

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, June 14, 1989

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 8, 1989, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, June 14, 1989, at 7:30 p.m. at the Eugene City Hall, Eugene, Oregon.

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 7:35 p.m.

BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH: Ms. Calvert introduced the May Bus Rider of the Month, Janice Nelson, who rode the buses in this area until she moved away at age five, then came back in 1973 and has been riding since. Ms. Calvert said the District appreciated its faithful and interested bus riders.

Ms. Nelson made a suggestion about bus service. She said she takes the bus at 5th and N. "B," but on weekend mornings she cannot get to Bi-Mart to begin her work shift by 8:00 or 9:00 a.m. She said she only has to walk ten blocks or so, but there are others who cannot do that, and she would suggest offering service earlier in the morning on weekends, for employees who have to work earlier shifts.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Calvert asked for audience participation on items of a general nature. There was none.

MOTION **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Mr. Brandt moved that the minutes of the May 17, 1989, regular meeting and the May 26, 1989, adjourned meeting be approved as distributed. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved by VOTE unanimous vote.

MOTION **RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES:** Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the resolution reaffirming that Lane Transit District will continue to operate service within the boundaries specified in Lane Transit District Ordinance No. 24. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion, and the resolution was VOTE unanimously approved.

ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 1988-89 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET:

Staff Presentation: Ms. Loobey explained that the supplemental budget was not only necessary to transfer money between funds at the end of the fiscal year, but also to transfer the year-end balance to the capital reserve fund, as previously recommended by the Budget Committee.

Brentt Ramharter, Finance Administrator, stated that the major areas in which the District received more money than anticipated were in a fuel tax reimbursement, payroll taxes, and passenger fares. The fuel tax refund was not in effect at the time the budget was adopted, and resulted in \$119,000 in unanticipated revenue. Painting of the eight used buses purchased from Tri-Met caused the need for an additional \$20,000 in the Maintenance budget this year. Mr Ramharter said that a total of \$9,472 was needed from the year-end balance to balance the operating budget for FY 88-89, and the rest would be transferred to the Capital Improvements Fund, as recommended by the District's Budget Committee on May 3, 1989. He added that the \$9,400 may also be transferred to the Capital Improvements Fund at the end of the fiscal year, but it was difficult to project that closely before the end of June.

In response to a question from Ms. Calvert, Mr. Ramharter explained that the fuel tax was a tax which had been imposed by Congress on tax-exempt entities, and then rescinded because of administrative problems in handling the volume of paperwork caused by requests for refunds.

Public Hearing on Supplemental Budget for FY 88-89: Ms. Calvert opened the public hearing on the Supplemental Budget for Fiscal Year 1988-89. There was no testimony from the audience, and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION

Board Deliberation and Decision: Mr. Brandt moved that the Board adopt the Supplemental Budget as set forth on pages 17-19 of the agenda packet (attached to these minutes). Mr. Parks seconded the motion, and the Supplemental Budget was unanimously adopted.

MOTION

ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 1989-90 BUDGET:

Staff Presentation: Mr. Ramharter explained that the FY 89-90 budget presented in the agenda packet was identical to the budget approved by the District's Budget Committee on May 3, 1989. He said there may be small areas where changes might be needed, but those areas are insignificant at this time. If needed, the Budget Committee will be convened mid-year. Mr. Ramharter said that staff were somewhat concerned about the payroll tax base not being as high as anticipated, so they will be watching that closely. He added that this may not affect the operating budget, but could affect the amount to be transferred to the Capital Improvements Fund.

Mr. Brandt asked about the proposed state tire and battery tax. Ms. Loobey said that bill had only passed through the House, with a motion for reconsideration.

Public Hearing on Fiscal Year 1989-90 Budget: Ms. Calvert opened the public hearing on the FY 1989-90 budget, as recommended by the Budget Committee on May 3, 1989. There was no testimony from the audience, and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION

Board Deliberation and Decision: Mr. Andersen moved that the Board adopt the resolution on page 20 of the agenda packet, which adopts the Fiscal Year 1989-90 budget in the total combined fund sum of \$16,782,450, as previously approved by the Budget Committee (resolution attached to these minutes).

