

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 20, 1989

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 14, 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, September 20, 1989, at 7:30 p.m. at the Eugene City Hall, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: H. Thomas Andersen, Secretary
Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Thomas Montgomery
Herbert Herzberg
Keith Parks, presiding
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Janet Calvert, President
Gus Pusateri

CALL TO ORDER: In Ms. Calvert's absence, Mr. Parks called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS: Mr. Parks introduced two Board members who were attending their first meeting. Tom Montgomery lives in Springfield and is filling the position held by Rich Smith until his term expired in December 1988. Tom's term will end December 31, 1992. Tom has B.S. degrees in Anthropology and Biology from the University of Oregon, and has been the manager of the UO fish hatchery since 1982. He has ridden bus systems most of his life. Herbert Herzberg lives in southwest Eugene and is replacing Janice Eberly, whose term also expired in December 1988. His term will end December 31, 1992. Herb has been the president of Field Agent Laborers Local 121 Construction since November 1987. He has served on the LERC advisory board since its inception, served on the CETA board for Lane County during the first three years, and has been a member of the Eugene Bethel Lions Club since 1959.

BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH: The August and September Bus Riders of the Month were present to be introduced to the Board. Mark Nasholm, the August Bus Rider of the Month, is a Eugene native who has been riding the bus for the past 12 years. He is also a ham radio enthusiast and offered his services during the World Veterans' Championships this summer. Mark told the Board that he is legally blind, and needs help boarding or finding a seat once in awhile. He said that all the bus operators, riders, and other LTD employees have been wonderful, and that when he was looking for a house several years ago, he made sure it was on a bus route.

Wanda Mountjoy, the September Bus Rider of the Month, is well known for her outspoken optimism about life, and is apt to defend her bus operators against any negative remarks. She was born in Nebraska and came to Oregon in 1940 and began riding the bus right away. Her husband, Smith, took many pictures of this area in the early 1900's, and some are displayed at the Lane County Historical Museum. Mrs. Mountjoy said that words cannot express how wonderful the bus drivers and everybody have been to her. She said her eyesight is not good enough to drive, so she goes everywhere on the bus. She presented the Board with a packet of pictures from her husband's collection, including one of the *Register-Guard* building on Willamette Street in 1864.

Mr. Parks presented Mr. Nasholm and Mrs. Mountjoy with certificates of appreciation and LTD key chains.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: The September Employee of the Month, Angie Sifuentez, was present to receive her award and be introduced to the Board. Angie was originally hired as a Customer Service Representative on December 6, 1974, and was promoted to Marketing Representative in October 1982. Mr. Parks read from comments in the agenda packet which described Angie as a team player who could be counted on when the chips were down. After receiving her check and award, Angie said she wanted everyone to know that she appreciated all the nice things that were said about her.

MOTION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Andersen moved that the Board approve the minutes of the June 14, 1989, special meeting; the June 21, 1989, regular meeting; the July 19, 1989 regular meeting; and the August 16, 1989, regular meeting. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

VOTE

APPROVAL OF FISCAL YEAR 1989-90 SECTION 9 OPERATING AND CAPITAL GRANT APPLICATION: Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, called the Board's attention to pages 26 and 27 of the agenda packet. He explained that Congress had not yet allocated the funds, but LTD expected to receive \$1,215,000 in federal Section 9 capital and operating assistance. The bulk of the money, \$1,075,000, is for operating assistance. An additional \$80,000 will be allocated for spare bus parts, and \$60,000 for the purchase of one-half of a 35-foot bus. Mr. Pangborn explained that this half-bus is part of the total purchase of 25 buses the Board approved three meetings ago. Because UMTA likes transit districts to use Section 9 funds toward bus purchases, this small amount was included in this grant application. Under grant rules, spare parts cannot be purchased as part of the total bus purchase with Section 3 funds, so Section 9 funds were used. The spare parts include two transmissions and two engines. Having these parts allows Maintenance to remove a transmission or engine from a bus to work on it, and replace it with one in good working condition, which means that the bus can get back on the road with as little down time as possible.

The local share for capital funding is 20 percent, and the local share for operational funding is 50 percent. This amounts to a little over \$1 million in local match, for which the District has adequate funding.

