

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, December 11, 1989

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 7, 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 Monday, December 11, 1989, at 6:00 p.m. in the LTD Conference Room at 1938 West 8th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Herbert Herzberg
Keith Parks, Vice President
Gus Pusateri

CALL TO ORDER: Ms Calvert called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. Mr. Andersen was not yet present.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW PURCHASING AGENT: Ms. Loobey introduced the District's new Purchasing Agent, Jeanette Tentinger, who had been promoted from Accounting Clerk.

MOTION

MEETING OF THE LTD CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that a meeting of the LTD Contract Review Board be called to order. Ms. Loobey explained that this meeting was necessary in order to bring current Contract Review Board Rules in compliance with changes in state and federal legislation, and to streamline the language in the Rules and eliminate unnecessary language. She introduced Randall Bryson of Bryson & Bryson, District Counsel. Ms. Tentinger called the Contract Review Board's attention to Section 3 of the revised LTD/CRB Rules, which would allow the District to use a negotiated procurement process in certain cases. This process would allow the purchase of buses based on other criteria rather than on purchase price only. Mr. Brandt asked if Section 3 referred only to rolling stock. Mr. Bryson replied that it did. Ms. Calvert asked if this process could have been used for construction of the new facility. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, replied that federal regulations allow this process to be used only for the procurement of buses. Mr. Brandt asked if this was a new policy, to which Ms. Tentinger replied that it had been enacted after the District last purchased buses.

Mr. Bryson stated that allowing negotiated procurement was a little more flexible and theoretically could save money. He added that, apparently, more

and more transit districts are using this process to purchase buses. Mr. Brandt asked if, using this policy, a transit district could accept a higher bid as long as other factors are better in a particular situation. Ms. Tentinger said that was correct. Mr. Pangborn used an example of including criteria for the future. He explained that LTD has to keep an inventory of parts for the buses, so the District has placed value on having buses with similar components because of training and carrying costs.

Ms. Tentinger identified other changes recommended for the LTD Contract Review Board Rules. Section 32 was changed in response to a change in the Oregon Revised Statutes, which requires written findings each time exemptions to the rules are adopted. Mr. Bryson explained that in the past, the CRB made the findings, but now it is up to the District to present findings to the CRB for its approval or disapproval. He stated that this is a technical change in the way the Contract Review Board Rules are adopted or amended. Ms. Tentinger stated that the staff memorandum given to the Contract Review Board members states the District's findings regarding why some of the Rules should be changed.

Mr. Brandt asked if all the changes had been explained in the letter. Ms. Tentinger replied that they had. She said a qualifying paragraph had been added, stating that the District will not allow contracts totalling more than \$40,000 to any one contractor during each year without going through a formal bid process, although the formal bid process does not need to be followed for purchases under \$25,000. The same thing is true for purchases under \$500; for an aggregate of more than \$1,000 in a year, the District needs three quotes to award to any one contractor. She added that some language had been simplified in the proposed Rules, and other changes were made to bring the District's Contract Review Board Rules in compliance with federal regulations. Mr. Bryson said that the District could create more stringent policies, but not less. For instance, he said, Tri-Met uses a \$10,000 limit for competitive bidding, but based on Bryson & Bryson's opinion that the federal limit of \$25,000 is reasonable, LTD had been using the higher limit. Ms. Calvert asked if this meant that verbal quotes are taken for purchases under that amount. Ms. Tentinger said that was correct, without a formal invitation to bid.

Section 7 of the CRB Rules deals with the sale of surplus property, and will clarify the process the District has been following in order to conform with state regulations.

Section 51, Awarding of Contracts, allows the District to refuse to award to the lowest bidder if it is in the public interest to reject all bids. Mr. Bryson said LTD had always included that language in its contracts, but the language in the CRB Rules was a little misleading, so it had been included in Section 51.

Section 52 pertains to requirements for particular goods or services. Ms. Tentinger explained that in the past, District contracts were limited to a contract period of three years, but Section 52 had been changed to allow up to a five-year maximum. This allows the District to take advantage of service contracts, as with the attorney and engineers, who are familiar with the

District's practices. She added that the District could choose to not renew at any year within the contract period.

Mr. Montgomery asked if the changes were found in Mr. Bryson's letter. Ms. Tentinger said that the changes were in the letter, and the attached CRB Rules also included the proposed changes.

