MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, October 16, 1991

Pursuant to notice given to ***The Register-Guard*** for publication on October 11, 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, October 16, 1991, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Jack Billings
Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Janet Calvert
Tammy Fitch, Vice President
Keith Parks, President, presiding
Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services/Acting General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Thomas Montgomery, Secretary
(vacancy in subdistrict 5)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Parks stated that General Manager Phyllis Loobey was ill that evening. He also thanked Ms. Fitch for chairing the last meeting, when he was on vacation.

Ms. Calvert commented that she had ridden the bus in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and found out the hard way that all bus service stops at 6:30 p.m., when she became stranded at a shopping mall nine miles from downtown.

ADDITIONAL BUSINESS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Public Hearing on Board Subdistrict Redistricting: Mr. Parks stated that the Secretary of State's office had called the District to schedule a public hearing on the redistricting plan for the LTD Board of Directors' subdistricts. Because of the 1990 census, the subdistrict boundaries had to be redrawn slightly. No Board members were impacted by minor shifts in their subdistrict boundaries. Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, had drawn a tentative redistricting plan, and the Secretary of State's office had agreed with it, but still needed to hold a public hearing. The public hearing was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on Friday, October 26, in the LTD Board Room. Board members were invited to attend the hearing.

Oregon Transportation Commission Meeting in Eugene: The Oregon Transportation Commission planned to hold its November meeting in Eugene on November 18 and 19.

Ms. Loobey and the Board President and Vice President (Mr. Parks and Ms. Fitch) had been invited to dinner on November 18. The Commission scheduled a tour of LTD's facilities on November 18. Staff would be planning that tour, which would most likely include the Glenwood facility and the Eugene Station. Ms. Fitch said she would not be able to attend on Monday. Mr. Billings offered to attend in her place.

Mobility International U.S.A. (MIUSA) Award: Mr. Pangborn showed the Board a framed award received from Mobility International U.S.A. for participation in the 1991 U.S./Mexico Leadership Exchange Program. The text of the award, written in English and Spanish, stated that the program "provided international understanding and provided the opportunity for sharing information to improve the lives of persons with disabilities around the world." Mr. Pangborn explained LTD's cooperative relationship with MIUSA. Mr. Billings said his family had participated in the exchange, and a person in a wheelchair had stayed with them. Their visitor, from Guadalajara, had ridden the bus a lot, and was very complimentary about the courtesy of the drivers and the regularity of the buses, and was happy to be able to ride the regular bus system. She had also come to the U.S. in an old wheelchair and, through a grant, had received a lighter and more maneuverable chair, so had appreciated the visit for many reasons.

Mr. Pangborn also commented that much more of LTD's informational material was bilingual this year, explaining necessary ridership information in both English and Spanish.

New Agenda Format: Mr. Pangborn called the Board's attention to the agenda packet, explaining that the agenda notes section had been discontinued, and an agenda item summary sheet instead had been used to provide background information and brief summaries of action and information items in the packet. He asked the Board members to provide feedback to staff about how this format worked for them, or suggestions for ways the packet could be more useful for them.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Parks introduced the August Employee of the Month, Transit Planner Paul Zvonkovic. Paul joined the District in May 1987 and was nominated for this award by fellow employees. He was recognized for his hard work and exceptional organizational skills. When asked what makes Paul a good employee, Planning Administrator Stefano Viggiano said that Paul is a dedicated, hard-working, customer-oriented employee who gets along well with his co-workers, and who is also committed to making LTD the best transit system it can be. Mr. Parks presented Paul's achievement award to him and offered the Board's congratulations. Mr. Zvonkovic thanked the Board, and said he also wanted to thank the rest of the staff for their support, adding that they were a really good crew to work with.

The September Employee of the Month, Parts Clerk Mark Hay, was unable to attend the meeting, but would attend in November.

MOTION **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: Ms. Fitch moved approval of the minutes of the September 18, 1991, regular meeting as distributed. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion, and
VOTE the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE: Mr. Billings first provided a report on the October 10, 1991, MPC meeting, which he had attended as LTD's Board representative. At that meeting, the MPC considered an amendment to the MPC by-laws, which would allow two representatives from LTD. Lane County Commissioner Steve Cornacchia raised the question of LTD's ability to veto any actions of the MPC. Presently, it takes at least one vote from each entity to achieve a majority, so if both members of an entity voted no, that was, in effect, a veto of the action. Since LTD Board members were not publicly elected and their accountability was somewhat different than the elected officials on the MPC, it was decided to exclude LTD's right to veto any actions. The MPC approved these proposed amendments to the by-laws, to allow two LTD representatives who could vote but did not have the right to veto.

