

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, February 20, 1991

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 14, 1991, 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, February 20, 1991, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Janet Calvert
Tammy Fitch, Vice President
Herbert Herzberg, Secretary
Thomas Montgomery
Keith Parks, Vice President, presiding
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: (vacancy in subdistrict 5)

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

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Parks introduced the February Employee of the Month, Mike Northup, Computer Systems Analyst in the District's Management Information Services (MIS) division since August 1986. Mike was nominated by a group of coworkers who commended him for the quality and responsiveness of the technical support he provided. MIS Administrator Joe Janda said that Mike was always willing to take the time necessary to answer questions or provide assistance. Mike had developed expertise in desk top publishing, spreadsheet, and database software applications. In addition, he had served as project lead for the development of automated display case and timetable production systems, which had allowed the District to provide greater passenger information cost-effectively.

Mike said he would like to thank his fellow employees for the honor, and the Board and Executive Committee for providing a great place to work.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Parks asked for comments from the audience on issues other than service adjustments. One unidentified woman said she would "sing LTD's praise." She thought LTD was wonderful and said thank you to the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING ON SERVICE ADJUSTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991-92:

Staff Introduction: Ms. Loobey explained that the Annual Route Review, performed annually, consisted of reviewing the service the District provided for the previous year and suggestions from customers, employees, and the public. Staff also reviewed under-utilized

routes, problems with productivity, and where increased service might be needed, and then made recommendations for service changes for the following fiscal year. After adoption by the Board, those changes were included in the budget for the following year. Ms. Loobey added that this was a very important step in the budget process each year.

Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, called the Board's attention to page 10 of the agenda packet. He explained that staff were not asking for Board action that evening, but wanted to preview some of the items being considered for service changes, and to hold a public hearing to receive input on some of the suggestions. Staff planned to return to the Board in March with a final recommendation for Board approval.

Mr. Viggiano stated that one of the key features of this year's Annual Route Review was trying to address running time problems, since reliability was a key factor in people's decisions to ride the bus. There were also three unique issues affecting the current Annual Route Review. First, the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) which was recently passed mandated an increase in LTD's Dial-a-Ride (DAR) service. Second, this year the District had received an unprecedented number of service requests. There were requests for additional service, later service, and service to new areas, both within and outside the current boundaries. Third, staff were planning a Comprehensive Service Review (CSR) of the entire system for the following year. The last CSR was completed 10 years ago, and the District had been making incremental changes each year since that time. Staff believed it was now necessary to once again look at the system as a whole. Therefore, this year staff tried to avoid any major route restructuring. Instead, they had tried to address problems that they believed should be changed before another year passed.

Mr. Viggiano briefly reviewed the service which had been implemented during the last two years. In general, he said, the majority of that service had met or exceeded staff's predicted productivity levels. Where it had not done so, it was fairly close, and staff believed that it would meet those levels over time. Mr. Viggiano highlighted the changes made to address running time problems. Those service changes had been measured, and a positive effect was found. Data indicated that a lower percentage of buses were late, and very few were late enough to cause people to miss their transfers on a regular basis. Where changes were not made, those routes were arriving later due to continuing changes in the environment, such as more traffic and more riders. Mr. Viggiano said that those were the problems that staff intended to address in this year's service recommendation.

Micki Kaplan, Service Planner, gave a brief overview of the Americans with Disabilities Act and its impact on the District, as well as an historical background of LTD's accessible services program. The ADA, a civil rights law for persons with disabilities, was enacted in July 1990. It included specific requirements for transportation, but no funding to help transit systems meet those requirements. According to the ADA, new buses purchased must be lift-equipped. With the arrival of LTD's 25 new Gillig buses in March, and the retirement of the seven used buses purchased from Tri-Met, LTD's fleet would once again be 100 percent lift-equipped, in accordance with a policy adopted by LTD 10 years ago.

Ms. Kaplan explained that LTD was a pioneer in fixed route lift-equipped service, which was actually less expensive to operate than Dial-A-Ride service, on a per-trip basis. LTD

contributed funds to the DAR program, which was under contract to the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG). L-COG, in turn, contracted with Special Mobility Services to provide the DAR service. The demand for elderly and disabled (E&D) transit service grew, and in 1986 the Oregon legislature approved a one-cent cigarette tax for E&H services. Called the Special Transportation Fund, this tax provided \$450,000 per year, which passed through LTD to L-COG. LTD also contributed \$107,000 in local funds. A small portion of the \$557,000 went to L-COG to manage the DAR service and special transportation program.

Ms. Kaplan said that LTD would easily meet or exceed the ADA fixed route service mandates, but that there would be some costs associated with Dial-A-Ride. An ADA compliance plan must be developed by July 1991, and a new citizen advisory committee was formed to accomplish that. The ADA required, by January 1992, comparable paratransit service for people who were unable to ride fixed routes, unless this requirement created an undue hardship. However, the terms "undue hardship" and "comparable paratransit service" would not be final until July 1991.

Currently, the paratransit service provided by contract with L-COG offered service from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on weekdays, with no weekend or weekday evening service. Geographic coverage similar to fixed route was no problem, but hours of service would need to be increased to comply with the ADA. Ms. Kaplan explained the proposed service increase for DAR. Service would be offered from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. on weekdays, 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Saturdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Sundays. Ms. Kaplan explained that the actual service plan had yet to be developed (for example, whether the service would be provided by Special Mobility Service vans or a taxi subsidy, etc.). Staff's proposal was developed for budgeting purposes. LTD and L-COG staff, the Special Transportation Planning Committee (a citizen advisory group), and a planning consultant would be developing the actual service plan during the summer of 1991. Ms. Kaplan said that the proposed service plan could be brought to the Board at a future date, if they wished. She added that if DAR service had not been provided that evening, some of the people in the audience for the public hearing would not have been able to attend.

