

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, March 15, 1989

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 10, 1989, 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 Wednesday, March 15, 1989, at 8:00 p.m. at the Eugene City Hall.

Present: H. Thomas Andersen, Secretary  
Peter Brandt, Treasurer  
Janet Calvert, President, presiding  
Keith Parks  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Janice Eberly, Vice President  
Gus Pusateri  
Rich Smith

**CALL TO ORDER:** Ms. Calvert called the meeting to order at 8:00 p.m., and stated that she wished Governor Goldschmidt would appoint the two Board members to replace Mr. Pusateri and Dr. Smith. Their terms have expired, but they remain on the Board of Directors until replacements are named. There was some discussion by the Board about what could be done to help the process along, but no action was taken at this time.

**BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH:** The March Bus Rider of the Month, Earl Steed, was not present at the meeting to receive his award.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Calvert introduced the March Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Bob Osborne, who has been employed at LTD for almost 10 years. Ms. Calvert called attention to Mr. Osborne's excellent attendance and safety records, and said that the people who nominated him stated that he was very friendly. After receiving his certificate and check, Mr. Osborne said that he appreciated his selection as Employee of the Month very much.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** There was no member of the audience who wished to speak at this time.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Ms. Calvert asked why the approval of the bonus for exceptional service had not been included in the minutes. Ms. Loobey explained that the District's attorney had informed staff that recalling a meeting to order after adjournment in order to discuss a new topic, as was done at the February meeting, did not constitute a legally convened meeting. Since the General Manager does have the authority to grant such a bonus, the Board vote was not essential; rather, Ms. Loobey used it as input that the Board would approve of

the bonus being given to staff. Mr. Andersen asked if the General Manager, then, had exercised her authority to do what the Board had discussed, and she said that she had.

MOTION  
VOTE

Mr. Parks moved that the minutes of the February 15, 1989, meeting be approved as distributed. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

**RECOMMENDED SERVICE CHANGES--1989 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, explained that the recommended service changes for the following fiscal year were coming before the Board earlier than usual in order to include those assumptions in the FY 89-90 budget. He called the Board's attention to page 20 of the agenda packet, on which a summary of changes in the hours, cost, and expected effect on ridership could be found. He briefly reviewed previous service changes, noting that this is an important process, since new service takes a year or two to mature. Because the Springfield service redesign and some other service improvements were made in September 1988, staff will report to the Board about them again in the future, after they have had more time to mature.

The productivity of Saturday service to nonurban areas is approximately to 75 percent of weekday productivity. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff had hoped weekend ridership would be equal to weekday ridership, so will continue to track the productivity on those routes.

Mr. Andersen asked what minimum productivity standards are. Mr. Viggiano replied that the minimum under the current service policy is 50 percent of the service average, which means that anything that does not meet 50 percent does not meet the standards. However, he said, a new service policy was included in the February agenda packets, but has not yet been approved by the Board. Under the proposed policy, the minimum standard has been increased to two-thirds of the system average, or about 67 percent.

Mr. Andersen and Mr. Brandt stated that the changes were being recommended were changes to fine-tune the service, not major changes, and Mr. Brandt said he felt comfortable letting staff make those changes.

Ms. Calvert asked if the estimated costs were in net or gross terms. Mr. Viggiano replied that they are net costs, assuming savings in some areas.

**Public Hearing on Proposed Service Changes for FY 89-90:** Ms. Calvert opened the public hearing on the proposed service changes for FY 89-90. There was no comment from any member of the audience, and Ms. Calvert closed the public hearing.

MOTION  
VOTE

**Board Action:** Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the service changes for Fiscal Year 1989-90 as outlined in the agenda packet. Mr. Andersen seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

**FISCAL YEAR 1989-90 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, used an overhead projection to show a revised Capital

Improvements Program (CIP), and called the Board's attention to page 33 of the agenda packet, which showed the CIP for individual years and then in five-year increments. He stated that there are three areas under Capital Projects where nothing is budgeted for next fiscal year, due to the District's move to the new facility. These areas are maintenance, bus-related equipment, and facilities improvements. Most of the \$292,950 requested for capital expenditures was being requested for passenger boarding improvements and non-revenue service vehicles.