Mr. Billings gave the MPC input about how important it was to locate a site for the Eugene Station, and about the Eugene Station Advisory Committee which was being formulated. Mr. Billings also told the Committee that LTD was very pleased that the MPC was recognizing the important link between mass transit and land use planning.

Mr. Parks asked if both LTD representatives needed to attend each meeting. Mr. Billings said that, like any group, they would like to have all members present, and LTD's presence would count toward a quorum. Mr. Viggiano explained that one person from each entity had to be present to have a quorum, and at least one of LTD's representative would need to be present to ensure a quorum on transportation issues. Mr. Billings added that five voting members, including one from each jurisdiction, made up a quorum. He said that what was a transportation issue was completely undefined,and he thought it would be a broader definition that the MPC originally thought.

Mr. Parks asked if anyone wished to serve as LTD's second representative to the MPC. Ms. Calvert said she had discussed this with Mr. Pangborn earlier, and that she would be willing to participate for the time being, with the hope that the additional new Board member, when named, would like to take over this position. She said she felt that she could do this unless another Board member wished to.

MOTION Mr. Brandt moved that Janet Calvert be appointed as LTD's second representative to the Metropolitan Policy committee, beginning immediately and serving at the pleasure of the LTD

VOTE Board of Directors. Mr. Billings seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Parks commented that he had to go to the Eugene City Hall several times last week, and couldn't find a place to park, unless he parked six blocks away in a one-hour space and paid $.75. He said he took the bus after that, and commented that the whole downtown parking issue was "crazy." Parking under City Hall had been converted to employee parking only. Ms. Calvert said the parking problem was interesting, because retail in the downtown area was not that busy.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE: When Mr. Herzberg resigned from the Board due to his move to a different subdistrict, his position on the Board Finance Committee became vacant. Mr. Parks appointed Jack Billings to fill that position. Mr. Pangborn said that staff were hoping to convene the Finance Committee during the last week of October to go over the Long-Range Financial Plan before the November Board Strategic Planning Retreat.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Long-Range Financial Planning: In order to help the Board prepare to make a decision on a change in the payroll tax rate at the November Board meeting, Mr. Pangborn reviewed the issues or goals discussed during last April's discussions about the long-range financial plan. First, the Board created a Payroll Tax Fluctuation Contingency account, or "rainy day fund," to allow the District to respond to variances in payroll tax receipts. The Board was able to create the fund, for the first time in the District's history, because the District ended FY 90-91 with higher revenues than anticipated. Mr. Pangborn stated that the creation of this fund was a fairly significant step in long-range financial planning.

The second goal was to be sure the District addressed its long-term capital needs--buses and the Eugene Station in particular. The District has had a Capital Improvements Program which was folded into the Long-range Financial Plan. Mr. Pangborn said that it appeared that LTD had a good, solid financial plan in order to raise the local share for capital projects. He said it was very positive, and that the District had been able to address its capital needs, shown by the new buses and the Glenwood operating and maintenance facility.

The third area was the District's general financial health, which Mr. Pangborn described as very positive. Following the independent audit for last fiscal year, Finance Administrator Tamara Weaver had presented a performance report, showing contingency funds, reserve funds, and a very strong financial position for the 1990s and the challenges the District will face.

The fourth area concerned flexibility in the payroll tax. During discussions of increasing the payroll tax rate, the Board and Budget Committee expressed a concern or desire to leave a cushion between the payroll tax rate and the maximum rate allowed by law. Mr. Pangborn said this concern would need to be addressed again as the Board discussed setting the payroll tax rate for 1992.