Ms. Kaplan said that the increase in DAR service was planned for the fall, when LTD's other service changes would occur. During next year's Annual Route Review, staff will have had some experience with the new DAR service.

Ms. Kaplan introduced Terry Parker of L-COG, who could also answer questions from the Board.

Ms. Calvert asked what percent of regular buses were in service until 11:00 p.m. Mr. Viggiano said that about half of the routes operate until 11:00 p.m., and they also operate less frequently, so approximately 1/4 of the regular service was offered in the evenings.

Mr. Viggiano then discussed specific recommendations for fixed route service, explaining that staff had grouped the recommendations into high, medium, and low priorities. After Board and public feedback, staff would develop final service recommendations. High priority service recommendations were listed on pages 14 and 15 of the agenda packet. Mr. Viggiano explained that the most requested service was for service to operate later in the evenings, both

on weekdays and on weekends. Currently, the last Saturday departure from the Eugene Station was at 9:20 p.m., and the last Sunday departure was at 7:20 p.m.

In the current recommendation, staff had added a \$20,000 contingency for tripper service that might have to be provided during the year for overloads. Tripper service had been provided in past years, but was being budgeted for the first time this year.

Mr. Viggiano explained that service changes would be implemented in September 1991, so the FY 91-92 costs were lower than annual costs. The 13 high priority items and the increased Dial-a-Ride service would cost \$220,000 in FY 91-92, with an annual cost of \$287,100.

Mr. Viggiano next discussed another group of service recommendations, designated "medium priority" by staff, beginning with recommendation number seven on page 16 of the agenda packet. He explained that there were about 14 pockets within the service area where LTD did not provide service, based on low ridership due to the density of the area, the number of people in certain age groups, etc. Of the requests for service received from residents of some of those areas, staff had determined that the Laurel Hill Valley area would be the easiest to serve at a fairly minimal cost.

Mr. Viggiano explained that it was more expensive to add one week night hour of service, five nights a week, than to add one Saturday hour. Additional weekday hours had been requested by customers, but it was a costly service addition.

The total cost of the first six medium priority recommendations would be \$72,500 for FY 91-92, with an annual total of \$92,000.

On page 17 were listed services which were requested but not recommended for implementation at that time. Those requests were for additional frequency, service to new areas, and additional trips. Due to time restraints, staff had completed a very general cost estimate on these services.

Ms. Calvert asked about improvements to Coburg/Crescent in the second tier of recommendations; whether the route was already so productive that \$40,000 in improvements would pay off. Mr. Viggiano said the route was productive during the times it was offered, and this recommended change was a high priority among bus operators. He explained that routes #66 and #67 were confusing, and the proposed service changes would make that service easier to understand.

Someone from the audience asked about airport service. Mr. Viggiano replied that an analysis had been done the previous year. Staff had researched the experiences of other communities the size of Eugene/Springfield, and the current service offered by local hotels. Staff determined that LTD could not run productive service to the airport; there was not enough demand in the community, and there was a variety of airplane arrival and departure times for which LTD would have to provide service. Reno was the only successful community, partly due to the high number of airport trips, and partly because the regular routing went through the airport on the way to another community.

Public Hearing on Service Adjustments for FY 91-92: Mr. Parks commented that the Board would have an opportunity to ask more questions before a vote was taken on service recommendations at the next meeting. He then opened the public hearing on the proposed service changes.

(1) The first speaker was David Kelly, of 2260 Augusta Street, in the Laurel Hill Valley. He urged the Board to adopt service to the Laurel Hill Valley, which was on the medium priority list. He said that area was in the service area and part of the funding tax base, and was close to Eugene neighborhoods but without easy access to the bus. The closest bus was the Thurston route, at Franklin and Walnut, a 10- to 40-minute walk, depending on who was doing the walking. Mr. Kelly showed that there was a strong interest in the neighborhood, asking those present from the Laurel Hill Valley to raise their hands; about 15 people did so. Mr. Kelly said the Valley was a diverse neighborhood, and LTD would be serving people with a variety of circumstances, including children, retirees, workers, and students. A lot of residents were University of Oregon faculty and students and Sacred Heart Hospital employees, who were already paying for bus service but could not use their passes due to the lack of service. He said that service could be provided in a fairly straightforward fashion, and mentioned the City of Eugene's focus on alternative transportation.

Mr. Kelly said he had included a survey in the Laurel Hill Valley Citizen's Association's quarterly newsletter in January, and had received responses from 15 percent of the households, which he said was a good response for a mailed survey. Of those responses, 97 percent (all but one) said they would use the bus if it traveled down Franklin and to the University one time per hour. Of those, 34 percent said they would ride once or twice a week, and 45 percent said they would ride daily. If there were only four buses to the area daily, 87 percent would ride, with 34 percent saying they would ride one time per week or more, and 32 percent would ride daily. More than 80 percent of the respondents said that at least one other person in the household would also be riding the bus. Many of the surveys were from either Augusta or Riverview, which were the two major north/south streets, but he did receive surveys from every street. A number of people also took time to write comments. Five or six of those comments said that the kids in the family would have increased opportunities for recreation, to use the library, etc. Students mentioned the environmental and economic advantages. One person said he or she needed a car only because there was not bus service. There were only two negative comments; those were that Floral Hill was too narrow for bus traffic, but that bus service should be on another street in the Laurel Hill Valley area. One person had arthritis and could not walk to the bus stop and needed to use Dial-A-Ride, but found it too unreliable to get to appointments.