Ms. Calvert stated that the money that had been set aside for Valley River Center last year was still on hold and would be discussed at the April Board meeting. Mr. Pangborn explained that \$240,000 had been budgeted, but the Board had directed staff to come back with a specific expenditure plan before spending the money. He said that staff were negotiating with Valley River Center management regarding a possible plan which will address the District's concerns very well, with a good layout and nice appearance. Mr. Andersen asked who paid for the plans. Mr. Pangborn replied that Valley River Center did; John Amundson, who was hired to draw the plans for the Bon Marche, was also drawing the plans for the proposed transit station improvements. Mr. Pangborn added that LTD needs to negotiate the final plan, cost, and who will pay for what share. Ms. Loobey explained that typically the District pays for the shelter and the developer pays for all the flat work, and this is what staff will be negotiating for with Valley River Center. She added that this was the arrangement with the West 11th Fred Meyer store and with General Growth of California, which is building the new Gateway shopping center.

Continuing with the CIP, Mr. Pangborn discussed the figures for office furniture and equipment. The major cost, he said, would be to upgrade the main office photocopier to a faster, more reliable machine with a bigger capacity. He said also that the photo ID machine at the CSC had broken a number of times, and a new one was being requested in the CIP. The current machine will be used for employee identification purposes at the new property in Glenwood, and the new machine will be used at the CSC, where reduced fare identification cards are made. Additionally, the CSC's coin counting machine is old and needs to be replaced. Two televisions are being requested; one for in-house training purposes in the drivers' lounge and one to use at the CSC for a training program for children.

In discussing computer software and equipment, Mr. Pangborn stated that the personnel data base is continuing to be developed, and staff are beginning to do some of the projects that TransCom suggested, such as computer-generated timetables. Some computer hardware is being requested for a new receptionist position, which will be requested in the budget, as well as for the CSC, for in-house desk-top publishing, and for a printer to replace one that is beyond its service life. The money for computer software and equipment will not be spent until it is necessary, he said, and includes such things as keyboard replacement, hardware and software upgrades, etc.

Mr. Pangborn stated that the "big ticket" item for next fiscal year is passenger boarding improvements. The bulk of the money is for shelters, with other expenditures for shelter garbage cans, bus stop sign posts, and information displays. Half of the current bus stop signs will be replaced next year with

a more informative sign, and the other half will be replaced the following year. He added that the City of Eugene sign-making shop silkscreens and makes the signs.

In the category "vehicles and accessories," 15 new buses and replacement of 10 of the 500-series buses are requested for FY 89-90. Automatic passenger counters (APCs) are computers which automatically count the people getting on and off the buses, which the District does manually now. Staff also wish to replace two of the field supervisors' vehicles which have travelled more than 110,000 miles. Also, at the new facility, drivers will need to be shuttled to and from the downtown station for work assignments. Mr. Pangborn explained that the District has to pay travel time in most cases, and having shuttles will save having the drivers walk to Franklin and catch the bus.

Two mobile radios are being requested to upgrade the system to the buses. The District will be moving its radio function to a new site that the City of Eugene is constructing, and will be using radio rather than telephone lines. A clock is also being requested, because the system supervisors announce the time to the bus drivers on an hourly basis, but have found that using telephone or television time can be off each day, and the drivers are constantly having to change their watches. This new clock will eliminate that variability.

MOTION

Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the Fiscal Year 1989-90 Capital Improvements Plan as presented. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, and the FY 89-90 CIP was approved by unanimous vote.

VOTE

**BOARD SALARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989-90:** Mr. Brandt, Chairman of the Board Salary Committee, commented that most of the Board members present were members of the Committee that made the recommendations included on pages 39 and 40 of the agenda packet. He said the recommendation is basically a simple, straight-across 3.5 percent salary increase for the District's salaried employees. One category was added at grade 2 for a receptionist when the District moves to the new facility. The minimum salary for that position (\$1,089 monthly), he said, was found to be required in the market place. Mr. Brandt stated that the Committee did recommend that the Board improve administrative salaries with a 3.5 percent increase, and with the addition of a receptionist position. He added that some comparisons were made with other locations, and that the comparison information could be found in the agenda packet.