MOTION

Mr. Parks seconded the motion, and the FY 89-90 budget was unanimously adopted.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Facility Project Update: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, stated that a notice of termination had been issued to Hyland & Sons on June 7, to be effective June 14. Hyland & Sons had worked on June 14, but would not be on the project the following day. The bonding company had estimated that it would take four to 30 days to find a contractor to complete the project.

Mr. Andersen asked what would happen in the interim. Mr. Viggiano replied that staff would like the construction activity to continue, so are trying to work out an agreement with the bonding company for LTD to hire someone for the interim. LTD would be reimbursed by the bonding company for the cost of the interim management, and would not be held liable for construction problems that may arise. Mr. Andersen asked how long those negotiations might take, and Mr. Viggiano replied that staff hoped to have an agreement signed the following day. Mr. Andersen then asked if the District had someone in mind as the interim contractor. Mr. Viggiano replied that Steve Pinnel, of Pinnel Engineering, who had been hired six weeks before to review the problems with Hyland, is quite good and experienced with the project. Mr. Viggiano went on to say that the activity on the project is quite low, but some activity would continue, and the District's construction manager would remain on the job.

Mr. Parks said that KMTR-TV said the project was "dead in its tracks." Mr. Viggiano said he had told a KMTR reporter exactly what he was telling the Board, and that the District hoped to keep everything moving ahead on the project. There is some indication from the bonding company that, once Hyland is off the project, the bonding company will pay the subcontractors. They may not pay everyone everything they are owed immediately, but enough to keep the project going for now.

Ms. Loobey added that the bonding company had disbursed all of the \$750,000 LTD had paid in May, with none of that money going to Hyland or to the bonding company. She said that the subcontractors have contracts and an obligation to fill those contracts, but their contract is now with the bonding company rather than with Hyland & Sons.

Mr. Viggiano further explained that the District had determined that Hyland & Sons was in default and then terminated the contract. Dave Hyland had written a letter acknowledging that his firm was in default. The District has an

attorney specialist helping with this case, in addition to Bryson & Bryson, the District's legal counsel.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were not sure how long the interim period would be. If it is longer than one week, he said, there will be some difficulties on the project because Hyland had been doing the concrete work. In order for LTD to hire a concrete worker, there would have to be a public bidding process, which would take a long time. Therefore, he said, staff were asking the Board to reconvene that evening as the LTD Contract Review Board, to authorize staff to hire a concrete contractor in an emergency. He added that this is the last option for the District, but may be necessary because of the critical path of the project.

Mr. Parks asked about owner intervention in the project. Mr. Viggiano replied that the District would secure a release of liability. He repeated that this action would be a last resort and was probably unlikely, and was not an authorization to proceed. The attorney had drafted a resolution to that effect.

System Comparison Analysis: Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, explained that the system comparison analysis began in response to a request from Mr. Brandt. It compares LTD's system with other systems in the U.S. Mr. Pangborn explained that staff did not use a scientific process to find the comparison systems. Harsh weather conditions in the mid-west can throw off ridership characteristics, so most systems used in the analysis are west-coast or similar-size college communities.

In comparisons of productivity, LTD's 28.1 rides per hour compared favorably with the average of 25, and was exceeded by only three properties. LTD's farebox to operating cost ratio, 19.9 percent, was also exceeded by only three properties. The cost per trip was lower at only two other properties. In Washington, the farebox to operating cost ratio (11 percent at Olympia; 12 percent at Vancouver) is affected by the local option sales tax. Ms. Calvert commented that cost per ride in Vancouver is \$3.00. Mr. Pangborn explained that they do a lot of rural service and peak-oriented commuter service to Portland, which is more expensive. Mr. Brandt asked how Santa Cruz pays for bus service. Ms. Loobey explained that transit districts in California receive state sales tax and also state support that matches local efforts in the sales tax, similar to Washington. Mr. Pangborn added that the Santa Cruz system also contracts with the University of Santa Cruz. Mr. Brandt commented that they had more riders and a smaller number of buses. Mr. Viggiano added that they also contract with the schools for K-12 service.

Mr. Pangborn stated that these figures show that, for a community of our size, LTD provides a fair amount of service but also exceeds other communities in terms of productivity. He added that this kind of survey is done about every five years and that, in general, LTD looks at least better than average.

Ms. Calvert said she was interested in a comparison of spares ratios, since that was discussed by the Board recently. Mr. Pangborn said that some other properties had ratios which seem very high. Mr. Viggiano added that LTD's total includes the eight Tri-Met buses, which staff try not to use very often. He said

that the effective spares ratio of accessible buses is now very low. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, explained that the Tri-Met buses are used as little as possible because they do not have lifts, they have no power steering, and they have old transmissions.

