

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, March 18, 1992

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 13, 1992, 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, March 18, 1992, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Jack Billings  
Peter Brandt, Treasurer

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

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** William Bohm of 3075 Willakenzie Road, Eugene, said that he rode the #60 VRC/Cal Young every day to work and back. He had with him a petition from 42 neighborhood residents and bus riders to maintain the Willakenzie/Bogart loop of that service, which was proposed to be cancelled. He mentioned Glen Powell, who was 96 years old, and Glen's wife, Louise, who was 86, whose only means of transportation was the LTD bus, and who were extremely unhappy about the cancelled service. Mr. Bohm said that most of the people he talked with were unaware that the service would be cancelled, and wondered why the information was not posted in the community. He said he had heard by word of mouth, and called an LTD planner, who told him that the cancellation was due to poor ridership. He asked how LTD made such an arbitrary decision, and said he didn't feel the cancellation was warranted for the amount of people in the neighborhood and the amount of service they have. The neighborhood, which Mr. Bohm said was probably one of the fastest-growing areas in Eugene, with new homes every day, also included Monroe Middle School and a retirement complex, all served by that loop. He felt it would be a disservice to the neighborhood to eliminate the service, especially if they would probably have to wait three to five years before they could have bus service through there again. He presented the petition to the Board, and asked them to reconsider elimination of the service.

Ms. Calvert asked if the service would be cut completely, or just the frequency of service. Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, replied that the service on that loop would be cut completely. He explained that the #60 route went to Valley River Center, Cal Young Road, the loop on Willakenzie/Bogart/Bailey Lane, and back through Valley River Center to downtown

Eugene. The area east of Coburg carried about 10 boardings a day, or about one per trip. He said that Mr. Bohm was correct, that this was a fast-growing area; however, the current service was not productive. It was staff's expectation, however, that service would be added later.

Ms. Hocken asked if the elderly couple could qualify for Dial-a-Ride. Mr. Viggiano said that if they were frail elderly, they could qualify, but not if they were just elderly. Mr. Pangborn added that if they proved they could not get to the bus stop, they could qualify.

Ms. Hocken then asked if the people who signed the petition were bus riders. Mr. Bohm said he obtained 15 signatures on the bus, and the rest in the neighborhood, from people who rode occasionally. He said that to cut service to that area now would not be right, because it was growing so greatly, and people in that area were contributing to the payroll tax.

Ms. Calvert asked if it were true that routes were reviewed every year. Mr. Viggiano said that service was reviewed every year, whether or not there was a major route review such as the current year's Comprehensive Service Redesign.

Mr. Viggiano mentioned one other concern about serving the area. The route currently went through Valley River Center both ways, so it was a slow way to go downtown, and he suspected that people already walked to Coburg Road for faster, more direct service. For instance, the stops at Sheldon Plaza and by the park and ride at Papa's Pizza were heavily used.

Mr. Bohm said, however, that between 7:00 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. the #60 went downtown rather than through Valley River Center, and was pretty convenient service. Mr. Viggiano explained that before Valley River Center opened in the morning, the route traveled directly onto Country Club Road from Willagillespie. After 9:30 a.m., every inbound and outbound #60 traveled through Valley River Center. Ms. Loobey asked Mr. Bohm if the park and ride at Papa's Pizza would serve his purpose, and he said it would not.

Ms. Calvert asked if there would be a possibility of some of the Coburg Road buses making the loop Mr. Bohm was concerned about. Mr. Viggiano said that with some additional time, the bus could make that loop, but not with the current schedule. The #67 made a big two-way loop around the area, but the Coburg Road bus did not deviate off Coburg Road.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Mr. Parks introduced the March Employee of the Month, bus operator Gene Shaw. Mr. Shaw was hired as a part-time bus operator in January 1991, and had recently received an award for exceptional attendance. He was nominated by a member of the community whose son had been in an accident. Mr. Shaw had stopped to assist the son, and the parent commended Mr. Shaw for his help and kindness, and for being such a caring person. When asked what made Mr. Shaw a good employee, Transportation Administrator Bob Hunt said that Mr. Shaw continually strove for excellence in the way he did his job, and enjoyed working with his customers and other members of the LTD team, which showed in his pleasant and caring attitude toward all with whom he came in contact.

Mr. Parks presented Mr. Shaw with an award and check. Mr. Shaw said that every day he came in contact with a lot of people from various parts of the country, including major metropolitan areas, and that it was rare for a day to go by without someone saying that LTD was the best transit district they had ever ridden. He said he was proud to be a part of the District and its good reputation.