Mr. Kelly said the danger in the proposed service was that it was too "bare bones" and could fail because it wasn't convenient enough for the riders to use. He said that riders would deal with a certain amount of inconvenience, but at a minimum needed early and late commute runs, and at least three in-between for errands, plus weekend service. He said there was a lot of interest in service beyond that minimum, but it seemed as if that was a good minimum place to start. He thought that the service would be heavily used if it proceeded to the Eugene Station, and there was only one transfer to Valley River Center.

(2) Steve Cone, of 3910 Donald, the Executive Director of the Pearl Buck Center, said he had moved to Eugene from Wisconsin seven months ago, and was impressed with LTD's system, especially the on-time service. He spoke on behalf of persons with developmental disabilities. He supported implementation of the paratransit service recommendations, stating that people with developmental disabilities needed various types of support, including transportation, to maintain employment. They did not always have the opportunity to work at a 9 to 5 job, and often worked the second shift, on weekends, etc. He said that was why it was important to expand paratransit service on weekends and evenings.

(3) The third speaker was Vicki Travis, living at Deerhorn and Dowdy in Springfield. She said she represented about 300 households that were up Deerhorn off York Lane and Booth Kelly, and said she had submitted several hundred signatures to LTD a couple of months previously, and had spoken with Micki Kaplan. She said she worked at the University and issued the bus stickers, but that the nearest bus stop for her was two and a half miles from her house, and the McKenzie Bridge hours were not always convenient. She said there were a lot of youth, students, retired people, and people who didn't drive who would have a lot of use for even a couple of trips a day. She added that Deerhorn was open on both ends, so the bus could make a loop.

(4) Helen Jameson, who lived on Deerhorn Road, said the residents would even appreciate a small shuttle from 69th Place on Main Street to Deerhorn and back to 69th, if that was less expensive for the District.

(5) An unidentified woman in the audience said it was difficult to hear the staff presentations because staff were facing away from the audience, which she thought was rude.

(6) Cynthia Stevens, who lived at Third and High in Eugene, said that the #1 Downtown Shuttle used to go to the University of Oregon and back to 5th Street Public Market, but the 5th Street portion was eliminated, so the bus went to the Eugene Station and back to Celeste Campbell Senior Center. She said it would be nice if the route could return to the old system. She said she was also especially interested in extending the hours for service. The last available bus was at 6:20 p.m., which she said might be okay for seniors, but meant she could not go out in the evening. If hours were extended seven days a week, it would be helpful to her and to non-disabled people in her complex.

(7) Fred Renter, of 1305 Bogart, said he was there to represent the interests of people with developmental disabilities. He was the Executive Director of Independent Environments, which provided support to people with developmental disabilities. He said his comments would focus on people in wheelchairs who require paratransit services. He spoke in favor of the proposal to expand weekend and evening service on Dial-A-Ride. He stated that he supported and appreciated what LTD had done in the past in terms of accessibility. He thought it was within a positive spirit that the Americans with Disabilities Act called for paratransit service which was comparable to fixed route service, and he hoped that LTD would continue within that spirit, and would look for ways to provide the kinds of services that were recommended in the ADA.

Mr. Renter also spoke in support of expanded service on routes #66 and 67. He said that the #66 and #67 ran past one of the houses in which people with developmental disabilities lived, the McNair House at 946 Coburg Road, and expanded service on those routes would enable them to go places in the evening and on weekends. It would also enable the McNair House residents to use the fixed route service as much as possible.

(8) Connie Gosney, a resident of the McNair House, said she would like to be able to ride Dial-A-Ride on the weekends.

(9) Paul Maguire, of 946 Coburg Road, said it would be nice if Dial-A-Ride could run more often. He said he could not go anywhere at 5:00 p.m., and that fixed route service stopped at 6:30 p.m. at his house, so he would appreciate it if LTD would run Dial-A-Ride more often, because it would help him quite a bit. He said he would like to go to church on Sundays, but there was no way to do so. In order to ride fixed route service, he would have to cross over a busy street to Crescent, and he did not like to cross it. He said that if it would be possible for the #66 and #67 to travel on Sunday for church, he would be thankful.

(10) Ellen Lombardo, who lived on West Amazon, said it would be nice to have extended hours in the evenings and on weekends for Dial-A-Ride so she could go out to dinner, shopping, or to a movie.

(11) Arline Black of 1175 Almaden, said she would like to see Dial-A-Ride service expanded. She said she belonged to several organizations, and several people in those organizations who used Dial-A-Ride on a regular basis and would like to see it expanded so they could do the kinds of things that were accessible to other people, such as attending classes, shopping, etc. She said she couldn't always get places on the fixed route, and would need to know where she was going. Saturday and Sunday service on Dial-A-Ride would be nice, she said, because she always had to find rides to go to church or other places, especially when some fixed route buses did not run on Sundays.

(12) Don Perry, of 30th and Willamette in Eugene, said he would like to see the Dial-A-Ride system extended. He said he was dependent on the bus system because he could not drive a car due to his epilepsy, and could not use Dial-A-Ride because he was not in a wheelchair. He thought the Dial-A-Ride requirements were discriminatory because he was qualified as a handicapped person, but could not ride Dial-A-Ride. He thought it should be "opened up to people in his shoes."

