

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 19, 1990

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 13, 1990, 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 19, 1990, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: H. Thomas Andersen, President, presiding
Janet Calvert
Tammy Fitch, Secretary
Thomas Montgomery
Keith Parks, Vice President
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Herbert Herzberg

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Mr. Andersen formally thanked Ms. Calvert for her years of dedicated service to the District as President of the Board of Directors. He said he had appreciated her dedication and was just beginning to understand the extra hours she had dedicated to the District during her eight years as president of the Board. He added that the Board members were grateful for all her work, and were happy that, although she had resigned as president, she was still a member of the Board.

Mr. Andersen then presented Ms. Calvert with a small wooden bus, with a plaque inscribed, "Janet Calvert, President, LTD Board of Directors, 1983-1990."

BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH: The August Bus Rider of the Month, Irene Forte, was not present to receive her award. Due to staff time constraints caused by a heavier-than-expected workload, the Bus Rider of the Month program had been suspended in September for approximately six months. Staff will inform the Board when and if they are able to resume this rider appreciation program.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Andersen introduced Tonja Bohrer, LTD's receptionist, who was chosen as the August Employee of the Month. He reminded the Board that it had approved a new position of receptionist, which was filled when the District moved to the new facility. He said he had talked with Tonja many times on the telephone, and would second the comments in the agenda packet. He said Tonja always knows how to help him

when he calls, and has always greeted him with a smile. He stated that he was happy to have Tonja as the District's receptionist, and as the August Employee of the Month.

Mr. Andersen also introduced the September Employee of the Month, Transit Planner Micki Kaplan. Mr. Andersen said that Micki had been at LTD four years, and was nominated for Employee of the Month by her administrator, based on her continued pattern of excellence, which was highlighted by some very significant accomplishments, including successful passage of the University of Oregon group pass program, and her successful management of the District's service to persons with disabilities. Mr. Andersen said the Board had seen some of Micki's work, and were thankful for her service and dedication toward LTD.

GENERAL MANAGER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS: Ms. Loobey said she first wished to introduce a new staff member, Tamara Weaver, the District's new Finance Administrator, who was attending her first Board meeting. Tamara was previously employed by the City of Springfield as its Budget and Treasury Supervisor, and had been at LTD about six weeks. Ms. Loobey stated that Ms. Weaver was highly skilled and competent, was working very hard, and fit right in with the organization.

Ms. Loobey also stated that last year, the Board and Budget Committee had approved funds for new uniforms for the bus operators. She had been in the operators' lounge before the meeting, and has asked bus operator Paul Headley to come to the meeting to show the Board the new uniform. The uniform included a choice of solid blue, blue and white, or red and white striped shirts; a cardigan; a choice of tie; long or short pants for the men or long pants or culottes for the women; and a spring jacket with a zip-in liner for winter. Ms. Loobey stated that the uniform committee, who went through a lengthy process of examining many alternatives, did an excellent job, and that everybody liked the uniforms and looked smashing in them.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Andersen asked for comments from the audience. There were none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Andersen stated that a correction should be made on page 4, second paragraph, of the July 17, 1990, minutes, changing, "support and cooperation" to "spirit of cooperation." Ms. Fitch moved that the minutes of the July 17, 1990, regular meeting be approved as corrected. The motion was seconded, and the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

MOTION
VOTE

APPROVAL OF FISCAL YEAR 1990-91 FEDERAL OPERATING AND CAPITAL GRANT APPLICATION: Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, explained that the annual appropriation for transit funding had not yet been made by Congress, so staff did not know how much LTD would receive in capital and operating grant funds. He said it was more difficult to guess this year, because of the deliberations going on between the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Congress. Mr. Pangborn had been told that LTD could receive an amount between a 5 percent increase and a 40 percent decrease. Last year, the District received a 5 percent decrease, and anticipated that again this year. If there were a 40 percent decrease, that would delete all LTD's capital appropriation, and also cut into its operational appropriation. It would mean that the budgeted amount for federal grant revenues,

\$1.2 million, could be as much as \$200,000 to \$300,000 under budget. Mr. Pangborn said he assumed there would be some kind of agreement at the last minute.