Mr. Brandt suggested that this comparison be published in the newspaper. Ms. Loobey said that the Board and staff understand what these figures mean, but the statistics might not mean much to the media or public. She said that the District has sent annual reports to the business community and at one time discussed these kinds of statistics with a special committee on transit. However, she said, there are still those critics who do not believe the statistics because they do not wish to.

Mr. Brandt asked about Baton Rouge, where more than 50 percent of their farebox revenue is from the University. Mr. Viggiano explained that Baton Rouge has an arrangement in which the transit district provides service for the university students and counts the revenue as farebox revenue.

Ms. Calvert thanked Mr. Viggiano for the survey and analysis. Mr. Brandt thought that it might be interesting to find additional comparison properties and do more of these surveys. Ms. Loobey said that comparison data can be received from a number of sources, and LTD can be compared with all properties in the country if the Board wishes, but it is better to have some commonality with the other properties before a comparison is made. Mr. Brandt said he would not be interested in that kind of survey. Mr. Viggiano added that printed survey data is usually two to three years old, so staff had called to receive this information, and were pleased with the results. Mr. Brandt commented that the comparisons were better than he thought they would be.

Legislative Update: Ms. Loobey said that the Oregon House had considered that day five of the transportation bills which were generated through the Transportation 2000 process originated in the tri-county area. Senate Joint Resolution (SJR) 12 involves a constitutional amendment to allow an area to use local option motor vehicle registration fees for transit. HB 3447 provides for a local vote if an area wishes to use local option motor vehicle registration fees for transit. Ms. Loobey stated that these two bills are far more applicable to the tri-county area.

HB 3446, the weight mile/gas tax, would add another two cents to the gas tax and a corresponding increase in the weight mile tax for trucks, and would appropriate money from the State Highway Fund available to the Department of Transportation for use on the streets of small cities. This bill passed out of the House.

HB 3055 is a tire and battery tax which would provide that replacement tires would be assessed at \$2.00 per tire and replacement batteries would be assessed a \$3.00 fee at the point of retail sale. The money would be collected by the state; 50 percent would be allocated to a transit capital acquisition fund and 50 percent would be distributed to mass transit districts and transportation districts based on the number of motor vehicle registrations in those

counties. This passed the House with a motion for reconsideration, and was to be considered again the following Thursday.

Mr. Parks asked if the committees were beginning to close, and where these bills would go next. Ms. Loobey said that none of the bills had referrals to Ways & Means, but would all go to the Senate Transportation Committee.

Annual Employee Picnic: Ms. Loobey reminded the Board that the annual employee picnic would be held on Sunday, July 23 at Shotgun Creek Park, and that all Board members and their families would be welcome to attend.

Annual Independent Audit: Mr. Brandt wondered what had transpired after the Board's decision not to authorize payment for extra expenses to Coopers & Lybrand, the District's independent auditors. It was explained that Coopers & Lybrand had sent a letter the previous day, stating that they did not want to jeopardize their contract, but that they do believe the rules were changed after their bid was accepted, and quoted some rules as examples. They said they would complete the audit this year, but will open negotiations for a greater increase than the 5 percent allowed in the contract for next year. At that point, the District can either renegotiate or go out to bid.

Monthly Financial Statements: Mr. Brandt asked about the unfavorable variance in Maintenance. Mr. Pangborn explained that in the Materials & Supplies category, the federal gas tax was not budgeted, but was paid when fuel was purchased. Painting the eight Tri-Met buses was also not budgeted, in the Contractual Services category.

Mr. Brandt also asked about State Special Transportation Fund money. Mr. Pangborn explained that this is pass-through cigarette tax money, received from the State fund and passed on to the Lane Council of Governments to fund service for the elderly and handicapped. The District does not know ahead of time how much money will be received, but budgets at the maximum level. Mr. Brandt asked if the funds were lower because people are smoking less. Mr. Pangborn replied that the population of the state is growing, but per capita smoking is not.

Downtown Station Committee: Mr. Brandt said he did not want the new Downtown Station Committee to have a lot of meetings to talk about things over which it has no control. He said he was not quite sure why the District and City were activating the committee at this time, and wondered if the situation was any different than it was two years ago.