MOTION After Mr. Andersen's arrival, Mr. Brandt moved that the LTD Contract Review Board accept staff's findings and amend the Contract Review Board Rules to comply with federal law. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, which then carried by VOTE unanimous vote.

MOTION RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously VOTE approved that the meeting of the LTD Contract Review Board be adjourned and that the LTD Board of Directors return to regular session.

MID-YEAR BUDGET REVIEW: Mr. Pangborn discussed the District's budget as of October 30, 1989. He explained the revenues and expenditures and the status of each budget category. In discussing the District's expenses, he stated that much of the Marketing budget is front-end loaded; for example, the Riders Digests and system maps are printed and mailed in September. Transportation's expenditures were very close to budgeted, at 32 percent for the year. Maintenance had a positive variance, at 28 percent expended for the year, due to savings in fuel in the Materials & Supplies category. Mr. Pangborn estimated that this category would be under budget between \$50,000 and \$100,000.

None of the contingency budget of \$200,000 had yet been spent, but \$125,000 of the transfer to capital fund had been expended so far, as the 20-year lease payment to Valley River Center for the VRC Transit Station.

Mr. Pangborn said that the interesting part of the budget that year was in payroll tax collections. He explained that payroll taxes were 2 percent below projections, but it was more significant than it sounded because of the way payroll taxes are collected. In the last four years, FY 85-86 through FY 88-89, payroll taxes had increased 4 percent, 6.3 percent, 7.2 percent, and 9.7 percent. However, a change had occurred between the third and fourth quarter. Mr. Pangborn stated that these quarters showed positive growth in the first three years, but last year decreased substantially, from \$1,978,000 to \$1,476,798. When the budget for the following fiscal year is proposed, he said, staff, the Budget Committee, and the Board have only the first three quarters' revenues upon which to base estimates for the following year. Receipts for the fourth quarter of the current year are projected, and the next year's budget is based on those projections. It was projected that the District would receive \$1,539,248 in payroll tax receipts in the fourth quarter of FY 88-89; however, actual revenues for that quarter were \$1,426,000, a 2 percent decrease. This meant that the District began the new fiscal year with a lower base than expected.

This year, payroll tax receipts were budgeted at \$6,541,000 for the year, at a projected 8 percent increase for the year. This means that, in order to balance the payroll tax category for the year, payroll tax receipts would actually have to increase 10.2 percent to make up for the unforeseen decrease in

the fourth quarter of 1988-89. However, the increase for the first two quarters of FY 89-90 was only 6.6 percent, or \$53,562 less than projected. Mr. Pangborn said that projections for employment are that it will "cool off." If so, it is expected that LTD will run an estimated \$148,673 deficit in payroll taxes. This "cooling off" of the economy will also have an impact on future year's payroll tax projections.

Ms. Calvert asked what caused this lack of income. Mr. Pangborn said that, as far as staff could tell, it appeared to be in the wood products industry and smaller businesses. In the long run, he said, he was not sure this particular variance was going to affect the District much one way or another, partly because it is anticipated that LTD will receive an additional \$150,000 in interest earnings in other areas. However, the District will need to make some hard decisions about what to anticipate in terms of payroll tax growth for next year. In February, when staff have more information, staff will discuss with the Board what this means in terms of the budget and other revenue options, such as the battery and tire tax proposed in the last legislative session, a self-employment tax, an increase in payroll taxes, etc.

The Board took a short break at this time, and Board members had their pictures taken for future use.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT: Ms. Loobey explained proposed federal legislation, the Americans With Disabilities Act, or SB933, and what adoption of the legislation would mean for transit districts. She said that staff basically supported the legislation, except in one key area. She explained that language in the bill would require mass transit operators to provide fixed-route accessible service and comparable levels of paratransit service. She referred to a memorandum in the agenda packet which explained the District's concerns in detail. Ms. Loobey said she had talked with Congressman DeFazio and that he understood her concerns but didn't know if anyone could stop the legislation at that point. She said discussions on the legislation had slowed down somewhat since then, but would be heating up again in the near future.

STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION: Ms. Loobey explained that staff had recently begun looking farther into the future, five years instead of three, for finance, planning, operations, and marketing. The further this planning process goes, she said, staff need identification of where the District is going and what it will need to do to get there. She said that staff had been discussing issues and changes in the local environment that might influence the District. For instance, one problem projected for the future is that of finding qualified members of the work force, which may mean that employers will have to do more training than they have had to do in the past.