Ms. Loobey reminded the Board that the Section 9 grant application is an annual process and that these funds are apportioned to specific transit

districts. Section 3 funds, however, are discretionary, so LTD competes with other properties for those funds.

Public Hearing on Section 9 Operating and Capital Grant Application:

Mr. Parks opened the public hearing on the District's application for federal Section 9 capital and operating funds. There was no testimony from the audience, and the public hearing was closed.

Board Deliberation and Decision:

MOTION

Mr. Andersen asked what percent loss would be caused by Gramm-Rudman. Mr. Pangborn said it would be about 5 percent, or \$50,000. Mr. Andersen then moved that the Board authorize the General Manager to submit a grant application for Section 9 federal operating and capital funds through the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, in the amount of \$1,075,000 in operating assistance and \$140,000 in capital assistance, for Fiscal Year 1989-90. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

ELECTION OF BOARD VICE PRESIDENT:

Mr. Parks explained that Janice Eberly, who was no longer a member of the Board, had been the Board's Vice President. The Board was being asked to elect someone to fill this position until the regular elections are held. In December, elections will be held for all four Board offices, for two-year terms which will begin in January 1990.

MOTION

Mr. Andersen nominated Keith Parks to fill the position, noting that Mr. Parks was the only experienced Board member who was not already an officer. Mr. Montgomery seconded the nomination. Mr. Andersen moved, seconded by Mr. Brandt, that the nominations be closed. Mr. Andersen then moved that the secretary be instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for Mr. Parks as Vice President, to complete Ms. Eberly's term which ends December 31, 1989. The motion was seconded and Mr. Parks was elected by unanimous ballot.

VOTE

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Facility Project Update: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, informed the Board that since the memorandum on page 28 was written, a new mechanical subcontractor was on the site and learning about the project. The mason was still not on the project, but Mr. Viggiano understood that was basically because that subcontractor was busy with other work, and the LTD masonry work was not on the critical path at that time. Mr. Herzberg asked what was included in the masonry work. Mr. Viggiano replied that it was just the brick work.

Marion Construction of Salem, the new general contractor for the project, at first estimated project completion for December 31, 1989, but that date will likely change because the mechanical subcontractor has not been on the project until now. The new completion date was thought to be sometime in January 1990, but that date would not be known for another week or so.

Mr. Parks asked if the new Board members were familiar with what had happened with the original general contractor on this project. Mr. Herzberg and

Mr. Montgomery had attended briefings about the District and its operations, so were familiar with the project.

Mr. Andersen wondered if it would be possible to recover staff time as well as direct costs from Fireman's Fund. Mr. Viggiano said that staff have been keeping track of their time, and would submit a claim for the additional time spent on the project. Since June, Mr. Viggiano had spent approximately 10 percent of his time on the project, but all together, the cost for staff time probably amounts to less than \$10,000.

Mr. Viggiano said that some months ago, the Board toured the new facility, which was 40 to 50 percent completed at that time. A lot more work has been completed since then. The sheet rock is up in the rooms, so it is now easier to get a better sense of the layout of the facility. He offered to schedule a couple of tours to meet the Board members' schedules, because he thought they would find the facility interesting at this stage of development. The Board members who were present scheduled a tour for 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 26.

Eugene Downtown Transit Station Site Selection Committee Update: The Committee is comprised of three LTD Board members, Janet Calvert (Committee Chair), H. Thomas Andersen, and Peter Brandt; one Eugene City Councilor, Rob Bennett; one Eugene Planning Commissioner, Gerry Gaydos; and one Eugene Downtown Commissioner, John Brown. Mr. Brandt informed the Board that the Committee had met three times, and that good progress had been made. The Committee so far had developed objectives and criteria for possible sites for a new Eugene Transit Station, as well as deciding how those sites would be evaluated. Approximately 17 initial sites had been narrowed to five, based on some criteria which showed that the eliminated sites did not meet the overall objectives of what the Committee and the District are trying to accomplish. For example, some were too far from the city center, some were on-street sites, etc.

