

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

February 19, 1985

Pursuant to notice given to the Register-Guard for publication on February 14, 1985 and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Tuesday, February 19, 1985 at 7:30 p.m. in the Eugene City Hall.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer  
Janet Calvert, President, presiding  
Joyce Nichols  
Gus Pusateri  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Janice Eberly, Vice President  
Larry Parducci, Secretary

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Calvert said that she and Ms. Eberly had attended the District's annual Awards Banquet on Sunday, and that the other Board members had missed a very nice banquet, with the largest employee attendance ever. She expressed hope that the others would be able to participate next year.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Calvert asked that anyone with comments on particular agenda items wait until those items came up on the agenda, and opened the floor to persons with comments of a general nature.

Paul Bonney, of 587 Antelope Way, Eugene, stated that he had read the draft fare policy in the agenda packet. He thought the ideas on passes and prepayment of fare were sound. He also wondered if the District was aware of the fact that people who board the buses downtown sometimes get away without paying, and encouraged the District to continue enforcement of fare payment.

Vic Beers of 2185 Carmel, Eugene expressed concern about the budget and wondered what the Board's justification was for any increase in salaries this year. Ms. Calvert asked if he could wait until the issue came up on the agenda.

Jim Hale of the Metropolitan Area Planning Advisory Committee said he was there to speak as a private citizen. He had talked to the Board in June and asked for their input on transportation planning and transit goals. He stated that last year there was some doubt about appropriate goals for transit among members of the committee, the Planning Commissioners, and elected officials, and a high goal of 15% was reduced through political compromise to 8%. He said that LTD had played a role in that

decision and that others had relied on the District's judgment in this issue. He believed, however, that the information had changed since last summer, especially with the report on maintenance facilities needs published by ECO Northwest. He discussed three documents in that report-- Technical Memo #1, a work program finished in August; Technical Memo #2, a ridership forecast published in September; and the summary document written at the end of October. He expressed the belief that if those documents had been available last summer, the final transit goals for LTD would have been lower. He stated that he does support the need for a new maintenance facility and the use of consultants to help show the District what its expectations ought to be, but he did not support the established goals.

Harold Chapman of 51 Chapman Drive, Eugene, who accompanied Mr. Hale to the meeting, spoke next. He listed the variables (which could have either a positive or negative impact on transit ridership in the Eugene/Springfield area) reviewed by ECO Northwest in its study. Those variables included population and population density; employment and employment density; average household income; local parking policies; college enrollment; fares; size of buses; and the effect of the geographic configuration of communities on ridership. Level of employment was determined to be the best predictor of ridership. In its forecast, ECO Northwest predicted what LTD ridership would likely be and stated that, if one had to select one boundary in a single forecast, lower is by far the most likely. Mr. Chapman went on to say that just increasing the modal split from its current level of less than 1% to its historically high level of 1.41% means a 45% increase in the modal split. He said that the consultant's report assumes that LTD can handle increased ridership between now and 1990 by gradually reaching the productivity that it had in 1980. The report also stated that an increase in the modal split to 1.5% by the year 2000 is the most optimistic assumption that LTD should make in forecasting ridership. In order to reach the current goal of an 8% modal split by the year 2000, the consultants state that an annualized growth rate in ridership of 16.7% would have to be achieved.

Mr. Hale then showed maps divided into zones which detailed the percentage of home-based work trips in each zone. He stated that there is a great variation, depending on the zone, in what an 8% goal really means. He said the transit ridership expectations in the transit model would mean a decrease in net auto trips to and from downtown, the University, and other areas. He thought that if the Planning Commissioners and others who had worked on the transit goals had known that decreases in auto trips were being projected, they would not have adopted the same transit goal. He urged the Board members to examine the transit goals to see if they believed those goals could be met. He stated that he was making a strong case that they could not. He also said that a very important segment of the community is the one which is distrustful of LTD's plans and programs, and better feelings would bode well for LTD. He thought that if more people believed the transit goals were truly attainable, they would be more apt to support what the transit district does.

