

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 20, 1992

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 14, 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, May 20, 1992, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Peter Brandt, Treasurer

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

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Parks introduced the May Employee of the Month, Inside Cleaner Sherry Player, and presented her with a check and letter of appreciation. Sherry was hired as a Part-time Inside Cleaner on November 23, 1984, and promoted to full-time on December 21, 1987. She was nominated by 17 co-workers, who listed her "great attitude" toward LTD, her work, and her co-workers; her contagious laughter; her kindness and sharing; and her committee involvement as some of the reasons for the nomination. When asked what makes Sherry a good employee, Maintenance Supervisor George Trauger said that Sherry is a very important team member on the cleaning crew. She works very hard to keep the interior of the buses clean, and is always willing to help out wherever needed. She always maintains a positive and enthusiastic outlook, and is a very caring individual, who makes sure that her peers are not forgotten in time of need or in time of celebration. Her positive outlook enthusiasm, hard work, and caring efforts are appreciated by her co-workers.

MOTION **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Ms. Fitch moved that the minutes of the April 15, 1992, special Board meeting be approved as distributed. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion, and the
VOTE minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

LCC GROUP PASS: Planning Administrator Stefano Viggiano explained that LTD staff and the Lane Community College (LCC) student government had been discussing a group pass for LCC students. The majority of the discussions were about the cost of the program. Mr. Viggiano said that LTD had offered a cost of \$8.72 per student per term, which staff believed to be the lowest price the District could offer and still be in compliance with the Board-

adopted Group Pass Policy. LCC's counter-proposal was \$6.59 per student per term, which was \$2.13 per student per term less, or about \$50,000 less per year.

Mr. Viggiano discussed the assumptions used in the formula to set the price, and how LTD and LCC differed in those assumptions. He explained the four components in setting the rate. First, farebox replacement costs were determined by factoring ridership, average fare, and an inflation rate. LTD and LCC agreed on the average fare, but disagreed on ridership and the inflation rate, and were \$11,000 apart. The District had suggested using the same inflation rate that it used in the pricing plan and for other group passes, based on inflation for July 1990 to July 1991. Staff had used an inflation rate of 8 percent, which included 6.3 percent inflation plus the amount of added service. LCC suggested using 3.1 percent as the inflation rate. The percentage for added service was based on the policy that any service added as a result of a group pass program should be charged to that program. LTD and LCC agreed on a rate of \$30 per service hour, but LTD suggested that 11 hours of weekday service would need to be added, and LCC suggested seven or eight hours of service. LTD staff anticipated overloads from a substantial ridership increase, and Mr. Viggiano explained that staff's figures were their best guess, and that they believed it best to err on the high side. If ridership were underestimated, LTD might have to deny people service, and they could miss their classes.

Mr. Viggiano said that, according to the Group Pass Policy, organizations that did not pay the payroll tax were required to pay long-term fleet and service costs in their Group Pass rates, because increased ridership generated additional demands on the rest of the system. This figure was based on the proportion of the group's ridership to total ridership. Staff assumed a doubling of LCC ridership and a 4 percent annual service growth at \$30 per service hour. Together, staff's assumptions resulted in a cost of \$8.72 per student per term.

Mr. Montgomery asked about the current lowest term pass rate for students. Mr. Viggiano replied that LCC students paid \$46 per term for a term pass, and that rate would be increasing to \$50 per term in the fall. Mr. Billings commented on the difference between \$50 and \$8.72 per term. Mr. Viggiano explained that the \$8.72 would be paid by all students, whether or not they rode the bus. Ms. Calvert asked if LCC employees would also participate, and Mr. Parks asked if the downtown LCC students would be a part of this program. Mr. Viggiano replied that the current negotiations were for LCC main campus students only. Eventually, employees could be added to the program, as at the University of Oregon (UO). LTD and LCC had discussed a Group Pass Program for downtown students, but it would be a separate program if it occurred, because the downtown students did not pay the same fees that the main campus students paid.