LTD does not normally receive its federal funding until sometime between the end of December and February. The application was being submitted in September because review by the regional office takes about a month, and staff were hoping that Congressional appropriations would be made by mid- to late-November. It then takes another month for federal processing before the District can draw down the money. If funds are needed before the federal grant money is received, the District can use its capital reserves, which are held in the Local Government Investment Pool.

Mr. Andersen asked if there would be a reduction in both capital and operating funds. Mr. Pangborn replied that LTD received a little less than \$1.3 million last year. If there were a 40 percent reduction, that would amount to approximately \$500,000 less, or a total of about \$800,000. The District budgeted about \$1.1 million for operations for FY 90-91. The reduction in funding would first be taken from the capital side, and if that wasn't enough to cover the reduction, the balance would be taken from operational funding. That money could be taken from the amounts budgeted for contingency, services, etc., or taxes could be increased, or any combination of the above.

Mr. Pangborn stated that staff recommended Board approval of the application so that the District's application would be in the queue when appropriations were made.

Public Hearing on FY 1990-91 Operating and Capital Grant Application:

Mr. Andersen opened the public hearing on the Fiscal Year 1990-91 UMTA capital and operating grant application. There was no public testimony, and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION **Board Deliberation and Decision:** Ms. Calvert moved that the Board authorize the General Manager to submit a grant application for federal Section 9 capital and operating funds through the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, for Fiscal Year 1990-91, in the amount of \$1,210,000 in operating assistance and \$200,000 in capital assistance. Ms. Fitch

VOTE seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

DOWNTOWN STATION RELOCATION DETAILED STUDY: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, said that the detailed study for the four finalist sites for the downtown Eugene station was beginning. The District had budgeted \$20,000 for that study. Since that time, a fairly detailed scope of services had been completed, and the prices submitted by consultants were considerably higher than anticipated, with the initial cost set at \$58,000. Staff were looking at ways to reduce the costs. One way to do so would be to pare down the scope of services, and another would be for the consultants to look for potential fatal flaws first, so that sites will not be studied in detail if they do have fatal flaws. The City contributed \$10,000, but the District was facing a potential deficit in capital of \$28,000 for this particular budget item. As a point of comparison, Mr. Viggiano said that the site study for the Glenwood facility cost \$65,000, beginning with 300 sites and a needs projection. Staff had thought that a study beginning with finalist sites would be considerably less costly; however, in some ways the downtown station is more complex, particularly in regard to traffic engineering downtown. Ms. Fitch asked how much the economic analysis affected the cost of the study. Mr. Viggiano

replied that the economic analysis would cost about \$10,000, and was an item that may or may not need to be done, depending on which sites were chosen as the final sites.

Mr. Viggiano explained that the study was being structured to proceed with things staff knew had to be done, while holding off on discretionary items or items which were dependent upon previous items, to see if they were necessary. Ms. Fitch asked about mixed-use development at 8th and Willamette. Mr. Viggiano replied that the 8th and Willamette site may not be large enough for a mixed-use development, but mixed-use might work at another site, so staff were studying the feasibility.

Mr. Andersen asked staff to comment on the significance of the City's willingness to contribute \$10,000 to the study, which he thought was a sign of their good faith. Mr. Viggiano stated that it was very significant; staff had not anticipated the donation, and it showed that this was a priority for the City as well as for LTD. LTD staff had originally asked for an in-kind contribution in traffic engineering services, but City staff were too busy, so the City offered \$10,000.

Ms. Fitch asked what the chances were that the District could spend \$48,000 and all the sites would be ruled out. Mr. Viggiano said that was a risk, partly based on a political decision. He said the District might find a County-owned site but not be able to purchase it unless the County was willing to sell.

Ms. Calvert said she had suggested that the Committee ask a County representative to participate on the Committee. As Committee Chair, she had sent a letter to the Committee asking if any members had concerns about that idea. If the Committee members agreed, she would ask a County Commissioner to be named to the Committee. Mr. Viggiano added that it was hoped that a Commissioner could identify any problems with specific sites along the way, rather than the Committee finding out about problems at the end of the process.