Ms. Loobey stated that it is very important for the Board to be part of this planning process. She said that staff have their own perspective, but need to hear from the Board members what they think is important. In an examination of what staff believe will be the District's various areas of emphasis in the next five years, it became clear that staff desire to have greater input from the Board and greater Board involvement, because the District seems to win when

that happens. For example, she said, she believed confidently that the District was going to "win" with the downtown station process.

Ms. Loobey explained that staff had spent two days learning about the strategic planning process and two days since then working to determine the target areas for staff and Board action in the next five years, and to collapse those target areas somewhat. Now she said, staff would like Board input and advice to be sure staff are on the right track.

Mr. Pangborn said that one goal of the staff process had been to better integrate the division plans. In the past, he said, divisions projected a different number of years into the future, for different reasons. Now staff were looking at a longer time frame to be sure the divisions' projects and actions were supporting each other. Another goal of staff was to bring the Board in on the process earlier than in past, when Board members were involved with the annual goal-setting process. The process so far involved brainstorming, and the target areas had not yet been refined.

Staff had developed a list of 13 major target areas. Mr. Pangborn said he hoped to discuss the top six and their subcategories with the Board that evening. He stated that staff sometimes have a propensity to "bite off more than they could chew," so they looked at six which had received the most staff votes to see what could be accomplished in the next five years. The 13 areas were not listed in any priority order.

(1) Expand Service to Meet Demands: Mr. Pangborn stated that last year the Board had approved a plan that said service would grow 2 percent per year. However, partly due to the University of Oregon prepaid program, ridership was growing more than 2 percent per year. Additionally, there are other new developments in town which need to be studied to see if ridership demand is there.

(2) Improve System Reliability: The 15 percent increase in ridership this past year, and a new type of service offered, are beginning to degrade the District's ability to provide reliable service, and staff believe this situation needs to be considered carefully.

(3) Improve Employee Development: This category refers partly to the projected change in the work force and need for additional training, as well as to the District's emphasis on providing excellent service as a service agency.

(4) Improve Political Support of Transit: Mr. Pangborn said that, to a degree, LTD does have the support of other political players in this community, as seen in the downtown station and VRC station processes, which he called two real indicators of the District's success in this area. In the future, however, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) monies may come to the state as a group to be spent on either roads or transit. Tri-Met in Portland already has the kind of support needed to assure funding for transit, but LTD may not have that yet.

(5) Increase System Security: Staff have been receiving anecdotal reports that people do not ride the bus because they do not feel safe. Staff would like to find out what the issues are and how to address them.

(6) Improve Organizational Development: Staff are interested in ensuring that as the District grows, good decisions are made.

Mr. Pangborn said that the other seven categories are not as critical, from staff's perspective. They are:

(7) Improve Passenger Facilities; for example, evaluating and improving operational and passenger facilities maintenance, bus stop improvements at the UO and LCC, or the addition of more passenger shelters.

(8) Expand Prepaid Program, possibly to LCC, the City of Eugene, private businesses, or for K-12 school services.

(9) Improve LTD Capacity to Increase Productivity: This could be done by assessing driver productivity limits, establishing what is expected of driver/passenger interactions, or examining productivity/service standards and operating procedures.

(10) Improve Customer Information/Assistance Program, or helping the customers understand how to ride.

(11) Increase General Ridership, which might be done through general advertising, targeting commuter markets, or targeting other special markets, such as seniors, teenagers, or special services.

(12) Internal Security, which would include determination of the actual security needs of employees, operations, and revenue control.

(13) Improve Response to Special Services: Services such as the Lane County Fair, football and basketball shuttles, and the new holiday lights tour are a way for the District to provide service to a part of the community that does not normally ride the bus.

(14) Improve Ridership Retention Programs: Studies indicate that 30 to 50 percent of all riders turn over annually. Staff are interested in finding out why they ride one year and not the next, and how to retain them as riders.

(13) Increase Elderly and Handicapped (E&H) Services: This might include creation of long-range plans, District response to the Americans with Disabilities Act, or an increase in funding for the consortium.

Mr. Pangborn said that the first category, Expand Service to Meet Demand, would entail an evaluation of new service opportunities and expansion of the prepaid program. He said that the University of Oregon (UO) prepaid program had been the single most successful program to meet a pressing community need for transportation and have a positive response. The UO, both students and faculty/staff, support the service and use it to capacity and beyond. The City of Eugene

is surveying its employees to see if they want to join the prepaid program. The District needs to decide how far to take this program and under what kinds of financial arrangements. Expanding service to meet demand could also entail increasing the hours that the Customer Service Center (CSC) stays open, to respond to the current problem of not being able to obtain information when the buses are running but the CSC is closed. Questions to answer are whether the telephone information system should be automated or handled by increased staffing, and whether keeping the CSC open is important in terms of security for the customers.