Mr. Billings wondered about LCC's suggestion to use a 3.1 percent inflation rate, and asked if labor and other costs next year would be higher than 3 percent. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, said that labor costs next year would be 5.7 percent. Fuel volume would increase due to an LCC group pass program, and fuel costs would increase more than 3 percent. Inflation for bus purchases was estimated at 8 percent per year in the Capital Improvements Program. Mr. Billings suggested that 6.3 percent might be a low estimate for inflation. Mr. Pangborn said that 6 percent would be a fairly close estimate,

because a 4 percent inflation rate was used for materials and services in the FY 92-93 budget, but added service costs would exceed that.

Mr. Billings wondered if the same kinds of factors were applied to the UO Group Pass Program. Mr. Viggiano said that the UO Group Pass Program was begun before the policy was adopted, but was consistent with the current Group Pass Policy, because the UO was a payroll taxpayer. The factors used to determine the UO's costs for the program were farebox replacement plus the cost of added service.

Ms. Hocken said it seemed that one of the differences was that the District projected a doubling in ridership, and LCC projected a smaller increase. She wondered if this made a difference in costs. Mr. Viggiano said it would make a difference in two factors--service and long-term costs. If the increase were smaller than anticipated, the District might not have to add as much service. However, a doubling of ridership would be more like the District's experience with other group pass programs, and staff believed it to be a reasonable estimate. Mr. Lewis said that in the past, LTD staff had said they did not expect ridership to double in all cases. Because LCC's district went beyond the area where LTD provided service, he thought LCC's estimate of a 69 percent increase in ridership was a better estimate than LTD's 100 percent increase.

Mr. Parks asked if students currently paid for parking; they do not. Mr. Billings asked if the District had the buses to put into service but would need additional personnel. Mr. Viggiano said that was correct. Mr. Billings then wondered if there was a typical cut-off point where the District knew it was time to hire additional cleaners or other ancillary staff. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, said staff did not have a clear cut-off point, but that there would have to be additional maintenance and service time for the additional buses. Mr. Viggiano added that maintenance costs were included as part of the \$30 per service hour charged to group pass programs. Additional bus purchase costs were included in the long-term fleet costs, but not in direct costs.

Mr. Parks asked for staff's recommendation regarding the rate for the LCC Group Pass Program. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff believed that \$8.72 per student per term was the lowest cost the District could offer and still adhere to the Group Pass Policy.

Martin Lewis, of 1544 Alder, Eugene, said he had been working with the LCC students to establish a group pass program. He stated that both LCC and LTD were public servants, and that LCC's mission was to provide education at a low cost, allowing greater access to education. The taxpayers had created a tax base for LCC in 1990. He believed that LCC's proposal was fair and covered LTD's costs. LTD's ridership estimate was higher than the Origination and Destination survey used as the basis for the UO contract. The inflation rate LCC proposed was based on the U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics rate at the end of January, which was an actual figure based on January to January, not a projected figure.

Mr. Lewis said that the terms of the Goal 12 statewide mandate would be difficult to achieve. Those goals were to reduce parking spaces by 30 percent and decrease vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) by 30 percent. He thought that if students rode the bus during college, they might continue to ride when working.

Mr. Lewis said that there were overloads within the existing LCC station. He thought that LTD should add buses there anyway, so the rate LCC proposed addressed that concern. He also believed that LCC students should not be assessed a fee based on what the college, as an institution, did or did not pay in terms of payroll taxes. He proposed paying the payroll tax on the student government itself, which, based on a \$72,000 payroll, would be about \$404.

Mr. Billings asked if a typical term was two and a half months long. Mr. Lewis said that it was, but that they had used days of the year rather than months in their calculations. He added that LTD and LCC were not that far apart in their proposals, and that he appreciated the Board's consideration of LCC's request.

Ms. Hocken asked to clarify whether students were able to use the Group Pass while school was in session, and whether that was term by term. Mr. Lewis replied that the pass would be good for the entire term, the same as at the UO. LCC's proposal did not include summer term. Mr. Pangborn explained that students would use verification stickers on their student body cards, good for about a week into the next term, and good for travel anywhere on the system. Mr. Lewis said that LCC was proposing a three-year contract, different than the UO's annual renewal.