Mr. Brandt handed out maps showing where the original and final sites are located. He explained that the existing site was included in the final five sites for comparison purposes, but does not meet the criteria of having an off-street site. The other final sites were #4, the butterfly lot; #6, the Greyhound lot; #13, the future City Hall lot; and #17, the elections lot, located on the north side of 6th Avenue, between 5th and 6th.

The next step the Committee will take will be to apply the criteria, in order to determine the one or two most promising sites and further investigate their availability, suitability, etc. Mr. Brandt said he was sure that everyone on the Committee had his or her own opinion about which site would be the best, so choosing the final site could be a difficult process. He explained that the list of objectives and criteria is basically related to finding a site that is close to downtown; close to where the greatest ridership is; has good access; includes costs which are in relation to the benefits received; is off-site; and has long-range potential.

Mr. Brandt said that, in his mind, the most important criterion is to look at mixed-use possibilities, in order to develop the transit station in combination with another development such as an office building or the Greyhound bus

station, and share the cost. He added that the Committee's work so far is very preliminary but moving along fairly well.

Mr. Parks asked if this was an advisory group and, if so, to whom. Mr. Brandt said this was an advisory group to LTD. Mr. Parks asked if public input hearings would be scheduled. Ms. Loobey replied that there will be opportunities for public input, including public hearings. Mr. Brandt added that staff from the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG), various departments in the City of Eugene, and LTD were all doing the work for the Committee, and that he thought it was a well-coordinated effort. Mr. Parks said he thought it would be good if this joint venture could continue through the public hearing process.

Mr. Andersen said he would echo much of what Mr. Brandt said. He was pleased at the cooperation at this level among the governmental groups. He thought the appointed officials all seemed to be moving toward the same goal, and thought they would not be moving in any way that is adverse to the LTD Board. Mr. Brandt thought that problems might arise after the site is selected, if there are residents or business owners who object to the transit station being in a certain place.

Mr. Herzberg asked if the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was involved in this process, because the EPA sometimes created stumbling blocks. Mr. Montgomery wondered if the EPA should be involved earlier instead of later in the process. Ms. Loobey replied that the issues the EPA might be interested in would be either noise or air pollution, and that the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) would be the direct contact agency for sole source pollution, and the District would have to obtain some sort of a permit. Also, the project would have to meet federal noise abatement regulations.

Valley River Center Transit Station: Ms. Loobey called the Board's attention to a staff memorandum on page 30 of the agenda packet. At the June Board meeting, the Board approved spending \$125,000 to construct a transit station at Valley River Center (VRC). One issue facing the District at that time was that going out to bid for a separate contract to construct the station would have increased the time and possibly the cost of construction. However, by leasing the station from VRC, the station can be constructed in conjunction with the VRC improvements being made now. According to the terms of the contract with VRC, LTD will lease the station for 20 years for an advanced lump sum payment of \$125,000, which is not quite the full cost of construction. If, after 20 years, a new lease is negotiated, it would be consistent with lease agreements with any other station, such as at the new Gateway shopping center. VRC has agreed to pay the additional costs which are not covered by LTD's budgeted amount of \$125,000.

Mr. Andersen wondered about the phrase, "if a new lease is negotiated." Ms. Loobey explained that the transit station is a specialized use, and staff believe that VRC wants LTD at the shopping center, so it is unlikely that LTD would not be able to negotiate a new lease. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, added that if Valley River Center wanted to build a new store where the transit station is before the 20-year lease expires, VRC would have

to work with LTD to find a new place for the transit station, and VRC would be obligated to replace the station.

Year-end Performance Report: Joe Janda, MIS Administrator, discussed the District's second year-end performance report, in which the District's performance in several key areas was compared with performance in FY 87-88. Mr. Janda stated that FY 88-89 was a record year for the District in all areas. Ridership increased 15.6 percent compared to the previous year, and reached a record high of 4.4 million passenger trips. He explained that passenger trips measure a continuous trip, including transfers. The main reasons for this ridership increase are (1) the UO prepaid pass program, in which students pay \$4.50 per term for unlimited ridership on the system--last year, 750,000 student trips were taken on the system, and about 10 percent of the ridership increase can be attributed to this program; (2) service adjustments; and (3) general growth in the population of three to five percent per year.

