

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, December 18, 1991

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 12, 1991, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a work session and regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, December 18, 1991, at 6:30 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, presiding  
Patricia Hocken  
Thomas Montgomery  
Keith Parks, President  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Parks called the work session to order at 6:40 p.m. He welcomed Ms. Hocken to her first meeting as a member of the LTD Board of Directors.

**WORK SESSION - EUGENE STATION PROGRAMMING:** Planning Administrator Stefano Viggiano first reviewed the design guidelines for the Eugene Station as discussed by the Eugene Station Advisory Committee. These guidelines were included in the December 18, 1991, agenda packet. Life-cycle costing was also discussed. Mr. Montgomery asked how it was possible to design something flexible enough to accommodate buses and possible future light rail. Mr. Viggiano replied that it would be difficult, but the District would need to try to determine how light rail would work with the transit station. For instance, light rail would probably be on the street, so the station could be designed with a platform that could be retrofitted to accommodate street access in the future. In general, he said, the more space the station has, the more flexibility the District will have in the future to make changes necessary to fit all the appropriate functions fit in the station.

Gerry Gaydos, Chairman of the Eugene Station Advisory Committee, was present to discuss the Advisory Committee's recommendations. He listed the members of the Advisory Committee and the organizations they represented (Mike Schwartz/Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce; Jesse Maine/Springfield Area Chamber of Commerce; Debra Ehrman/Eugene City Council; Jonathan Stafford; Eugene Downtown Commission; Dave Kleger/at-large position; Jef Faw/at-large position representing Lane County; and Mr. Gaydos, representing the Eugene Planning Commission). Mr. Gaydos stressed that the Advisory Committee, in recommending a multiple-use concept, was not suggesting the development of air rights over the facility.

Rather, multiple use could be something as minimal as ensuring that there are services for people using the bus, or possibly parking, or possibly some retail development.

Mr. Viggiano called the Board's attention to programming issues listed on page 5 of the agenda packet. He said staff were seeking the Board's direction on some of those key issues, and asked if there were any additional programming issues the Board wished to discuss. He used overhead projections to show what staff envisioned would be included on the site, divided into two areas: the Customer Service Center (CSC) and the passenger platforms. Included in the CSC would be a sales counter, restrooms, telephone information stations, etc., in about 7,000 to 8,000 square feet, which could be one story or two. A two-story building would require an elevator.

Staff envisioned the passenger platform as including cover or shelter for passengers, paving, passenger information displays, off-site improvements, and passenger amenities. The "look and feel" of the station had been discussed by the Advisory Committee. Mr. Gaydos said that the Advisory Committee saw any of the three sites as a "gateway" to Eugene. For instance, the I-HOP site would provide a transition area from the urban core to the University of Oregon; the Elections site would provide a transition from the urban core to the 5th Street area; and the Pasta Plus site would provide a transition from the urban core to residential and Sacred Heart Hospital areas. The Advisory Committee thought that this entrance or transition concept was important to consider, so that setting a standard for the area may be more appropriate than merely being compatible with the surrounding development.

Mr. Gaydos said that the Advisory Committee had also expressed concerns about noise, the smell of diesel fuel, and diesel smoke at the station. They suggested a high level of lighting, partially because there was a perception that the current station was unsafe. They also suggested a "livelier" station designed for high turnover, to make sure people could be moved through the station without significant problems. The Advisory Committee also believed that, if the platform areas were not covered, the District might have problems with snow and ice in the transition areas between shelters or cover.

The Advisory Committee also recommended that the station and the streetscape be pedestrian friendly, with smooth floor surfaces for the disabled and elderly. Good visibility between the CSC and boarding areas was considered important for safety, accessibility, and ease of use.

The Advisory Committee had recommended that commercial activity be accommodated on the site so the station would not be a block by itself outside the community. However, the District should make sure that any commercial activity worked well on the site, in order to meet transit's needs first. The Committee envisioned unified, compatible development, in which LTD did not subsidize business.

Mr. Gaydos also expressed the Advisory Committee's opinion that the station should create a link to the core of downtown, and that the City of Eugene and LTD should work together toward site-specific off-site improvements to meet the City's goals and to provide the transition discussed earlier. That is, the sidewalk area outside the station should be considered a part of the station and not abandoned.