Ms. Calvert asked if it was District policy to renegotiate the policy yearly. Ms. Loobey said that the precedent to renegotiate yearly was set at the UO because of the University's annual election on issues, and with other units of government because their budgets were on the same annual cycle as LTD's. If a multi-year contract were negotiated, incremental costs would be set throughout the contract.

Ms. Fitch wondered if staff had subtracted out LCC staff when gathering ridership information. Mr. Viggiano said that idea had just been suggested recently, and was a valid suggestion. Mr. Lewis said that LCC projected that 3 percent of the staff and faculty used the bus, and lowered their estimate to accurately approximate the number of students with term passes.

Mr. Parks told Mr. Lewis that the Board had a difficult time determining the formula, and there was a lot of discussion about what would happen if a Group Pass Program were cancelled and the District was left with extra costs for equipment and service that were no longer needed. He wondered if the UO students would want to renegotiate their contract based on a lower cost for LCC. Mr. Lewis said that LCC's group pass costs would still be higher than the UO's, so he thought there would be no reason for the UO to want to renegotiate.

Mr. Billings said he had some real struggles with this issue because, like all Board members, he supported LCC as an educational institution. However, the problem he had was that the Group Pass Policy was in place to provide the Board with a constant answer when asked for group pass program. Contrary to Mr. Lewis's statement, he said, he believed that the UO would be interested in renegotiating. He said that Mr. Lewis was correct about Goal 12, and he believed the District should do anything it could to encourage ridership, but he was not satisfied with Mr. Lewis's figures. Mr. Billings thought that offering a group pass program to LCC at those figures would require some sort of subsidy on the part of LTD's other

ridership. He thought that an inflation rate of 3.1 percent was not realistic, since it cost LTD more than that to operate. He said he was not challenging LCC's ridership figures, and thought that probably no one knew exactly what the correct ridership figure was.

Mr. Billings stated that he thought a 6.3 percent inflation rate was reasonable, and that \$8.72 per student per term was a realistic figure. The difference between the rates proposed by LCC and LTD was \$2.13 per student per term. He said he was aware that many LCC students were barely scraping by, but, seen in perspective, \$2.13 amounted to possibly two gallons of gas within three months, and was not a lot more than paying for a carton of cigarettes or two cups of espresso. He said he did not believe that LTD should subsidize LCC to the detriment of other riders, and that he could support an LCC group pass at \$8.72 per student per term.

Ms. Fitch said she agreed with Mr. Billings. If the District accepted LCC's ridership numbers but used LTD's proposed inflation rate, that would be somewhere between \$119 and \$120, which might be a difference of five cents per student per term. She suggested that the District use an inflation rate of 6.3 percent and accept LCC's ridership figures. Ms. Hocken asked if she meant to accept ridership figures which were 6 percent lower than LTD's. Mr. Viggiano said there were two methods to collect ridership data, and the 6 percent difference was a result of only one of the methods. Averaging the two methods would reduce ridership about 3 percent, or a decrease of about eight cents, to about \$8.64 per student per term. Ms. Fitch said that ridership seemed to be the only place where LTD could "give" on its position.

Mr. Montgomery said he believed that Mr. Brandt, who was absent, would oppose this reduction in the rate. Students who did not ride the bus could vote against the proposal, and if LCC did not institute a group pass program, the next least expensive option for riding the bus was \$50 per student per term. He thought that \$8.72 was a great opportunity.

Mr. Lewis said that the student government would have to think this was a reasonable proposal before referring it to a vote of the students. It would not be made available--the students would not be given the choice--if the student government did not think it was reasonable.

Mr. Parks commented that LCC was constantly worried about money, but had 4,000 free parking spots, which subsidized the private automobile. Mr. Lewis said that was part of LCC's accessibility at a lower cost, and that people came from Creswell, Cottage Grove, etc., where there was no bus service.

MOTION Mr. Billings moved that LTD make available to Lane Community College students a per student per term pass at \$8.72. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion. Mr. Billings said that
VOTE he would like to bring this issue to a close. With no further discussion, the motion carried 5 to 1, with Ms. Hocken voting in opposition and all others in favor.