Ms. Calvert mentioned the change in the vesting period recommended on page 40 of the packet. She said that she and Ms. Loobey are members of the pension trust committee, and had learned that it will take more discussion than they had originally thought to make this change. She added that they will report to the Board when it is worked out.

Mr. Brandt stated that the General Manager's salary is not included in this proposal, but will be discussed later with the Board Salary Committee and then the full Board.

Mr. Parks said he had no problem with the Committee recommendation; that the 3.5 percent increase was just barely in the spread of organizations surveyed.

MOTION Mr. Brandt moved acceptance of the Board Salary Committee recommendation  
 VOTE regarding administrative salaries for Fiscal Year 1989-90, found on pages 39 and  
 40 of the agenda packet. Mr. Andersen seconded, and the motion carried  
 unanimously.

Ms. Calvert commented that she had just received her packet containing forms on which to evaluate the General Manager's performance, and encouraged the Board members to complete their forms and return them to Jo Sullivan as soon as possible.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Report of the Triennial Review by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA):** Mr. Pangborn told the Board that UMTA's representative had only been on the property one day instead of the scheduled two, and that there did not appear to be a lot of substantial improvements that will be required. He said that a number of the minor things that were mentioned have already been handled or soon will be. UMTA did like the Five-year Service and Financial Plans; which are the kinds of plans that UMTA was asking the District for. He added that he hoped the letter in the agenda packet gave the Board a good idea of the myriad of details and minutia required by UMTA.

Mr. Andersen agreed with UMTA that some improvements could be made in the District's notification of public comment opportunities for fare increases and service changes. Ms. Calvert noted that the packet announcing the public hearing had been sent to the President of the League of Women Voters, so she thought there had been some effort made to broaden the base. Mr. Pangborn added that there would be more notice in District publications such as "Bus Talk," posters on the buses, etc., to better notify the customers. He stated that one of the reasons people do not attend those kinds of public hearings at LTD is that the District has been adding service or only cutting when there is very low ridership. Mr. Andersen explained that he is concerned with due process, being sure that the public is given notice and the opportunity to be heard, whether or not anyone exercises that opportunity.

Mr. Parks asked if notice of the Board meeting times and dates is on the schedules. Ms. Loobey said that it is not, but can be found in "Bus Talk" and the "Rider's Digest." Mr. Pangborn added that specific agenda items are mentioned in "Bus Talk," but that the TransCom study had said LTD already has too much information on its timetables. Mr. Parks said his experience has been that people will let you know when they think you are doing something wrong.

**Legislative Issues:** Ms. Loobey called the Board's attention to a legislative update found on page 47 of the agenda packet, and said she also had packets of draft bills available for the Board's information. She explained that when she was in Washington, D.C., for the American Public Transit Association's Legislative Conference in March, she had nine or ten separate appointments with members of Oregon's congressional delegation and/or their staff members to discuss funding for surface transportation.

Ms. Loobey was also involved in discussions of the mechanism by which the 4-J School District could assume the controlling interest in the property at 8th and Garfield. She said it appears that there is no longer ambiguous language, which means that there is no mechanism to let the school district take over the property. However, UMTA staff were interested in the proposal and thought it made sense. UMTA agreed that if Representative Peter DeFazio will sponsor report language on an authorization bill, UMTA will go along with it. She explained that UMTA is not interested in having policy guidelines or federal statutory language because it does not want to be dealing with such facility transfers all over the country. The City of Eugene's legal firm in Washington, D.C., will write the report language for Representative DeFazio. Ms. Loobey stated that the fact that LTD and 4-J went together for discussions with UMTA seemed to help.