The four sites being studied were the Greyhound lot, the Butterfly lot, the Firestone lot, and the Elections lot. Mr. Viggiano said there was a possibility that the kind of station the District was envisioning could not be accommodated in a half-block site. He added that he thought \$58,000 for a detailed site analysis was at the high end of the scale and the District might not spend that entire amount. He recommended, however, that the Board approve the transfer of \$28,000 from future shelter projects to the site study. He said that transfer would not affect the current year's shelter project, which included installation of 40 new shelters.

Mr. Parks asked about Mr. Viggiano's comment that the station might not be possible on a half-block site. He said the Committee had already picked the sites for the study, and it seemed late in the game to be deciding what size site was really needed. Mr. Viggiano said staff were currently investigating that question. A space needs study was being done in order to determine the total square footage needed. Mr. Montgomery asked how early in the study it would become clear that a half-block site was not adequate. Mr. Viggiano said that would be the primary agenda item when the Site Selection Committee met on October 8. The Committee would discuss what could be accommodated on a half-block, and what the trade-offs would be. The Elections lot is a full-block site. The County owns five-eighths of the site,

and the rest is privately owned. The Firestone lot is a three-fourths block site, if it includes the property that would be gained by closing 10th Avenue.

Ms. Calvert said that early in the discussions, a half-block was considered "tight" but adequate. Mr. Viggiano said that buses and a passenger waiting area can fit on a half-block, but perhaps not the Customer Service Center. The question being discussed now is whether this is an appropriate trade-off. As the District considers the types of amenities it wants to accommodate on that site, other suggestions have been proposed, such as a downtown operators' lounge, a meeting room, or public restrooms. These are all amenities that probably would not be accommodated on a half-block site.

Mr. Parks asked how the contract would read for spending the \$58,000 on the detailed site study. Mr. Viggiano said the costs for time and materials would be outlined in ten phases, up to a maximum of \$58,000. The consultants would not be able to start a phase until staff authorized them to.

Ms. Fitch asked if the study had started already, and if all sites were being considered at once. Mr. Viggiano said the space study and layouts for half-block sites were being studied at that time. When that information is available, it will be taken to the Site Selection Committee for a decision on how to proceed. Ms. Loobey added that she thought appropriate checks and balances were in the program, and that staff would stay in close contact with the Committee. She believed the controls were present so that the District would not spend a lot of money and end up with a dead-end product.

Mr. Montgomery asked what would happen if the full \$58,000 was not spent. Mr. Viggiano replied that the money would go back to the future shelters project.

MOTION Mr. Montgomery moved that an amount up to \$28,000 be transferred from future shelter projects in the Capital Improvements Program, for the study of four final sites for a future downtown transit station. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.
VOTE Ms. Fitch said she would appreciate another report at the next meeting.

Ms. Loobey said that the key to the issue is that all the buses will fit on a half-block site, but the project should also be a benefit to the community. The District had considered leasing space nearby for the CSC, but since the transit station will be a long-term facility, it may be that co-locating the CSC on the site is a better idea. She said that staff had some concerns about the half-block site, and also did not want to fail to do something on the site that is a benefit to both LTD and the community. She added that, while there seemed to be some change in direction on that aspect, at least it was very early on in the study, while space needs are being examined.

Ms. Loobey said that part of the discussion is a result of looking at what other transit districts are currently doing in the northwest. Spokane Transit Authority is using mixed-use development in its downtown station; Pierce County Transit recently announced a mixed-use private/public development for its downtown station as part of the downtown rehabilitation project. She had attended the Washington State Conference just after Pierce County announced that project, and private developers said it was a great project and good for the

community, and would spur additional development around the transit station. She added that it would serve the District well to examine some of those issues about what the station will mean to the District and the community in the long term. Furthermore, this community focus was spurred a little by the City's interest as shown by allocating \$10,000 for the site study.

BUS INVENTORY GRANT APPLICATION: Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, explained that the Oregon Public Transit Division was attempting to compile an inventory of all available transit vehicles in the state. This information would ultimately be given to the Legislature to show the investment in public transit and the need for replacement within the state. The inventory would include transit properties from Tri-Met in Portland to small areas with one van for elderly and handicapped service. The District has an inventory for its own buses, but not for all the other vehicles run by the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG), Florence, Oakridge, Cottage Grove, etc. This type of inventory within the county has never been done, so LTD would be working with L-COG to accomplish it. As an incentive to complete the inventory, the State was offering \$5,000 grants.