He asked the Board if they would schedule some time to review the full ECO Northwest report rather than just the summary.

Ms. Calvert asked Mr. Hale if he wanted the Board to respond before the new T-2000 goals are adopted. Mr. Hale replied that the T-2000 process (being renamed the TransPlan) is too far along to reconsider some of the assumptions, but he thought the computer runs could still be made with lower assumptions without slowing down the process to a great degree. Mr. Hale stated that he planned to make the same presentation to other groups, as well, including the Planning Commission. Ms. Calvert thanked him for his presentation, and said they would be discussing the issue later on the agenda for that evening.

MOTION  
VOTE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Brandt moved, seconded by Ms. Nichols, that the minutes of the January 15, 1985 regular meeting be approved as distributed. With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

SALARY SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES: The Board's attention was called to the memo from the Board Salary Subcommittee on page 16 of the agenda packet. Mr. Pusateri, Chair of the Salary Subcommittee stated that the Subcommittee had looked at what was done last year and planned administrative salaries for this year in combination with the Consumer Price Index and other increases which are pending around the community. The Subcommittee believed that the recommended increases are not out of line and are consistent with other salary rates and schedules.

Ms. Loobey explained that the recommendation includes a general adjustment of 3.5% to the Administrative Salary Schedule, and an additional adjustment to grades six through 13, where the salaries are more out of line with the marketplace. She said it would take longer for someone to reach the maximum rate, and a cap at 100% would be placed on salaries, rather than at 108%, as it had been previously under the Pay for Performance plan. In response to a question from Mr. Brandt, Ms. Loobey stated that grades six through eight would receive an additional 3% to the salary scale; grades nine through 12 would receive 4% in addition to the 3.5% general adjustment; and grade 13 would receive an additional 5%. Mr. Brandt commented that 3.5% didn't seem like very much of an increase for grades one through five, and asked about the number of employees in each category. David Harrison, Personnel Administrator, replied that there are three accounting clerks and four clerical specialists in those categories. He also explained that not every District job had a comparable job in every agency, but each job was compared with at least four or five others.

Mr. Brandt then asked how the people in grades one through five feel when everyone else gets a bigger increase. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, stated that most of those employees are supervised by the division directors he supervises. He said that they are understandably not happy with the situation and with being singled out as the lowest members of the salary scale, to begin with. However, he said,

they do understand that the District is paying at market or a little above for the jobs they do. They enjoy their jobs and understand that their pay is comparable to other places. In other words, at one level they think it is fair, and at another level they think it is not. Mr. Pusateri remarked that compared with the outside market, they are staying even and not losing ground. Mr. Brandt thought the rate of pay for the accounting clerks was good for the market. Mr. Pangborn explained that in the City of Eugene, accounting clerks' duties fall in a more limited area, but the District's pay level is justified by the larger area of responsibilities of its accounting clerks. Mr. Brandt stated that he thought no one could say the recommended raises are excessive.

Mr. Beers, a member of the audience who spoke earlier, asked about the total dollar amount of the pay increases and whether the District expected an increase in its income, as well. Ms. Calvert explained that the administrative salary increases amounted to \$65,000, and that LTD looks at its total anticipated income for the following year and develops a budget which does not exceed expected income. Mr. Beers then asked if the raises were being proposed just for the sake of getting raises, or if they were deserved or needed. Ms. Calvert replied that most companies see raises as a way to help their employees keep up with the cost of living. He further asked how the District could justify salary increases, and what would the District do for revenue with the Weyerhaeuser plant laying off and the majority of income to support LTD coming from payroll taxes. Ms. Calvert said that the District's options would be to increase fares, cut expenses, or whatever it needed to do to balance the budget.

## MOTION

Mr. Pusateri moved that the Subcommittee recommendation on page 17 of the agenda packet, regarding salary increases for administrative staff, be adopted as recommended. Ms. Nichols seconded the motion.