EUGENE STATION: Mr. Parks asked that this item be placed next on the agenda, since City Councilor Debra Ehrman was present and would like to participate in the discussion.

Eugene Station--Input from Eugene City Council: Ms. Ehrman explained that the City Council had met that day and Councilor Rutan had said he had seen a copy of the Eugene Station time line, and felt that the City was plugged in a little later than it should be in the decision-making process. Ms. Ehrman presented a letter from Mayor Miller which stated the Council's continued interest in helping to facilitate the downtown Eugene station, which was still a high priority for the Council. She said there had been some discussion about Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) involvement, and that she had explained that a joint meeting of the Eugene Station Advisory Committee and the LTD Board of Directors had been scheduled for June 10, and that, unfortunately, some of these processes take longer than hoped. Ms. Ehrman had been invited to the Eugene Hotel Retirement Center to listen to the residents' concerns. She said she knew it was not possible to please everyone on these issues, and added that she was willing to take back any discussion to the City Council.

Mr. Parks said that the District had been trying desperately to have the Eugene City Council give some moderation to the requirements about parking in downtown Eugene, and some City Councilors had visited the Board. Mr. Parks said he would like to have the City Council with the District on the Eugene Station issue.

Ms. Loobey asked what the City Council had wanted Ms. Ehrman to do. Ms. Ehrman replied that the Council had wanted her to ask that LTD brief the Council earlier than suggested on the time line, before the summer of 1993. That would not necessarily require a meeting of the City Council and the LTD Board, but at least a briefing by staff, including what the Council could do to help, and where the District saw problems arising. Ms. Ehrman said she had tried to convey to the Council that she believed this was going on.

Ms. Loobey said that if the City Council wanted the District to brief the Council at a work session, the District would be more than happy to do so. She thought it could be done either at the staff level or with a joint meeting of the two governing bodies. She liked the idea of the MPC process because MPC was a regional committee that included County and Springfield city representatives. Ms. Calvert said that LTD could request to be on the MPC agenda at an appropriate time.

Eugene Station--Budget Transfer: Mr. Pangborn explained that staff were asking to use \$15,000 from the FY 91-92 contingency fund for publications, public information, and possibly additional studies and surveys regarding the Eugene Station. The money had been budgeted for FY 92-93, but would be used in the current fiscal year instead. Staff's emphasis was to help focus concerns and facts, and believed that it would be better to start immediately rather than waiting for the new fiscal year in July.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board approve the Resolution authorizing the transfer of \$15,000 from the Fiscal Year 1991-92 General Fund Contingency Account to General Administration--Materials and Services. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion.

Mr. Montgomery expressed the concern that the money be replaced in FY 92-93. Mr. Pangborn explained that the \$15,000 would not be spent from the funds budgeted for this purpose next year, and would be available for cash carry-forward at the end of FY 92-93.

VOTE

There was no further discussion, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

Eugene Station--Consider McDonald Site for New Station: Mr. Pangborn stated that staff were proposing to add the McDonald Site, between 10th and 11th Avenues and Olive and Willamette Streets, to the list of three sites (Elections, I-HOP, Pasta Plus) currently under consideration for a new Eugene Transit Station. (The District's Customer Service Center (CSC) was currently located at the McDonald Site.) There were two reasons for this request. First, the Board was concerned about the impact of parking damages on the other three sites, and had asked if there were any viable locations in the 36 downtown blocks that did not require that kind of damage payment. One-half of the McDonald site was currently used for two City parking lots, and one-fourth was used for a bingo parlor and by the Shamrock Press.

Mr. Montgomery recalled that, previously, any property owned by other than a private property was not readily for sale, and wondered about the City's property this time. Mr. Parks stated that the reason the District wanted to look for privately-owned property was that the District could not get the public bodies to commit ahead of time to sell their property. Mr. Pangborn said that this might be why the City wanted to be part of the process. He added that the I-HOP and Pasta Plus sites were the only two that were privately owned. There were no assurances from the City, but there had been discussions at the staff level. If there were no fatal flaws with the site, LTD would look to the City Council for direction. Mr. Parks asked that, if the Board added the site for consideration, staff initiate discussions with the City so the District would not waste its time if the City would not sell.