Mr. Andersen asked what the alternatives are to transferring the property to 4-J. Ms. Loobey said that the District has to make an effort to sell, because UMTA does not want to be a landlord. The property would have to be leased at market value, and 4-J does not want to do that. She explained that UMTA will receive 80 percent of the selling price, and that is what 4-J and LTD are trying to get transferred to the school district.

Ms. Calvert added that if the property is not sold to a similar operation, the District will have to take out the fuel storage tanks, which is an expensive proposition. Ms. Loobey said that the 8th and Garfield property still has a 15-year life because of the improvements LTD has made.

Mr. Andersen said the description of HB 2421 was not accurate; where it stated that public employees will not be exempt, it should say public employers.

Mr. Brandt asked who made the decision to support or oppose certain bills. Ms. Loobey said she was suggesting that this is what the District should do. Mr. Brandt then asked why the Board would vote in favor of saying it supports new taxes when LTD does not need more money. Ms. Loobey said this is the first time the state is looking at a comprehensive package for surface transportation, and federal money will be drying up. She said that most of the bills involve capital funds only. She explained that federal Section 9B capital funding had gone from \$900,000 a year to \$300,000 a year. She added that she would not be surprised if 9B capital funding were cut 4 to 8 percent next year. Ms. Loobey said that LTD has had support from the State general fund in the past. Mr. Brandt thought that the State should have a comprehensive plan, not what he considered a bunch of "junk."

Ms. Loobey explained that the cigarette tax, which the District currently receives for elderly and handicapped service, would be raised one cent. She thought the tire and battery tax might have some promise regarding the feasibility and amount of money that it would raise. Additionally, it does not require a constitutional amendment. She added that it is important to find a way to receive capital money from the State. Mr. Brandt asked who was proposing the tax. Ms. Loobey replied that Transportation Commission Chairman Mike Hollern was, and that it had big support from Portland.

Mr. Brandt said he wished to go on record as saying that LTD should say no. He thought that the people from Portland were trying to "sneak in the back door" on everything they do, and wondered why they didn't do a better job of running the transit district. Ms. Loobey replied that this is not necessarily just an issue for Tri-Met; a number of the bills are local option. The motor vehicles fee to be used for local roads in the tri-county area is not supported by the City of Eugene. She added that the proposals are put forth by a lot of other people besides LTD and Mike Hollern.

Ms. Loobey thought the Board may need to have a special meeting to discuss these issues, before the next Board meeting, because the issues are "heating up." Mr. Brandt stated that he did not see why the LTD Board should support them unless the members believe there is a good or redeeming value for a specific need where the District is not currently being served. Otherwise, raising money just to raise money might have a backlash. Ms. Loobey thought the Board should also be interested in helping support statewide issues. The Special Transportation Fund, from the cigarette tax money, is for all transit operators in the state. The tire and battery tax would benefit 45 or so providers, allowing elderly and handicapped providers to buy vans. She said that if the State is looking for measures that help transit, but transit pulls back, transit might actually need that help somewhere down the road.

Mr. Brandt said he thought LTD should not "get thrown in the pot" with people from Portland who need the money. Ms. Loobey said the money would benefit all cities and counties. Mr. Brandt thought, however, that LTD would be saying "give us more money, but we don't need it in the next five years." Mr. Parks said that 15 of the requested buses are discretionary Section 3 funds, and there is no guarantee that the District will receive that money, and that there is a lot of uncertainty in the plan. Ms. Calvert thought that working with others would build cooperation and favors, and Mr. Parks added that the District will not build a political base if it works for itself only.

Mr. Brandt then questioned why LTD was lobbying in Salem; stating that maybe the District needs to show interest but not make a big deal over the issues unless there is something of importance before the Legislature. Mr. Parks said you can't know something is important unless you are keeping track. Mr. Andersen asked if the District had a lobbyist or consultant. Ms. Loobey replied that LTD belongs to the Oregon Transit Association (OTA), and OTA hires a lobbyist. Mr. Andersen asked if Ms. Loobey represented positions as those of the Board, the staff, or OTA when testifying. Ms. Loobey said she generally would say that she is Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Oregon Transit Association and General Manager of LTD, for identification. She always wears the hat of OTA, she said. Mr. Andersen asked if the reason LTD is lobbying in Salem is to represent LTD or professional association activities. Ms. Loobey said it was a combination of interests. Mr. Andersen thought that both would benefit LTD. He added that the Board may want to take some particular stands on some issues. Ms. Calvert commented that the issues are not as direct as they were during the last legislative session, when binding interest arbitration was being discussed.