**MOTION**      **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Mr. Montgomery moved that the minutes be approved as distributed. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken then said that the second paragraph on page 10 stated that a transfer policy with a one-hour time limit had been approved, but that the policy was actually for one hour and twenty minutes. Mr. Montgomery moved that his motion be amended to include the correction on page 10. Ms. Hocken seconded the amendment to the motion. The amended motion to approve the minutes was then passed by unanimous vote.

**VOTE**

**COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN:** Ms. Loobey stated that to the best of their knowledge, staff believed that the service being proposed for FY 92-93 could be sustained in the Long-Range Financial Plan.

Mr. Viggiano called the Board's attention to page 16 of the agenda packet for that evening. He said he did not plan to discuss the proposed service changes, which had been discussed in detail prior to a public hearing at the February 19, 1992, meeting. However, a couple of changes had been made to the proposal since that time. He said that staff were no longer recommending any change to the 11X Express, following testimony by riders at the public hearing. Staff had recommended that a different express route, the #1-105, take the place of the 11X. However, if the 11X were left in place, staff thought it would be best not to implement the #1-105 at this time. This change amounted to an annual savings of about \$18,000.

Planning staff had also met with riders who were concerned about the proposed changes to the #27 Fairmount. They reached general agreement that the route should eventually change, but staff were recommending that it be left as is for the next year. The route had been the same for twenty years, and did not have tremendously low ridership, so staff were comfortable with leaving it alone for one year, and developing changes with the neighborhood group.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff had originally proposed deleting a portion of the #50 Park route on South Park, to address running time problems. However, because of concerns about the loss of service and operating problems on the route originally proposed, staff recommended restoring the service on South Park and making changes on Howard. This recommendation would not actually delete service on the route, but it would shorten the route somewhat, to alleviate the running time problems.

Mr. Viggiano told the Board that it would cost the District approximately \$20,000 per year to provide peak hour service on Willakenzie/Bogart/Bailey Lane loop. He explained that, to some extent, the low ridership was the result of service design, so he expected that staff would return to the Board to add service to that neighborhood in the next few years. Bailey Lane and Bogart were scheduled for street improvements during the summer.

Ms. Fitch asked if the route did not go through Valley River Center when the shopping center was closed, and if the Willakenzie/Bogart/Bailey Lane were added back on, whether that would reduce the cost of providing service on that loop. Mr. Viggiano explained proposed routing on a two-way loop via Oakway or Country Club Road, without traveling on Coburg Road, for the #60 and #61 routes. To provide service to Bogart and Bailey Lane, another bus would be added and connect that area with downtown Eugene via Coburg Road.

Ms. Calvert asked if there would be any way to provide service to that loop from Harlow Road. Mr. Viggiano explained that not very many streets go through from Harlow to Willakenzie, and there had been some talk about putting a traffic barrier on Van Duyn or Satre. The #12 Harlow was also a fairly well-utilized route, so it would be difficult to deviate the #12 through that area. However, he thought routing from Harlow to Willakenzie would be an interesting possibility.

Ms. Hocken asked if staff assumed the #60/61 loop routes would have good ridership. Mr. Viggiano said that this loop was currently being served and had fairly good ridership, because it was fairly direct service into town. In the future, when service is added back to Willakenzie/Bogart/Bailey Lane, it will be more direct than current service.

Mr. Parks asked if homes being built to the east would be "landlocked," or there would be through streets. Mr. Viggiano said it would be difficult to serve that area, and that the Bogart/Bailey Lane loop provided fairly good service to the area. North of Beltline, he said, staff were working with the City to be sure there would be through connections so buses could travel through that area.

Ms. Loobey said staff would follow up with Mr. Bohm, because he was probably representing the District's target market in that area and justified the District's efforts with the City to be sure there were east/west roads available to bus travel. Staff would also contact Mr. and Mrs. Powell, to see if they could qualify for Dial-a-Ride.

Mr. Viggiano revised the Service Cost and Ridership Summary on page 26 of the packet, reducing the total annual cost from \$366,800 to \$348,300 and total ridership from 327,200 to approximately 300,000.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board approve the recommended changes in service for Fiscal  
VOTE Year 1992-93, with the deletion of the #1-105 Express route. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion,  
and the proposed service was approved by unanimous vote.