Ms. Loobey said her perspective was that when the Board was discussing this issue the last time, LTD, the City of Eugene, and groups within the City, such as the Downtown Commission and the Planning Commission, all met separately with their own agendas and came together once in awhile at pivotal points. The Board's frustration was that LTD was ready to discuss some hard decisions, but could never get firm decisions from the City and other groups. The Board then said LTD would wait until the City determines what will happen with the opening of certain streets, etc. However, Ms. Loobey said, the situation is different

this time, because the groups will be brought together earlier in the process to develop a common agenda.

Some things happening in downtown Eugene now will have an impact on where the station should be placed. For instance, the Pankow development will have a tremendous impact on traffic in downtown Eugene, especially on Olive Street. If Olive Street is opened for parking, it will be critical to LTD's operation in that area. The District, however, is in a better position this time to get something done, especially if meetings are held with other groups early in the process and a common agenda is agreed upon. She said she believed this process would be far more fruitful for LTD this time.

Mr. Parks asked how many groups would be involved. Mr. Pangborn said that Gerry Gaydos would represent the Planning Commission; John Brown would represent the Downtown Commission; and Rob Bennett would represent the City Council. Three Board members would also participate on the committee. Mr. Pangborn added that the Downtown Commission is an advisory group to the City Council, and generates most of the Council action on downtown issues, such as eliminating free parking downtown. Mr. Brandt asked who would take the lead on this committee. Ms. Loobey stated that the Board is positioned to take the lead if it wishes to do so. The Board members are experts on what the transit district needs, and can balance those needs against what the City will say is going to happen downtown. She added that LTD cannot determine the location of the downtown station until the City gives the Board information about population shifts, the center of downtown, street openings and closures, etc.

Ms. Calvert said that Mr. Viggiano would brief the Committee's Board members on what staff believe are the issues and recommendations, so that the first agendas can be developed. Mr. Brandt said he did not want the media to say that LTD was getting anxious to build a new downtown station. He said, rather, that the District is ready to cooperate but needs to know how. Mr. Parks agreed with this statement.

Mr. Parks asked if the non-LTD committee members would be voting on these issues which affect LTD. Mr. Pangborn replied that it is staff's hope that the committee will reach some kind of consensus for a recommendation in the best interests of the City and the District. He said that LTD has assets and resources and the City needs the District, but also has needs for traffic flow, etc.

Mr. Pangborn stated that if Olive Street is opened, it will create difficult operating conditions for the District. In order to achieve the best results for the City and LTD, staff from City planning, traffic engineering, downtown development, and LTD will be working together. He said he had the feeling that the City would tell LTD to make the decision. He added that he believed the City is prepared to say what they plan to do and who does not want LTD near their business areas. Mrs. Walwyn, owner of the Schaeffer's Building, has been allowed to not pay on her loan, because she says she has been damaged by having the buses outside her building.

Mr. Brandt said it was his impression that LTD is the one saying the buses need to leave the current area, but said he was not in a panic to relocate the station. Ms. Calvert said she also was not in a panic to relocate, but thought the Board needed to look at where the station could go before all the property becomes unavailable. Mr. Brandt also stated that the District needs a contract from the City that it will not open or close streets around the station, or otherwise change the situation after the station is relocated.

Mr. Brandt asked why LTD was taking the initiative in setting up the meetings if it was not "panicky" about relocating. Ms. Calvert replied that LTD had been asked to meet with the Downtown Commission because of Mrs. Walwyn's unhappiness with the current station's location. Ms. Loobey said that staff are concerned that the District not get itself into the same frustrating box as the last time, when different groups were meeting and nothing came of it. The idea this time, she said, is to work together to make a determination and come out with a product. The committee's members represent the City's interests at different levels and have some influence over decisions regarding the new station, should LTD decide it needs one.

Mr. Parks was also concerned that the City hadn't made the proper major decisions to enable LTD to gain a decision from this committee process. Mr. Brandt seconded this concern, and said that at the first committee meeting LTD should lay out its concerns about what happened before. Ms. Calvert said the committee would meet approximately once a month, and thought that goals for LTD and the City should be established at the first meeting. Mr. Pangborn thought it was imperative that everyone puts his or her cards on the table at the beginning, so the different agendas, and whether there can be a common agenda, will be known.

Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, stated that the transit district is a key player in downtown with very legitimate needs. The bottom line, he said, is that the current station was built in 1982 and is now inadequate. LTD has had a 50 percent increase in ridership since 1982, and its needs are not being addressed at the current station. He said it seemed to him that the transit district has a responsibility to keep saying that it does have certain needs in downtown. Mr. Viggiano thought this process afforded the District an opportunity to better itself in downtown Eugene, and that alternatives to improve the station drastically are available.

Ms. Calvert said she thought that, from the Board's discussion, Mr. Viggiano would have a good idea of how to prepare the agenda for the first committee meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Pangborn stated that there would probably be no meeting in July, since staff knew of no issues requiring Board action. The Board unanimously approved a motion by Mr. Brandt to adjourn the LTD Board meeting and call the LTD Contract Review Board to order.

MOTION
VOTE

MEETING OF THE LTD CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD: Ms. Calvert called the meeting of the Lane Transit District Contract Review Board (LTD/CRB) to order at 8:50 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the possible need to hire

an interim construction manager and employ a concrete contractor, since a substantial amount of construction was dependent upon completion of delinquent concrete work at the construction site. This action became necessary as a result of the termination of Hyland & Sons as the contractor for LTD's new maintenance and operations facility in Glenwood. Mr. Viggiano handed out a resolution drawn up by District Counsel Randall Bryson, which declared an emergency and authorized LTD to employ a concrete contractor without competitive bidding, either directly or through Pinnel Engineering, Inc., as interim construction manager. Mr. Brandt asked if staff had checked this action with Art Tarlow. Mr. Viggiano explained that Mr. Tarlow is an attorney with Bollinger, Hampton & Tarlow in Portland who specializes in construction law. He added that the District would use Mr. Tarlow's counsel if the employment of a concrete contractor actually came to pass, but that he thought this probably would not happen. Mr. Pangborn stated that the Contract Review Board needed to adopt this resolution because of certain State purchasing laws, in the event that the District needed to pursue this course of action.

MOTION

Mr. Brandt moved that the LTD Contract Review Board approve the resolution, provided all is finally approved by the special legal counsel with respect to the contract, to ensure that the District does not enter into an action that will cause any formal liability. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion, which then passed by unanimous vote.

VOTE

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Andersen moved that the meeting of the LTD/CRB be adjourned. With no further discussion, the meeting was duly adjourned at 8:55 p.m.


Board Secretary

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District hereby adopts the supplemental budget, as approved by the Budget Committee for 1988-89 in the total sum of \$637,855, now on file at the Lane Transit District offices, located at 1944 West 8th Avenue, Eugene.

RESOLUTION MAKING APPROPRIATIONS

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District also increases and decreases appropriations in the current 1988-89 fiscal year budget and that the supplemental budget is appropriated as follows:

GENERAL FUND

Transfer to Capital Projects Fund	\$ 628,383
Materials and Supplies	9,472
Total General Fund Appropriation	\$ 637,855

June 14, 1989

Date


Board Secretary

ATTACHMENT TO JUNE 14, 1989, MINUTES

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
BUDGET TRANSFER FY 88-89

	BUDGET	BUDGET TRANSFERS 05-31-89	SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET	AMENDED
REVENUE BEG FUND BALANCE				
PASSENGER FARES	1,672,100		92,900	1,765,000
CHARTER REVENUE	20,000		2,000	22,000
ADVERTIZING REVENUE	72,900		0	72,900
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	2,500		0	2,500
INTEREST REVENUE	150,000		126,400	276,400
PAYROLL TAXES	5,794,000		251,000	6,045,000
UMTA SECTION 09	1,041,400		0	1,041,400
STATE OPERATING	554,100		35,900	590,000
STATE SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION	362,000		0	362,000
OTHER OPERATING GRANTS	3,000		0	3,000
UMTA SECTION 18	18,600		4,260	22,860
UMTA PLANNING	8,000		6,395	14,395
FUEL TAX REIMBURSEMENT	0		119,000	119,000
TOTAL RESOURCES	9,698,600	0	637,855	10,336,455
ADMIN - PERSONAL SERVICES				
GEN'L ADMIN	257,300			257,300
MIS	63,400			63,400
FINANCE	176,200			176,200
PERSONNEL	46,300	(10,000)		36,300
SAFETY & TNG	70,700			70,700
TOTAL	613,900	(10,000)	0	603,900
- MAT'L & SUPPLIES				
GEN'L ADMIN	88,300			88,300
MIS	12,700			12,700
FINANCE	10,500			10,500
PERSONNEL	7,800	10,000		17,800
SAFETY & TNG	16,200	500		16,700
TOTAL	135,500	10,500	0	146,000
- CONTR SVCS				
GEN'L ADMIN	30,000	(10,000)		20,000
MIS	26,200	(6,000)		20,200
FINANCE	21,300	1,200		22,500
PERSONNEL	14,900	6,000		20,900
SAFETY & TNG	14,500	(4,000)		10,500
TOTAL	106,900	(12,800)	0	94,100
MKTG/ - PERSONAL SERVICES				
PLNG				
MARKETING	189,100			189,100
PLANNING	157,500			157,500
CUSTOMER SERVICES	191,100			191,100
TOTAL	537,700	0	0	537,700