(13) John Dale, of 1965 Patterson, said he rode the fixed route service and liked Dial-A-Ride. He said he appreciated having the ability to go to nice supper clubs, and expanding service on Dial-A-Ride in the evenings would be nice. He said he was in Eugene on a trip in 1986 when the bus driver missed his stop on a rainy day, so called a van to take him to the person's house where he was staying. He said he was unable to cross busy streets to get to the bus, but the door-to-door service of Dial-A-Ride "couldn't be beat with a stick."

(14) Rex Jameson, of 1263 Main/70 Cox Way, Springfield, said he had been chosen as a Bus Rider of the Month in 1988. He said LTD still had good service, but there were some things he had seen in the past two years that could be done better and/or more safely for the

riders. He said some were impossible due to traffic conditions on the roads, but he wanted to address them. First, it had been recommended to eliminate the Pheasant Park service on the outbound #15 LCC Gateway. He said he agreed with that, but would like to change the direction of the routing around Gateway Loop. He said the service ran on the west side of Gateway, but the major apartments were on the east side, and he foresaw that as a possible problem for people crossing the street. He thought that traveling on the east side of the street would be a lot safer. He suggested making a left turn out of Pheasant park, instead of a right-hand turn, or going straight through, to be driving on the east side of the street. He also thanked the District for making changes to the #11 Thurston, in which the inbound bus stopped on 5th Street at 5th and "B," and the outbound stopped on "B." He thought this was safer and more timely routing.

Mr. Jemeson also talked about the proposed additional hours on fixed route service. He called himself a "night owl" and said that later hours would make it possible to attend the Hult Center events and other similar activities. He said he understood LTD had to be run somewhat like a business, but that later hours would be appreciated. He also wondered if the Hult Center had been approached about accommodating bus riders by offering earlier programs. Mr. Jemeson thanked the Board for the bus service, and said he hoped it could be made even better.

(15) Mary Kelly of 934 Washington Street said that LTD had the most perfect service. She said she came to Eugene one year ago because of the marvelous bus service, but wondered why the District eliminated the senior citizen's free fare day. She asked that it be reinstated, to allow seniors to ride for free one day a month. She said she would like "Cinderella," or later evening, service also, and asked the Board to not just try the service for a few weeks, since it may take riders a while to get used to using the service.

(16) Pamela Fisher, of 2192 Augusta in the Laurel Hill Valley, gave the student's perspective. She said she was a University of Oregon graduate student, and it was at least one mile for her to walk to the bus. She would rather use the bus from an economic standpoint, since gasoline was expensive. She said there was an issue of safety when riding a bicycle through Laurel Hill Valley in the evening, because the lights were not good and the streets were narrow and curved. Because many students worked late in the library, she asked that LTD consider one late night route for students trying to get home after a late evening on campus. She thought LTD would have large student ridership and summer use.

Don Perry spoke again, this time about the #23 Fox Hollow, and the #23 X, an express bus. He said that sometimes when riding the #23 at 4:30 p.m. or so, the buses were really packed, but the #23X express buses were sometimes almost empty. He wondered if it would be more appropriate to have both pull into the mall at the same time.

Additional written testimony from the public was given to the Board members and is attached to these minutes as part of the public testimony regarding service adjustments for FY 91-92.

Closure of Public Hearing: There was no more testimony from members of the audience, and Mr. Parks closed the public hearing at 9:00 p.m. He called a five-minute recess while the public left the room, and the meeting resumed at 9:05 p.m.

MOTION **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Ms. Fitch moved that the minutes of the January 16, 1991, regular meeting, the January 23, 1991, adjourned meeting, and the February 6, 1991, adjourned meeting be approved as distributed. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion, and the

VOTE minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

Eugene Transit Station Federal Appropriation: Ms. Loobey called the Board's attention to the summary statement on page 39 of the agenda packet. She said that staff were recommending that the Board direct staff to seek to obtain a \$10.4 million appropriation of federal funds for a new Eugene Transit Station, in order to have this project in the federal funding cycle for the following federal fiscal year. She explained that timing was important. Congress would be working on the reauthorization of the federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act, and the mix of federal to local share might change from 75/25 to 60/40. If local match went from 25 percent to 40 percent, there would be more issues for the Board to address in funding a proposed new Eugene Transit Station. Further, she wanted the Board to understand that if they asked for the federal apportionment at that time, if the process still worked the same way, funds would be set aside for three years. The Board would still have a lot of questions to answer about the downtown station, and if a fatal flaw were found, then LTD could still let the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) know that the District would not be moving ahead with the project.

Ms. Loobey said that the amount of the grant application seemed large, due to a built-in inflationary factor, since the District would probably not be constructing the station until FY 1993-94. If the District missed this funding cycle, then the station could be delayed by a whole year. Section 3 funding would be used, because under the current law that would be the appropriate source. Section 3 included a set-aside for one-time capital projects, and this was the funding used to build the Glenwood facility.

In response to a question from Ms. Calvert, Ms. Loobey said that UMTA would program the money for this project, and the funds would be available for three years. The first year of the project included the design stage, etc.

