

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 16, 1993

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 11, 1993, 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, June 16, 1993, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Brandt was not yet present.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Mr. Parks opened the meeting for comments from the audience. There were none.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** The June Employee of the Month, System Supervisor Gene Anderson, was present to meet the Board members and receive his award. Mr. Parks explained that Mr. Anderson was hired as a bus operator in November 1976, became a system supervisor in 1978, and planned to retire in July 1993. He was nominated by 99 co-workers; some of the comments made about him are that he was helpful, caring, humorous, and fun to work with. Many comments also were made in reference to the good-natured pranks Mr. Anderson had played on others and the laughs they had enjoyed with him. Comments made by Transportation Administrator Bob Hunt were that Mr. Anderson took great pride in and assumed full responsibility for the way he did his job. He had achieved the goodwill and affection of those whom he supervised, which Mr. Hunt described as a very positive achievement for a supervisor.

Mr. Parks presented Mr. Anderson's certificate and check to him. Mr. Anderson said he had enjoyed working at LTD almost 17 years, a time during which Ms. Loobey had brought LTD from almost nothing to its current position. He said his work at LTD had been enjoyable, and his philosophy was that if you enjoyed doing something, you should give it your all, and that will result in good things for yourself and those around you. That was why he tried to greet everyone with a smile and help new people feel that they were part of the team.

**MOTION**     **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Montgomery moved that the Consent Calendar for June 16, 1993, be approved as presented. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion, and the Consent Calendar was approved by unanimous vote, with Mr. Brandt not yet present. Consent Calendar items were: approval of the minutes of the May 19, 1993, regular Board meeting; approval of a Resolution Reaffirming District Boundaries; and approval of FY 93-94 Special Transportation Fund Continuation Contracts.

**VOTE**

**MOTION**     **YEAR-END TRANSFER TO THE CAPITAL FUND:** Mr. Brandt arrived at this point in the meeting. Mr. Billings moved approval of the Resolution transferring up to an additional \$900,000 from the General Fund to the Capital Fund for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1993.

**VOTE**     The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

**MOTION**     **CREATION OF SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION FUND:** Ms. Loobey stated that the creation of a Special Transportation Fund had been discussed during the Budget Committee meetings. Ms. Calvert moved that the Board approve the resolution authorizing the creation of a Special Transportation Fund beginning July 1, 1993. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, and the resolution was approved by unanimous vote.

**VOTE**

**ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 1993-94 BUDGET:**

**Staff Presentation:** Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, stated that the budget for the Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 1993, must be adopted by the Board before the beginning of the fiscal year. Included in the agenda packet was the budget as approved by the Budget Committee on May 5, 1993, in the form required by state law for adoption.

Mr. Pangborn stated that two questions had been raised by the Budget Committee, and staff were preparing responses to those questions: (1) the issue of comparing budgeted figures to budget as opposed to comparing budgeted to actual; and (2) the growth of expenses in comparison to revenues and the issue of farebox-to-operating cost ratio. The expenses in the Marketing budget associated with the public education campaign would be frozen until the Board had a chance to review the issue of a public education campaign. Mr. Brandt asked why staff did not want to present the explanations to those questions before the Board's vote on the budget, and what the purpose of a separate explanation would be. Mr. Pangborn said that the FY 93-94 budget had been prepared in the way that traditionally had been acceptable, up until the current year's budget discussions, and staff felt that the direction from the Budget Committee was to move forward for FY 93-94, and review the process prior to next year's budget formulation.

**Public Hearing on Fiscal Year 1993-94 Budget:** Mr. Parks opened the public hearing on the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1993-94. There were no comments from members of the public, and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION**     **Board Deliberation and Decision:** Ms. Hocken moved that the LTD Board of Directors approve the Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 1993-94 budget in the total combined fund sum of \$32,124,872, and making appropriations as represented in the Resolution. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion.

Ms. Calvert stated, in response to Mr. Brandt's comments, that at some point the Board had decided to hold the discussions on the Budget Committee's questions when there was more time to do that in a more thorough manner than would be possible before budget adoption. Mr. Parks added that there could be four new Board members by the time the next budget was formulated, and they might want to do something differently. Mr. Brandt said he wanted to go on record as saying he would vote "no" on the budget because he thought there were a lot of unnecessary expenditures built in, and that the increases in expenses were far greater than justified, based upon the revenue increases, especially the farebox increases, and he believed the District was spending far more money than necessary on other than transportation service. More service was desired by the public, and the District had not been able to fulfill those wishes. Mr. Brandt said he believed that the some of the expenses in the budget should have been analyzed much more carefully than was done.

VOTE Ms. Fitch called for the question. The motion to approve the Resolution adopting the FY 93-94 budget and making appropriations carried by a vote of 6 to 1, with Mr. Brandt voting in opposition and all others in favor.

**STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) PRIORITIES:**

Mr. Billings informed the Board that the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) would discuss the TIP priorities the following day. At the last MPC meeting, there had been some uncertainty about how the local jurisdictions would present the priorities. It was decided that the staff of the jurisdictions would see if they could determine the rank ordering for projects. He said that the Eugene Transit Station had been ranked second in importance by the professional staff, even though no Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds would go toward that project. Staff had agreed upon criteria for rank ordering, and Mr. Billings thought staff had made a pretty good effort in a short time. MPC members would decide the following day if they agreed with the criteria and rank ordering. Mr. Billings said that the TIP projects were for the period 1995 to 2000, and Ms. Calvert added that it was the expectation that about half of the projects on the list would be funded.

Three LTD projects had been listed for inclusion in the 1995-2000 TIP projects list. In addition to the Eugene Station, a park and ride at 58th and Main in Springfield was ranked seventh; and a park and ride at Beltline and Coburg Road ranked ninth. Mr. Billings said that in the briefing that day with LTD, there had been discussions about where a park and ride at Beltline and Coburg Road might be, and if LTD was in a position to develop two park and ride transfer stations within a relatively close proximity in time, as well as the fact that the River Road Station had been built ahead of demand and drew some criticism from the public. Staff were looking at a transfer station at 58th and Main with an eye toward building upon the District's experience at the River Road Station. Mr. Pangborn said that at 58th and Main, there would be some transfer capabilities, but it would be more of a park and ride for people from the McKenzie River area, Marcola, Camp Creek, and other areas, where they could park their cars and catch an express bus. Ms. Calvert added that there also was a potential for a park and ride on West 11th Avenue, but that was not yet in the planning stage.

Mr. Brandt asked how a project could be listed higher in later years. Mr. Pangborn explained that the TIP projects were fairly long-term capital projects. Some rankings depended

upon construction dates or when the funds would need to be earmarked for a particular project.

Mr. Brandt asked why LTD was voting on the list, and wondered how the list had been prioritized. Mr. Pangborn explained that the technical staff from LTD, the State, the County, and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield had used the same criteria and each jurisdiction first set its own ranking. Then the technical staff met and developed a composite ranking to recommend to the MPC members. This was the first time this system had ever been used. Mr. Billings said that the ranking could change completely during MPC discussions. Ms. Calvert added that the alternative to the local agreement on ranking would be for the State to rank the projects for the local area.

Mr. Brandt wondered why the Eugene Station was on the list, since the State was not giving LTD any money for that project. Mr. Pangborn explained that the Eugene Station was the only project on the list for which there was no STP funding, but it had to appear on the list because it was federally funded, and the TIP list was required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). He said that the local jurisdictions gave it a high rating because it was seen as a local priority. Mr. Brandt wanted to make sure that LTD's MPC members Janet Calvert and Jack Billings had been given a briefing on the staff ratings. He was assured that they had.

**MOTION** Ms. Fitch moved that the Board endorse the priorities of local projects to be included in the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Transportation Improvement Program as listed in the agenda packet. Mr. Billings seconded. The motion carried by a vote of 6 to 0, with Mr. Brandt abstaining and all others voting in favor.

**VOTE**

**HIGH-SPEED RAIL ACTIVITIES:** Ms. Loobey stated that the Oregon Transportation Commission had requested that LTD name a representative to a committee that would deal with high-speed rail and its integration within the local community. The committee probably would meet once a month for 12 to 15 months. All local jurisdictions were being asked to name representatives. Ms. Calvert said she thought Ms. Hocken would be a good representative. Ms. Hocken asked if staff also would attend the meetings. Ms. Loobey said that the Board representative would have full staff back-up, and if the Board member were unable to attend any meetings, the staff member would serve as an alternate on the committee.

**MOTION** Ms. Calvert moved that the Board appoint Ms. Hocken to represent Lane Transit District on the Willamette Valley Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation. Mr. Billings seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

**VOTE**

**LETTER TO LANE COUNTY FAIR BOARD:** Ms. Loobey said that the Fair Board's master plan included a parking element, and LTD had not been an integral part of the parking/transportation planning process. She explained that the purpose of the letter was to remind the Fair Board that LTD is here and could help with transportation issues. Mr. Montgomery moved that the Board send the proposed letter, on page 37 of the agenda packet, to the Lane County Fair Board. Mr. Billings seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

**MOTION**

**VOTE**

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Transportation Rule Implementation Project (TRIP) Public Hearing:** Ms. Loobey said that the Board President had submitted a letter to the Eugene Planning Commission, in support of the TRIP code amendments, and MPC member Janet Calvert had testified at a public hearing on the amendments. Another public hearing was scheduled, and then the TRIP code amendments would be forwarded to the Eugene City Council. Ms. Loobey said that staff would continue to monitor the progress and report to the Board.