Ms. Nichols asked Mr. Brandt, the only Board member present who was not a member of the Salary Subcommittee, if he thought he had been given enough information to make a decision on this issue. He answered that he relied on the subcommittees to do their research and make appropriate recommendations, and he felt he had enough information. It was his opinion that the raises were very small compared with the way District staff work. Ms. Nichols commented that she thought the approach the Subcommittee took was fairly conservative.

## VOTE

With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

FARE POLICY: Ms. Loobey called the Board's attention to the draft fare policy found on page 19 of the agenda packet, and said it was the first time the staff and Board had looked comprehensively at a fare policy and pricing measures and codified them to use in the future to help staff do their jobs better. The policy was divided into three areas: administrative factors, pricing factors, and promotional factors. She asked Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, to discuss the key policies for the Board.

Mr. Viggiano stated that this is the first written fare policy the District has proposed. Staff had previously used unwritten rules and procedures to guide them. The draft policy formalized those unwritten rules and introduced some new ideas. He explained that the policy statements in each category supported one or more objectives.

Policy #4, he explained, encourages prepayment of fares, because people who do buy passes and tokens tend to ride more often. One way to encourage prepayment would be to increase the differential between cash and tokens/passes.

Policy #5 deals with when and how to increase fares. Mr. Viggiano explained that the District's recent policy has been to use an incremental approach, with smaller but fairly frequent increases. This has not had the disastrous results experienced when the District waited to increase prices and then increased them by a large amount. This policy statement also recognizes the negative impact of too many increases, and seeks a balance.

Policy #9 deals with attracting new riders. An example is cooperating with the Lane County Fair Board to offer the public free rides during the Lane County Fair. Staff have surveyed riders and learned that fare discounts are attracting large numbers of people who have never been on the bus before.

Policy #10 proposes that discounted fares be used to encourage ridership during traditionally low demand periods. Mr. Viggiano explained that this is when there is excess capacity on the system and the District has no extra expenses for handling increased ridership at this time. The goal of the policy would be to stabilize ridership throughout the day, and the best way has proven to be by discounting fares. Many transit systems have adopted this policy as they have grown larger. Mr. Pusateri wondered if the people who had already paid for passes or tokens would receive any benefit from this kind of a discount. Mr. Viggiano replied that they would not, which was one of the drawbacks of the system. For instance, the District presently discounts fares on the weekend, but passholders do not benefit from that reduction. Mr. Pangborn mentioned that there are options to encourage passholders, as well, such as the Totally Transit Summer Pass promotion which was so successful the previous summer.

Policy #12 recommended that the value of the service to the patron be considered in determining the fare. For instance, the downtown shuttle is a short loop and is of less value to the patron, who could choose to walk, so the fare is lower. Mr. Brandt had a question about the wording of this policy, and staff agreed to reword it to make the intent more clear.

Policy #13 recognizes that transfers are an essential part of the system, since some people are forced to transfer in order to complete their trips. The patrons' needs in this area should be considered when transfer policies are set. Ms. Calvert asked what the present policy is,

to which Mr. Viggiano replied that patrons are allowed one hour between the time they get off the bus and get on the next one. This policy is appreciated both by merchants and patrons.

MOTION  
VOTE

Mr. Brandt moved that the Board adopt the fare policy with some rewording on policy #12. Mr. Pusateri seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

GRANT APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL AID URBAN FUNDS: Mr. Viggiano explained that in 1982 the District signed an agreement with the City of Springfield in which LTD agreed to replace one asphalt bus bay (added midway through construction of the Springfield Transit Station) and make other improvements to the surrounding asphalt as requested. Certain problems in using the lifts at this station can also be addressed during this project. The funds for the project were budgeted and now available in a grant from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA). However, staff are proposing to use Federal Aid Urban funds which have become available. Those funds are allocated between the cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County, carpooling, and LTD. In the past, FAU funds have been used to build the Springfield and River Road transit stations and are now being used to fund the improvements at 13th and Kincaid and to build the Parkway Station at 29th and Amazon Parkway. Use of FAU money for the Springfield project now would allow the District to install additional passenger shelters, which always meet with favorable response from the community, with the UMTA funds.