Mr. Pangborn said that the Board and Budget Committee will have to struggle with questions such as what happens to the payroll tax; should a self-employment tax be enacted; and should transit work for a tire and battery tax, which was barely defeated in the last legislative session?

Ms. Calvert stated that this is combined with the problem that LTD's federal tax dollars, both capital and operating, are decreasing. She added that the District may not have to take any action if federal money is received at the same rate. Mr. Pangborn agreed; however, he said, a change in the national agenda is to change from an 80/20 match to a 50/50 match for capital funding.

Mr. Andersen said he was definitely in favor of the prepaid program. He thought this kind of program was a benefit for any group, public or private, and that one reason to offer prepaid service is to overcome people's fears, and have them tell others about the service. He wondered what would happen with the butterfly lot parking downtown if that lot is chosen for the new downtown transit station, and said that a prepaid program would benefit the County in this situation.

Mr. Andersen said that in many cases the District was creating the demand for service through its marketing efforts rather than just responding to demand; it seemed to him that this was a goal and that the District could not drop those marketing efforts. Rather, he said, LTD needed to keep pushing at both ends. Mr. Pangborn agreed that service and ridership progress do not happen independently; for instance, the demand at the University of Oregon enabled the District to have more bus parking there, for which staff had been asking for a number of years.

In discussing the target area of improving system reliability, Mr. Pangborn said that LTD had reached a pressure point in system reliability that staff believe they need to respond to. One way to help improve system reliability would be to increase supervisor field and response time. Currently, the field supervisors are spending too much time with office work rather than interacting with customers and bus operators. A related long-term issue, then, is who will take care of the work in the office to allow increased time in the field. Another component of system reliability is maintaining adequate fleet size and age; staff recommend an average age of eight years and a spares ratio of 17 percent. Currently, LTD has a nine to ten percent spares ratio, including the non-accessible Tri-Met buses which the District had to purchase for emergency use. It takes two to three years to buy buses, so a long-term planning process is vital in terms of LTD's ability to expand service.

Staff also suggested investigating operating procedures to see if system reliability can be improved. For instance, headways, or the time between buses on routes, are generally one-half hour. However, traffic differs throughout the day, and affects the customers' perceptions about reliability. Better coordination with other agencies regarding detours, parades, construction, accidents, etc., would help LTD plan more reliable service during those disruptions. Other suggestions from staff were to improve communications to the customers; analyze road calls; and increase appearance standards (cleanliness, body repairs, etc.), because of the effect those may have on people who choose whether or not to ride the bus.

Ms. Calvert commented that more people are riding the buses and there is more stress on the drivers. Increased traffic downtown also makes it more difficult for buses to travel around town. Mr. Pangborn said that someone had suggested educating the public about letting buses back into traffic, in order to help the buses remain on schedule and, therefore, be more reliable.

Mr. Pangborn then discussed the proposed emphasis area of improving employee development. One way to accomplish this would be to assess the organization's skills and needs and develop training plans. He said that drivers have less time to answer questions than they did in the past, and they have a higher stress level because of that. Stress training, better ways to learn and give information, or basic skills training when people are hired are examples of how to respond to this problem.

Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, commented on the changing work force, saying that by the year 2000, the quality of employee that the District is able to attract may decrease.

Other suggestions are to centralize training, which is now handled by each division administrator; increase or improve supervisory training; and provide more opportunities to cross-train staff, which benefits both the employee who can learn another part of the job and the employee who is then able to attend meetings or take time off, etc., knowing that the job will be done correctly. Staff had also suggested expanding specialized assignments, such as having bus operators assess the safety and other concerns regarding bus stop placement; creating a training advisory committee; creating career paths for employees; and assess the value of the Disney training program for LTD's customer service emphasis. In other words, Mr. Pangborn said, this category deals with the ability to provide the best human resources to support increased service and reliability.