Ms. Ehrman said that the last Request for Proposals (RFP) for that site was for housing, which was later moved to a different site. Bob Hibschman, of the City of Eugene staff, said there were no specific development plans for that site, but some interest had been expressed. Ms. Ehrman said that the way to proceed would be to take the issue back to the City Council.

Ms. Calvert asked why this site was eliminated before. Mr. Pangborn said it was eliminated at the point where the Board chose the I-HOP and Pasta Plus sites. The staff recommendation at that time was actually to study the I-HOP and McDonald sites, but the McDonald site did have some problems. It was not a full block, because the McDonald Theatre, which was on the National Historical Register, was located on one-fourth of the block. The McDonald Site was somewhat far away from where staff and the Board believed development would go in downtown Eugene. Also, the City had been talking about a development at 11th and Willamette, but that development had subsequently moved. However, the location was also on the "plus" side, since the District was already located in that area, and some of the issues of location had already been dealt with. Because some people who opposed using the I-HOP site wanted LTD to consider the McDonald site, staff thought the site should be studied so the District would know its advantages and disadvantages, and how it fared in the final evaluation.

Mr. Parks commented that the District had spent money examining other sites, with no cooperation from the City or County, so had moved in a different direction. He wondered if it would be cheaper to buy a whole block with buildings than to pay parking damages.

Ms. Calvert said that, even though she would like to move forward with the selection process, if the District spent another month examining the McDonald site and it proved to be better, it could save time in the long run. She thought the District should study the site, but said she would like to come to some agreement with the City, so that the District's questions could be addressed.

Ms. Fitch wondered if the Council might be able to consider this site before the June 10 joint meeting of the LTD Board and the Eugene Station Advisory Committee. Ms. Ehrman said the issue could be addressed at the Council meeting the following week. Mr. Billings thought the District might not be able to have a firm commitment from the City if LTD adhered to its time line. He said he saw no reason to keep the Pasta Plus site on the agenda, because it had too many problems.

Ms. Hocken said she was somewhat concerned that the personnel on the City Council would be changing, and the present Council could commit to selling the McDonald Site, but could not commit the new Council to doing so. Mr. Parks shared her concerns.

Mr. Montgomery asked if it would take a long time to process the new information on the McDonald site through the Eugene Station Advisory Committee. Mr. Pangborn thought that adding this site would not delay the process. He said that at the June 10 joint Board/Advisory Committee meeting, staff would be able to present about the same level of information on the McDonald site as it had on the I-HOP site. The District could move ahead with the architect for cost estimates, etc., so the sites could be compared. He explained that the Advisory Committee had not met since February, and that staff had been putting together answers to the Advisory Committee's and Board's questions and dealing with some controversy about the sites since then. Ms. Loobey added that staff had communicated with the Advisory Committee, to let them know that staff were processing the answers to their questions, and the joint meeting had been scheduled with them. Many issues, such as the size of the waiting area, the need for public restrooms, the necessity to have a station downtown and off-street, etc., would not be different with the McDonald site, so the District would not be going back to "square one."

Mr. Parks wondered if excluding the Pasta Plus site would be taking that decision away from the Advisory Committee. Ms. Fitch asked if the Committee was interested in that site. Ms. Loobey thought not. She said the Board had not previously taken action about dropping the Pasta Plus site, but there seemed to be a consensus that it would not be as high rated, due to problems with the site, such as the need for stop lights and street widening. Ms. Hocken said she was not ready to exclude the Pasta Plus site, since every site had some problems. The Pasta Plus site seemed to have some operational difficulties and costs; however, if it were the only site left at the end of the process, it would need to be looked at again. She added that if the District wanted to get the downtown station built, it might have to spend more money than it wanted to.