In discussing whether public restrooms should be provided at the Eugene Station, the Advisory Committee realized that this was a difficult question because of the capital and operating costs involved, but believed that public restrooms should be included. The District brings people from a long distance, and should recognize the need for public restrooms. The major argument against restrooms would be cost and safety, but the Advisory Committee believed that there were some things that could be done to minimize the perception that they were not safe. Mr. Billings asked if the Advisory Committee envisioned that the public restrooms would be inside or separate from the CSC. Mr. Gaydos said the Committee members had discussed that question, but had made no recommendation. The major concern was that the restrooms be visible. If the CSC were heated, it might make sense to include the restrooms as part of the CSC.

The Advisory Committee had also discussed the need to provide a climate-controlled waiting area, and unanimously agreed that there should be one; that there was a need to go beyond having a heated space for employees only. The Committee recommended a climate-controlled space at least the size of the current CSC waiting area, which had about 30 chairs. However, if the station had a boarding area that was entirely covered, the climate-controlled waiting area may be smaller. On the other hand, during snowy and icy weather when buses do not run on time, there may be a need for more warm waiting space. This waiting area should be comfortable, but not so comfortable that people stay for a long time. One of the Advisory Committee members, Dave Kleger, had pointed out that there was a greater number of senior citizens, who might not adjust to the weather conditions as well as younger people. There was also a perception of well-heated buses, and the need to keep the same level of comfort in a heated Customer Service Center. There was some discussion about radiant heaters outdoors, but the Advisory Committee had thought that an indoor heated area would be more appropriate.

Mr. Viggiano explained four options in providing shelters at the CSC: no shelter, small shelters at various locations around the platform, as at the current station; a cover over the entire exterior portion, or boundary, of the platform; or a cover over the entire platform. Mr. Gaydos said that the type of shelter would make a difference in the look and feel of the shelter; for instance, the airiness or light levels at the station. The Advisory Committee had thought it would be nice to have the entire platform area covered, to encourage the perception of riders that they can be comfortable throughout their entire trip. In addition to the perception standpoint, a cover was important to protect the sidewalk from becoming icy. The Committee had discussed the idea that weather protection seems to be more important for short trips outside, as in going from one bus to another, than for longer outdoor trips where a person expects to get wet. It was the Committee's belief that the more cover, the happier the transit users would be.

Mr. Viggiano asked the Board to discuss these same questions, in light of the Eugene Station Advisory Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Parks asked if the cost estimate was still \$12 million. Mr. Viggiano said that the estimate for the Elections site was \$10.6 million, including purchase. Construction costs were estimated to be about \$7 million. Mr. Parks asked if there would be any way to design the station in steps of development or improvement. Mr. Viggiano said that staff had discussed

constructing the southern platform in the Elections site design at a later date. However, at the I-HOP and Pasta Plus sites, staff hoped that there would be just one platform, so phasing in development might be more difficult. Mr. Parks was concerned that the District was committing to this area for the next 20 years. Mr. Viggiano said staff believed the site would accommodate the station for 20 years with 26 bus bays.

Ms. Calvert asked why a coin counter was needed at the CSC if there was already one at the Glenwood facility. Mr. Viggiano explained that the CSC would not be designed for a coin counter for passenger revenue, but would include an area for CSC staff to count the money in their own sales drawers. Ms. Calvert said she hoped staff were considering "pigeon control" to reduce the nesting of the birds. She thought public restrooms or other amenities were important, but they were some of the amenities which the City had originally installed and later removed because of problems. She said she didn't feel that LTD should provide amenities that the City did not provide because they did not wish to or because they had problems with those amenities. She agreed that the restrooms were needed, but thought there should be some cooperation and realization that LTD was providing amenities that the City should also have.

Mr. Montgomery said he thought the District should provide public restrooms, but they did not need to be plush. They should be easy to maintain and repair and monitor, so might need to be inside the CSC. He said that anyone who traveled with children would agree that public restrooms were needed. Also, if baby changing areas were provided, they should be provided in the men's restroom as well as in the women's. Mr. Montgomery thought that perhaps covered passenger shelters were more important than a large indoor waiting area, but he wasn't sure he agreed that it should be a large covered area. He thought that perhaps the perimeter could be covered, with one cover going from one side to another. He said that the walking area also did not need to be terribly plush; people should be able to walk and push strollers or use wheelchairs without loose brick, etc. He said he was a firm believer in things that were built to last and easy to maintain. He also said that his initial reaction to commercial activity on the site was that he did not care for it, but he had not given it enough thought yet. He stated he would not spend a dime on a clock tower.