In response to a question from Mr. Pusateri, Mr. Viggiano explained that it is generally LTD's position that it is the cities' obligation to make these kinds of repairs. Once the work is done, the District's obligations will be fulfilled and the station becomes Springfield's responsibility.

Public Hearing on Grant Application: Ms. Calvert opened the public hearing on the grant application for Federal Aid Urban funds. Hearing no comments from the audience, she closed the public hearing.

MOTION  
VOTE

Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the staff recommendation and the resolution as set forth on pages 26 and 27 of the agenda packet. Ms. Nelson seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Presentation on Downtown Plan: Russ Brink, Downtown Manager for the City of Eugene, was present to discuss the Downtown Plan, the Price-Sonoma development, and the implications for LTD. Mr. Brink stated that some parts of the plan are still not decided and are still to be negotiated. The next six months will tell a lot about the feasibility of the project and if it ends up being as it was shown on his drawings, he said. Another unknown factor at this time is what the project will cost.

Mr. Brink stated that he had been the Downtown Manager for six months and that downtown management as a theme was popular across the country. He explained that it is based on the same ideas that have guided shopping center management, including marketing, tenant mix, and supplementing services being provided by cities in the downtown area. His job, he said, is to get all the pieces of the puzzle to fit and to work with other agencies, such as LTD. He hoped to be able to continue the good discussions begun with Phyllis Loobey, Ed Bergeron, and Andy Vobora, and said that projects cannot be adequately addressed unless everyone with a piece of the pie cooperates and discusses the issues. Presently, he said, downtown Eugene is being marketed as a place to do business, shop, and participate in cultural and entertainment activities. His office works closely with the Eugene Downtown Association (EDA), and is now also working on projects for image development, including planting, painting, and policing, through a business watch program and increased police personnel on the mall, in order to have the mall perceived as a safer place to be.

Mr. Brink said the Downtown Plan in general had been adopted by the City Council. The major focus at this time is the opening of Willamette between 10th and 11th, and LTD staff have been involved on a task force which is developing a range of options for that street opening. Downtown is also now at the beginning of what could be a very long process. He explained that 18 months ago the City entered into negotiations with Price Development Company, and is now in the position of a six-month bridge between negotiations and disposition and development. This is the point where the developer and the City make a commitment for a project. The City's obligations are to appraise the property in the project area for acquisition and resale to the developer and to continue negotiations on the site area and design elements. The developer's obligation is to acquire letters of commitment from at least two major department stores to anchor the project. He said the project had already changed somewhat and would be changing again.

The core of the project, which is anticipated to stay basically the same, includes the three-block area bounded by Charnelton, Willamette, Eighth, and Tenth streets. The existing buildings in that area, except the Bon Marche, would be replaced by a two-level retail complex with the Bon and two other large stores anchoring the mall (one at the location of the existing Sears building). The developer also wants to make provisions for a fourth department store at a later date. The most recent proposal was to have a major department store on the site of the present Rubensteins or M Jacobs, with a bridge to the rest of the mall, but that proposal was not well received and will probably be revised.

Mr. Brink also spoke of the need for more parking adjacent to the department stores. Two new structures are proposed for areas that now have surface parking, and parking would cover one level below the entire complex. He said the parking ratio started high and will have to be reduced through negotiations. Also proposed is a market plaza or public space for public activities, such as Saturday Market and the Eugene

Celebration. Maintaining a public gathering space is seen as a high priority. One idea is to create a produce market place, or something similar to the Yamhill Market in Portland, on Eighth Avenue, in order to minimize the hard concrete edges and to have street level activities on the perimeter.

Mr. Brink also talked about LTD's points of access into the process, and where the process was going in the future. First, a subcommittee of the Downtown Commission is to review the project, then public hearings will be held by the Downtown Commission and the City Council. He also mentioned the good communication between the staffs of the Eugene Development Department and LTD.