Another emphasis area suggested by staff was improving political support of transit. One component of this category is better interagency staff contacts and coordination, as is happening now with the Downtown Station Site Selection Committee, which is actually advocating for transit. Another component suggested was to have more Board involvement in community transit issues, or a higher profile for the Board. Board members might be involved in a speaking circuit or with other decision-making groups in the community. Staff could also increase their involvement in community groups, which has had a substantial impact in the past, especially when staff are present to answer concerns about transit.

Another way in which LTD could improve political support of transit would be to improve the credibility of the TransPlan, especially regarding the modal split. Staff had also suggested a transit riders' advisory committee, since there currently is no real advocate for transit among users in the community.

Mr. Andersen said that this seems to be the only area that indicated direct Board involvement at other than the oversight level. He agreed that, at least for the form of things, it looks good to have an advisory committee; sometimes recommendations are pigeon-holed, but at least the recommendations were made. He used the example of the Downtown Station Site Selection Committee, and thought that if the goals were realistic, the committee and agency would work toward those goals. He added that he was willing to speak to anyone on behalf of LTD.

Ms. Calvert thought it might be good for the transit district to initiate a change in the modal split recommended in the TransPlan, to say what modal split LTD could reach, and ask for cooperation in meeting that goal.

Ms. Loobey stated that City Councilor Rob Bennett, who is also on the Downtown Station Site Selection Committee, had told her that the City Council said the infrastructure and transit improvements are high on their agenda. She had told Mr. Bennett that there had never been a letter from the City Council outlining an assignment for the LTD Board, to work for a collaborative process. He had suggested that Ms. Loobey try to get the City Council and LTD Board together for a meeting.

Mr. Andersen said that the LTD Board is a low-profile board; no one knows he is on it unless he tells them. A lot of people active in the community do not know there is a Board focus, or in fact that there is a Board. There has not been a lot of controversy surrounding Board discussions, so LTD issues do not generate a lot of press. Ms. Calvert suggested letting the community know when there is a change in the Board's membership. Mr. Andersen suggested making sure the newspapers had a picture in addition to the Governor's announcement.

Mr. Pangborn next discussed the emphasis area of increasing system security. Staff thought the District should assess customer security to find out if it is real or perceptual. This issue is growing at Tri-Met and other systems, so it is not too soon to address it at LTD, especially in a public relations sense. Mr. Pangborn said there is a growing concern about the profanity used by kids on the buses, which Mr. Andersen said his children had talked about as being done by "older kids." Ms. Calvert said that LTD's riders are often young, poor, or older. As one way to respond to concerns about "the kind of people who ride the bus," Mr. Pangborn said, staff had suggested that LTD should promote cultural diversity, because sometimes people are uncomfortable with people who are not like they are. Mr. Andersen thought the buses had a greater cultural mix than in a cross-section of Eugene. Mr. Dallas gave an example of a developmentally disabled rider who helped a driver who was being assaulted. This incident, he said, resulted in a very positive response from the drivers toward the developmentally disabled person.

Other issues in system security are the need to assess bus operators' security needs; to assess fare evasion by customers, to determine if this is a

significant problem and how much it would cost to try to combat the equity issue; and to ensure that more supervisor time is spent in the field, and that the supervisors are properly trained to handle customer confrontations, etc.

Improving organizational development could include the creation of a plan (through a management audit, employee survey, or peer group review, for instance); evaluation and improvement of internal communications with employees (whether staff are receiving the feedback they need in order to offer reliable service, etc.); the formation of a labor/management committee; assessment of employee input into the decision process; improvement of the records management system; or an increase in Board training and decision review. Mr. Pangborn stated that sometimes staff take issues to the Board that staff have worked on for months, and the Board is given a memorandum and asked to make a decision. Staff would like to know if the Board members feel comfortable with this process in terms of training or the information they receive. Would Board members need to know more about the District to be more politically involved? Ms. Loobey mentioned the Board training offered by the American Public Transit Association (APTA) and other agencies. She said the Board could decide that new Board members would attend APTA training, for the reasons that Ms. Calvert found her experience useful and productive. Or Board members could attend the APTA Western Conference, at which some Board training is also offered. Ms. Calvert said she had attended both, and found the Governing Board training to be most useful. She said there are other opportunities with professional organizations for training for policy-making bodies. Mr. Pangborn commented that in Oregon, most Boards are similar to LTD in terms of involvement, but it is much different in other parts of the country. He asked the Board members what better training staff could provide for them.

Board Discussion: Mr. Dallas said this plan looks like a very ambitious plan because it is looking five years into the future. Mr. Pangborn and Ms. Loobey asked the Board to consider what on the list should be done in the next five years, and what might not be on the list that the Board would like to have done.