Mr. Brandt said he thought that, generally, the Advisory Committee had good ideas, but his vision of what they had in mind was that it would be similar to a destination resort, and that people would think it was such a wonderful place that they would want to spend time at the station. However, he said, the District caters mostly to people who want to get where they are going as fast as they can. He thought the ideas for the station were too grandiose, and that the facility should be designed with the least amount of cost and the most efficient to provide transportation, not as a meeting place. He thought that providing public restrooms would be a problem, and that maybe they would not be used that much for the masses of people the District serves, but maybe the District had to provide them. He said that mixed use would not work, because it would bring in other people. His vision of the station was that it should be as clean and nice as it could be, but not a beautiful place. It should be efficient, effective, as cheap as possible, and not a landmark. He envisioned having a piece of ground the District could control; a place where buses could pull in and pick up their passengers, and then leave. He thought the station should provide the least amount of covered space possible while still providing comfortable transfers for passengers. He did not want to create a place for people

to come to be comfortable, because that was not the purpose of the station. He said his view of the station was quite different from the Advisory Committee's, and that building the Committee's vision would be nice, but would be creating something that was not LTD's job.

Mr. Montgomery said he thought the District had to provide public restrooms, but they did not have to be "grand," and he thought they should be somewhere where they could be relatively stringently controlled. Other than that, he said, he didn't know that the District needed to go beyond the outside covers and efficient use of space for buses and having inside what is needed in order to conduct business.

Mr. Brandt thought that the cost of maintenance and future costs to LTD for those additional kinds of things would be significant. He thought that not many people paying the payroll tax would be willing to provide public restrooms for downtown Eugene, and said that excessive costs for maintaining public restrooms should be factored in.

Ms. Fitch said she would rather look at life-cycle costing than at the lowest costs, and build the facility to last 20 years. She said it may not be vital that the facility look nice or be a landmark, but thought some low-maintenance shrubs, etc., should be included. However, commercial activity was not a necessity. She thought that the off-site improvements were the City's responsibility, and this would be a good place for the City to work with LTD. She believed that public restrooms were a necessity, but they could be minimal and built for low maintenance, and designed so people would not be lounging in them. As far as climate control went, she said that if you live in Oregon, you live with the environment. She did not think the entire platform needed to be covered. Ms. Fitch said she thought the District needed to work with the City, and mentioned that some parking would be returned to the City when the current station was vacated.

In response to a question from Mr. Brandt, Ms. Loobey said there would be a parking issue with every site. Mr. Brandt said the station should not be built if the City could not abate the parking requirements. Ms. Loobey explained that the problem was not parking for LTD's vehicles; rather, the problem was to replace or pay damages for any parking the station displaced. For instance, by taking away the First Baptist Church's 95 privately-owned parking spaces, the District would damage the church's property.

Ms. Calvert said she believed there should be some climate-controlled customer area. Ms. Fitch said it did not have to be large, but she agreed there should be a place for people to get out of the weather. Ms. Loobey suggested room for 50 chairs, and Ms. Fitch said it could be 30 chairs plus standing room and room for wheelchairs.

In discussing the need to build to last, Mr. Brandt commented that railway stations had all closed down because technology has changed. He said that no one would be capable of predicting what will happen with transit in the next 20 years, and he could see the transit station closing in ten years because it is inadequate to the District's needs. He thought the District would have to recognize that it hoped the station would last, and not build it with "chintzy" materials, but with the concept that the District might want to add to it or change it in some way to make the site last longer. However, he thought it was too long-term to design it to have buses there 20 years from now. Mr. Montgomery commented that if you build

something to last for 20 years, you are usually forced to use it for 30. Even if the station became obsolete, he said, it would have to function for 10 to 20 years and beyond. However, Mr. Brandt thought light rail might change that.