Ms. Calvert asked how Mr. Brink saw transit fitting into the project. He stated that this area is a key to negotiations regarding parking needs, and that both the existing parking inventory and the proximity of transit facilities to the project will be on the City's side in negotiating with the developer regarding the ratio of parking and parking structures. Mr. Brink said he believed the transit facilities needed to be given a very high priority and be kept close to the development. Ms. Calvert also mentioned the need for a commitment of longer than two years for a transit facility. Ms. Nichols commented that a number of downtowns across the country have been malled off and the lack of foot traffic or through street traffic in those areas has led to the decline of some of the stores. She wondered what would happen to the smaller stores if there was a parking structure on essentially every corner of the development. Mr. Brink stated that some of the businesses will go out of business, but that he hopes to be able to keep some of them downtown. The developer is hoping that some will go back into the development. He said the relocation question is a tough one, and that building the development will be disruptive to the existing businesses.

Ms. Nichols also wondered how close the project is to having commitments from four major department stores. Mr. Brink replied that there has only been allusion to this in the discussions, and that there is only speculation on this issue so far. He said he thought the Bon would like to stay, and they are hoping to convince Sears to stay, as well.

Mr. Brandt asked about Willamette street being open on the edge of the development (between 8th and 10th). Mr. Brink replied that the development could work either way, but he didn't envision it being open. Ms. Calvert asked if the public area would be controlled by the development or officially a public area. Mr. Brink said the plan is for it to be public and not controlled by the development, but the details are complex to work out. It is envisioned that the core of the plaza would be a truly public space to be managed by the public, with a reciprocal easement agreement. There are some security questions if Broadway and Olive are left open to foot traffic 24 hours a day, or at least well into the night.

In response to a question, Mr. Brink stated that he is not on the task force discussing the opening of Willamette between 10th and 11th, but that the goal is to have the street opened by early Fall. He said a lot of design and transit problems need to be resolved first. In tax allocation funds, incremental revenue that occurs in urban renewal districts, the necessary funds, as estimated by the City, are on hand and budgeted for the project. Ms. Nichols asked about private versus public funds for the Price-Sonoma development. Mr. Brink replied that the City would have three financial commitments: the acquisition of property to be resold to the developer; the relocation of businesses; and parking structures, which are usually owned by the cities. A fourth commitment which he mentioned was that of the public space in the development. He said there is some tax revenue but that a gap exists between what the project could cost in public dollars and what the City could come up with.

Ms. Calvert and the Board thanked Mr. Brink for his presentation, and he stated that he would like to return at a later date with a progress report for the Board.

Commuter Promotion: Sue Hanson, Marketing Representative, was present to explain a new promotion aimed at encouraging downtown Eugene employees to ride the bus. A memo in the packet explained why the downtown commuter was chosen as a target market, and Ms. Hanson showed the Board printed materials which will be used in the campaign. The theme of the campaign, called GO PASS, is a take-off on the game of Monopoly. The commuter is shown how use of monthly passes could save \$400 over the cost of driving a car for a year ("collect \$400"). A "Monopoly Board" design on the advertising highlights downtown, the 5th Avenue area, and the University area and shows types of (not specific) retailers in those areas. The advertising also highlights tokens, passes, transfers, and the shuttle route. Anyone who purchases a monthly pass will receive a "Go Pack," which is similar to the Totally Transit coupon book, offering discounts from merchants in the greater downtown area. Staff will work with employees in downtown businesses in their lunch rooms, etc., to plan personalized service through use of a trip planning card. Employees will also be given three day passes to encourage them to try the system.

The promotion will be complemented with radio, television, and newspaper ads. The television ad was being filmed that week, with District employees as the main characters. Mr. Brandt asked what the goal of the campaign was, to which Ms. Hanson stated that the campaign tied in with the overall goal of increasing District ridership by 15% for the year. The campaign is to be implemented sometime in mid- to late March. In response to Ms. Nichols' remark that the promotional materials were very nicely done, Ms. Hanson stated that staff were working with Cappelli Miles & Wiltz, who had done the artwork. She added that staff were in the process of contacting businesses about the campaign. Merchants were enthusiastic about this promotion based on the response to their participation in the Totally Transit promotion last summer.