Ms. Hocken asked for an example of the changes that were made to the proposed code amendments. Ms. Loobey said there had been some concerns about the language dealing with some of the provisions, such as certain levels of landscaping in parking lots. This was basically a clarification issue. The Eugene Area Chamber of Commerce had expressed some concerns, and was more supportive of the TRIP provisions following some language changes. Ms. Loobey said that the transit issues had come through this process without substantial changes.

**LTD Ordinance No. 36 Enforcement Procedures:** Ms. Loobey said that a summary of the enforcement procedures to be used for Ordinance No. 36 was included in the agenda packet, and Transportation Supervisor Rick Bailor was present to answer any questions the Board might have.

Ms. Hocken asked if there would be any way to take strollers and carriages on the bus if they couldn't be folded. Mr. Bailor said that the rule is that strollers cannot be brought on the bus occupied; the baby must be out of the stroller, and the stroller must be brought in as a piece of baggage that can be stowed away. Mr. Brandt said he did not see that discussed in the summary, but it was listed on the ticket. Mr. Bailor said that it was covered in the summary under obstructing the movement of customers. He said that the District had never completely informed riders of the safety aspects, so he thought it would be an educational process. Ms. Hocken wondered what could be done to clarify the occupied/unoccupied stroller differentiation. Mr. Bailor said that the citations would be used by transit district supervisors who would be using the wording on the citation more as a reference, not so much as a legal document. The definition was clear in the ordinance itself, but having the phrase on the citation would help the supervisor refer to the proper section of the ordinance.

Mr. Montgomery asked why "use of obscenities - minors present" and "use of obscenities" were listed separately. Mr. Pangborn explained that District Counsel Randall Bryson had said there was probably a stronger legal argument against using obscenities when minors were present. An Ohio ruling stated that there is probably a constitutional argument that a person cannot be profane if there is a captive audience. Oregon law says that a person cannot be profane around minors.

Ms. Calvert said she assumed that the Rider's Digest would contain some explanation of why these rules were in place. Marketing Representative Connie Bloom Williams replied that the staff had been carrying out a public education campaign in the on-board newsletter, "Bus Talk," and posters would be placed on the bus the following week. Specific information about the ordinance was not included in the Rider's Digest, because that included mostly

service detail. Ms. Calvert said she worked with a population that included young women with children. She suggested that the District offer some education about what kinds of strollers would fold. Mr. Pangborn said the District was not proposing to do anything differently than it currently did, which meant that a child in a stroller could not use the lift, and that bus operators would explain the policy to the riders. He said that this did not tend to be a problem area; rather, it tended to be more of an issue of education, and it helped to explain the safety issues of an open, rolling stroller on a bus. Once educated, people usually were ready when the bus arrived, with the child out of the stroller. Ms. Calvert wondered how many people might choose not to ride the bus if they thought they could not bring strollers on, at all. Mr. Pangborn suggested that staff might be able to work with Ms. Calvert to get the word out to her clientele.

**June 9 Transportation Briefing for Eugene City Council:** During the City Council's June 9 work session, LTD staff presented the Feasibility Study of the Downtown Shuttle and the Board's May 19 recommendation, as directed by the Board on May 19. Ms. Loobey said that staff talked with the Council about the improvements that the Board felt would be helpful in moving toward a shuttle system. The Council asked for a briefing about how the Board considered service requests, so staff explained the analysis and priority-setting done each year to determine service improvements. The Council was interested in that and in the Board-approved criteria for a shuttle, such as downtown density. Ms. Loobey said that staff told the Council that those were the kinds of things triggered by the Transportation Rule Implementation Plan (TRIP), the Central Area Transportation Study (CATS), and other local transportation plans, and that the Board felt that this was not the proper time for a shuttle. The Council members asked if the Board would review using Autzen Stadium for a park and ride if there were a transit-only bridge between Autzen and Agate Street. Staff informed the Council that several things would have to occur, such as designated parking, agreements with the University of Oregon, etc. Ms. Loobey thought the Council understood that some things would have to occur before the Board would consider providing a downtown circulator shuttle, and the Council members thought there were higher priorities than the City of Eugene finding money to fund the shuttle at that time. She thought the Council seemed more willing to understand that the Board considered a number of factors in stating their priorities, including the benefit to the community and fixing problems in current service.

**Commuter Club Voucher Program:** A summary in the agenda packet explained a new program offered to employers who wish to take advantage of a transportation fringe benefit provided in the Comprehensive National Energy Strategy law. In response to information on the law provided by LTD to area employers, Key Bank of Oregon contacted LTD to inquire about the commuter club voucher program for its Eugene employees. Key Bank's Portland employees already received a tax-free transit benefit of \$21 per month, toward expenses for traveling to and from work on public transit or via car pools or van pools.