Mr. Billings said that cheapest was not necessarily the best, but neither was the most expensive. He was in agreement with Ms. Fitch and others that even though there was no guarantee that the facility would work the same way in the future, if it were built with a 20-year life in mind and the District made good choices, it would work that way. If it were only built for 10 years, that was how it would work. Mr. Billings said his vision of the station included a heated area for 30 to 50 chairs, and institutional-model restrooms (stainless steel) which could be washed out with an industrial strength hose. He said that for the number of people who would be traveling through the station in 10 or 20 years, the District needed to provide restrooms, but they did not need to be "palatial." He said he did not favor radiant heaters, because they were not efficient, and he did not think the entire platform needed to be covered. He was also not enthusiastic about mixed-use, because LTD would have to be a landlord, and would have to decide who or what would be on the property. Mixed-use development could also attract some of the people the District was trying to exclude, and food service would mean more trash. Mr. Billings said he did not know how much money the District was obligated to spend on art, but he was not interested in spending a lot, and a clock tower was not something he had to see in the design. He suggested that a clean, well-lit, well-maintained station might be a landmark in itself; if it were created nicely enough, it might be considered a landmark due to its appearance and use. He said he also was not interested in concrete pavers, since they usually had problems with moss; textured concrete would be fine with him.

Ms. Hocken thought that the quality of construction should make the station last at least 20 years, but the station did not have to be fancy. She commented that the Hult Center had put money inside the structure rather than outside. She thought the station should be attractive but not necessarily a downtown landmark. She did not want concrete pavers; other kinds of pavement made more sense. Ms. Hocken thought that commercial activity was not necessary and could be a problem. She liked the idea that the District's obligation did not extend to the edge of the site, and thought the City should provide low-maintenance shrubbery. She suggested that, if maintaining public restrooms became an insurmountable problem, they could be locked later. She hadn't thought about outside seating areas until that evening, but sort of liked the idea. She supported covering the entire platform, to avoid problems with ice, and because she thought people would wait outside if they were covered, so the CSC would not need to be as big inside. She did not consider radiant heating outside to be very effective. She also thought the cover might be one way to introduce something artistic and nice and to give the image of a transit station, rather than building a clock tower. She liked the idea of glass or something to let the light in, which would give the station a more attractive appearance.

Ms. Calvert thought there could be some things in the design which would create a pleasant atmosphere, so it was not a concrete fortress. Even a textured surface would make the station look less institutional, or tile could be incorporated to break the sameness of a wall. She stated also that interesting things could be done with outside public art, and a small investment could make the design of the station more pleasant.

Mr. Parks said he did not think the station should be designed for 20 years, other than having adequate property to add facilities if needed, and shelters should be added as the District went along. Even with total platform coverage, ice and slipping would still be problem at the entrance to the buses, etc., and it was hard to become liability-proof. He said he would like to see a design which accommodated the basic design of the station, or basically a transfer station, where people did not loiter. He said the operating design was important, and he thought the plans should be put out on a punch list, so the Board could work on the list as it went along. He said there were some basic issues which the District would need to face on any site, and the District was not an entity alone unto itself. The parking issue would need to be resolved; if not, the District could spend years in court. He said LTD should be realistic and take care of what it impacted. The problem was that all downtown sites had the same problems, but LTD would be cooperating with others downtown, and he hoped those others would cooperate with LTD. He asked that the staff and architect list the issues with a price tag, so the Board could consider them carefully.

Ms. Hocken asked how many people have to wait 15 minutes to transfer. Mr. Viggiano said he would guess that the majority of riders transfer right away, because every major destination is served at each pulse, even though every route is not. Some of the outlying areas are served every half-hour to hour, but the riders learn to time their rides into the station with a transfer time in mind. He said it could be as many as 80 percent who transfer without a significant wait. About half of the people boarding downtown come from somewhere downtown, so they may get there early to be sure they get on their buses. Mr. Parks said that if passengers could transfer within short distances, it would speed things up. Currently, they sometimes had to run because they had a long way to go.

Ms. Calvert asked about excess property on the I-HOP site where a compromise about parking could be made. Mr. Viggiano replied that this was true in the design for the Elections site, but the I-HOP site was only about 80 percent of a block, so he thought the District would need the entire area. However, the Pasta Plus site might include land that the District did not need.