Ms. Calvert asked if this redesign would last another 10 years, like the last one did. Mr. Viggiano replied that in the 1980s the population didn't grow very much, and the need for future redesigns would depend on population growth in the 1990s. Ms. Loobey added that the impact of land use and transportation requirements would also make a difference.

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, said that the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) was part of a series of actions that the Board took each year in preparation for the budget. The series included decisions on fares, salaries, and service, in addition to the CIP. The CIP included all capital for the next

six years that could be anticipated at that point, but staff were asking for approval of only the 1992-93 segment of the CIP, in order to incorporate those figures into the budget. The reason for showing anticipated capital needs for five or six years was to allow the District to plan for major capital purchases and save the local share for those purchases. Those savings were included in the Long-Range Financial Plan, which would be discussed as part of the budget deliberations.

Mr. Pangborn explained that the District received Federal Transit Administration (FTA) (formerly UMTA) Section 9 funds according to a formula, assuming Congress appropriated the money. This was a major source of funding for the District, at about \$400,000 in federal funds for capital, at an 80/20 match. This meant that the District needed to save about \$.5 million annually to match the federal capital funds. Capital costs included bus stop improvements, office equipment, tools, machinery, etc.

Section 3 discretionary funds were also available at an 80/20 match for buses and major facilities. The Glenwood facility was built with Section 3 funds. Additionally, occasionally there was some state money to use as matching funds. In the past, LTD had also received Federal Aid Urban funds (FAU) for certain projects.

Mr. Pangborn discussed the summary table on page 28 of the packet. The STF direct purchase of \$2,500 was a direct result of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Four million dollars had been budgeted for the Eugene Station, but it was still unclear when those funds would actually be spent. That amount would be the maximum LTD would spend in FY 92-93, for property acquisition, etc. The Eugene Station project would be spread over a four-year period, with property acquisition in FY 92-93, construction beginning in FY 93-94, and completion in FY 95-96. It was anticipated that the District would receive three grants of \$3.5 million each from the FTA.

The FY 92-93 CIP also included \$7,850 for office furniture and equipment, and \$98,350 for computer software and equipment, as part of a five-year replacement and expansion plan. Mr. Pangborn explained that the District had just replaced a number of six-year old computers, which were past their design life, and were actually handed down to other staff. Also included in this category was funding for an in-house payroll system, to replace the current contracted services of Automated Data Processing Systems of Portland. Payroll currently was sent to Portland by modem, and was relatively cumbersome and fairly expensive. Passenger boarding improvements were a significant capital expenditure, with funds budgeted for the Eugene Station and expansion of the University Station. FAU money, at a match of 94 percent federal and state, and 6 percent local funding, was allocated for the University Station, which was far beyond capacity. Staff hoped to have the expansion completed by January 1993. A small amount of Section 9 money was allocated for planning for the Eugene Station in FY 92-93. In 1993-94, two years out, a \$5.9 million bus purchase was planned.

Mr. Montgomery asked about the difference of \$2,200,000 between 1993-94 and 1997-98 for two additional buses. Mr. Pangborn explained that inflation for buses had been 6 to 8 percent a year. In addition, stringent clean air requirement and ADA requirements would become effective, so staff were making a guess at what the cost for those might be.

As seen on page 32, the total amount budgeted for CIP projects in FY 92-93 was \$4,793,950, with \$4 million of that allocated for the Eugene Station. Mr. Pangborn said that in all cases, the District had federal funding approved or likely to be approved. If the expected funding were not approved, staff would revise the CIP for Board approval.

Ms. Calvert asked about building up the local match for the \$5,900,000 bus purchase scheduled for 1993-94. Mr. Pangborn said that the Long-Range Financial Plan set aside \$116,000 for the next two years, and the District was already saving money for capital purchases planned for 1997-98. Tamara Weaver, Finance Administrator, said she anticipated that the District would have about \$2.5 million set aside by July 1, 1992.

Mr. Parks asked if the District would have to do any retrofitting of the buses in response to new regulations. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, replied that the District was not yet faced with that requirement, although some of that was being seen in larger cities. However, the Clean Air Act did not prescribe retrofitting specifically. It would be up to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to write regulations on how transit districts would meet the standards. Mr. Pangborn added that because LTD was in an area with a population of less than 500,000, retrofitting would not be required to meet the new standards. However, new buses would have to meet those new standards.