ATTACHMENT TO JUNE 14, 1989, MINUTES

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
BUDGET TRANSFER FY 88-89

	BUDGET	BUDGET TRANSFERS 05-31-89	SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET	AMENDED
- MAT'L & SUPPL				
MARKETING	100,200	10,600	9,472	120,272
PLANNING	6,200			6,200
CUSTOMER SERVICES	47,700	(4,000)		43,700
TOTAL	154,100	6,600	9,472	170,172
- CONTR SVCS				
MARKETING	166,200	(10,000)		156,200
PLANNING	9,000	1,500		10,500
CUSTOMER SERVICES	1,100	400		1,500
TOTAL	176,300	(8,100)	0	168,200
TRANSPORTATION				
PERSONAL SERVICES	4,121,100	22,300		4,143,400
MAT'L & SUPPLIES	23,600			23,600
CONTR SVCS	514,000	(15,000)		499,000
TOTAL TRANSPORTATION	4,658,700	7,300	0	4,666,000
MAINTENANCE				
PERSONAL SERVICES	1,054,100	(8,000)		1,046,100
MAT'L & SUPPLIES	882,400	53,000		935,400
CONTR SVCS	58,000	13,500		71,500
TOTAL MAINTENANCE	1,994,500	58,500	0	2,053,000
FACILITIES MAINTENANCE				
PERSONAL SERVICES	29,200	2,000		31,200
MAT'L & SUPPLIES	22,900	(15,000)		7,900
CONTR SVCS	111,500	11,000		122,500
TOTAL FACILITIES MAINT.	163,600	(2,000)	0	161,600
OTHER				
TRANSFER TO CAPITAL PROJECTS	846,700		628,383	1,475,083
TRANSFER TO RISK MANAGEMENT	260,700			260,700
CONTINGENCY	50,000	(50,000)		0
TOTAL OTHER	1,157,400	(50,000)	628,383	1,735,783
TOTAL	9,698,600	0	637,855	10,336,455

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the budget of Lane Transit District for the Fiscal Year 1989-1990 in the total combined fund sum of \$16,782,450 is hereby adopted, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the amounts for the Fiscal Year 1989-90 are appropriated for the following purposes by organizational unit:


GENERAL FUND

	<u>Administration</u>
\$ 667,100	Personal Services
\$ 122,270	Material & Supplies
\$ 110,550	Contractual Services
	<u>Marketing & Planning</u>
\$ 594,700	Personal Services
\$ 189,550	Materials & Supplies
\$ 207,000	Contractual Services
	<u>Operations</u>
\$ 4,509 500	Personal Services
\$ 22,100	Materials & Supplies
\$ 472,100	Contractual Services
	<u>Maintenance</u>
\$ 1,139,200	Personal Services
\$ 1,141,321	Materials & Supplies
\$ 198,900	Contractual Services
	<u>Unallocated Expenditures</u>
\$ 200,000	Contingency
\$ 767,959	Transfer to Capital Projects Fund
\$ 409,700	Transfer to Risk Management Fund
	<u>CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND</u>
\$ 5,113,000	Capital Outlay
\$ 14,200	Capital Lease Principal Repayment
	<u>RISK MANAGEMENT FUND</u>
\$ 903,300	Risk Management Expenditures, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager is authorized to make expenditures and incur obligations within the limits of the foregoing.

June 14, 1989

 Date



 Secretary