Mr. Gaydos said he had tried not to mislead the Board in his summary of Advisory Committee discussions. He stated that the landmark concept meant that the location would make the station a landmark; it would not necessarily have to be built to be a landmark. If the station is built to move buses and people in and out, but still with the concept that the community cares about transit and LTD cares about itself, it will be a landmark. No one was suggesting that the District build a "Taj Mahal"; rather, the Advisory Committee believed the station should be designed to be easy to clean and care for.

Mr. Gaydos said that the Board seemed to be thinking about the station as a building, but it was not a building; it was a site. He asked the Board if they wanted fortress walls around the site, or landscaping to separate the sites, etc. He said the Committee did not deal with that aspect, just with the intent to build a pedestrian-friendly facility. The restrooms, he said, should be included in recognition of how people live today, but did not need to be plush. At the I-HOP site, where people would look onto Franklin and East Broadway, there could be a barrier along the street, or something else to recognize that it was not just a blank wall. Mr. Gaydos said that the station would be a landmark, and the Board should be sure to think

about that. He mentioned the turnaround by the Nordstrom store in Portland, which was an attractive and functional landmark which said that the community cared about transit, without a significant expense. He said that these were "look and feel" issues, and a good design could make small spaces look big or rough edges look smooth. Mr. Gaydos said there was no Committee recommendation that LTD should pay for off-street improvements, but the Committee did think these improvements should be considered.

Mr. Parks thanked Mr. Gaydos for his participation on the Advisory Committee and his input at the Board meeting. Mr. Parks said that probably none of the Advisory Committee's suggestions were suggestions the Board would not have listed, but the Board might be reacting the way it was because of the estimated cost of the station on the Elections site.

Ms. Calvert asked Mr. Gaydos to express the Board's thanks to the Advisory Committee for all the work they and Mr. Gaydos had done. Mr. Gaydos left at this point in the meeting.

Mr. Brandt said he was concerned that the District was getting the cart before the horse. He thought the cost of the site needed to be determined before trying to determine how much the facility would cost. Mr. Viggiano explained that staff were trying to have a construction cost estimate for each site while working on land acquisition costs, in order to give the Board an estimated total project cost for each site. He said that Architect Eric Gunderson would apply a standard square footage cost based on the amenities the District wanted to include. The actual design and specific costs were not being done at that point. Mr. Brandt said he did not want to spend too much money before he knew the property costs, the problems with the site, and the community's reaction. Mr. Viggiano said the cost for the architect's work on this element, in addition to acquisitions costs was somewhere between \$1,000 and \$10,000, but was closer to \$1,000.

Ms. Hocken asked what factors about the site controlled the costs. It was explained that what was underground, such as soil conditions and old service station storage tanks, could make a difference. Ms. Hocken asked if it were possible to obtain cost estimates for covering the entire platform or only part of the platform. Mr. Viggiano said it was a square-footage cost, so doubling the area would also double the cost.

The Board took a ten-minute break at this point in the meeting.

Mr. Viggiano said he would like to respond more specifically to questions about shelter costs. He explained that a shelter with a wood frame and metal roof would cost \$35 per square foot; a steel frame with metal roof would cost \$55 per square foot; and a steel frame with glazed roof would cost \$90 per square foot. For a 30,000 square foot cover, the low-end cost would be \$1 million, and the high-end cost would be \$2.7 million. To cover the perimeter of the platform would cost about two-thirds those amounts, because making the cover too narrow would allow the rain to come in under the shelter. He said that the shelter at the Elections site was designed to be 40 feet wide, which covered the front door of the bus.

Ms. Fitch asked about the shelters at the current Eugene Station. Mr. Viggiano replied that they were 30 feet by 10 feet, or 300 square feet. They were glazed on top, with concrete columns. The original cost for these shelters also included costs for backlit graphics, which



would not be included in the costs for new shelters. Ms. Fitch wondered if individual shelters could be phased in. Ms. Loobey stated that with the number of people using the station, wheelchairs, and the extension of the lifts from the buses, small shelters obstructed the walkway and affected the efficiency of moving people through the station, so the District may not want to have small shelters. She said it would depend on the station design and how the buses pulled in to the boarding areas. Ms. Calvert stated that phasing in construction later would cost twice as much later.