Mr. Parks asked if the application would have to be approved before the money could be spent. Ms. Loobey said that any money spent before federal approval would have to come out of local funds, because costs could not be incurred prior to federal approval. Mr. Parks asked if UMTA would approve the project or just the funding. Ms. Loobey said they would assess the project against other projects in the region, so it would be a combination of looking at the project, and then determining if they would fund the requested level of costs. Ms. Calvert asked if this meant conceptual approval rather than final project approval. Ms. Loobey replied that it did. Ms. Fitch asked if Ms. Loobey would present this project in Washington, D.C., in March. Ms. Loobey said she would, that it was part of a package to be presented by the City and LTD. Ms. Fitch asked if the County saw the transit as a high priority, as the City did. Ms. Loobey replied that the County did not, but that staff had not expected them to. Instructions from the Board to staff were to approach the County to see if they would consider

selling the Elections Lot, and staff had begun that process, but the County was not dealing with this project in the same way the City was. Ms. Fitch asked if the County would be going to Washington, D.C., with the City and LTD. Ms. Loobey introduced Jody Miller of the City of Eugene, who said that the County typically went later and did not lobby the same package.

Mr. Herzberg asked if the \$10.4 million figure for the grant application was figured on a 75/25 match, and if that was based on current construction costs. Ms. Loobey replied that it was based on a 75/25 match, and an inflationary figure had been built in for construction costs. Ms. Calvert said she would like to see LTD be able to build a facility for less than that amount, but considering the President's transportation plan, if LTD could get this grant with the endorsement of the City, the District should go ahead and do it, especially while there was a supporter in a powerful place in Congress.

Mr. Brandt stated that he was against this proposition; and had thought a lot about it and talked with Ms. Loobey about it. He explained that he was against it because it was not morally right and proper to tell the federal government that LTD needed to have \$10.4 million allocated to presumably take money away from some other project in some other city, when LTD didn't have the foggiest idea of what it wanted to spend on this project. Second, Mr. Brandt said, he could not conceivably see that LTD would spend \$13 million on a downtown station. He said this was being almost dishonest in his mind. If LTD did not know what it really wanted, then it should give UMTA a range. He said that if he would vote for this, he would, in essence, be saying that he thought LTD should spend that much money, and he did not agree with that. He said he would hate to think that LTD would hurt its city or its chances if it did not move ahead with this project, but he also didn't think that the District was ready to move ahead, so he would vote against this recommendation as presented.

Mr. Herzberg said he didn't think LTD would be able to build anything cheaper and have somewhat the same design. He said he would venture to say any cost reductions would be very little. He said that construction costs would continue to climb, and if LTD wanted something that looked halfway decent and lasted a while, the District would have to pay for it. He said that the concrete required by heavy buses would not be cheap, and he did not think that the proposed costs were exorbitant. He said that if the District was going for a new station, then he was ready to ask for this amount. He thought it would be good if LTD could tie down this application before the match changed to 60/40.

MOTION Mr. Herzberg moved that the Board direct staff to seek to obtain a \$10.4 million appropriation of federal funds for a new Eugene Transit Station. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Ms. Calvert asked Mr. Brandt if he was uncomfortable with the District submitting any proposal. Mr. Brandt said that if he submitted a proposal, he would put a range in, some more reasonable amount, maybe up to this amount. He said the District would be telling the community it thought this was the appropriate amount, and telling the federal agency to take this money away from other viable projects. Then, if six months or a year later LTD spent less money, someone else would have already lost out. He said he could not do business that way, and would not run his personal, private business that way. He thought it would be a total misrepresentation on LTD's part to the federal government, and he would only be in favor of

alerting them to it and see if LTD could have an open-ended agreement to get included in the 75/25 versus 60/40 grant match.

He said he wanted to be positive about it but he couldn't see LTD asking the senators or going to the government at this point, because the District could not supply the reasons that it needed that much money. The site had not been selected and no decisions about the station had been made. He said it looked as if the District was being money-grabbers.

Ms. Calvert said that, to her, asking for this grant was asking for conceptual approval. She asked if the grant could be amended downward. Ms. Loobey said it was easier to go downward, and that most often UMTA would not amend a grant upward. Mr. Brandt said the Board would be asking the General Manager to work with the City government and federal legislators to make a commitment to LTD, and he did not think LTD was ready for that. He said that maybe if everyone else was doing things this way, then LTD should, also, but he did not do business that way.

Ms. Loobey asked Mr. Brandt what he would see as an acceptable range. Mr. Brandt said that when the station was first envisioned, it was in the \$3 million to \$5 million range. He said it had started out so far away from \$13 million that it was unbelievable. He said that was at least double the acceptable amount for him. He said he might not feel that way if someone could demonstrate to him based on expected growth, etc., that this was a bargain for a system that produces \$11 million a year, but it did not make sense to him. He said he always envisioned much lower costs for the station, and that he also saw the Board and staff as slowly convincing themselves that \$10 million to \$13 million was the right amount, which would make it a self-fulfilling prophecy. He said he could not believe that the District would need to spend more than \$5 million to \$6 million on the station.

Mr. Brandt said also that LTD needed a lot more cooperation from the City and County before going ahead with this project. He said he was never going to vote to take money out of one taxpayer's pocket and put in another's pocket, such as to add parking when the District was trying to eliminate the need for parking, and that was a large part of this cost. He said he would vote for \$5 million, because that would be more reasonable. Ms. Calvert asked if he would vote for \$8 million. Mr. Brandt said he would not.

