

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE COUNTY MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

May 18, 1982

Pursuant to notice given to the Eugene Register-Guard for publication on May 13, 1982, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular meeting of the Board of Directors of Lane County Mass Transit District was held at the City Hall in Eugene, Oregon, on May 18, 1982, at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Peter M. Brandt
Janet Calvert
Janice Eberly, Secretary
Kenneth H. Kohnen
Glenn E. Randall, Vice President/Treasurer, presiding
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Ted J. Langton, President

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Mr. Randall, presiding as Chairman in the absence of the Board President, stated that there was a short agenda and he hoped the Board could conclude its business in a short period of time.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Randall asked for participation from the audience on any item on the agenda. There was none.

PUBLIC HEARING ON ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW: There was no participation from the audience on this subject.

MOTION VOTE APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Ms. Eberly moved, seconded by Mr. Brandt, that the minutes of the March 23, 1982 Special Meeting and the April 20, 1982 Regular Meeting be approved as circulated. The motion carried unanimously.

ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW--EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Ellen Bevington, the District's Planning Administrator, summarized the information included in the agenda packet. As background, she said that staff had performed a productivity study which was broken down into number of people per vehicle hour. Two critical areas which were not meeting Board-approved productivity standards were brought to the Board as a final recommendation from the Annual Route Review, and would be implemented in September. The first, the #52 VRC/IRVING, has a recovery rate of less than 10% and fails to meet productivity standards at any time. In discussing the second, the Laurel Hill Valley, Ms. Bevington said that the District had tried

various alternatives, but the route has never met productivity standards. After taking into consideration social factors and the valley's isolation, staff still felt they must recommend deletion of the route.

MOTION After further technical explanation of the staff memo in the agenda packet, Mr. Kohnen moved that the Board adopt the staff recommendation as shown on page 30 of the agenda packet, which reads: (1) Authorize restructuring of #52 VRC/IRVING as outlined in staff recommendations (copy attached to minutes); and (2) Authorize restructuring of #29 UO/LAUREL HILL, including the deletion of service to Laurel Hill Valley, and the development of an abbreviated #29 U of O route. After being seconded, the motion passed on a unanimous vote.

VOTE

WISTEC CHARTER PROPOSAL: Kathryn Cox asked to speak on behalf of the Willamette Science and Technology Center (WISTEC). She explained that the program WISTEC was proposing was not tied directly to children, but they would probably be the majority of users. The aim of the program is to bridge the gap between pure and applied science and to let people know the diversity of economic backgrounds of this community. Some of the places scheduled to be visited are Pacific Northwest Bell, chemistry labs at the University of Oregon, fish hatcheries, etc. WISTEC would plan to schedule one bus per week, with presold spaces. Activities which would coincide with the week's bus tour would be planned for the rest of the week. Ms. Cox thought the WISTEC tours might eventually be tied in with occupational education in the public schools, transit, and the Convention Bureau.

Mr. Kohnen asked for comments from the staff regarding the availability of drivers, buses, etc. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, replied that the District had the equipment and drivers to provide the service. Mr. Randall asked if WISTEC had considered using existing bus routes, to which Ms. Cox replied that a number of places scheduled to be visited are not on existing routes, and that it might be a problem to take a large number of young people on the existing routes, especially if transfers were involved.

Ms. Cox explained that, although WISTEC is funded primarily through memberships, the trips are open to the public, and the area schools would be notified. She also said that the dollar charge was chosen because it was felt that \$1.00 was all the public would pay.

Mr. Brandt asked if the Board had agreed to similar programs in the past. Ms. Loobey explained that in the past three years or so when people had asked for special considerations in the fares, staff had tended to remain neutral and the Board had tended to not allow those special considerations. Mr. Randall added that the fear of starting a precedent and budget constraints had been the major deterrents, although he had voted in favor of the last such request and didn't feel that the new Board had to be committed to what the Board had done in the past.

Mr. Brandt commented that this request provided a community-wide service, whereas the last request was for a special interest group. He added that he agreed with Ed Bergeron's memo that the benefits would be community good will, public

service, and a potential future increase in passengers. Ms. Eberly thought the 20% return to LTD compared favorably with the current farebox return.