Mr. Brandt said one item was missing, that of fiscal responsibility, especially a commitment to work on and improve the dollars that come to the system from the use of the system. More important than political support, he said, is taxpayer support; they pay 80 percent of the bill and should receive an important emphasis in the five-year plan; possibly in a separate category from political support.

Mr. Brandt said also that he would almost rather have a goal to expand the demand to meet the service; that maybe the District should get more riders before service is expanded. As a minor point, he said, he did not like the idea of more advisory committees, especially for riders. He thought it would work against, rather than for, LTD. He said staff were trying to do what is good for everybody, but should really concentrate on what is good for the District. Advisory committees, he said, could come up with ideas that LTD isn't going to be able to address, which would frustrate the members of the committee. He thought it seemed like another layer of bureaucracy, but if staff wanted to do it to increase support, maybe it would be appropriate.

Ms. Calvert commented that she did not ride the buses regularly, but that it would be interesting to get on one of the more crowded routes, especially one that is over capacity. She wondered how you design a system to address those problems, especially when there is an unevenness of demand. Mr. Pangborn said he thought staff were receiving enough feedback from bus operators and statistics to show that the District is pushing system capacity. There are standing loads during rush hour in many cases. There is increased productivity during off-peak hours, and rides per hour increased considerably last year.

Mr. Brandt thought the District should assess the prepaid plan carefully, because it makes LTD very vulnerable. If a disgruntled group decided not to implement the service in future years after buses had been purchased to provide the service, it would be like putting all the District's eggs in one basket. He said the prepaid service was obviously successful, and the right place to be successful with that program was at the UO. Mr. Pangborn said that LTD had saturated LCC with student passes, and sales go up and down with enrollment. Mr. Brandt cautioned that non-users who pay for a prepaid plan could have it stopped and the District could lose that program overnight. He said the support for the program at the UO could change after the new parking garage is built. Mr. Pangborn said part of that process goes back to political support for transit and the improved credibility of the TransPlan, especially as related to parking, zoning, parking fees, etc. It has been suggested that the City code be changed to allow prepaid passes instead of parking spaces.

Mr. Brandt said that some of the emphasis areas talk a lot about getting better and improving, but he got the impression they were talking about getting bigger. Ms. Loobey said she thought staff's focus was to be prepared and anticipate what the future will be, and to direct that future where they are able. She said there would be a lot of changes in the economy, the work force, environmental concerns, etc., and that staff were not simply saying they want to get bigger, but to get better at what they do and be more proactive in anticipating the future.

Ms. Loobey stated that the TransPlan modal split was really set by someone else. Local units of government ignore it and then ask why LTD has that high of a modal split. Mr. Brandt stated that too many people in downtown Eugene are spending the taxpayers' dollars because someone said they should, but that the plan should draw on the strengths of people who know what is going on.

Mr. Brandt also said he was disappointed in what he saw as an unbelievable waste of time in the approach in how staff are going to get the answer to the downtown station site selection. He was interested in knowing how much time staff spent, for which the people of Eugene receive nothing. Ms. Calvert commented that taking risks does not always come out how you want it to. She said it was important not to get into the syndrome of not taking risks because of that. She said she thought the District was very efficient and spent time efficiently. Ms. Loobey added that LTD only has to worry about one aspect of public service, rather than many aspects under one agency.

Mr. Andersen said he would say the top six categories should remain the top six, because many in numbers seven through thirteen actually further broke down the top six. He said he saw three groups within the top six: employee development and organizational development; system reliability and security; and political support and expansion of service. He said that if the District did numbers one and two, number three would follow.

Ms. Loobey commented that service growth at 2 percent per year, as set by Board policy, did not happen, and the District did not have the capacity for a 15 percent growth in ridership. The goal to expand service to meet demand was not there because staff want LTD to get bigger, but rather so the Board would review the policy statement and look at the implications. If the policy remains at 2 percent growth per year, the District will have a problem with expanding the prepaid program to the whole City of Eugene, for instance. Mr. Montgomery added that if service is expanded to meet demand, and the demand is also expected to increase, it will drag along all the rest of the categories by necessity, because those first two could not be accomplished without the others. Ms. Loobey agreed that the goals were all interrelated, and that none could be a discrete activity. She said staff were talking about areas of emphasis and what they were being careful about and anticipating change in, both externally and within the District. In response to Mr. Brandt's concerns, Mr. Dallas added that growth is coming, and staff wanted to achieve well-managed growth. He said there was a higher realization at the staff level that all these activities were interrelated, and that all division action plans would reflect tasks which would complete these activities. He added that the organization was trying to get better coordinated and integrated in terms of what will come in the future.

