

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

Wednesday, January 22, 1986

Pursuant to notice given at the January 15, 1986 regular meeting, and to *The Register-Guard* for publication on January 21, 1986, an adjourned meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held at 7:30 a.m. on Wednesday, January 22, 1986 in the District's conference room at 1938 West Eighth Street, Eugene.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Janet Calvert, President, presiding
Janice Eberly, Vice President
Joyce Nichols
Gus Pusateri
Rich Smith
Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Larry Parducci, Secretary
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Calvert called the meeting to order at 7:40 a.m.

MOTION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Dr. Smith moved that the minutes of the December 18, 1985 adjourned meeting and the December 23, 1985 adjourned meeting be approved as distributed. After seconding, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION FUND--REVIEW OF FUND AND APPROVAL OF L-COG CONTRACT FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT: Mr. Pangborn explained that during the last session of the Legislature, an additional tax on tobacco, sponsored by Jane Cease of Portland, had been passed. The proceeds of the tax are to be used for transportation, specifically for the elderly and handicapped. The tax revenues will be allocated on a per capita, county-wide basis. The District should start receiving these funds in April of this year.

Mr. Pangborn stated that the District has taken a long-term view for transportation for the elderly and handicapped, resulting in 100-percent fixed-route accessible service, and has coordinated special services through a consortium which is under the umbrella of the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG).

Leon Skiles, Senior Planner, gave a history of the District's involvement in services for the elderly and handicapped. In 1976, LTD began a service known as Dial-A-Bus, a curb-to-curb service provided on demand and dispatched by LTD employees. In 1979, federal legislation

mandated that the District adopt a transition plan, outlining the District's policies and how service was to be provided for the elderly and handicapped. At that time, the Board of Directors adopted a policy which stated that LTD would pursue 100-percent fixed-route accessibility (providing service with lifts on all buses), and that the District would phase out the Dial-A-Bus service.

In 1980, LTD contracted with Special Mobility Services (SMS) to operate and dispatch the Dial-A-Bus service. The District was still responsible, however, for service standards and funding. In 1984, LTD and a consortium of other service providers contracted with L-COG to manage the curb-to-curb service, with SMS still operating the service (now called Dial-A-Ride). L-COG now has final responsibility for service standards, but LTD continues to be deeply involved, and 100 percent of the funding still comes from LTD. In 1986-87, however, the Special Transportation Fund, from the tobacco tax revenues, will provide a portion of the funding for programs such as Dial-A-Ride.

Mr. Skiles further explained that the internal cost for providing Dial-A-Bus was approximately \$400,000 per year, with a cost per trip of about \$15.00. Approximately 21,000 rides were taken per year. In 1982-84, LTD paid the L-COG consortium approximately \$127,000 per year in funding for elderly and handicapped curb-to-curb services. The number of rides have not dropped considerably, so the high level of efficiency gained by offering like services through a consortium significantly lowered the cost per trip.

According to the legislation passed in June of 1985, which set up the Special Transportation Fund (STF), when a city has a transit district, the STF funds go to the transit district. If the transit district does not encompass the entire county, then the money is to be allocated in proportion to the portions of the county which are in and out of the District. The District encompasses about 80 percent of the county, according to the 1980 census, so funds will be allocated accordingly.

Mr. Skiles stated that all of the STF money is to be used for direct service to the elderly and handicapped, and cannot be used for administration of the fund; however, it can be used for administration of service. The reason behind this being written into the law, he said, was to get the money to the users who need the service. This means that it will take District funds and staff time to spend the money for elderly and handicapped services. The STF monies can be spent for new service or to maintain current services, as well as for the planning of new service.

The legislation also calls for an advisory committee to assist in the spending of the money. After Board action that day, staff planned to work on the formulation of the committee.

Responsibilities associated with overseeing the Special Transportation Fund include making decisions regarding allocation of funds to programs or agencies requesting STF funds, both within and outside of the

District's boundaries. Other providers of elderly and handicapped services would come to LTD to request funds, and LTD would have to decide which programs were appropriate to receive those funds. Staff thought this responsibility was not appropriate for the District, and that it was somewhat counter to the direction of reducing LTD's responsibility and involvement in special transportation needs. Staff preferred that the District be a partner in the process, but not the sole decision maker. The Lane Council of Governments has a broader, county-wide basis, and is more involved with special service delivery, and is in a better position to make these kinds of decisions.