Mr. Andersen asked how much of the \$5,000 would be spent on the project. Mr. Pangborn said LTD's portion would involve a computer printout of LTD's vehicle list, which is a by-product of the District's investment in its fleet maintenance program. The process would take longer for L-COG, to which LTD already contributes over \$10,000 per year for administrative costs, because serial numbers, mileage, maintenance records, etc., will have to be obtained for all the other transit vehicles in the county. The L-COG inventory would be updated on an annual basis and used for special transportation fund purposes, especially to begin managing the vehicle replacement process.

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved that the Board approve the resolution authorizing LTD to submit a grant application to the Oregon State Public Transit Division for \$5,000 for completion of the Public Transit Division vehicle inventory form. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, which

VOTE then passed by unanimous vote.

RESOLUTION NAMING BOARD PRESIDENT AS PENSION TRUSTEE: Ms. Fitch
MOTION moved that the Board adopt the resolution naming H. Thomas Andersen as Trustee for the
VOTE LTD Salaried Pension Plan. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, and the resolution was adopted by unanimous vote.

RESOLUTION NAMING THE LTD DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Ms. Fitch moved that the Board adopt the resolution stating that the Advisory Committee of the LTD Deferred Compensation Plan shall be comprised of the persons holding the positions of LTD General Manager; LTD Director of Operations; LTD Director of Administrative Services; LTD Personnel Administrator; ATU, Division 757, Executive Board Officer; and ATU, Division 757, Local Chairman, rather than appointing individuals to the
MOTION Advisory Committee by name. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, and the resolution passed
VOTE unanimously.

RESOLUTION NAMING THE LTD ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEE BENEFITS TRUST TRUSTEES: Ms. Fitch moved that the Board adopt the resolution stating that the Trustees of the LTD Administrative Employee Benefits Trust shall be comprised of persons employed

VOTE by LTD in the positions of General Manager, Director of Operations, Director of Administrative Services, and Personnel Administrator. Mr. Parks seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

RESOLUTION CHANGING THE ADDRESS OF LTD AND ITS REGISTERED AGENT:

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board adopt the resolution changing the address of LTD's business office and registered agent, and direct the General Manager to inform the Secretary of State and the Lane County Clerk of that change. Mr. Parks seconded the motion, and the resolution was unanimously adopted.

VOTE

ELECTION OF BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Andersen said that he had resigned the position of Board Secretary at the last Board meeting, after being elected President, so a new Board Secretary needed to be elected. The duties of the Secretary basically involve signing papers after Board action.

MOTION Ms. Calvert nominated Ms. Fitch for the position of Board Secretary. Mr. Montgomery seconded the nomination. Mr. Parks moved that the nominations be closed, and Ms. Fitch was elected Board Secretary by unanimous vote.

VOTE

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Group Pass Program Update: Mr. Andersen commented that Sacred Heart Hospital had begun a group pass program in September, in accordance with the group pass policy adopted by the Board in May. Ms. Calvert said she heard that the new parking structure was full of cars from the physician's offices, and there was no room for hospital employees. One staff member at Sacred Heart told Ms. Loobey that many employees were very excited about being able to ride the bus. Ms. Loobey also commented that the cost of parking in Eugene was very low, and if it were priced as it should be in this community, a lot more people would be riding the bus.

Ms. Fitch commented that McKenzie-Willamette Hospital was also interested in a group pass program. Ms. Loobey said that McKenzie-Willamette had an even greater parking problem than Sacred Heart. Over the years, McKenzie-Willamette had asked for shelters and expressed interest in bus service, and Ms. Loobey recently had been talking with hospital administrators about the group pass program. Mr. Pangborn said that the personnel administrator of McKenzie-Willamette had asked for a presentation, so LTD staff had explained the program.

Mr. Andersen asked about the Willamette National Forest Service and Aster Publishing. Mr. Viggiano replied that both groups had inquired about the prepaid pass program, and staff had explained it. The inquiry from the Forest Service was from its downtown Eugene office. Mr. Parks asked if the Forest Service was a payroll taxpayer. Ms. Loobey replied that it was not, nor was Lane County or the City of Eugene. The State, however, pays an in-lieu-of payroll tax payment. Two different formulas for payment were approved by the Board, with differences in rates depending on whether or not the group is a payroll taxpayer.