Mr. Herzberg said that one of the reasons he made the motion on the \$10.4 million was that he went through this process before, as a board member for Ya-Po-Ah Terrace, when the board was looking into building a 240-car parking structure on the east side of Ya-Po-Ah Terrace. He said it cost more than \$3 million for ground-level parking and part of a floor-level parking area. He said he looked at that little project compared with what LTD was looking at, and he thought the proposed figure was not exorbitant. He thought some of the fancy things could probably be eliminated to get the station built, but he did not think \$10.4 million was exorbitant, for excavation, concrete, etc. Mr. Brandt said he did not disagree, but that he was saying that this type of expensive project was not justified. He said the amount was probably a fair cost, but that the station was over-designed and LTD was over-spending for its size of operation. He didn't think that LTD's local taxpayers wanted to spend \$2 million or \$3 million, and that LTD had gotten totally off track. He said he envisioned a place where people could get off one bus and on another, but now a big covered station with public restrooms, etc., had

been designed. If that was what the rest of the Board envisioned, he said, then he guessed LTD would need to convince everybody it wanted to do that. However, he said, he never had that vision, and he didn't think LTD could afford it.

Ms. Loobey said that the District did not have a sense of where the project might go. She said the Board had asked for additional information about 3/4-block sites, and the Board would be meeting with the City Council on March 4. If the Board was generally uncomfortable with setting a figure, staff could ask in Washington, D.C., how they wanted the District to approach the process. She said that nothing said the District could not go back to Washington, D.C., when the cost of the project was more resolved and to the Board's liking.

Ms. Calvert said she would hope the price would not be that high, even though she had seconded the motion. She asked if it would do irreparable harm to the project if it were pared down. Ms. Loobey said staff would be looking at ways to pare the project down, but there would be some of the same associated costs (for design, site preparation, etc.) no matter where the station was located. She said that some of the design features could be eliminated to reduce costs, but the Board had not yet gone through that process. The total cost could be reduced, but if the District found that the associated costs were similar, then design would have to be reduced. She said to Mr. Brandt she thought the Customer Service Center (CSC) was a very important part of the design and should not be eliminated, but that if the Board was more comfortable doing that kind of assessment and developing project costs on another 3/4-block site, that would be done.

Ms. Fitch asked how long it would be before this project was dealt with by UMTA. Ms. Loobey said that staff would be alerting them in March about the fact that LTD would be coming to them with this project. The project would be funded in the next federal fiscal year's funding cycle, beginning October 1, 1991. However, the sooner LTD could alert them about the project allowed UMTA to set priorities, and the better off the District would be. Ms. Fitch thought that if Ms. Loobey and the City asked for \$10.4 million, the District could continue to do its work in looking at sites, designs, etc. If the costs were reduced to \$8 million, for example, she wondered if a request to reduce the grant could be sent to UMTA at that time, and if there was any time limit for doing so. Mr. Herzberg commented that the grant could be decreased but not increased. Ms. Loobey added that this would be only one of the many decisions the Board would have to make about this project, so it would be an ongoing process, and that UMTA could still allocate any money LTD didn't need to another project.

VOTE

Ms. Fitch called for the question. The motion carried on a vote of 4 to 1, with Ms. Calvert, Ms. Fitch, Mr. Herzberg, and Mr. Parks voting in favor, and Mr. Brandt voting in opposition.

Ms. Fitch said she would like to add to the minutes that this was something she would like to see the Board strive for, that when Ms. Loobey went to Washington, D.C., the Board have a time line that staff were working within, so that the Board's comfort level, which was definitely below this, and so that they would get some of those questions answered, so the District could request less or lower its anticipations.

Mr. Parks said he could think of several things that would throw off the whole project, such as a change in the formula for capital allocations, or a lot of other money issues. He said that if this project would be that simple and be done with now, he would vote no, but it was not that simple.

RENEWAL OF COOPERS & LYBRAND CONTRACT: It was explained that the original contract with Coopers & Lybrand as the District's independent auditor was a three-year contract, and that it could be extended for up to five years before the District needed to go out for proposals from auditing firms.

MOTION Mr. Brandt moved that the Board renew the audit agreement between Coopers & Lybrand and Lane Transit District for a one-year period ending February 18, 1991, in the amount of \$9,961. Ms. Calvert seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

BOARD SALARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SALARIES AND BENEFITS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991-92: Ms. Fitch, Chairman of the Board Salary Committee, said that the Committee had met and received good input regarding salaries at other agencies. She said they did not approve the staff recommendation as presented, but altered it somewhat to the recommendation found in the agenda packet. One of the Committee's concerns, she said, was that currently the District's retirement plan was funded at 4 percent of salaries, which was quite a bit below the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) and others, which were funded at 10 to 14 percent. The Executive Committee had recommended a salary adjustment of 5 percent, 2 percent for deferred compensation and/or flexible spending account; and 1 percent for retirement. The Salary Committee changed that recommendation to 4 percent salary, 2 percent deferred compensation/flexible spending, and 2 percent retirement contribution; in the hopes that the District would have to deal with retirement a little less in the future. She said the recommendation was in line with the increases received by the contract employees, and that the costs for contract employee and salaried employee increases were the same over a two-year period.