MOTION

Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the request for the charter of LTD buses for the WISTEC project at a cost to WISTEC of \$5.00 per hour, the number of occasions not to exceed ten times during the summer. Ms. Eberly seconded the motion. Mr. Kohnen asked Ms. Cox if the limitation of 10 trips presented a problem, to which she replied that it did not. With no further discussion, the motion carried 4 to 1, with Mr. Randall voting against the motion and Brandt, Calvert, Eberly, and Kohnen voting in favor.

VOTE

LANE COUNTY FAIR REQUEST: Mr. Randall announced that Steve McCulloch was present with a request to offer the public free bus transportation during the week of the Lane County Fair. He also called the Board's attention to the memo on this subject that Ed Bergeron had written and delivered to Board members the previous day.

Mr. McCulloch stated that the Fair Board, instead of trying to establish its own bus system for a week as it had in the past, wanted to work with LTD this year to provide free bus service throughout the system during Fair Week. He explained that one of the main objectives of offering free service would be to keep cars out of the neighborhood during the fair. He further said that the Fair Board had a \$30,000 advertising budget, and would play heavily on a "ride the system" aspect if there was free service for the week.

Mr. Brandt asked how scheduling extra buses worked. Ed Bergeron, Marketing Administrator, replied that the District would supplement the existing summer service with one extra bus, a shuttle from Autzen Stadium through downtown Eugene and on to the Lane County Fairgrounds, with primary emphasis on using the existing park and ride locations. Mr. McCulloch thought that by using the entire system, fairgoers could arrive at the fair better and faster than by using six separate, non-LTD park and ride locations.

Ms. Loobey stated that normally the District would make about \$13,000 during that week, and the amount of farebox revenue loss would be less than \$1,000. However, she said, it would be hard to place a value on the promotional aspect of working with the Fair Board to provide the service. Ms. Eberly commented that since there is so much lead-time before the Fair, if the proposal were approved, it would be appropriate to send a letter to merchants in the service area.

MOTION

Ms. Calvert moved that the Board accept the proposal by the Lane County Fair Board for free bus service during the Lane County Fair. Mr. Kohnen seconded the motion, which carried on a unanimous vote. Mr. McCulloch informed the Board that this proposal, as approved by the LTD Board, would appear before the Fair Board the following Thursday, May 20, at 9:30 a.m. for final approval. He thanked the LTD Board members for their consideration and approval of the proposal.

VOTE

POLICY MANUAL CHAPTERS 8, 9, AND 10: Ms. Loobey gave the Board members a replacement page for page 64, because the section on legal publication of the budget had originally been written incorrectly.

Regarding page 71, section 10.014, Ms. Calvert asked what the fare regulations were that the General Manager would be approving. Ms. Loobey said that there are a number of state and federal regulations over which the Board does not have authority. Staff would report to the Board but would adapt those guidelines to be in compliance with state and federal regulations. Mr. Randall asked to have the section clarified by a statement such as "as state and federal regulations require." Mr. Kohnen commented that he was not disturbed by the section but there were other reasons for General Manager approval of fare regulations, such as designation of sales outlets. He stated that the Board sets a general policy outline and this section entails what the General Manager would do to carry out that general policy.

Because of several Board members' concerns about this section, Ms. Loobey stated that staff would reword the section and bring it back to the May meeting.

MOTION
VOTE

Ms. Calvert moved that the Board adopt Chapters 8 and 9 of the Board Policy Manual. Mr. Brandt seconded, and with no further discussion, the motion carried unanimously.

SALARIED EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT PLAN--SIXTH AMENDMENT: Ms. Loobey explained that it was the purpose of this amendment to allow the District to take advantage of the expertise of staff who were at the point of seeking retirement but who would like to work part-time before full retirement. The actuaries and administrators of the retirement plan had reviewed the amendment and stated that there would be no subsequent additional cost to the District. Ms. Loobey further explained that currently retirees lose their benefits if they work after retirement.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Kohnen moved that the Board adopt the Sixth Amendment to the Salaried Employees Retirement Plan (copy attached) as presented in the material beginning on page 73 of the agenda packet. Ms. Calvert seconded the motion, which carried on a unanimous vote.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING: Mr. Randall asked for questions regarding the information items included in the agenda packet. There were none.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING: Mr. Randall then stated that he was serving notice of his intent to move to rescind the action taken at the April 20, 1982 meeting whereby the Board voted to expend \$188,000 for the Eugene Mall Project. He asked that the staff make this an agenda item for the June meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(h): The Board then adjourned to Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h) in order to discuss the District's preparations for court-ordered binding arbitration with Mr. Doug Barton of Corbett, Kane, Berk & Barton, LTD's attorneys for this arbitration process.