A fifth area discussed last spring was the District's unmet service requests. Mr. Pangborn said that the list of service requests from last spring had actually been expanded upon, and he would discuss service needs in more detail later in the meeting.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff's immediate concern was to provide the Board with enough information to feel comfortable setting a payroll tax rate for next year. In November, the Board would be asked to set the rate for January through December, 1992, a period which overlaps two fiscal years, 1991-92 and 1992-93, and becomes complicated in terms of payroll tax collections. The payroll tax accrues on a quarterly basis. For the months of October through December, it takes the month of January to process, then in February, the money for that previous quarter is received. That quarter would be collected at the current rate, .049 percent. If the Board changed the rate effective January 1, 1992, the next collection would be in May, at the new rate. That would be the only collection at the new rate in the current fiscal year. Payroll taxes at the new rate would be collected during three quarters of Fiscal Year 1992-93, a year which the District had not yet begun budgeting in any detail. A year from this November, the Board would be asked to look at the payroll tax rate again. In effect, setting a payroll tax rate for the next calendar year also sets a budget target for the next fiscal year. The payroll tax was the only revenue for which the District had much flexibility, and once it was set, the rate would continue. Mr. Pangborn said that this was not to say that the predictions made now would hold true during the budget process; the payroll tax base could go up or down.

Mr. Brandt said he thought the District could raise the rate at any time. Mr. Pangborn explained that the Oregon Department of Revenue used to send out quarterly tax announcements. However, paperwork and procedures were revised during the last legislative session. Now the Department of Revenue sends out a unified tax form, with printed tax rates for the next calendar year, at the end of December. The Department of Revenue did not want to leave LTD's tax rate blank and send out separate forms every quarter. If the District did want to change the rate at a particular quarter, LTD would have to pay for mailing the notices to all the businesses, and the Department of Revenue staff thought individual businesses might not get the rate right because of too many forms, leading to more audits, late payments, etc. However, Mr. Pangborn said, if the tax base changed significantly and the Board wanted to change the rate during the calendar year, staff would see if it could be done.

Mr. Pangborn said that the Department of Revenue did not have very much information regarding the collections the District does receive. Staff had asked for additional information when collections did not seem to make sense, but it was difficult to obtain. Ms. Calvert asked how much LTD paid the Department of Revenue for its services. Tamara Weaver, Finance Administrator, replied that LTD paid the Department of Revenue $150,000 to $180,000 per year, which Mr. Pangborn said was not a high rate in terms of $7 million in collections.

Mr. Pangborn said the Board had three main issues to consider in setting the payroll tax rate: what would happen to all other revenues; what would happen to the payroll tax base (the local economy, in terms of wages and salaries); and what would be the appropriate level of service for the District to provide next year (because service determines expenses).

Mr. Pangborn explained that "Other Revenues" accounted for 38 percent of the District's revenues. Staff would discuss this in more detail with the Board at the strategic planning retreat, but were assuming an overall increase of 4.5 or 5 percent in this category next year. That assumed that the federal revenue would not increase; state revenue would stay the same or decrease somewhat due to Ballot Measure 5; and passenger fares and some of the other revenues would increase at a higher rate.

Ms. Weaver said that the District would be using the Long-Range Financial Plan as an ongoing tool to help set the tax rate. In discussing how the economy would impact the payroll tax base, how to balance next year's and the following year's budgets, and how to discuss the trends that are indicated in the out years, she discussed some assumptions for the Board. She used a graph to show that, historically, LTD charged the full .6 percent tax rate allowed for a brief period during the last recession, but lowered it to .005 during 1983. For eight years there has been a cushion between the maximum rate allowed and the actual rate set. This gives the District the ability to move revenues by the rate and not be totally dependent upon the economy. There was a slight dip in revenues when the economy grew but the rate was lowered to .49 percent effective June 30, 1987, where it has remained. The growth in payroll tax revenues during that time was due to economic growth.

Ms. Weaver said that the difficulty in setting the rate revolved around uncertainty concerning this growth. Another graph indicated the changes, year by year, of the economy. During the same 12-year period, the percentage change in the payroll tax base in Lane County had fluctuated rom a -4 percent to a positive 22 percent, with no impact caused by the payroll tax rate. The average change over those years was a positive 7 percent, so if the District had been able to collect the tax evenly, 7 percent would have allowed LTD to operate without service disruption during the 12 years. This year, with the cash reserves, the Board had taken some steps to smooth out the wide annual fluctuation in tax rate collections.

Mr. Billings asked what the percentages were actually measuring. Ms. Weaver explained that staff reviewed the payroll tax base quarter by quarter, and measured how it changed in relation to the same quarter in the prior year.