Based on these issues, staff began drafting a program for administration of the county's Special Transportation Fund. Mr. Skiles explained that the Oregon Public Transit Division will disburse the funds and monitor LTD's compliance with the legislation. As proposed by staff, LTD's responsibilities will be to establish an advisory committee; develop any local standards which are felt to be necessary for the expenditure of the STF money; develop a contract with L-COG to administer the funds and monitor L-COG in that process; and disburse the funds to L-COG. The advisory committee would advise the District and assist in making these decisions. When the contract between L-COG and LTD is signed, the responsibility for administering the program would shift to the Lane Council of Governments. The responsibilities of L-COG would be to seek input from programs that desire funding; award the funds; develop service standards for compliance with the funds; develop and maintain contracts resulting from the allocation of funds; institute reporting and accounting procedures; and distribute the funds to the actual service providers. L-COG would also need to have an advisory committee, made up of two parts: an in-district advisory committee, and an out-of-district advisory committee. The money could be allocated to three types of programs: 1) programs through the consortium, including Dial-A-Ride and the Area Agency on Aging and the Maxi Taxi program; 2) programs from outside the consortium (including an attempt, for instance, to try to involve Pearl Buck or the City of Eugene in the consortium); and 3) programs outside the service area.

Mr. Skiles stated that one of the main points being presented was that the District would make the decisions for administration of the funds and would monitor L-COG's actual administration of the funds, but would not be involved in awarding funds or setting up the local contracts or standards. What staff are trying to do is shift responsibility for those particular decisions to L-COG, and to outline in a contract a set of standards for L-COG to adhere to, including the state legislation.

At that time, said Mr. Skiles, staff were asking for Board acceptance of the direction staff were taking; and an allocation of an additional \$6,800 for additional staff resources for L-COG for initial administration of the Special Transportation Fund, for this fiscal year only. After this fiscal year, he said, the cost for administration of the program would be absorbed by members of the consortium through local share match, since

the Special Transportation Funds cannot be used for administration of the program.

It is anticipated that L-COG would assume responsibility for the consortium around April, and would start to award STF funds to particular programs in June. In July, the money from the STF can be spent. The money will be reaching LTD in April, but staff believe that July is an appropriate date for beginning to expend the funds, in order to allow enough planning time and to make decisions on spending.

The original estimate was that the State would receive \$3.2 million from the Special Transportation Fund, of which \$320,000 would be allocated to the District for disbursement and administration. However, Public Transit staff now estimate the funds to be 80 percent of the original estimate, which would result in LTD receiving \$80,000 for the balance of this fiscal year, and \$280,000 in Fiscal Year 1986-87. If this year proves to be successful, Jane Cease may try in the next biennium to increase the tax dedicated to the Special Transportation Fund from one cent to two cents.

The State has an approval process for funding sources. If staff's proposal is approved, Mr. Skiles said, staff would seek approval for passing the money on to L-COG, and they would seek approval for allocating the funds to requesting agencies and programs.

Mr. Brandt asked if the STF monies would replace the \$127,000 which LTD pays to L-COG each year to provide the Dial-A-Ride service. Mr. Pangborn stated that this was an interesting question which had been raised by Tri-Met in Portland. Jane Cease replied to Tri-Met that this was not the intent of the legislation, and that the STF was supposed to be a supplement and not a replacement for current funding of services for the elderly and handicapped. She stated that, if transit districts eliminate their support for ongoing programs, she will have the law amended to force the districts to resume that funding. Mr. Pangborn stated that staff are hoping to find a middle route which will meet what Ms. Cease sees as the District's obligation under the intent of the legislation, and, at the same time, reduce LTD's obligation. One of the suggestions District staff have been discussing with L-COG is a local match, in which programs which apply for STF funding would have to put up some of their own money as a match. This would mean some kind of an ongoing obligation on the part of LTD for Dial-A-Ride service, but possibly on a lower level. Part of the matching funds could be used for administrative costs, and LTD would not have to provide funds for that purpose after this year.

In further explanation of the District's continued funding responsibility, Mr. Skiles stated that Jane Cease's assumption is that the service level for elderly and handicapped persons throughout the state is not at an adequate level. She promised to her constituency that this money would be used to increase the service level. Public Transit at this point is saying to transit districts that they should use this money in good faith to increase the service levels within their areas. If Jane Cease does not

see this realized, she will endeavor in the next biennium to make the legislation much more strict, causing an increase in service levels. Mr. Brandt thought that Ms. Cease could not cause any transit district to spend money that it did not want to spend, however. Mr. Pangborn agreed that, at some point, the District's allocation to Dial-A-Ride service is a decision that is made locally, by the Budget Committee and the Board of Directors. At the point where the staff and Board discuss this issue with the Budget Committee, he said, staff hope to have a firmer idea of the structure, so they will know how requests will be made and, if, in fact, the District contributes any or no money, how it will go through the process.

Mr. Pangborn stated that one thing the proposed program would do would be to get the District out of a "sticky" situation of agencies and program representatives coming before the Board to request funds and the Board having to balance those requests and make decisions. L-COG and District staff both see this role as better filled by L-COG.

In response to a question from Mr. Brandt regarding the advisory committee, Mr. Skiles stated that the advisory committee can only be made up of elderly and specialized transportation providers and users. He explained that the District has a very good rapport and a good working relationship with the elderly and handicapped community; there is mutual trust and credibility, and LTD has been able to avoid the controversy which has plagued some other transit districts, while providing very good service. Mr. Skiles believes that the committee and the District will be willing and able to look at the other's position as well as their own in a cooperative way. Mr. Pangborn added that Mr. Skiles will be working with the advisory board and then reporting to the LTD Board. Any controversy would likely occur with L-COG and the decision-making process; however, Mr. Skiles stated, the area has a tradition of a lack of controversy. The intent of the advisory group is in advice and assistance, and to provide a pressure group toward the transit district and the decision makers, but the District is not obligated to do what the advisory group says, and the advisory group is not obligated to agree with what the District does.