Mr. Dallas stated that ridership levels are increasing 4 to 6 percent a year, even without the UO riders. The concept staff had in the past is that more productivity is better. Now, he said, staff are beginning to discover that some levels of productivity have a maximum. Schedules are tight, and the District is becoming unable to meet the needs of the number of riders per hour in the system during the day. Mr. Brandt said he would like to see a video of standing-room only crowds. Mr. Montgomery said that could probably be found on the Springfield run from the UO at 3:30 p.m.

Mr. Pangborn said that another problem in addition to standing loads on the buses is that of meeting the schedule. For instance, if a bus now has to stop at least at every other stop, and needs to deploy the lift for a customer in a wheelchair, that bus will come in to the transfer point late and people will miss their transfers. This means that they will have to wait another half-hour for the next bus, which may make them evaluate their ability or desire to ride the bus. He said the District may have to add extra time to routes, which would cost money, just to make the routes reliable, and could mean that service would not be added to community. Mr. Dallas added that other related issues are driver and supervisor training to deal with these problems, as well as changing community expectations. He said that peoples' expectations in the community are different, and the District needs to know just what those expectations are; e.g., what level of service they want; if they want time for the driver to answer questions; if standing room only is okay; etc. Ms. Calvert commented that visitors to the community usually compliment LTD's drivers' courteousness because

they do not get the same kind of treatment elsewhere. Mr. Montgomery was concerned that the increased stress levels might mean LTD would lose drivers.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff would put this information in written format for the Board. Mr. Brandt said he would like to see updated demographic studies, especially regarding community growth, and wondered whose studies LTD used. Mr. Pangborn said LTD used Portland State Urban studies, through the Lane Council of Governments, which is the information all agencies are using. Mr. Brandt said that seeing those studies would put things in better perspective for him. Ms. Loobey commented that more than just population growth is involved. For instance, enrollment at the UO is down, but there are more riders, so the saturation is better. Mr. Pangborn added that Marketing put a lot of effort into marketing the system this year, and included marketing to students in the dormitories for the first time. Also, this year's freshmen came to school with the prepaid program in place.

Regarding special promotions, Ms. Calvert said she thought the District should continue the summer programs for kids and others to keep training riders, and to keep ridership up during the summer. Mr. Andersen asked about an orientation program for high school students considering the UO, focusing on the mobility offered by the system. Ed Bergeron, Marketing Administrator, explained that this year Marketing worked closely with the UO for student orientation; mailings were sent to incoming students and separately to their parents. He said the District was not able to do this the first year of the prepaid program, but added it last summer. He added that the UO has been very supportive of LTD's efforts. Mr. Pangborn said that, with the success and continuation of the service, it is possible that future UO decisions regarding parking or student housing on campus will be made with a long-term commitment to transit, as well as ongoing financial support. Mr. Montgomery commented that he had heard positive comments from students, and that the District's response has been good when students plan activities.

Mr. Brandt said he supposed that as soon as the downtown area is not a shopping or retail center, things will change. In his opinion, downtown will eventually be a work place and if it were promoted that way, more people would ride the bus. He thought shopping would occur at lunch time and until 6:00 p.m. for the people who work downtown.

Ms. Calvert wondered if there might be a way to do a shortened version of this discussion for Mr. Herzberg and Keith Parks, the Board members who were not able to attend that evening. Ms. Loobey said this discussion would also be helpful for the seventh Board member, who should go before the Senate for confirmation hearings in January.

There was some discussion about the fact that the terms of Mr. Brandt, Ms. Calvert, Mr. Parks, and Mr. Andersen all were to expire at the end of 1989. Ms. Loobey explained that by law, a Board member serves until replaced, and that the Governor had not yet decided whether the four Board members would be reappointed. Mr. Brandt asked what would happen if the District could not get a quorum for a Board meeting. Ms. Loobey said that staff could conduct business within the adopted budget, but could not make policies or do other business

requiring Board approval, such as making decisions regarding fares, service, the Capital Improvements Plan, or boundary issues.

MOTION
VOTE

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Andersen moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:05 p.m.



Board Secretary