Mr. Billings thought that it would be easier to drop the Pasta Plus site if another one were added. Apart from the cost, he did not see the Pasta Plus site as a choice that was very probable, or one that would be considered very seriously by the Board, since it was too far from County and City government buildings. However, he said, excluding it was not a matter

of principle with him. Mr. Parks said that the Pasta Plus site was thrown in as an alternative, because the Board wanted several sites rather than just one. Mr. Billings wondered if there was concern on the part of the Board members that Mr. Brandt was not present to participate in the discussion about the Pasta Plus site.

MOTION Mr. Billings then moved that the District include the McDonald Site with the other sites under consideration for a new Eugene Transit Station. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion.
VOTE There was no further discussion, and the motion carried on a vote of 5 to 1, with Mr. Montgomery voting in opposition and all others in favor.

Ms. Hocken asked if this would be the last site to be added. Mr. Pangborn said that staff hoped it would be the last one. The McDonald site had some advantages, but it would have its detractors, also. Those who had concerns about using this site might ask the District to look elsewhere, but the District had looked at the rest of the sites, and any others would be too far on the fringe of downtown to be viable sites. Mr. Pangborn said the Sears lot might be suggested, but it was proposed to be used for parking for a new library.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board President write a letter to the Eugene City Council asking if the Council would consider the McDonald site as a possible transit station site, and consider the sale of the lot to LTD for the purpose. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion.
VOTE There was no further discussion, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Ms. Loobey said that part of the process included contacting surrounding property owners, so staff would begin to do so.

Eugene Station--Decision-Making Process and Time Line: The proposed time line, on page 46 of the agenda packet, showed a decision on a new site being made in one year, in May 1993. A couple of steps, such as the environmental assessment, that previously had been scheduled after the decision were now listed before the decision. The June 10, 1992, joint work session with the Eugene Station Advisory Committee would not be a public meeting; rather, it would be a discussion of all the information acquired since February. A public hearing in the Eugene City Council Chambers was proposed for the end of June. The public hearing would be just to receive input. It would be an opportunity for people to come forward with their support or lack of support for certain sites, and the Board would have those comments about concerns or sites as they moved through the rest of the process.

It was anticipated that the Eugene Station Advisory Committee would make a recommendation to the Board in August 1992. The Board would then be asked to select two preferred sites, and an environmental assessment would be done on the top choice. If that site proved to have a fatal flaw, the in-depth assessment could be done on the second-choice site.

Mr. Pangborn explained that the environmental assessment was a requirement because LTD received federal funds. It would be somewhat less than performing an environmental impact statement. Ms. Fitch wondered if the District knew ahead of time what the environmental assessment was searching for. Mr. Viggiano said that the process and the issues were very clear, such as historical resources, archaeological sites, pollution, etc.

Usually, there were some aspects that needed to be mitigated, but they usually were able to be mitigated. He believed that would be true for the District's final site, as well. Mr. Pangborn added that the environmental assessment would take about three months, but would avoid finding a fatal flaw later in the process.

Mr. Pangborn said that on the time line the staff had suggested going to the City Council, the County, etc., after the site was chosen, but Ms. Ehrman had suggested that might be necessary earlier in the process. The final steps in the site selection process would be consideration of the District's application for a Conditional Use Permit by a Eugene Hearings Official, in April or May, 1993, and then approval by the Board of a grant application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Mr. Billings wondered if the Eugene Station Advisory Committee members should be invited to listen to the public testimony on June 25. Mr. Pangborn said he thought the idea was to invite them, although it was really the role of the Board to be the public arbiter on the issues. It would be helpful to them, however, to listen to the concerns of the community.

Mr. Billings suggested that the Board be prepared to select one preferred site and a second, back-up site, rather than two sites of equal value. He also suggested that the Board move the review of the sites with the Eugene downtown organizations, the County, and the City of Springfield into 1992 as part of the determination about preferred sites. Ms. Fitch agreed with this change, and suggested that Springfield be included in the list of who would be approached for input about the sites. Mr. Pangborn said that discussions by the MPC would include the County as well as Springfield representatives. Ms. Loobey said there was also a Springfield Chamber of Commerce representative, Jesse Maine, on the Advisory Committee, and staff could make presentations to the Springfield Chamber and City Council. Mr. Montgomery wondered if the name of the station should be changed to something other than Eugene.