Ms. Calvert asked about the recommendation for a comprehensive salary study. Ms. Fitch said it had been five years since the last comprehensive salary survey, so staff had recommended that a consultant be hired to conduct another survey, especially because the private sector normally did not respond to salary surveys conducted by LTD. Mr. Parks asked if job specifications would be rewritten. Ms. Loobey explained that five years ago, the study had looked at various classifications in relation to the marketplace, and said that would be done again. Mr. Brandt asked how the Committee had arrived at the estimated \$20,000 for the study. Ms. Fitch said it was a staff estimate. Bill Nevell, Personnel Administrator, added that the study five years before had cost \$10,000 to \$12,000. Mr. Brandt thought that \$20,000 was way too much, and that LTD could find someone to perform a fairly simple survey for \$10,000. He also wondered why a study needed to be done, if the jobs had stayed the same. Ms. Loobey said, however, that many of the jobs had changed over the years, and until they were analyzed, the District wouldn't know if it was paying comparable pay for comparable work. She added that if only salary information was gathered, it would be a much simpler analysis than also doing a classification study. She thought it would not be possible to have a classification study for \$10,000.

Mr. Brandt said he would like to be sure the Board had a chance to talk about this study again. He said he was not clear about why one needed to be done, and thought it would be like saying that staff did not know what their jobs were. He thought staff should be able to write down what their jobs were, without paying for the interview process. He said the District probably needed to have a salary survey, but thought LTD should be very careful about doing so. Mr. Parks commented that every time a classification study was done, it took three years to implement the recommendations, due to all the complaints. Ms. Calvert asked if that happened last time at LTD. Ms. Loobey said that there had been quite a bit of controversy. Mr. Brandt said he wouldn't change the recommendation at that time, but he thought the Board should be careful in looking at this question again. Mr. Parks thought that doing the entire classification study would cost \$100,000 in staff time, and that if base data had been taken, it would not need to be taken again. Ms. Loobey stated that what staff did not know was how much the jobs had changed, and if that change would be a factor in changing the classifications or the relationship of certain jobs to each other. Mr. Brandt said that if the Board really thought that LTD's salaries and job classifications were out of line or improper, it would spend a lot of time and money, but he thought the salaries were in line and proper.

Ms. Fitch said that a partial survey showed that LTD's salaries were 11 percent low for the public market, so she wanted to see comparisons with the private market. She said she did not think the private market was increasing like the public market. Mr. Brandt agreed.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board adopt the Salary Committee recommendation, excluding the comprehensive salary survey described in point #4, for the FY 1991-92 administrative compensation package, and that the results be used to formulate the proposed 1991-92 budget. Mr. Brandt seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote. The following changes were thus approved: (1) adjust the salary schedule uniformly by 4 percent; (2) provide employees with funds, in an amount equal to approximately 2 percent of total salaries (\$660 per person), that can be used only as follows: (a) contribute to the flexible spending account plans (funds can be used to pay for child care and health care costs), and/or (b) contribute to the deferred compensation plan; and (3) increase the District's contribution to the retirement plan by 2 percent (as a percent of base salary).

VOTE

MOTION **RENEWAL OF FEDERAL PURCHASING AUTHORIZATION:** Ms. Fitch moved that the Board approve the Resolution authorizing Purchasing Agent Jeanette Tentinger to acquire federal surplus property from the Oregon State Agency for Surplus Property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brandt and approved by unanimous vote.


VOTE

CALENDAR: Ms. Loobey said she had spoken with Mr. Brandt about holding a meeting of the Board Finance Committee, to discuss long-range financial projections that Finance Administrator Tamara Weaver had developed. She said this would be one of the steps in preparing for the budget process and budget adoption by June 30. The Finance Committee (Mr. Brandt, Mr. Herzberg, and Mr. Parks) agreed that they would meet sometime prior to the March 13 Board meeting.

Ms. Fitch and Ms. Calvert said they would like staff to consider increasing the weekend fare from 50 percent of weekday fares to something closer to two-thirds. They thought the

ridership on weekends and the addition of weekend service because of demand warranted a higher weekend fare.

MOTION **ADJOURNMENT**: Ms. Fitch moved for adjournment to Wednesday, February 27, 1991,
at 6:00 p.m. in the LTD Board Room. The motion was seconded, and the meeting was
VOTE unanimously adjourned at 10:00 p.m.


Board Secretary

WRITTEN TESTIMONY FOR
PUBLIC HEARING ON SERVICE ADJUSTMENTS

LTD BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

February 20, 1991

FEB 15 1991

2/15/91

David R. Kleger
2154 Golden Garden St.
Eugene, OR 97402
Tel: 689-2536

Board of Directors
Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, OR 97401-0470

Re: 1991-92 Budget Development

Dear People,

A prior committment prevents my being at your next meeting, hence this letter.

In addition to my long standing advisory role with LTD on public transit access, I am presently serving as co-chairperson of the L-COG Specialized Transportation Fund Planning Subcommittee. My comments in this letter are my own, but are influenced by L-COG STF committee and sub-committee discussions.


I wish to express my support for the LTD staff proposed increase of \$125,000 over the '90-91 budget for the paratransit (Dial-A-Ride) allocation. An obligation to provide paratransit service equivalent to fixed routes is a key component of the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) (PL 101-336) which became law last Fall. This is the only major area in which LTD does not already meet ADA requirements. Increased funding is necessary to expand Dial-A-Ride service to evenings and weekends.

As presently understood, the ADA expects progress on equivalent paratransit service by January 1992. To have funds available for timely progress, funds must be included in the LTD 1991-92 Budget being developed now.

I am frustrated to report that we do not have a clear idea about how much demand there will be for evening and weekend Dial-A-Ride service. All we know is that there have been repeated and numerous customer requests for expanded service hours throughout our paratransit experience, reinforced yet again during a pair of public forums held by the STF Planning Sub-committee only three weeks ago. The staff proposal represents a guess about what it will cost to begin our ADA compliance effort. \$125,000 will permit us to demonstrate a timely, good faith effort to expand toward equivalent service, within the very tight ADA timeline.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and your years of excellent service to persons with disabilities.