Ms. Fitch wondered if staff and the architect had looked at other northwest facilities. Ms. Loobey said that staff had contacted a number of properties with downtown station across the county to find out the average cost per bus bay. Mr. Viggiano added that this information showed that the cost per bay for the Elections site design was about average. Ms. Fitch was wondering, however, about cities comparable to Eugene in size, with similar weather conditions. Mr. Viggiano said that most new stations had shelters that covered the entire length of the boarding area (or perimeter of the passenger platform), even in better climates.

Mr. Viggiano then summarized what he had heard from the Board members in specific categories: (1) Look and "feel" of the station--use life-cycle costing; high quality materials are important but not beyond that, such as no concrete pavers; and quality is important as long as it is functional. (2) Downtown landmark--don't use a landmark as a feature; the station itself may be a landmark, so don't go beyond a quality station. (3) Commercial activity--a resounding "no" from the Board (but the Advisory Committee had also suggested having space for food carts, and the Board had not discussed that). Mr. Billings said there should not be structures for food vendors, and Mr. Brandt mentioned that food and drinks were not allowed on the buses. Ms. Loobey suggested that there could be newsstands or boxes. Mr. Viggiano said food carts were located on the platform at the University Station, and catered to people as they got off the buses. (4) Off-site improvements--no support for LTD to do this alone, but there was support for the City to participate with LTD. (5) Restrooms--yes, but utilitarian, easy to maintain, and functional. (6) Climate-controlled waiting area--yes, but not too big. Ms. Calvert asked about options other than climate-controlled waiting areas. Mr. Viggiano said the District could provide a counter with space in front of it for a line, without a waiting area. Mr. Brandt said the District could even have staff indoors and customers lining up outdoors, like the University of Oregon ticket windows. Ms. Hocken suggested that an indoor waiting area did not have to be heated above about 50 degrees, because bus riders would have their coats on, as long as the staff area could be heated adequately. Mr. Brandt said he guessed a waiting area for up to 50 people was fine, since there was currently a waiting area for 30, and some people probably need that kind of area. Ms. Loobey thought that seniors, children, and babies probably needed an inside waiting area. (7) Extensive shelters--cover the perimeter. Mr. Viggiano said he thought the Advisory Committee had actually recommended covering the perimeter, also. Ms. Hocken suggested that the covered area might not have to extend to the buses themselves. Mr. Viggiano explained that the Advisory Committee members said that even though people in Oregon have to be outside in the rain a lot, for short trips it was more important to not have to get out an umbrella, etc., than it was for longer walks. They thought that for a positive perception of the station, it was important for customers to feel protected. Ms. Fitch asked about covering only the middle of the platform. Mr. Viggiano said that was an option, but that might not cover people going from one bus to another.

Ms. Calvert said that freezing and thawing were a problem, but the cheapest way to handle the problem was to get a crew to shovel the ice. Mr. Viggiano said that a heated platform was not being recommended, but that covering the platform was. Ms. Loobey stated that even the small amount of snow and ice the area receives had been a problem in a past, because the bus steps get clogged with snow and ice from people's shoes. Because snow and ice conditions create busy times for Transportation and Maintenance, Administrative staff had been dispatched to the mall to scrape snow and ice off the bus steps. Although it does not happen a lot, it creates a safety problem when it does happen. Ms. Fitch added that ridership goes up during snow and ice conditions, and there are a lot of people who are not used to riding the bus at that time.

Mr. Viggiano said he assumed from the discussion that the Board preferred to consider medium-cost shelters around the perimeter of the site, and the Board responded affirmatively.

Mr. Viggiano said that since the Board had not yet discussed parking issues, and staff would have more information about that in January, this topic should be held until the next work session in January.

Mr. Parks asked if the District would get any credit for giving back parking along 10th Avenue. Mr. Viggiano replied that the City had a code requirement that parking must be within 400 feet. Ms. Calvert said that the City and LTD needed to have a conversation about the City Code. She said she did not want to build a station under the current City Code, and be told that the City "would work with LTD." She thought the District should be telling the City exactly what it needed. Mr. Viggiano explained that staff were currently working with the City and that the code might change as part of the Commercial Lands Study. Mr. Brandt asked if that study would be a ten-year process. Allen Lowe, of the City Planning staff, said that the study was moving toward the City Council and the development of an implementation package, which might take 12 to 18 months.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the First Baptist Church and the Register-Guard believed they needed a certain amount of parking to make their buildings work, and they would argue that the District had damaged their property even if the parking lost were not code-required. Ms. Calvert thought the District might be able to accommodate weekend parking in a creative way. Mr. Viggiano told the Board that it was staff's intent to begin discussions with the Baptist church about parking issues.