Mr. Andersen wondered how the District arrives at its goals for each year, and what the projections are for FY 89-90. Mr. Janda said the goals are projections based on the previous year, and that staff are projecting a 5 percent ridership increase over FY 88-89. The UO program has had one year of maturity, so increases there are not expected to be as great.

Mr. Parks asked if prepaid programs were offered to the City, County, or other entities. Ms. Loobey said that staff were working with the City and County toward similar programs.

In discussing service, Mr. Janda said that since 1979-80, there has been a slight decline and then a gradual build-up of service. By making minor adjustments and some enhancements, the District has taken an incremental, gradual approach to service. Mr. Andersen noted that service is behind ridership, and wondered if an increase in service should be expected. However, Mr. Janda said he thought ridership follows service. Mr. Brandt commented that the best situation is for ridership to increase while service stays "flat." Mr. Janda said that, currently, the service level is almost 12 percent lower than service at the last time of high ridership in 1979-80.

Mr. Janda explained that productivity is the measure of total person trips per schedule hour. In 1988-89, productivity was at 20.3 person trips, the highest level ever. This means that for every hour of service, 20.3 person trips were made on the system.

Mr. Janda then talked about bus fares. He said that fares, service coverage, and service frequency all affect a person's decisions regarding whether or not to ride the bus. In 1979-80, ridership was at an all-time high. When fares were nearly doubled at the end of that year, ridership dropped dramatically, calling attention to the sensitivity among customers regarding fares. Ms. Loobey added that the District learned a lesson, that fares cannot be left low for a long time and then increased dramatically. Instead, LTD has been increasing fares incrementally, by increasing the cash fare at one time and the next time increasing the cost of purchasing passes and tokens. Since beginning this

practice, the District has not seen the loss of ridership when increasing fares. Instead, riders will change to the cheapest fare mechanism for them.

Mr. Janda then discussed performance measures in the Transportation division. Road call down time was described as the number of minutes a bus is off schedule because of mechanical failure or an accident. Another bus is dispatched, and down time is measured from the time the dispatcher gets the call to the time a bus is back in service and on time for that route. Last year, schedule down time was decreased by 8.1 percent, which Mr. Janda said was a tribute to the working relationship between the Maintenance and Transportation divisions in responding to these situations and getting a bus back in service.

Absenteeism measures the percent of bus operators who are absent as a result of illness or injury. That trend has also been downward over time. Mr. Janda explained that every one percent drop in absenteeism results in a cost savings of approximately \$20,000. Illness cannot be controlled, but a wellness program has been implemented at the District to encourage employees to be more proactive with their health. An incentive program has also been implemented to encourage attendance. Mr. Andersen said he understood that it was made easier to achieve the incentive cash awards and that absenteeism had then dropped off. Mr. Janda said that was correct. Mr. Montgomery asked about the relationship between the money spent and the money saved to decrease absenteeism. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, replied that the ratio is somewhere around three to one; that is, if the District spent \$25,000, it would expect to save \$75,000.

Fleet maintenance performance indicators include miles between mechanical road calls, fuel miles per gallon, and oil miles per quart. Mr. Janda said there had been a 7.2 percent increase in number of miles traveled. The District's buses travel roughly 3.25 million miles a year, or almost 9,000 miles each day. The average bus travels 165 miles on a weekday. Mechanical road calls are measured when a bus is actually pulled out of service. In FY 88-89, this figure decreased from 8,000 miles between road calls to 3,500. However, the Maintenance division recently implemented a new computerized fleet management system, and the way in which mechanical road calls are reported has changed. In the future, Mr. Janda said, staff will have a much more accurate data base.

Fuel miles per gallon and oil miles per quart are decreasing primarily because the fleet is aging and the buses have traveled more miles.

Mr. Andersen asked how staff assess complaints and compliments. Mr. Janda stated that complaints are written and distributed to the appropriate division for resolution, but staff's suspicion is that they under-count compliments. For instance, staff receive compliments in daily conversations but have a tendency not to report them. However, if staff hear complaints, they are reported so that there can be some review and resolution. As an example, Mr. Dallas said that Mr. Andersen had told him that Mr. Andersen's children were having some trouble on the bus. Mr. Dallas filled out a complaint form in order to research the problem; however, if Mr. Andersen had paid the District a compliment, Mr. Dallas would have been less likely to write that up.

