

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

March 12, 1985

Pursuant to notice given at their February 26 adjourned meeting and to the Register-Guard for publication on March 7, 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, March 12, 1985 at 7:30 p.m. in the Eugene City Hall.

Present: Janet Calvert, President, presiding  
Peter Brandt, Treasurer  
Janice Eberly, Vice President  
Joyce Nichols  
Larry Parducci, Secretary  
Mark Pangborn, Acting General Manager  
Shannon Evonuk, Recording Secretary

News Media Representatives:  
Ed Kenyan, Register-Guard  
Tracy Berry, KEZI-TV

Absent: Gus Pusateri  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Calvert asked if anyone from the audience had any comments to make to the Board before proceeding with the meeting. She also said they could comment upon a specific issue when it came up for Board discussion during the meeting. There was no comment from the audience at this time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Due to illness of the Recording Secretary, the minutes of the February Board meeting would not be available for approval until the April Board meeting.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Calvert introduced Jim Saville, who was chosen the March Employee of the Month. Ms. Calvert explained that Mr. Saville has been with the District since 1977, has an excellent safety and attendance record, and is highly regarded by staff. She congratulated him for being chosen; Mr. Saville thanked the Board.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM: Karen Rivenburg, Finance Administrator, spoke to the Board about the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). She explained that this is the second year a CIP has been presented to the

Board. The CIP covers a 20-year period, but the first three years of the program are the most detailed; after that time, individual projects may change somewhat, but it still gives a general idea of capital expenditures expected to take place over the rest of the period.

She said the CIP has a two-fold purpose: firstly, as a budgeting tool; and secondly, as a planning document, so, in a few years, there are "no surprises" as to large capital expenditures.

Ms. Rivenburg went on to say the next major capital project--the new facility--if approved, would require committing the majority of our planned capital expenditures for the next two to three years to that facility. The other capital expenditures would be cut to the "bare bones."

The three main areas of capital expenditures are buses, referred to as rolling stock; passenger facilities, such as transit stations, bus stops, and information displays; and central office facilities. The last category has been of a lesser priority in the last few years, and staff feel it is time to address that area.

Ms. Rivenburg then summarized the CIP to the Board, as listed in Pages 9-14 of the Board packet. If approved, the new facility would cost approximately \$8 million. This is an estimate and is based upon what other transit properties across the nation have been spending for similar facilities. The proposed money needed for the facility has been divided between Fiscal Years 1985-86 and 1986-87, as it is expected that the facility would proceed in a phased fashion, as is being done with the facility study. This assumes the results of the study will be the recommendation for a new facility. The \$2 million requested in Fiscal Year 1985-86 would cover site acquisition, preliminary engineering, and costs involved in beginning site construction. Ms. Rivenburg repeated that those costs are estimates at this time--they are not final figures.

Ms. Rivenburg next discussed the area of bus acquisition. There are nine 400 series coaches now in suburban use. If Section 18 monies should become available to the District, staff would pursue replacement of those coaches with five suburban coaches. If this money does not become available, that replacement would not be pursued. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, explained to the Board that suburban coaches are designed differently than standard coaches, and are those used for service to Junction City, Elmira, upper McKenzie, etc.

The total amount of the CIP for Fiscal Year 1985-86 is \$2.7 million, \$2 million of which are monies for the proposed new facility, and \$600,000 of which are monies for the suburban coaches. Section 9 monies--a total of a little over \$1 million--are estimated to be allocated to us. As for monies for the proposed facility, Section 3 funds would be tapped. The local match for those funds would be 25 percent. The total local share for Fiscal Year 1985-86 is projected at \$603,000.

Ms. Calvert asked how this approach to funding the new facility affects areas such as computer acquisition. Mr. Pangborn said the alteration of the CIP would affect: 1) passenger boarding improvements, such as the proposed transit station at Valley River (which has been put aside for at least the next two years); 2) shelters, pads, and bus stops--its budget being cut almost in half, from approximately \$100,000 to \$50,000; 3) maintenance equipment, with the premise that, if a new facility is built, much of the maintenance equipment would be built in to the design of the facility; and 4) computer equipment, which has been cut back substantially. He explained that if budgeting for the new facility is not approved by the Board, then the CIP will have to be looked at again, and revisions made accordingly.

Ms. Calvert asked if this would slow down the process of the shelter at the University of Oregon. Mr. Pangborn replied that it would not--that project is already in progress, and, in fact, construction is planned to begin before the end of the current fiscal year. He reminded the Board that they will have another opportunity to review this CIP with the Budget Committee. The request by staff at this meeting was to hear any concerns or changes the Board may have, so staff can incorporate those into the budget requests sent to the Budget Committee. He also stated that this does not mean the Board has made the decision to go ahead with the new facility. One of the major concerns staff have is whether to budget \$600,000 for the replacement of the suburban coaches. He stated that the current ones in service are very old buses, and need to be replaced.