Sincerely,


Dave Kleger

February 12, 1991

2250 Riverview
Eugene, OR 97403
(503) 484-1994

Re: Bus Service to the Laurel Hill Valley

Dear Board Members:

The following are my family's specific needs for alternative transportation, i.e. bus service. Although our needs are probably different from the average rider, when we need transportation, we really need it. Our neighbors have been very helpful and I'm sure will continue to be, but I feel it is an unnecessary imposition when we are entitled to bus service in the Laurel Hill Valley.

My family has the following specific transportation problems:

1. My granddaughter is a teenager who needs to get back and forth from the main part of Eugene to work and visit friends;
2. My daughter is developmentally disabled and needs transportation to work so that she may have a wider choice of jobs;
3. Our housekeeper has to walk twice weekly from the bus at DMV on Franklin Blvd. to 2250 Riverview and then 3 hours later has to walk back;
4. I have severe rheumatoid arthritis and my feet are crippled so that I have great difficulty walking. When I have to have my car repaired, except for when my neighbors can bring me home from the garage, I have to ride the tow truck. Recently, my hands have been in a very bad flare-up and I can't open my car door. Alternative transportation would be very helpful.

Three or four times a day bus service would help a lot. More trips through the vally may cause ecological damage.

Bus service is needed as of several years ago, therefore I hope we do not have very much longer to wait.

Sincerely,
(minor)
Charlotte Nowosielski
Charlotte (Minor) Nowosielski

TESTIMONY RECEIVED FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON FEBRUARY 20, 1991

Received from: Dawn Howard
c/o U S West
272 Country Club Road
Eugene, OR 97401

Phone No. 484-8400

Received by: Susan Hekimoglu
Administrative Secretary
Lane Transit District

"Currently, the #60 runs past the phone company going downtown for the last time each day at 5:51 p.m. We who work at U S West would like a bus at 6:51 and, if possible, 7:21 p.m. Our office stays open until 7:00 p.m., and there is virtually no other public transportation available nearby. There are other offices along Country Club Road that are also open later in the evening."

March 13, 1991

TO: LTD Board of Directors

FROM: Paul McGuire, LTD bus rider, 946 Coburg Road, Eugene, in telephone conversation with Transit Planner Micki Kaplan

RE: TESTIMONY REGARDING 1991 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW:
Route #67 Coburg/Crescent

Paul McGuire, an LTD bus rider, called to support the 1991 Annual Route Review staff recommendation to expand service on Coburg Road during weekday evenings and on weekends. Mr. McGuire wants more service on Coburg Road during weekday evening, Saturday evening and Sunday, on the #67 Coburg Crescent route. Mr. McGuire is unable to drive a car, and is dependent on LTD for mobility. Mr. McGuire wanted to attend the LTD Board of Directors meeting tonight, but was unable to because his bus route, the #67 Coburg/Crescent does not run in the evenings.

According to Mr. McGuire, the distance to the closest #66 bus stop is far and the crossing is hazardous because he uses a power wheelchair. Mr. McGuire currently has no other transportation options available. If the #67 Coburg/Crescent route operated more frequently, particularly on week nights and Sundays, he would ride the bus and be able to go places.

THE LAUREL HILL VALLEY WANTS BUS SERVICE!

Here is the text of the LTD questionnaire, along with results. It was mailed to Laurel Hill Valley households in the January 1991 newsletter; 15% of the recipients sent back a response.

1. Would you use an LTD bus that loops through the neighborhood, connects to the Franklin Blvd route, and stops at the University of Oregon Transit Station, IF the bus ran once an hour all day and evening?
Yes: 97% No: 3%

2. How often would you use the bus described in question 1?
Daily: 45%
Once or twice a week: 34%
Once or twice a month: 13%
Less than once a month: 3%

3. Would you use a bus with the same route that only ran about four times a day (morning and evening commuting runs, plus a mid-morning and mid-afternoon run)?
Yes: 87% No: 8%

4. How often would you use the bus described in question 3?
Daily: 32%
Once or twice a week: 34%
Once or twice a month: 18%
Less than once a month: 0%

5. How many people in your household, including yourself, would use this bus? One: 18% Two: 45% Three: 11% Four or more: 18%

THE LAUREL HILL VALLEY DESERVES BUS SERVICE!

- The Laurel Hill Valley is a close-in Eugene neighborhood without access to the bus:
 - * Located between Hendricks Park and I-5
 - * Closest bus is Franklin and Walnut; 10-40 minute walk.
- We're a diverse neighborhood. The LTD would be serving a variety of economic circumstances, children and retirees who are presently isolated, and workers and students of all types.
- Many in the neighborhood are UO faculty, staff, or students; there are also a number of Sacred Heart employees. These people are paying, directly or indirectly, for bus service but can't use it!
- Providing service would be straightforward because of our proximity to the LTD's Glenwood facility. Service between the Valley and the Eugene downtown station, via the university, would be ideal.
- The City of Eugene is focusing on alternative transit plans; adding bus service to the Valley would be in line with those plans.

THE LAUREL HILL VALLEY IS LOOKING FORWARD TO BUS SERVICE!

(Presented for the Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association by David Kelly; 2260 Augusta Street, Eugene 97403; phone 686-2375.)