Mr. Brandt stated that he thought it was a disservice to the people of LTD who have supported the District, and the Board had kept its taxes down, for LTD to be supporting increased taxes. Ms. Calvert said she preferred to look at this

issue more globally than just what LTD had done in Eugene, because the District had gotten money from other places when it needed it. Mr. Andersen said he did not see that the Board was supporting the issues; rather, Ms. Loobey was acting as Chair of the OTA Legislative Committee. Ms. Loobey said, however, that LTD is part of the association and the association needs to know how the LTD Board feels on the issues.

Mr. Andersen asked if Ms. Loobey anticipated testifying on any specific issues before the next Board meeting. Ms. Loobey said that she would be testifying on HB 2421 and SB 511 on March 20.

MOTION

Mr. Andersen moved that the Board go on the record as opposing HB 2421 and SB 511, and authorize the General Manager to testify at any legislative hearings regarding HB 2421 and SB 511 and register the Board's opposition. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, which then carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

Mr. Andersen stated that in looking at a lot of the other bills, he didn't think they would go anywhere, anyway. Mr. Parks said that when managers go to Salem during the legislative session, they first are protecting their own agency's backsides and, second, are watching to see if something might benefit their organization and get on the books in support of it. He said lobbying provides knowledge and saves the self in a political game which is a fact of life. Ms. Calvert added that without lobbying, public transit is not the highest issue on legislative minds.

Ms. Loobey asked the Board to look at HB 3209 and HB 3108. She explained that HB 3108 cleans up the language on eminent domain, allowing a public entity to take immediate possession. Mr. Brandt said he was opposed because he did not think public entities should have any more rights than they already have. Ms. Loobey explained that when public entities go to court in eminent domain cases, they do so only over the purchase price, not over whether or not they will become the owners, but the law is ambiguous in referring to time of possession.

Mr. Brandt asked what "immediately" meant in the bill. Mr. Viggiano said he thought it meant 90-day notice. Mr. Brandt said he had a problem with an agency saying they were taking the property and that was that. Ms. Loobey said this bill would not change the law regarding the process of making the case; the public entity would just not have to wait as it went through the trial to set the purchase price before taking possession. Mr. Andersen added that the bill would mean that once it has been determined that the new owner is going to take possession, the new owner can do something with the property that is consistent with ownership. Mr. Viggiano stated also, that having been through eminent domain proceedings, one of the District's attorney's concerns was that the current law requires the new owner to put a sum into the court for the value of the property, but it does not say how that value is determined. This bill is trying to address that issue, to make the process clearer.

Mr. Andersen said he wanted to see what the ambiguities really are, and the specifics of what the bill is going to do. Therefore, he did not want to take



action on 3108 at that time. Ms. Calvert asked Ms. Loobey to obtain details on that bill for the Board.

Mr. Andersen asked Ms. Loobey how much more weight she added with her testimony. Mr. Parks commented that the General Manager does not testify for the Board, but takes the Board along to add more weight to the testimony. Mr. Andersen asked what difference it would make if LTD went on record for or against a bill. Mr. Brandt said it was important to him; that he was totally opposed to new taxes in any form.

Mr. Andersen asked if there was any way to obtain the Board's input if Ms. Loobey found out about any hearings coming up before the April Board meeting. Ms. Loobey said it depended on the reading of the bill, who is working on it, what committee it is in, etc. She said she had not received a calendar since the previous Friday.

MOTION

Mr. Andersen moved that the LTD Board support HB 3209, increasing the cigarette tax for elderly and handicapped services by one cent. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, and the vote carried 3 to 1, with Mr. Brandt voting in opposition and all others in favor.

VOTE

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no other business before the Board, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

  
Board Secretary