**REGULAR SESSION:** Mr. Parks called the meeting into regular session at 8:40 p.m.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Martin Lewis said he liked the recommendations from the Advisory Committee, and for the most part how the Board dealt with the Committee's recommendations. He said it was important to keep in mind the LCDC Rule 12, which required reduced parking and increased transit use. He thought that a nice facility, or landmark, would go a long way toward achieving that goal. He thought that public restrooms were vital and could be designed so they were not a problem. He also asked that there be adequate bicycle parking for bus riders.

**MOTION**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Ms. Fitch moved that the minutes of the November 20, 1991, regular meeting be approved as distributed. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, and  
**VOTE**            the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

**RESOLUTION TO ADOPT UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS DEFERRED COMPENSATION PROGRAM (also known as PEBSCO):** Ms. Loobey said staff were asking the Board to authorize her to sign a contract for a second deferred compensation program for employees. Mr. Brandt asked about the Board's liability for approving an investment device that may prove to be faulty in the future. He thought the trustees should approve the carrier and the Board should not be involved. Ms. Loobey said that the deferred compensation program trustees did not operate in the same way as the pension plan trustees. Pension trustees monitor the performance of the investment portfolios; advise and communicate with employees regarding investment portfolios; and act as a board regarding partial withdrawal of retirement funds. The PEBSCO representatives would not come to the trustees for investments; rather, individual employees decide how they want their funds to be invested. Mr. Brandt said he did not think the Board should vote on this issue; the employees could select whatever vehicle they want for their money. Even though this was how the first carrier was approved, Mr. Brandt thought staff should check with legal counsel, to determine why the Board needed to approve a specific investment vehicle. He was concerned that the Board might be determining an action regarding an entity it had nothing to do with.

Ms. Hocken said it would be interesting to see what the contract said--it might only say that the District will deduct payroll money for the employees' investments. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, said staff would ask the attorneys whether state law requires the Board to authorize a specific contract or just general program approval. He said that one of the reasons staff wanted to offer a second alternative was to lessen the District's liability. Having one plan implies to employees that it is exclusive, but two plans gives them choices. Mr. Brandt said the Board should not be involved if there was a liability issue.

**MOTION**      Ms. Fitch moved that this issue be tabled. Mr. Billings seconded the motion, and the  
**TO**              question of adopting a resolution to adopt a second deferred compensation carrier was tabled.  
**TABLE**        Mr. Parks asked staff to find out what was in the contract.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS:** **Treasurer:** Mr. Brandt said he would be happy to remain as treasurer, but did not want to hold any other office. Mr. Billings nominated Mr. Brandt for a two-year term as LTD Board Treasurer. Ms. Fitch called for a unanimous vote. The motion was seconded, and Mr. Brandt was elected by unanimous vote. **Secretary:** Mr. Brandt nominated Mr. Montgomery to continue as Board Secretary. Ms. Calvert seconded and moved a unanimous ballot, and Mr. Montgomery was unanimously elected. **Vice President:** Mr. Billings nominated Ms. Fitch to continue as Vice President. Mr. Brandt seconded. Mr. Billings moved a unanimous ballot; Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, and Ms. Fitch was elected Vice President by unanimous vote. **President:** Mr. Brandt nominated Mr. Parks to continue as President of the Board. Mr. Billings seconded; Ms. Hocken moved a unanimous ballot, Mr. Brandt seconded, and Mr. Parks was elected by unanimous vote. Mr. Parks said, however, that he reserved the right to resign from the position in mid-term.

**BUDGET COMMITTEE NOMINATION:** Mr. Parks said that Mr. Billings would be nominating Gerry Gaydos to fill the vacant position on the LTD Budget Committee. Mr. Brandt wondered if it was permissible to have two Budget Committee members who reside in the same subdistrict. Ms. Loobey explained that residence was not a requirement, other than residency within the general LTD boundaries. Mr. Billings moved that Mr. Gaydos be approved to a three-year term on the LTD Budget Committee, beginning January 1, 1992. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, and the nomination was approved by unanimous vote.