Mr. Brandt asked if a positive vote at this meeting would mean anything; Mr. Pangborn replied that it meant approval of what the Board sees as an appropriate direction for District staff to pursue.

Ms. Eberly asked for a clarification of the footnotes on Page 14 of the CIP. Ms. Rivenburg explained that the CIP does not include any expenditures for the move of the Eugene Mall Transit Station, shelters, or the "Special Section" (across from Sears), in case the 10th & Willamette opening should cause such a move. Mr. Pangborn said no plans have been made for this as the final decisions concerning the opening have not been made. The footnote concerning this was added in case there are some unforeseen costs to be borne by the District.

## MOTION

Ms. Nichols moved for approval of the CIP; the motion was seconded by Ms. Eberly. Ms. Calvert asked for discussion, to which Jim Hale, 464 Meredith Court, Eugene, replied that he would like to speak on the subject.

Mr. Hale commended the District on its move towards development of a CIP. He suggested the advertisement and holding of a public meeting geared specifically to this topic. He stated that he regards CIPs as a "wish list," and commented that this one was more realistic than others he had

seen. He said that a 20-year period for a CIP is longer than most, but indicates a good direction. He believes that acquiring a new facility is "entirely reasonable."

Mr. Hale said the fleet increase called for in the CIP indicates a doubling of the current fleet, and is well within the vehicle recommendations made by the facilities consultants--it is actually less, in his opinion. Mr. Hale has also determined that the District is expecting a "rough doubling" of riders. Compared with the almost doubling of the fleet, he has concluded that it looks as though the District is, in fact, only planning for a two percent transit ridership goal. Because of this, he objects to the adoption of the current CIP. He suggested only adoption of the first year of the CIP at this meeting, and to decide on the rest after District staff have had a chance to review the initial draft of the Transportation Plan (TransPlan). He also discussed the money slated for 10 articulated buses; in the ECO study, articulated buses were considered to be used in very narrow circumstances. The study indicates headways must be very short and traffic must be heavy before articulated buses are needed. He suggested the Board should know what routes the buses will be used on before approving this expenditure.

Mr. Pangborn responded to Mr. Hale's concerns by stating that the ridership model referred to on Page 12 of the packet is one that will help the District look at ridership gains on a short-term basis--for the next two to three years. Four to five years ago, the District had students from the Urban Planning Department at the University of Oregon conduct a study to develop a set of criteria which would aid the District in looking at ridership for the next two to three years. That study took into consideration factors of employment, price and availability of gas, population density, and other related areas. The study was used by District staff as a budgeting tool, but now, as some time has passed since the study was formulated, it has become out-of-date. During the last two years, the study has not been used at all due to its current inaccuracy.

Mr. Pangborn went on to state that the District's Planning staff's opinion differs with the ECO report on the subject of articulated buses. He explained that the main issue is not really one of purchasing articulated buses or not--that will have to be determined later--what is important now is the issue of much-needed expanded transit facilities. The next three years are the ones to be looked at the most carefully. The later years of the CIP are mainly an indication to the Board of where the District is heading, and what types of obligations and needs are anticipated. On the other hand, all these types of expenditures are primarily funded by the federal government. And, if the government is successful in pulling out these funds, as has been proposed, the District will have to rethink the entire CIP. In response to Mr. Hale's comment about the transit goal, based upon these budget considerations, the District does have an ambitious--but realistic--goal for transit, although at this time it must take a more fiscally conservative approach towards the budget.

Ms. Calvert asked for any comments. Ms. Nichols asked if an approval of the CIP at this meeting would tie the hands of any future District Board. Mr. Pangborn replied that the CIP will be reviewed every year by both the Board and the Budget Committee. Mr. Brandt asked when the Board would receive the final information regarding the new facilities. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, replied that the Facilities Subcommittee will meet on April 30 to prepare a final recommendation on the new facilities; that recommendation will be brought to the Board for their decision in a special meeting on May 7, which will take place before the Budget Committee meeting that same evening.

After Mr. Brandt called for the question, Ms. Calvert said the motion had been made and seconded to accept the CIP as presented in the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

VOTE

FISCAL YEAR 1985-86 GOALS: Mr. Pangborn explained that the goals were similar to those of last year, with a couple of significant changes: 1) Service was ranked as a second priority last year. This year, with the potential for loss of federal dollars and the slowing of growth of payroll taxes, staff are proposing to lower the priority of service. 2) Because of this, increasing passenger revenues is now considered the number one priority. In the area of efficiency, the new third priority, also because of budget constraints, the District needs to look at performing its functions more efficiently. That area covers staff efficiency, utilization of computers, and incentive programs and staff training. In the area of service, the District will be looking at making the most of current service levels, and is anticipating adding very minor service, if at all. Concerning public support, there is strong participation by staff in local business groups, community groups, and chambers of commerce. These goals, if adopted, will be used by staff in development of the budget.