Ms. Hocken asked how many vouchers Key Bank planned to buy. Ms. Williams said there were about 150 Key Bank employees, but staff did not yet know how many passes would be bought. Staff planned to monitor the program and would report back to the Board. Staff had received about six calls as a result of a "Bus Talk" article, and one law firm also had signed up for the program. Ms. Hocken commented that it was the first time that the law had

limited the amount that employers could reimburse employees for parking, and the allowable rate for transit had increased to \$60 per month.

**Board Correspondence:** Included in the agenda packet was a letter from Ron Heintzman, President and Business Representative of the Amalgamated Transit Union, Division 757, which had been sent to all Board members. The letter stated that a Union analysis of salaried and contract employee salary and wage increases showed a lower increase for the bargaining unit employees during the past six years. Staff had prepared comparative salary information for the Board. One example demonstrated the salary histories of a bargaining unit employee and a non-bargaining unit employee during their first three years of employment with the District. The second example was a six-year history of improvements made in the compensation schedules for bargaining unit and non-bargaining unit employees.

Ms. Hocken asked how many years it took bargaining unit and non-bargaining unit employees to reach the tops of their pay scales. Finance Administrator Tamara Weaver said that it took full-time bargaining unit employees three years to reach the top of their scale, and typically took about five years for administrative employees, although it could take less time if an employee were hired at a rate higher than the standard starting rate, or it could take longer, based on performance, because there were no automatic steps. Ms. Hocken commented that, if using the eight-year employment period mentioned by the ATU, a union employee had no step increases during the last five years, while a non-union employee took longer to get to the top of the scale, then received no step increases during the rest of the eight-year period. Ms. Weaver said that data on pay changes for individual employees varied widely, depending largely on whether the individual was still receiving step increases or if the individual's salary was adjusted during the salary study done six years ago. Ms. Loobey added that about 85 percent of the administrative staff were at Step 5 and no longer receiving step increases.

**Bus Service to Solar Heights Neighborhood:** Mr. Brandt asked if the Solar Heights community didn't want the bus service, after all. Ms. Loobey said that was correct. There was a continuing interest on the part of the people who had requested the service to have service nearby. The bus would go to 46th and Willamette, and if it could turn around at the Ridgeline Trail Park, service could be extended to 52nd and Willamette. The feasibility and cost of this option would be determined in the near future.

**Operations Summary Report:** Director of Operations Tim Dallas updated the Board regarding the purchase of new buses. The District had been in negotiations with at least two manufacturers, and thought both would bid on the contract for new buses. Gillig had estimated that the price would be in the range of \$200,000. The District received only one bid, from Gillig, at a price of \$219,000 per bus. Mr. Dallas said that staff were looking at the material that Gillig sent to justify and explain the pricing, and were calling other transit districts to compare buses and prices. It would be several weeks before a decision would be made, but there was a possibility the District would rebid the contract, if the price did not seem appropriate. However, he said, it wouldn't necessarily be to the District's benefit to rebid, because the bidder could say that the delay changed the production schedule and the price could be inflated. Gillig's bid would mean that the District would be able to purchase 25 buses instead of 27 or 28, so staff needed to gauge the long-range impact of that.

Mr. Billings asked if Gillig knew it was the only bidder. Mr. Dallas said that during the initial negotiations with the two companies, they were entitled to see the list of approval equals, and could tell if something was their submission or not. He said he did not know how much communication there was between manufactures, and that the bidding cycle depended on the production schedule for a manufacturer.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(d) and ORS 192.660(1)(i):**

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved that the Board adjourn to Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations, and pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(i), to evaluate the employment-related performance of the General Manager. The motion was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

**RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:** The Board returned to regular session at 9:30 p.m.

MOTION **BOARD SALARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Board commended Ms. Loobey for her excellent performance. Ms. Fitch moved that the Board approve the Salary Committee's recommendation for the salary and benefits package for the General Manager for FY 93-94: a 3.25 percent increase in base salary, for a total base salary of \$73,602, and an increase from \$250 to \$275 for the monthly automobile allowance. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion. Mr. Brandt said he wished to have on record that he did not believe the salary should be separated between a car allowance and salary; he believed they should be combined in a total salary figure. There was no further discussion, and the Salary Committee recommendation was passed by unanimous vote.

**DEPARTING BOARD MEMBER:** Ms. Calvert expressed her appreciation for Mr. Billings' participation on the Board, and wished him well in his new endeavors.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Ms. Fitch moved for adjournment. The motion was seconded, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

  
Board Secretary