Mr. Janda next discussed revenue and operating cost measures, found on page 36 of the agenda packet. Table VII on that page shows the farebox-to-operating cost ratio, or the percent paid for by the customer, back to the inception of the District. This ratio increased from 19.5 percent to 20.2 percent last year. Passenger revenues increased 14.6 percent in 1988-89, to \$1.7 million, following an upward trend since 1982-83. Last year, 58 percent of fares were prepaid, by the use of passes, tokens, day passes, and the UO subsidy program, and the remainder was paid by cash. Cash fares decreased from 46 percent to 42 percent. This use of prepaid fares is encouraged, because they are easier to administer and because people are more likely to ride if they have passes or some prepaid instrument.

Operating cost is defined as the cost of doing business, including overhead. Operating costs increased 7.5 percent last year, due to salary increases, additional employees to implement the new service, and inflationary adjustments. The farebox-to-operating cost ratio, which increased 3.6 percent last year, has been fairly stable over time, ranging from 18.6 to 22 percent, in spite of increasing operating costs. In comparing base fares adjusted for inflation from 1978, the 8.9 percent decrease in adjusted base fare is a significant accomplishment.

Two important performance measures at the Customer Service Center (CSC) are total calls received and the lost-call rate, shown on page 37 of the agenda packet. In 1988-89, the CSC experienced a 22 percent increase in calls, and made a significant improvement in the number of calls which were not lost. The CSC staff achieved a rate of 4 percent lost calls in a record year for number of calls received.

Safety and risk management measures are shown in table IX on page 37 of the packet. Miles between preventable accidents is defined as the number of miles between accidents which could have been prevented by the driver. Total system miles have been increasing over time. The average miles traveled between preventable accidents increased by 3.8 percent to 104,500 in FY 88-89. This represents about one preventable accident every 12 days. In FY 89-90, the District will be emphasizing defensive driving. The number of preventable accidents is normally lower directly after the employees go through defensive driving courses, so the number of preventable accidents is expected to drop again this year. Total liability claims increased by 32 percent, from 83 to 110. Workers' Compensation claims stayed the same, at 30 for the year.

Mr. Janda closed by saying that FY 88-89 was a strong year for LTD, due to increasing ridership and the general health and stability of the community, as well as more efficient service being offered to the community.

Mr. Brandt suggested that the Board President post a letter to all employees expressing the Board's appreciation of the employees' efforts to achieve the results just discussed by Mr. Janda. Mr. Andersen agreed, saying the employees should be proud of these results.

Transit Development Plan: Mr. Janda gave copies of the new Transit Development Plan (TDP) to the Board members, and offered to send copies to anyone

in the community the Board might suggest. He explained that requirements for receiving Section 9 funds used to require a yearly planning document. Now the TDP is more of an internal resource document for staff, but is also sent to the Chambers of Commerce and the public library, among others. Mr. Pangborn added that UMTA still requires a planning document, but is less stringent about what is included in it. Three- to five-year plans are included, as well as other materials which are more resource materials for staff than they are planning documents. The TDP is a compilation of LTD's operating statistics and plans. Mr. Brandt suggested that the TDP be sent to *The Register-Guard* and the *Springfield News*. He also asked who paid for the TDP. Ms. Loobey replied that the document was produced internally on the District's computer network.

Farewell for Former Board Members: Ms. Loobey said that Ms. Calvert and one or two other Board members had asked about having a farewell reception for three Board members whose terms had expired. She asked the Board's preference in doing so. Mr. Parks suggested having something before a Board meeting, but especially before the dedication of the new facility; he suggested a party for those who spent so much time planning the new facility. Mr. Brandt thought it would need to be a separate function, rather than at the beginning of a Board meeting, to be meaningful. Mr. Andersen suggested that Ms. Loobey and Ms. Calvert decide what would be the best way to recognize the outgoing Board members.

Results of State Legislative Session: Mr. Andersen asked what had happened to the transit legislation that Ms. Loobey had reported on at the June meeting. Ms. Loobey replied that everything passed except the tire and battery tax.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Andersen moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:10 p.m.


Board Secretary