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved that the Board approve the Capital Improvements Program for Fiscal  
VOTE Year 1992-93. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

**LTD DEFERRED COMPENSATION PLAN:** Mr. Pangborn said that before the last Board meeting, the Board Finance Committee had reviewed all the issues surrounding deferred compensation, and recommended to the full Board that an additional deferred compensation carrier not be added at that time. The Board directed staff set up policies and procedures to ensure that the Board was meeting all fiduciary requirements. Mr. Pangborn explained that when an employee chooses to defer salary in deferred compensation, that money remains the property of the District until the employee takes that money out of the deferred compensation plan. The purpose of the procedures was to verify and ensure that the Board meets its responsibilities in handling that money, and, most importantly, that the District monitors the deferred compensation carriers and maintains the integrity of the funds. The procedures would also set up an annual review process.

Mr. Parks asked if the employees were knowledgeable about the problems the Finance Committee had discussed. Mr. Pangborn said that Hartford, the company being used for deferred compensation, had a very high rating and good local representation, so there was a high level of assurance about the program. He was not sure the employees understood all that could go wrong and that it was still the District's money, so employees would be educated about those issues. On page 2 of the procedures (page 35 of the packet), the procedures said that all employees would be informed in writing regarding the procedures.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved approval of the Policies and Procedures for Deferred Compensation  
VOTE Program, as presented on pages 34 and 35 of the agenda packet. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

**EMERGENCY CONTRACT FOR SITE CLEAN-UP AT 8TH AND GARFIELD:**

Mr. Pangborn said the District had been involved in cleaning up underground spills on both sides of the old facility at 8th and Garfield. The spill was not significant on the south side of the property (south of 8th Avenue), and was predominately from not having over-flow protection where fuel was put in. That spill had been excavated. On the north side of 8th Avenue, however, the soil was contaminated. Tests were done and costs were estimated, but the District was finding that the cost would be much more than anticipated. About 200 cubic yards of soil would have to be removed, amounting to 15 to 20 big dump truck loads. Because the soil was not polluted to a high level and did not require special handling, it would be taken to the Short Mountain landfill. Ms. Calvert asked how the excavated areas would be filled in. Mr. Pangborn said they would be filled with gravel.

The District had two choices to continue the required clean-up at 8th and Garfield. First, the District could go out to bid for a new contract, which could be a lengthy process and might result in the hiring of a new contractor. Second, the District could continue the work with Russ Fetrow Engineering, which would exceed the contract unless the Board declared an emergency and authorized staff to sign a contract with Russ Fetrow Engineering to complete the soil removal and testing. School District 4J had sold certificates of participation and was holding the money and had to pay penalties, so 4J was anxious to continue with the purchase of the property.

Ms. Calvert asked if the pollution was from LTD or the previous owners. Mr. Pangborn said it most likely started with the prior owner, with a leak in the water/oil separation system, and the District probably bought a leaking system when it brought the property, or it began to leak later, but the District had no monitoring system. The DEQ might require the District to test the ground water on a quarterly basis. The test wells were already in place. Ms. Hocken asked if this would always be the District's responsibility. Mr. Pangborn replied that this depended on the sales contract. The school district said it was LTD's pollution and LTD should take care of it, and they would take care of any future pollution. It was unlikely that the school district would pollute the ground, due to stringent rules now in place. However, 4J would monitor the test wells for anything they used at that facility. Mr. Pangborn said that the school district would be very concerned about what liability came with the sale of the property, so staff had begun working with legal counsel on the contract. The school district was also concerned about who would clean up any pollution discovered in the future. 4J was not interested in taking care of the pollution that was already on the property, and the certificates of participation were from a bank and said that 4J could not purchase polluted property. According to DEQ requirements, LTD would be monitoring the ground wells for a decline in pollution. If pollution did decline, the DEQ would agree that LTD had cleaned the pollution and could cap the wells and quit monitoring them. Ms. Fitch asked if the sales contract would be written to limit LTD's liability. Mr. Pangborn said there was no contract yet, but that was how it would be written. Ms. Calvert asked if the District would know whether the wells were testing LTD's or 4J's pollution. Mr. Pangborn replied that 4J wanted to use a couple of the big tanks left in the ground. The wells show no pollution there, so the contract would say that 4J had to take care of future pollution from those tanks.

**MOTION** Ms. Fitch moved that the Board declare an emergency and authorize staff to sign a contract with Russ Fetrow Engineering to complete contaminated soil removal and testing at the 8th and Garfield property. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken asked about approving a specific dollar amount, and if there were a cost limit when declaring an emergency. Mr. Pangborn said staff were not aware of such a limit, but if there was one, the District was below that limit.