Ms. Weaver said that staff had decided to review the state economic forecast. After reviewing the indicators used by the state, the indicator that seemed to most closely relate to LTD was the wage and salary change. She had previously been looking at personal income, but wage and salary seemed to follow much more closely, because interests rates drop and personal income rates drop for people on a fixed income, but wage and salary more closely followed LTD's payroll base. During the last several years, LTD was either above or quite close to the state wage and salary change. Last year, LTD dipped to approximately 70 percent of state wage and salary change. For the first two quarters of 1991 (LTD's last two quarters of collection), payroll tax collections had been significantly above the state, but staff believed that to be due more to adjustments in revenues from the Department of Revenue than to the local economy. The Department of Revenue had been seriously understaffed, so had recently added staff, and LTD staff believed that there was currently a better collection effort. The economy itself suggested that LTD's collections should not be above the state indicator. Ms. Weaver stated that Oregon was stronger than the nation, probably due to exports, construction, and the inflow of population, which had strengthened Oregon's service industry. The timber problem had already impacted the tax collections during the last fiscal year.

Ms. Weaver showed actual numbers for the first two quarters of 1991. The state wage and salary change was 4.8 percent over the prior year, and dipped to 3.7 percent in the second quarter. The second quarter was the first time in the recession with a loss in total number of jobs in Oregon. Nevertheless, state economists were predicting that this was the bottom, and the state would be coming out of the recession in the third quarter of 1991, with a modest recovery after that time. Compared with the first two quarters of LTD's collections (5.4 and 6.2 percent), LTD's numbers were very strong but difficult to believe. An audit on the State was performed by the State, and the auditors disagreed with the level of reserves that the Department of Revenue was holding for LTD, so the State had to return the money to LTD. At the time, it seemed to be approximately $30,000 or $40,000. However, in her last conversation with the State, she heard a number as high as $145,000, but had not been able to confirm that amount. LTD received the money, but the audit report did not indicate that large amount.

Since LTD was at 70 percent of the state wage and salary changes last year, Ms. Weaver showed what it would be if it were at 70 percent again, which might exclude discrepancies based on Department of Revenue refunds. At 3.4 percent and 3 percent for the quarters, it would still be better than predicted during the budget process. At that time, staff and the Board were predicting no growth in the payroll tax base, so Lane County seemed to be stronger than anticipated eight or nine months ago.

Ms. Weaver used another graph to show the historical change plus the current predictions of the state over the next several years. The state economists basically were predicting a modest recovery with a slowdown.

Ms. Weaver then used a graph showing staff's best proposal for the number to use for payroll tax base growth during the next few weeks. Staff suggested setting it at 70 percent of what the state predicts. Ms. Weaver said that seemed like a good, conservative budget number to staff, but staff wanted to hear any information or suggestions the Board members may have. If 70 percent of the state rate were used, LTD would be looking at 3.3 percent for this year, instead of being flat, and looking at 4.8, 4.6, and 5.1. Last year, LTD came in at 4.6; the two or three preceding years were very much stronger, but the state did not expect that to maintain. There had been many years that LTD had been in the 4 to 6 percent range, so it appeared to be a reasonable assumption.

Ms. Weaver suggested that the Board Finance Committee review this information, and possibly make other suggestions for staff to pursue. Mr. Brandt asked if the projected state wages were for the whole state. Ms. Weaver said that they were, and that Portland largely drives the figures. During the last several years, LTD was surprisingly close to the state wage and salary changes. Looking at these figures on a year-by-year basis tended to smooth out some of the quarterly collection difficulties. Last year was the first year that there was a relatively serious difference between the state wage percentage change and Lane County.

Mr. Billings commented that the writer or writers of the staff report, "Board Decision on Payroll Tax Rate," did a nice job, and that it was very helpful and easy to understand. He said he gathered from Mr. Pangborn's presentation that the actual collections for the third quarter of 1991 were received about the end of November. Mr. Pangborn said the District would actually begin collecting the next quarterly payment at the end of October and the first of November, and hoped that by the November 20 Board meeting they would have a pretty good idea of what the third quarter looked like. However, that information would not be available by the strategic planning retreat.