Mr. Brandt asked what pursuing legislative actions, as listed under the category of revenues, has to do with passenger revenues. Mr. Pangborn explained that there had been discussion regarding a local sales tax as an option for funding transit, which explains why this was put into the larger category of revenue, although he agreed with Mr. Brandt that it had little to do with passenger revenues, and probably should be in a category of its own.

Mr. Brandt indicated he did not agree with the prioritizing of categories. He felt that all categories were important to the overall goal of improved service and increased ridership. Ms. Calvert asked for clarification of the implementation of the fare policy, also listed under the category of revenue. Mr. Pangborn reminded the Board that a new policy had recently been put together by staff, and that is what was being implemented. Mr. Brandt asked what would happen if the goals were adopted. Mr. Pangborn said they would be regarded by staff as a good indication of the Board's priorities, and would be used as a goal-setting document. Ms. Nichols said she saw them mainly as categories, rather than a prioritized order of goals. Mr. Pangborn said they are traditionally listed in priority order, as they are tied to allocation of resources, but they

could be changed, if the Board so chose. Mr. Pangborn agreed that the goals are all important.

Mr. Brandt said he would like to have seen the wording of "pursue legislative actions" changed to "consider legislative actions," although the Board in general agreed with the original wording. Ms. Eberly said, if the list was in a prioritized order, that the order was not as she wanted. She suggested looking at them simply as Board goals. Mr. Brandt added that, if these are considered in that sense, he would agree with them; Ms. Nichols concurred. Mr. Brandt moved adoption of the goals and objectives as presented, after eliminating the prioritized order. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parducci, and was passed unanimously.

MOTION

VOTE

MOTION

VOTE

LOAN RESOLUTION: Mr. Brandt moved adoption of the loan resolution included in the Board packet. Ms. Nichols seconded the motion, and it was passed unanimously.

In relation to this, Mr. Pangborn passed out a copy of a letter being sent to all payroll taxpayers and certified public accountant firms regarding the District's sale of the tax credit it received (and cannot use) for the purchase of the new buses.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Review of Design for Willamette Street Opening: Mr. Pangborn introduced three members of the City staff: Pat Lynch and Elaine Stewart, with Eugene Development Department (EDD), and Dave Rinehart, Transportation Engineer with Public Works, who is also a member of the Design Review Team assigned the task of designing the opening of the street.

Mr. Lynch spoke briefly on the public review process regarding the opening of Willamette Street between 10th and 11th Avenues. A series of public meetings will take place in the near future to discuss the upcoming opening. The recommendations received by the Board at this meeting will be taken to the Eugene Downtown Commission for a public hearing on the proposal on Wednesday, March 27, 7:30 a.m. This will be followed by a Planning Commission public hearing on Tuesday, April 2, 7:30 p.m. A City Council meeting will follow that, to be held on Monday, April 8, 7:30 p.m. Construction on the opening of the street will take place during July through September, with completion expected by the end of September.

Mr. Rinehart then began his presentation on the proposed design of the street. He displayed a "functional layout chart" of the street, and described various aspects of the design, explaining that several different scenarios were looked at before arriving at the present design. The design showed a "raised median," or center, of what will be a two-way street between 10th and 11th Avenues. It was hoped that this median would be useful as a psychological device to the motorist that this is not a high-speed street. At the northern end of the street, the sidewalks would become slightly wider, enabling a shorter walking distance after waiting for lights to change.

Mr. Brandt said he felt the design had many constraints. He felt the narrow opening on the northern end of the street would lead to a bottleneck of traffic. Ms. Calvert asked why the street was not designed as a one-way street going south. Mr. Rinehard replied that city officials wanted it designed to allow more people to head into the mall, rather than out. Ms. Eberly had concerns about congested bus/car interactions at the northern end of the street. Mr. Rinehard said the northern intersection of the street would be closed for construction for only two to three days in May, the work probably being done over a weekend.

Mr. Pangborn stated that one item the Board originally proposed to the City Council was, if Willamette were opened, would the City handle the reconsolidation of the transfer stations. He asked Mr. Rinehard if that was considered by the Design Review Team. Ms. Stewart replied to this question, saying that District staff have expressed concerns over this issue, and that the City is open to considering plans for this, although she stated no proposals have yet been submitted to City officials by District staff.