**VOTE** With no further discussion, the motion to declare an emergency and authorize staff to sign a contract with Russ Fetrow Engineering to complete contaminated soil removal and testing at 8th and Garfield carried by unanimous vote.

**BUDGET TRANSFER:** Kim Kaiser, Risk Administrator, said that staff had reviewed actual workers' compensation premiums for the current year, which were just under \$190,000. The District would also be making a cash payment based on claims experience, because at the end of the last fiscal year more expensive claims than anticipated were filed. Staff were requesting that the Board approve a transfer of \$104,200 from workers' compensation reserves to cover the additional expenses.

**MOTION** Ms. Hocken moved that the Board approve the resolution transferring \$104,200 from the Reserve for Workers' Compensation to Workers' Compensation expense line items. The  
**VOTE** motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Operations Summary Report:** Mr. Parks said that the Operations Summary Report was an excellent addition to the packet, and was a good way for the Board members to become informed about what was happening at the District.

**Board Member Report--Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):** Ms. Calvert said she had attended the March 12, 1992, meeting of the MPC, at which the role of the MPC had been discussed. There was some discussion that the MPC would have a larger role as a result of the LCDC Transportation Rule/Goal 12, but the members were not sure yet what that role would be. The question was whether the MPC should be a "super board" like the Metropolitan Service District in Portland, to decide how transportation funds would be spent. Ms. Calvert said there would be more discussion on this question.

**Board Member Report--Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) Citizen Advisory Committee:** Ms. Fitch said there had not been a quorum at the March 17 CATS meeting. Discussion centered around the Metro Plan and how CATS falls within that plan, and the fact that the committee could not create a document opposite of the document it works within. Because only seven out of 17 people were there, the committee may discuss rewriting the guidelines and determine who actually wants to be involved. The intent of the committee was to have its final document work within the guidelines of what had already been written.

In response to a question from Mr. Parks, Mr. Viggiano said that there were some people in the group who did not want the area to grow, or the central area to become any more



dense, but the Metro Plan, the guiding document for this area, said that both would happen, so the committee could not prepare a plan that violated that document. Ms. Fitch added that it was a frustrating role to be in, because some people thought that "green streets" and non-polluting vehicles through major corridors of the city were how to meet the requirements of the Transportation Rule/Goal 12, while others believed the Metro Plan advocated concentrated growth. She thought some of the issues would be better handled by staff, but were being discussed by the committee.

**Future Meetings:** Ms. Loobey said that Budget Committee meetings were tentatively scheduled for every Wednesday in April, and a short Board meeting might be held before the April 15 budget meeting. She suggested that when the Board met to discuss the Eugene Station, it should be at a special meeting with nothing else on the agenda.

Mr. Parks said that the Board should hold a public hearing and take all testimony in one period, which would probably take several hours. Ms. Hocken agreed that the Board would have to have a long public hearing, and wondered if it made sense to have it on one night and make the decision a couple of weeks later. Ms. Calvert said that, considering the number of signatures on the petitions, the public hearing should be held in a larger room, such as the City Council Chambers.

Mr. Montgomery asked if the Board would be hearing from the Eugene Station Advisory Committee. Ms. Loobey explained that the Advisory Committee had been scheduled to meet earlier, but they and the Board had asked a lot of questions for staff to research, so staff were gathering that information and the Advisory Committee meeting had been postponed. She thought the Committee would meet at least one more time before the Board worked on the issue again. Ms. Fitch said she would like to have a joint meeting with the Committee, so the Board could hear the Committee's comments and all could hear the answers at the same time.

Ms. Fitch wondered if the District would lose the federal money if the process took too long. Ms. Loobey said the District typically had three years to spend the funds, but this time it was written into law that the District would receive the money for the station. She thought the money would only be rescinded if the Board said it was not going to build the station.

Ms. Hocken asked if buses already ran south on Pearl. Mr. Viggiano replied that buses traveled on Pearl north of 8th Avenue and south of 10th Avenue, but not between 8th and 10th. Ms. Calvert said she was concerned that the parking issue was so fluid or uncertain, and that affected the District's decision. She asked if the City planned to change its parking regulations. Ms. Loobey said the City was working on changes, but the timing of those changes meant that they might not be law in time for the Board's decision.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Montgomery moved that the meeting be adjourned. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.



---

Board Secretary