Mr. Pangborn said that the final issue for discussion was one of service growth or expansion. Staff were proposing that the Board needed to consider a much more aggressive stand on service growth, and planned to discuss this further at the November 2 strategic planning session.

Mr. Pangborn used overhead projections to show the percent change in service hours since 1979-80. The recession in the early 1980s caused service cuts for three consecutive years. In 1982-83, the District provided 182,000 hours of service. Service increases since then had amounted to a total of 23 percent, and LTD would provide 225,000 hours of service in the current fiscal year. Service increases had averaged 2.7 percent per year.

Mr. Pangborn asked the Board to consider that information in conjunction with a second chart showing overall increases in ridership, which had shown almost 60 percent growth. The District in 1991-92 was carrying a lot more people without a lot more service hours, which made the system much more productive. However, buses were currently experiencing problems with running time and capacity, which was most apparent during the budget process last year. At the beginning of the budget process, staff had anticipated that LTD would be able to meet service needs amounting to more than $450,000. However, because of the slow-down in the economy, this amount was cut back twice, first to $324,800, then to $150,000, of which $87,000 was to fund Dial-A-Ride changes required by the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This process left a lot of service needs unmet. In addition, staff had another list of service requests which they knew the District would not be able to address. Mr. Pangborn said staff had a sense that a lot of demand for service had built up over the last couple of years, which the District had not been able to meet.

Mr. Pangborn discussed other areas that impact service needs. The Americans with Disabilities Act would require 1991-92 spending of about $200,000 in local money, in addition to the amount contributed by the State through the Special Transportation Fund from a two-cent cigarette tax. Staff were studying the ADA requirements, and expected that the District would have to add about $470,000 in current dollars in the next five years. Staff researched similar-sized cities which used Dial-A-Ride instead of fixed-route service, and determined that LTD's Dial-A-Ride requirements would be somewhat less than in other areas, based on the District's fixed-route accessible service ridership. The five-year total would equal about a 6.7 percent increase in service, or 1.3 percent per year, in order to meet the new requirements.

Mr. Pangborn stated that if additional funding to meet the ADA requirements became available, it would most likely be available through the State. Staff were beginning to research that possibility.

The final issue impacting service was the requirement to implement the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) Transportation Rule/Goal 12. Because of this requirement, the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) had been expanded to include two LTD Board representatives as voting members. Staff expected that there would be a fundamental change in the linkage between transportation and land use planning. Mr. Pangborn and Mr. Viggiano had attended a meeting of the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County to discuss what to do to begin to implement the LCDC Rule 12. Board member Tammy Fitch was representing LTD as a member of the Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) citizens' advisory committee. In the next 10 to 20 years, the local area would be required to provide a lot more alternatives to driving cars.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff were not certain how the state Clean Air Act would affect LTD. Tri-Met in Portland would have a very strong mandate for change, however.

As a result of these issues, Mr. Pangborn stated, staff believed that LTD would have to be much more aggressive in terms of service additions for the community in the next few years. The first step in this was the staff's plan to complete a Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR), which had last been done 11 years ago, and would take a lot of staff time in the current year. The purpose of the CSR was to determine how to make the current system more effective and efficient. Current service would be reviewed, as well as input from riders, bus operators, and the community. The District also was receiving good input from the Cities and the County. Following the CSR was a good time to add service, so that the most current information would enable the different parts of the system to fit together well.

Last year, the Long-Range Financial Plan had projected a 3 percent service growth for FY 92-93 and 2 percent in subsequent years, which is actually less than the average ridership growth during the past five years. Staff were proposing to the Board that this amount be increased to 5 percent for the first year, and 4 percent in subsequent years.

Mr. Brandt asked how the increase in service would solve the ADA problem. Mr. Pangborn said the recommended increase was a collective increase, with possibly 4 percent going to fixed-route service and 2 percent to Dial-A-Ride. Mr. Brandt stated that $460,000 was not a big percent of the District's revenue. Mr. Pangborn said it would amount to about a 6 percent service increase spread over five years. Mr. Brandt thought that in subsequent years the 1.3 percent to meet ADA regulations should be separated from the 2.7 percent recommended for fixed-route service increases. Mr. Pangborn added that the 2.7 percent fixed-route increase would be the same as the average increase for the past eight years, not including Dial-A-Ride service.