ADJOURNMENT: After returning to regular session, Ms. Calvert moved, seconded by Ms. Eberly, that the meeting be adjourned. With no further discussion, the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Janice W. Eberly
Secretary



LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

May 14, 1982

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lane Transit District Board of Directors
FROM: Staff
RE: Annual Route Review - Executive Summary

Background

The timeline for the Annual Route Review was established to allow for coordination of the service planning effort with the preparation of the budget and TDP for FY 82-83. Based on this timeline, the LTD Board received the results of the January 1, 1982 Route Segment Analysis in February. In the following month, March, low productivity services subject to review through the Annual Route Review process were identified. In April, alternatives to address the most deficient of these services were presented.

Planning has now prepared final recommendations to address two areas of deficient service - service to Laurel Hill Valley and the dispensation of the #52 VRC/IRVING, the lowest productivity route in the LTD system.

A technical appendix containing a complete description of the staff recommendation for each of these two service areas is appended. A summary of the recommendations is provided below. However, it should be emphasized that these proposals represent minor changes to the overall system. Less than 2% of the District's ridership will be impacted by the proposals.

#52 VRC/IRVING

The #52 VRC/IRVING ranks 27th out of 27 routes; it fails to meet minimum standards for weekday a.m. peak, weekday midday, weekday p.m. peak, Saturday a.m., Saturday p.m. and Sunday. Using only net variable cost, the farebox/operating cost ratio for this route is 13.2%. After conducting an extensive analysis of various alternatives, Planning proposes to restructure this route as follows:

1. Create #52 IRVING/RIVER ROAD to establish Irving-Eugene Mall connection via River Road, thereby eliminating the need for double transfers.
2. Extend #61 OAKWAY to provide two way service on Green Acres between Norkenzie and Delta Highway.
3. Establish a Riviera Express, a peak hour route between the Eugene Mall and River Road Transit Station, that would become operational in October.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT SALARIED EMPLOYEES'
RETIREMENT PLAN - SIXTH AMENDMENT

PARTY:

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT (which is the assumed business name of Lane County Mass Transit District and herein referred to as "Employer")

RECITALS:

A. Effective July 1, 1975 the Employer adopted a Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan. Subsequent to that date five amendments have been made to the Plan.

B. The Employer desires to further amend the Plan in certain respects.

NOW, THEREFORE, effective as at July 1, 1981, the Lane Transit District Salaried Employees' Retirement Plan is hereby amended as set forth on the pages attached hereto which are incorporated by reference herein as follows:

Section VIII - Retirement Benefits.

1. Paragraph 8.4 at page 21.
2. Paragraph 8.6.2 at page 21b.

DATED this 19 day of May, 1982.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

By: Phyllis P. Looney

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT SALARIED EMPLOYEES'
RETIREMENT PLAN - SIXTH AMENDMENT

retirement occurs. Retirement benefit payments shall commence in all events on the above dates, provided an application therefor is timely filed prior to such date. If an application is not timely filed, the amount of payment required to commence as above will not be ascertainable on the applicable date, and commencement of retirement benefit payments shall be delayed until no more than 60 days after the application is filed or the amount of such payment is ascertained, at which time a payment retroactive to the applicable date shall be made.

Retirement benefit payments shall continue until the last monthly payment prior to death. Retirement allowance payments to a joint annuitant shall commence one month after the last payment due to the deceased retired Member and shall terminate with the last payment due prior to the death of such joint annuitant.

8.6.2 Reemployment After Retirement. If a retired Member is reemployed by Employer, his retirement benefits shall continue during the period of said reemployment; however, such Member shall not accrue any benefit credits during the period of reemployment.

8.6.3 Lump-Sum Payments. In the event the normal monthly retirement benefit payable is less than \$30, or the lump-sum Actuarial Equivalent of the monthly retirement benefit is less than \$1,750, the Retirement Committee may elect to pay the benefits