Ms. Eberly asked a question about the proposed parallel parking on the sides of the street. She wondered if that type of parking would cause delays in traffic flow. Mr. Rinehard said that typical parallel parking would cause some delays, but the spaces are to be designed so as to allow for "tandem" parking, a design which allows extra room either at the back or in front of each parking space so that cars can pull into the space with enough room to either back up or pull into it. This design has been used in other areas of downtown, he said. He felt the design was a workable one for both bus and car use.

Ms. Calvert asked the cost estimate of the project. Mr. Rinehard said a preliminary estimate is a total of \$400,000. Ms. Calvert asked when the reconsolidation issue is to be considered by the City. Mr. Rinehard replied he had no concrete answer for that; Ms. Stewart added that there is no set timeline for consideration of that.

Mr. Brandt stated his belief that this design will not work, and that there was not proper consideration given to the District by the City. Mr. Rinehard responded by saying it was his understanding, after speaking with District staff, that it was the District's intention to eventually move to an off-street facility, anyway. Because of that, he believes, in the short run, this design will work. Ms. Calvert said the District would not have recently built and invested into the Customer Service Center if they had intended to move it within a few years of construction. She believes that situation may have come up now because of the new complication of the opening of Willamette. Mr. Brandt said he could see where there will be problems with the opening, possibly causing the move of the Customer Service Center, and that someone will have to pay for it. Mr. Rinehard responded that the City Council will need to address that issue.

At this point, Stefano Viggiano stated that the design, as presented here, is acceptable to District staff. He went on to say the Task Force is not the right party to whom the District should address the larger question of major disruptions to the downtown transit station. Mr. Pangborn reiterated Mr. Viggiano's point, and, in response to a question by Mr. Brandt, stated negotiations with City officials would begin this week on that issue. The Board thanked Mr. Rinehard for his presentation.

MOTION

Widening of Sixth and Seventh Avenues: Mr. Brandt made a motion to endorse the widening of Sixth and Seventh avenues. Ms. Eberly seconded the motion. Ms. Calvert asked for discussion. Mr. Brandt stated he made the motion because he felt it will help economic development in the area, from which the District would also benefit. Ms. Nichols said the memorandum from Phyllis Loobey in the Board packet had laid out very well the questions the Board had regarding this. She added that she was very impressed with Ms. Loobey's response. The Board unanimously endorsed the widening. Ms. Calvert explained this vote meant the Board would simply go on record for endorsement of the widening.

VOTE

Clarification of Transit Goal: Mr. Pangborn said the memorandum in the Board packet from Mr. Viggiano clearly laid out the goal of the District in this area. If the Board had questions regarding this, he suggested directing them to Mr. Viggiano. He did state that he realized there were differences between the District's transit goal and the ECO report, but that he saw them as two different items.

Mr. Viggiano stated there was a correction in the memorandum--the eight percent goal would require carrying 37 million persons trips, not 28 million persons trips.

Negotiation Process: Due to the lateness of the meeting, Mr. Dallas briefly explained the upcoming negotiation process of the current union contract, which is due to expire on June 30 of this year. The District's drivers, mechanics, and information clerks are members of the Amalgamated Transit Union, which negotiates on their behalf. The District's negotiating team consists of Mr. Dallas; David Harrison, Personnel Director; and Bob Hewitt, of Cascade Employers, which is a labor relations firm on retainer to the District. Mr. Dallas expects the first meeting with the Union to occur the second week of April. He will probably have a progress report for the Board in May. He hopes to have the negotiations completed by the June 30 contract expiration.

Winter 1985 Route Segment Analysis Results and Petitions for Service to Marcola and Additional Service to McKenzie Bridge: Mr. Pangborn explained that every winter an annual route review is conducted to learn what routes are doing/not doing well, so the Planning staff can incorporate improvements in those routes into service changes in September of each year.

In relation to this, some petitions have been received by the District from citizens of both the Marcola area and McKenzie Bridge area to offer service changes in those areas. Those requests will be incorporated into



the Annual Route Review, and staff will come back to Board with some recommendations about whether changes in service are or are not warranted in those cases. The Marcola area, although once within the District boundaries, was removed from those boundaries. If the Board feels service is warranted in that area, District staff would go to the governmental jurisdiction responsible for that area--in this case, the Lane County Commissioners--and ask for their recommendation.

One-Day Seminar--Building Better Boards: Staff informed the Board members that, if they are interested in attending this upcoming seminar, they can contact staff to request more information about it.

Note from Employee of the Year: Included in the Board packet was a note of thanks from Paul Stuart, who was chosen as the 1984 Employee of the Year for the District. The Board thought it was a very nice gesture, and asked staff to thank Mr. Stuart in turn.

Ride on an 800 Series Bus: Due to the late hour, it was decided to postpone the ride on one of the new buses to another time.

MOTION  
VOTE

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Brandt moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Nichols seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

  
Secretary

BDMN3-12.SBE