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved that the time line be changed to include Mr. Billings's suggestions that the review of the sites with the appropriate Eugene organizations, Springfield, and the County be held in 1992 as part of the process to determine the preferred sites, and that the Board select one preferred site and one back-up site, rather than two equally-valued preferred sites. Mr. Billings seconded the motion, which then carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

FIRST READING, ORDINANCE NO. 35: Revised copies of the ordinance were handed out, and additional copies were available for the members of the audience. Mr. Pangborn explained that, in May, the Board approved a fare structure for FY 92-93. Ordinance No. 35 included the fare structure as approved by the Board, as well as a proposed fare structure for paratransit, which in the past had been handled by the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG). Staff were proposing an increase in paratransit fares, as recommended by the Special Transportation Fund (STF) Advisory Committee. These fares were consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) regulations.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board hold the first reading of Ordinance No. 35, and read the ordinance by title only. Mr. Billings seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE Ms. Loobey then read the ordinance title: "Lane Transit District Ordinance No. 35, An

Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services." The second reading and adoption of the ordinance were scheduled for the June 17, 1992, regular Board meeting.

LTD SALARIED EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT PLAN TRUSTEES: Ms. Loobey explained that LTD had two retirement trusts. The trustees of the LTD/ATU trust were the LTD Board President, the General Manager, the ATU business executive from Portland, and a locally-elected union official. The Salaried Employees Retirement Plan was a defined benefit plan and had always had only two trustees, which raised the issue of continuity over time, and the lack of a back-up who was familiar with the plan and could respond to questions was a problem. The trustees, who were the Board President and the General Manager, had discussed this issue and thought it would be productive and useful to add a third trustee to the Salaried Employees Retirement Plan.

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved that the Board approve the resolution on page 18 of the packet, reappointing A. Keith Parks and Phyllis Loobey and appointing Mark Pangborn, as Trustees and as the Retirement Committee for the Lane Transit District Salaried Employees Retirement Plan. **VOTE** Mr. Montgomery seconded, and the resolution was approved by unanimous vote.

FISCAL YEAR 1992-93 DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) GOALS: Ms. Loobey explained that this was a housekeeping measure, done on an annual basis as a requirement of federal funding. A minimum goal of allocating 10 percent of contracts financed in whole or in part by the Department of Transportation or other federal agencies to disadvantaged business enterprises was set by regulation. The District had set a goal of 14 percent for the last four years, and had not met that goal in only one year. Staff were suggesting that the goal be set at 14 percent for FY 92-93. Purchasing Agent Jeanette Tentinger was present to answer any questions the Board might have about the program.

Ms. Calvert asked if 14 percent was difficult to achieve. Ms. Tentinger said that last year the District only attained 12 percent, largely because of some equipment purchases where subcontractors were not used. For the most part, however, 14 percent was attainable in this community.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board adopt the resolution on page 19 of the agenda packet, amending the FY 91-92 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Policy and DBE Affirmative Action Program to the FY 92-93 DBE Policy and DBE Affirmative Action Program. **VOTE** The motion was seconded by Mr. Montgomery, and the resolution was approved by unanimous vote.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Update on Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Paratransit Service Issues: The draft Long-Range Paratransit Plan was handed out to Board members. Micki Kaplan, Transit Planner, explained that a public hearing on paratransit fares would be held on June 4, and the Lane Council of Governments and LTD would be asked to adopt the final plan at their June meetings. The plan was developed as a coordinated effort between LTD, L-COG, and a citizen advisory committee. Additional information on the ADA and paratransit service issues was included in a report beginning on page 50 of the agenda packet.

8th and Garfield Clean-up: Mr. Pangborn stated that it appeared that LTD had cleaned up the underground leakages at the 8th and Garfield facility. The report had been sent to the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for review, and LTD staff had begun discussions with School District 4J staff. LTD would have to perform groundwater sampling for at least a year, but the test results were currently okay. If the levels rose again, the District would hope to share costs with the school district. Mr. Pangborn thought that staff would have a proposal from 4J for purchase of the property within the next couple of months.