MOTION  
VOTE

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Americans with Disabilities Act Draft Paratransit Plan:** Mr. Brandt asked if the Board would discuss the ADA Draft Paratransit Plan before voting in January, and Ms. Hocken asked if a transcript of the public hearing would be available. Micki Kaplan, Transit Planner, said that the transcript would be available at the January meeting, and a staff presentation and Board discussion would be scheduled for that time. Ms. Kaplan said she was surprised that there was not a lot of participation at the public information sessions and the public hearing, especially after the amount of input the District received regarding paratransit service during the 1991-92 budget process. However, she said, public input about the plan was generally positive. The Executive Summary of the Plan was included in the agenda packet for the Board's review, and the draft plan had been included with the November agenda packets.

**Low Income Bus Fares:** Ms. Loobey said that approval of a program to provide discounted fare instruments to be distributed by local agencies would be scheduled for a future meeting. The recommendation was being developed in response to Board direction, and staff had researched the matter and were preparing a recommendation to bring before the Board.

**Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Federal Transit Act):** Ms. Loobey said that staff had not yet received a copy of the new Federal Transit Act, but did have a copy of the conference report. President Bush had signed the bill that day in Dallas, Texas. The bill had a number of important features, including increased funding for transit at about 5 percent the first year, and increased decision-making at the local level about spending money for transit. This would be done by the Metropolitan Policy Committee, on which LTD had two voting members. The bill also changed the name of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) to the Federal Transit Administration, or FTA. She said she would let the Board know when she received a copy of the bill.


**Board Member Reports:** (1) **MPC:** Mr. Billings reported on the December 12 Metropolitan Policy Committee meeting, attended by United States Senator Mark Hatfield. Senator Hatfield had talked about the history of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, which was replaced by the new Federal Transit Act, and suggested that there would be a change in the percentage of federal to local match in future federal legislation. (2) **CATS:** Ms. Fitch said she attended the December 3 meeting but not the December 17 meeting of the Central Area Transportation Study Citizen Advisory Committee. The Committee had anticipated discussing LTD on December 3, but had not gotten that far on the agenda. They did discuss bike paths through the city, and talked about bicycle lock-ups and the fact that carrying bicycles on the buses is more cumbersome than bike lock-ups. Mr. Viggiano attended the December 17 meeting, and reported that the Committee members did talk about LTD

issues at that meeting. They were interested in the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR), alternatively-fueled buses; Dial-a-Ride service; and airport service. The discussion was to continue on January 14, and he anticipated that the Committee would take action then. A discussion about shuttle service was begun, and would continue in January. Ms. Fitch said that the Committee had originally envisioned shuttles originating close to the downtown core, but she had explained that it makes more sense to park cars farther away from downtown and shuttle people in from a greater distance. The Committee had also talked about increasing parking costs, with a maximum number of parking spaces per building. Mr. Parks said the District needed to take positive action to create the situation to accomplish these goals. Ms. Fitch said CATS was also talking about taxing parking along Country Club Road, to offset the benefits of building away from the downtown core. However, LTD will not have to take a stand on that issue.

**Monthly Financial Statements:** Ms. Hocken said that since the Board had discussed deferred compensation earlier, she wondered about the offsetting assets and liabilities for deferred compensation. Tamara Weaver, Finance administrator, explained that it was actually a balance of the money in the Hartford plan, and was offset by liability because the District did not own any of that money, since it belonged to the employees. Ms. Hocken said she wondered why it showed on the District's books. Ms. Weaver said she would research that; it was on the books when she came to LTD, and the auditor had kept it there. Mr. Parks said it was a record of the District taking the employees' money and putting it somewhere. Ms. Fitch said that since it was deferred compensation it could not be guaranteed by the District, and if it becomes the individual's money, it has to be taxed. However, Ms. Hocken did not think that was the kind of plan that the District would have. Staff said they would research the questions and report back to the Board.

**Acting General Manager:** Ms. Loobey informed the Board that she would be out of town on vacation from December 21 through December 26, and Mr. Pangborn would be Acting General Manager in her absence.

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

  
Board Secretary