the performance of the General Manager. After seconding, the motion carried by unanimous vote.
VOTE

MOTION **RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION/ADJOURNMENT:** After returning to regular session, Mr. Brandt moved that the meeting be adjourned. After seconding, the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 10:00 p.m.
VOTE


Board Secretary