Olive Street Opening: Ms. Loobey wanted to let the Board know that staff were having ongoing discussions with City staff about the opening of Olive Street, and would continue to do so. Mr. Viggiano said that the opening was on a fast time line, with the City hoping to have the street open by fall. Mr. Montgomery asked if the design of the street would in any way affect the McDonald site, and if it would accommodate buses reasonably well. Mr. Viggiano said that if the District were to locate on the McDonald site, staff would argue very strongly for the right to use Olive Street for the buses. The street would not be wide, and would not be meant for high speed. Ms. Calvert asked if Mr. Viggiano would design the street differently if the station were there. Mr. Viggiano said he would design it differently only if it were designed for cars or buses only. However, it was designed to be pedestrian friendly, so he would not suggest a different design.

Rural Bus Service: Ms. Loobey said that staff were in contact with Lane County Commissioner Marie Frazer, who was working with the rural communities of Marcola, Oakridge, Creswell, and Cottage Grove to find some means to link those communities with Eugene with regular bus service. Staff were working with Commissioner Frazer to be sure her plans were compatible with LTD goals and budget, and would keep the Board informed of any future action by Ms. Frazer or the rural communities.

Pension Trust Performance Report: Ms. Loobey explained that the LTD/ATU #757 Pension Trust and the LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan were two separate trusts with different sums of money, but the funds were co-mingled. There were almost \$4 million in the LTD/ATU trust, and about \$1.6 million in the Salaried Plan. The funds were co-mingled for purposes of investment only, but were administered separately. Mr. Billings wondered why there was a different rate of return if the funds were invested the same.

Letters from Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Seneca Sawmill Company: Ms. Loobey said that staff had ongoing conversations with ODOT concerning the proposed improvements to the on-ramp at the River Road Transit Station. She said that staff's intent was to see that the Transit Station remained functional when the ramp changes were made. Mr. Viggiano explained that ODOT was considering an urban diamond concept for redesign of the intersection of Belt Line and River Road. LTD had a lot of support from the City and County engineers, so were able to convince the State that the slip ramp to the station from the on-ramp should remain an option in the environmental impact statement.

In response to the Seneca Sawmill letter, Ms. Hocken asked if staff knew how much revenue would be raised from payroll taxes on 401(k) contributions. Ms. Loobey said that those revenue collections were done through confidential reporting, and there was no way to know that amount.

Monthly Financial Statements: Ms. Loobey reported that expenses were almost 5 percent under budget at that point in the year, and staff expected revenues to exceed expenses.

Gotta Go Guide: Copies of the new "Gotta Go Guide" were handed out to Board members. Ms. Loobey said they were principally for the summer Freedom Pass users, and could be used year-round. She thought the "Gotta Go Guide" was such a useful compendium of information that she wanted the Board members to have copies for their families. The Guide was funded with the other sponsors (Eugene Parks and Recreation, Willamalane Parks and Recreation, and the Lane County Youth Commission).

News Releases: It was mentioned that news releases were now being mailed to Board members, so they could be aware of District promotions and activities as they occurred.

GENERAL MANAGER'S FY 91-92 EVALUATION; SALARY AND BENEFITS AND CONTRACT RENEWAL FOR FY 92-93:

MOTION **Executive Session Pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(i):** Mr. Montgomery moved that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(i), to evaluate the employment-related performance of the General Manager for the period March 1, 1991, through February 29, 1992. Mr. Billings seconded the motion, and the Board unanimously voted to move into Executive Session at 9:40 p.m.

VOTE

Return to Regular Session: The Board returned to Regular Session at 10:10 p.m.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board approve the following salary and benefits package for the General Manager for Fiscal Year 1992-93: inclusion of the fringe benefit supplement in the base salary; a 4 percent increase in base salary (now including the fringe benefit supplement), for a total base salary of \$71,285; and an increase in the monthly automobile allowance to \$250 per month; and that the Board authorize the Board President to sign a contract extending the General Manager's employment through Fiscal Year 1992-93. The motion was seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.


Board Secretary