In response to a question from Ms. Calvert, Mr. Pangborn explained that the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG) population growth figure was 2.2 percent, and staff believed that the District at least needed to keep up with population growth. During the eight-year period when LTD ridership grew 55 percent, the community's population grew only 4 percent. More people were riding the bus, but more people were also driving their cars.

Mr. Billings commented about the long stretch of buses at the current Eugene Station, and stated that how the District would add service was the central question to the downtown station. He said it had been mentioned at the last MPC meeting that Willamette Street should be opened to buses, but that suggestion died a quick death.

Mr. Pangborn said there were two other pieces to consider in meeting service requests. First was the Capital Improvements Program. During the next six years, the District would need to budget $14 million for replacement buses. LTD's 20 percent of this figure would be $2.8 million. Of $8.5 million for the Eugene Station, LTD's 20 percent would be $1.7 million. The federal funding had been written into the federal appropriations bill over a three-year period, so there was already a federal commitment for funding. The District also needed to plan for miscellaneous service vehicles and passenger boarding improvements.

When adding service, there would also be support needs, such as bus cleaners, mechanics, supervisors, and bus operators. Those support services had to be planned in the budget.

Mr. Pangborn explained that the next steps would be to discuss the payroll tax rate at the strategic planning work session on November 2, including estimates of the payroll tax base increase and estimated service expansion targets. From that discussion, staff would develop a payroll tax ordinance for calendar year 1992, to be read at the November 20 Board meeting and approved in December.

Mr. Brandt asked how additional service requests related to capacity problems on certain routes or buses, and said he wasn't yet convinced that the District needed that additional service. Ms. Fitch said she also would like to know how much service had been added for additional group pass programs versus regular system growth.

Eugene Station Security: Andy Vobora, Customer Service Administrator, discussed a number of problems with the current Eugene Station, which the District would be using for at least the next several years. First, there were a number of groups loitering downtown, for hours at a time. They were often loud, rude, or obscene; blocked the walkways; and intimidated passersby. The District also had concerns about the physical aspect of the facility, due to additional numbers of people using the station. The City previously had provided more services, such as street washing, etc., but they had pulled back from that level of maintenance. The facility was deteriorating more rapidly, and there was more vandalism and garbage. Bikes and skateboards were also a problem through the Eugene Station. Mr. Vobora said that developmentally disabled people were hanging out on the mall after work, and were mimicking other kids who were hanging out there.

LTD had formed a committee to work on these security issues, called the "Take Back Our Mall" committee. Some of the suggestions from the committee were to continue funding for the Eugene Guides program, which had been well-received by customers, and probably would be appreciated even more when darkness came earlier during the winter; to ascertain the District's legal authority in dealing with certain situations; to review the design and layout of the current station, and possibly move a section as a result of the CSR; and to look at the physical amenities, to see if they can be made more vandal-proof and more comfortable for customers.

Mr. Vobora said it was the District's obligation to provide a safe and comfortable place for its customers to transfer, especially since the system required many of them to transfer in order to reach their destinations. There had been some loss of potential customers who did not want to go through the Eugene Station, and staff wanted to reduce that loss. Staff also wanted to show the community that LTD could take care of its facility, but that the current station did not meet the District's needs.

Mr. Vobora said that staff would return to the Board with a time line and plan for the Eugene Station security program. Mr. Parks asked about the District's legal authority. Mr. Vobora replied that if the station were designated a special use area, the District might be able to ticket people for excessive loitering. There was some precedent for that at Tri-Met in Portland, where they worked with local authorities. Mr. Pangborn added that Tri-Met had enacted ordinances and had its own staff to enforce those ordinances, but the police also enforced the ordinances because they wanted to keep people moving and not loitering. Mr. Parks wondered if this would just move the groups and the problems around in the downtown area. Mr. Vobora said staff were working with other local groups in an effort to address the problems, or some of the problems would move with LTD to the new station.

1992 Board/Staff Activities Time Line: Mr. Pangborn called the Board's attention to the time line in the agenda packet, which gave an idea of the activities expected to occur in 1992.

Acting General Manager: Mr. Pangborn stated that if Ms. Loobey was well enough to take her planned trip to California the following week, he would be Acting General Manager.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Brandt moved that the meeting be adjourned. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned.

Board Secretary