In answer to a question from Mr. Pusateri, Mr. Skiles explained that the District had an advisory board from the elderly and handicapped community in 1979 to develop the transition plan. Since that adoption, staff have retained one person from that group, Dave Kleger, who used to work for Vocational Rehabilitation, as the District's advisor on issues. There is now an advisory committee on the consortium through Lane Council of Governments. It is made up of two consortium members and two members at large, one of whom is elderly and the other whom is handicapped. The other members are the Area Agency on Aging and the transit district. Mr. Skiles stated that the District would form the advisory committee to make the first set of decisions, and then that committee would become the advisory committee for the Lane Council of Governments. Mr. Skiles ended by stating that all the issues raised by the Board members were also being discussed at the staff level between LTD and L-COG. He said he envisioned

coming back to the Board at various points along the time line to ratify certain points of the program and its direction.

MOTION

Dr. Smith moved that the Board direct staff to develop a procedure, for Board review and approval at a later meeting, which would delegate Special Transportation Fund allocation authority to the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG), and that the District immediately contract with L-COG for the management of the Special Transportation Fund program for Fiscal Year 1985-86 for an amount not to exceed \$6,800. Ms. Nichols seconded the motion.

Ms. Eberly asked if these administrative funds would have to be paid after this fiscal year. Mr. Skiles stated that this was a one-time cost to LTD, and that local match funds would be used for administrative costs in the future. However, if LTD applies for STF funds, it will have to provide matching funds, just like other programs will be required to do. Mr. Pangborn stated that there is money in contractual services, originally budgeted for legal fees, which can be used to cover this year's administrative costs. Dr. Smith commented that this was not a lot of money to spend to transfer the responsibility to another agency. Mr. Brandt thought the District would be spending the money to have someone else do the work, but would still have the final responsibility and would spend staff time supervising L-COG. Mr. Pangborn agreed that some of this would be present, but L-COG would be doing the work and LTD staff would have to remain knowledgeable and involved to some degree. Mr. Skiles thought the training process would not be long or involved, because L-COG already manages other programs similar to this. Additionally, L-COG is and will be providing additional staff time in the same manner that Mr. Skiles will be involved. Mr. Brandt wondered about loaning L-COG the \$7,000 and having them pay it back. Mr. Pangborn stated that staff could raise the issue in contract discussions, but did not hold out much hope for it succeeding.

VOTE

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

SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM REQUEST FOR PASSES: Mr. Pusateri mentioned the request made by the Senior Companion Program at the January 15 Board meeting. The request had been made for 20 passes for senior volunteers to use in their work with 70 low-income seniors in Lane County, through a federally-funded program designed to help keep seniors out of nursing homes. There are 20 volunteers who have no transportation other than the bus, and the program is losing part of its federal funding because of lack of local match. The 20 passes could be used as match-in-kind, and would help the program stay funded and active until the end of the fiscal year. After that time, the program directors plan to apply for Special Transportation Fund moneys.

Mr. Pangborn stated that there is capacity on the buses, and the pass basically only costs the District the money for printing. Therefore, he said, staff recommend that the Board could allocate the passes until

June 30, 1986 only, and stipulate that they would not be renewed, even if the program is denied STF funding by L-COG.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Brandt moved that the District provide 20 passes per month for the Senior Companion Program until June 30, 1986. After seconding by Mr. Pusateri, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

SUMMARY OF STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSIONS: Mr. Pangborn stated that the Board would not have time that day to discuss this issue, but that it was important for staff to have feedback from the Board before the District's goals and objectives for next year are finalized. He called the Board's attention to page 19 of the January 15 agenda packet, and stated that the issue of revenues would be the greatest area of controversy for discussion. He stated that draft goals and objectives would be brought to the Board for their review at the February meeting, and he asked the Board members to review the strategic planning session summary on pages 18 through 20 of the agenda packet for discussion at that time. Ms. Calvert thought that the District had looked at the self-employment tax more recently than 1979, as it stated on page 19.

MOTION
VOTE

APPOINTMENT OF BUDGET COMMITTEE MEMBER: Ms. Eberly stated that Rosemary Pryor had been on the Budget Committee for three years and was willing to continue. She moved that the Board reappoint Ms. Pryor for a three-year term, beginning immediately. Ms. Nichols seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

SALARY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING: Members of the Salary Subcommittee (Calvert, Nichols, Smith) scheduled a meeting on Wednesday, February 5 at 11:30 a.m. at the Factory Restaurant in Springfield. Staff will pick up Ms. Calvert and meet the others at the restaurant.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:50 a.m.


Board Secretary