Ms. Fitch asked about progress toward a group pass program at Lane Community College (LCC). Mr. Andersen stated that it would cost LCC more money per student because it would require additional service. Ms. Loobey added that LCC is also not a payroll taxpayer. A lot of students and faculty have adequate access to parking, and pay nothing for it, so there are a lot of issues to resolve before an LCC pass can be instituted.

Mr. Pangborn added that Northwest Christian College (NCC) was also participating in the group pass program. Many NCC students are also University of Oregon (UO) students and purchase their passes through the UO. NCC students, faculty, and staff not associated with the UO pay a higher rate (\$23 or \$24) for the passes, because NCC is not a payroll taxpayer, and because of NCC's ridership before the program began.

Energy Contingency Plan: Ms. Loobey explained that staff had been actively developing responses to what they anticipated would happen with a 25 to 50 percent jump in ridership. She said that staff knew from experience that simply having the price of fuel increase does not convince people to get on the bus, but if there are escalating prices and a shortage, then people will ride. She said that LTD was not prepared for the dramatic increase in ridership during the last fuel shortage, and had to purchase some old buses from Los Angeles' back lots to handle the overloads. Having had that experience, she said, staff were currently examining all of the ramifications of a sudden increase in demand. There were many unknowns, so staff were exploring the possibilities under several parameters.

Ms. Fitch asked what cost per gallon had been budgeted for fuel. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, replied that the District had budgeted 76 cents per gallon. Based on projected use and the current price of 95 cents per gallon, he said, LTD can meet expenses. However, if use increases or the price rises higher, there may be budget problems. He explained that staff were working to determine the District's capacity to respond in terms of staff, rolling stock, and the budget.

Mr. Parks said that during the last crisis EWEB had used split shifts so that people could ride the buses. Ms. Loobey said that one of the District's bus operators had said that during the last crisis, the Union had found a service station that promised to take care of the bus operators' personal gasoline needs so that they could get to work, but that station is now closed. One of the issues being considered was how to get the District's employees to and from work during a gasoline shortage. She added that the discussion of past experiences, present fleet capacity, current manpower, and the budget was an interesting process for staff.

Transit Association Reports: Ms. Loobey said that she had gained much useful information from her colleagues at the Washington State Transportation meeting she attended in September. The Washington State Department of Transportation, the Washington Association of Counties, the Washington League of Cities, and the Washington State Transit Association had all agreed on a set of principles regarding reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, from which LTD receives federal Section 3 and 9 money, and would be going as a block before Congress; there would be no battle between transit and highway interests. Ms. Loobey said that for those organizations to have accomplished this was remarkable, because it makes it much easier for the Washington State congressional delegation to deal with those issues when everyone has agreed on the same principles. Part

of their incentive in this project is that the Washington State DOT operates transit, as it provides ferry service on Puget Sound.

Ms. Loobey said she had been trying to push that same kind of agenda with the Oregon Department of Transportation, the League of Oregon Cities, and the Association of Counties for the State of Oregon, and had talked with the Oregon Transit Association, Representative Hosticka, and Congressman DeFazio. Because the ODOT is simply highway oriented and does not operate any transit system in Oregon, they had not met with the same success in breaking the political log jam that occurs there. Transportation Committee Chairman Mike Hollern was planning to attend the Oregon Transportation Conference in October, and Ms. Loobey had asked for a conference with him. She said that if those entities in Oregon could agree on certain principles, then WSTA, OTA, and ODOT could join forces, which would stand them in good stead in the Pacific Northwest. In fact, she said, sometime in the future they might seriously consider forming a Pacific Northwest Transit Association.

Ms. Loobey said that Oregon transit has a strong position nationally on the Senate side, and that Representative AuCoin and Senator Hatfield have been very beneficial to transit in Oregon. In fact, Senator Hatfield was the one who made LTD's last bus purchase happen, and both have done a lot of earmarking of funds for Tri-Met.

Ms. Loobey stated that this all related to the fact that LTD was not just a little bus company anymore, but was involved in the much larger picture. It would be important for the Board to know and understand these policy issues in order to act appropriately on issues in the future.