Ms. Hanson also showed the Board the new tabloid, the "Rider's Digest," which was being mailed to Eugene households and included in the Springfield News as a supplement.

Staff Assignments: Ms. Loobey explained that the list of staff assignments within the District and in the community was included on pages 32 and 33 of the agenda packet in response to questions from Ms. Calvert about staff responsibilities. Mr. Brandt thought that these responsibilities amounted to a lot of extra time on the job for staff, and that they should keep track of these hours for discussion on raises, etc., since the long hours reduce their per hour rate of pay. Ms. Calvert thought this sort of involvement was common in many public agencies, however.

Governing Board Members Seminar: Ms. Loobey said staff had received information on a seminar for governing board members which will be held in Seattle in July. The Board should consider this seminar as the District goes through the budget process, to determine if there is interest on the part of any Board members, whether the Board President should attend, etc. More information will be available at a later date.

Progress Report on 800 Series Buses: Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, informed the Board that five of the new 800 series buses would be going into service the following Monday for the beginning of the new driver bid. The Maintenance division was working hard to get the buses ready for service, in addition to its regular maintenance responsibilities, so that one to three buses can go into service each week until all 31 are in revenue service. The Twin Coaches will then be phased out and stored until they are auctioned off.

Safe Harbor Leasing: Mr. Pangborn stated that the tax credit for the 800 series buses cannot be sold until all 31 are in revenue service. He planned to send a letter to the District's major payroll taxpayers within the next couple of weeks. He said that, ideally, staff would like to keep the credit in the local community because of the strong support the District has received from local businesses in the last few years. However, if no local businesses are interested, interest in the tax credits has been expressed from outside the local area.

Facilities Study: Mr. Dallas stated that an advertisement about the District's search for an appropriate site had been sent to the area's commercial realtors, with copies going to the Board members. He handed out copies of the appendices for the background material on the facilities needs study, stating that it was a good source document if the Board members are asked questions by members of the public. He asked that the Board refer other questions to him or to Eric Gunderson, the architect working with the District on the study. The timeline on the site selection is rapid so the findings can be integrated into the budget process. The deadline for submitting properties for consideration was March 1, with selection of the final four in priority order by April 30.

Update on 10th and Willamette: Ms. Loobey explained that staff were involved in a task force which was meeting to discuss only the opening of Willamette between 10th and 11th, and was not looking at the implications for LTD beyond the opening. However, she said, staff were making the District's issues known. She said the preliminary design for the street opening would be available for Board review at the March 12 meeting. One of the major issues at this point is whether the buses will be allowed to travel south-bound on this segment of Willamette and, if Willamette is opened to 20th, whether the buses will be able to travel north-bound. Ms. Loobey is also working with different City staff on other issues regarding the opening.

T-2000 Goals and Facilities Study Ridership Projections: Discussion on this issue was postponed until the March 12 meeting so the full Board could discuss the issue after having an opportunity to read the material handed out by Jim Hale earlier in the meeting.

Financial Statements: Since passenger fares in relation to the previous year were down, Mr. Brandt wondered if the District had fewer riders than last year. Karen Rivenburg, Finance Administrator, replied that ridership is actually up from a year ago, but several promotions designed to encourage new ridership have had an impact on fares. Examples of those promotions are the 25-cent weekend fare and a 20% sale on passes in December. Ms. Calvert also mentioned that the lack of snow this winter had had an impact on normal ridership levels. Mr. Pangborn stated that Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, had completed an analysis of the fares in January, and the Board would receive that analysis at a later date.

Reminder Regarding Salute to Commerce Banquet: Ms. Loobey reminded the Board that LTD was being featured at the Eugene Chamber's Salute to Congress banquet on Tuesday, March 26 at the Valley River Inn.

MOTION

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Nichols moved that the meeting be adjourned to 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 26, 1985 at the Red Lion, for a work session on strategic planning. Mr. Pusateri seconded, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

VOTE

  
Secretary

bdmm0219.jhs