Page 48 of the agenda packet showed a listing of issues that had been introduced to the OTA legislative committee, of which Ms. Loobey was the Chair. The General Managers from the five largest transit systems in Oregon (Portland, Eugene, Salem, Klamath Falls, and Medford) comprised the committee. The governor's package included financial aid to light rail funding, providing that the state fund half the local match for light rail extension.

Ms. Loobey stated that the state-wide tire and battery tax had missed by two votes on the Senate side in the last legislative session, with Lane County's two Democratic Senators voting no. The tax would have been very beneficial to all Oregon counties. Seven Oregon counties are also very interested in the video lottery, to supplant the loss of timber subsidies and O&C funds. A video lottery (card games on video machines) produces a lot of revenue for Montana. Ms. Loobey said that the motor vehicle emission fee was an idea that had been around a long time in the state, but would not work in Oregon because cars are not routinely inspected throughout the state. A motor vehicle registration local option fee might come back up in the next session. She also explained that in the 1987 legislative session, the public employee unions killed the wage tax bill, which would operate like FICA, with employees contributing at the same level as employers. The wage tax, however, was primarily a Tri-Met issue.

Ms. Loobey said she had wanted the Board to have some sense of the types of issues that will be coming up in the next legislative session. She said she believed it was incumbent upon LTD to be sensitive to the needs of other transit properties within the state, and that the

impact for the future is that these issues can help make up the differences in federal funding levels. It would be important for Medford and Klamath Falls to find some way of financing their capital projects other than the property tax. Ms. Loobey stated that even if some of these measures passed, LTD would not be obligated to enact them, or they may not apply to LTD right away. However, if transit capital funding continued to decline the way it had been, LTD would need another way to make up that money locally.

Strategic Planning: Mr. Andersen stated that strategic planning was something the Board had been talking about for quite some time, especially concerning the appropriate time for the Board to become involved in the planning process for the following year, whether it be at the beginning or end of the process. With a fully-constituted Board, the new facility, and new intergovernmental cooperation, it seemed to him to be an important topic. Ms. Loobey stated that the heart of that evening's agenda had to do with strategic planning, including the Washington and Oregon State Transit Associations reports and Mr. Andersen's report on the American Public Transit Association Board Members Seminar. She said they all had to do with the future, and how to respond to legislative initiatives.

Ms. Loobey reiterated that LTD was moving from a small to a large bus company, due not so much from the size of the fleet as from the District's role in the community. That role was beginning to change, and LTD was beginning to be recognized as a greater partner in the community, which, in turn, created more of an obligation for LTD to participate in the community. When looking at the "big picture," she said, there were a lot of policy issues that the Board needed to think about and understand. One way in which to do that was to involve the Board in strategic planning in one capacity or another. She said that the Board had asked to be more involved and staff were excited about the possibility of additional Board involvement, and suggested two scenarios.

In the first alternative, the Board would be involved early in the process, during goal-setting and action plan development. It would involve "rolling up their shirt sleeves" and devoting some time to the process, not unlike the Springfield Chamber of Commerce process in which Ms. Fitch and Ms. Loobey participated each year. In the second alternative, the Board would have less in-depth participation; more than currently, but less than alternative #1.

Ms. Loobey said that Mr. Dallas had talked with local units of government to learn how they do their strategic planning, and how well it works for them. He found out that it was beneficial for organizations to have their boards involved in the planning process. The boards typically deal with the "big picture" and staff handle the detail work, such as action plans, but the boards are also intimately involved in strategic planning.

Ms. Loobey asked the Board for direction regarding the strategic planning process. She suggested that the Board could spend a day or weekend at the coast, and that family members could go along to an out-of-town session; however, not to the strategic planning sessions themselves. She encouraged the Board members to seriously consider the first alternative. She said staff would return to the Board with more detailed and more concrete ideas of what might be accomplished at such a strategic planning session. She suggested that a facilitator could be hired to keep the process on track and focused, in order to reach the objective in the time allowed, especially for the first time through this process.

Mr. Andersen stated that, in response to all the legislative issues raised by Ms. Loobey, the Board could either sit back and watch or take an active role in some of these issues. The Board would not take an active role if it viewed itself as a passive, rubber-stamp Board, or as a little transit district that lets the larger properties take all the action. He said he would speak toward alternative #1. From other boards and business situations he had been involved with, he said there was no substitute for time spent off-site, away from distractions and the normal routine of business, to look at issues more in-depth, and to do some brainstorming, background, and education. He thought this could not really be accomplished during Board or subcommittee meetings.

Ms. Calvert said she thought it would be useful for the Board to meet with staff at the end of the process, that things might flow better if the Board and staff were in their own groups initially, as in alternative #1. Ms. Fitch said she would support alternative #1, having just gone through a process with a facilitator with the Springfield Chamber Board, which she believed resulted in better ownership and cooperation.

Mr. Parks said alternative #1 would be fine with him, providing that the Board as a group would attend, rather than just part of the Board. Mr. Montgomery said he would agree with pursuing alternative #1. Mr. Andersen said that Board members would all have to be willing to commit their time.

Ms. Loobey said that, because staff begin the budget process in January, the Board strategic planning session would have to be held as early as October or November. There followed some discussion of dates when Board members would or would not be available, and staff agreed to survey the Board to set a date before the October Board meeting.

Report on American Public Transit Association Board Members Seminar:

Mr. Andersen said his overall comment about attending the board members seminar was that it reaffirmed what he already knew; that Eugene has a very good transit district and that it is very well run and on top of most issues. As an example, he said, there was a major discussion about the need for intergovernmental cooperation, which is what LTD has been doing in relation to the relocation of the downtown Eugene transit station. Also, board members were told that they should start doing some long-range planning because they would begin losing some federal funding. LTD is already doing that, as well. Third, he said, he didn't think LTD's Marketing Administrator and his staff could have learned anything from the conference's marketing presentation. Mr. Andersen said he had talked about the District's prepaid group pass program, and most people were "flabbergasted." Other discussions dealt with disabilities and the need for 100 percent accessibility, which LTD has already accomplished.

Mr. Andersen also discussed two aspects of the conference which he thought were very positive. First, there are a lot of different types of boards--elected, appointed by the City Council, appointed by legislatures, governors, etc. He thought that Oregon's system was an appropriate one, because those who were elected spent a lot of time getting elected, rather than on transit issues. He also thought it was positive that there was a very large minority representation and contingent on the boards, including women, physically disabled, African

Americans, and other ethnic and racial minority groups. He thought this was especially important in the larger cities, where they represent the diversity of their riders.

Mr. Andersen said he was glad to have attended the conference, but he probably would not apply to go again next year. Ms. Calvert said it was good to go one time. Mr. Andersen recommended that other Board members avail themselves of the opportunity to attend, but felt he was doing more teaching than learning.

Letters from Riders and LTD Responses Regarding Service on Various Routes:

Regarding the Big Y shopping center petition, Ms. Loobey stated that LTD's inability to move coaches out of the parking lot and into the street configuration in that area makes that suggestion unsafe, so staff were looking at locating the bus stop closer to the intersection with a signal, for safe pedestrian crossing. She said that the District tries not to travel onto private property, unless there is a major destination, such as Valley River Center, where the pavement has been built up, there is an adequate turning radius, and the entrances and exits allow the buses to move safely in and out of traffic. When work is done on the Roosevelt extension in the area near the Big Y, staff hope the District will be able to work with designers to make the stops more convenient and safer for riders.

Mr. Parks said he had noticed a lot of people lined up at the stops there. Ms. Loobey added that staff are not only concerned about the safety of the people crossing the street, but the safety of the people on the bus, as well.

Underground Fuel Tank Removal at 8th and Garfield: Ms. Calvert asked about the underground tank removal at 8th and Garfield. Mr. Pangborn explained that the District had retained a local geo-technical engineering firm to assist LTD in tank removal and clean-up. The District was in discussions with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) about the requirements that would apply to the District for underground tank removal. Mr. Pangborn stated that the Board would be kept apprised of any progress or action in this area.

November and December Board Meeting Dates: Since the November Board meeting was scheduled to be held the day before Thanksgiving, it was decided that it should be held one week earlier, on November 14. The Board members present at the meeting said they would be available for the December 19 meeting, so there was no need to change that meeting date.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Parks moved, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, that the meeting be adjourned. There was no further discussion, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:20 p.m.


Board Secretary