

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, October 15, 1986

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 9, 1986, the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, October 15, 1986 at 7:30 p.m. at the Eugene City Hall.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer  
Janet Calvert, President, presiding  
Janice Eberly, Vice President  
Gus Pusateri, Secretary  
Rich Smith  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Joyce Nichols  
Larry Parducci

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Calvert called the meeting to order, and stated that a lot of what was planned for that evening would be summarizing and making sure everyone understands the Board discussion and direction from the special meeting the previous Monday.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: There was no participation from the audience.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Calvert introduced the October Employee of the Month, Don Hall, a bus operator who will have been working at the District for nine years next January. She stated that he was recommended for Employee of the Month by a supervisor, which was a high recommendation of his abilities. She said that she and the other Board members are proud to have so many outstanding employees, and congratulated Mr. Hall on this award. She presented him with his check and certificate, after which he stated that it had been a good eight and one-half years, and one of the best jobs he had ever had.

MOTION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Brandt moved that the minutes of the September 17, 1986 regular meeting be approved as distributed. After seconding by Ms. Eberly, the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

VOTE

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON PERMANENT DOWNTOWN EUGENE TRANSIT STATION: Ms. Loobey thought it would be useful for the Board and staff to review the discussion on this issue which occurred at the October 13 meeting. She said there were also some other activities in the staff site selection process that staff could review with the Board, and that staff were beginning a survey of patrons whose trips terminate in downtown

Eugene, to see if they do, indeed, walk north and east when they get off the bus.

Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, stated that the Board met the basic need which existed on Monday--that of approving criteria for inclusion in the Urban Renewal Plan Update. Now, in response to Board discussion, staff were proposing to slow down the pace in terms of locating a site for a bus station downtown. He discussed a time line for three program areas. The first, the Urban Renewal Plan Update process, involves attendance at a public hearing on the Update and continuing to work with City staff on the site selection process. The second area, continuation of the site selection process, will include a survey of downtown bus riders to know who uses the bus now, and why; a survey of other transit districts that have recently constructed downtown transit stations; a report at the December Board meeting; re-examination of alternative sites in January; and selection of first and second choices in January and February. During this time, staff and the Board will continue to work on design and financing, either through committee or the full Board, as the Board wishes. The third process, determination of the availability of the Butterfly Lot, will involve meetings with the County and legal counsel; determination of the necessary legal action and cost; Board approval to proceed with legal action if the Butterfly Lot is the preferred site; and, finally, legal action.

Mr. Runyan wanted to know if the District had received a firm response that LTD's criteria for a downtown transit station will be included in the Urban Renewal Plan Update. Mr. Pangborn said it has not been firmly stated, but should happen. Mr. Runyan thought this should be clearly stated in the letter of transmittal, and Mr. Parks thought a statement about holding a joint meeting with the City Council before the Update is adopted should be added to the letter.

Mr. Pangborn stated that staff wanted to determine that evening any issues which the Board members felt were still unresolved, such as an on- or off-street facility; weighting of the criteria; the impact of future development, such as the Riverfront Park or University of Oregon expansion; control of loitering; or the use of private property.

Mr. Brandt said he would like the Board members to make sure they don't forget that they have to try to obtain some guarantees from the City regarding street usage, etc. He would like to see what other cities do and what LTD can do over time, so that the transit station will not be destroyed and so streets will not be used in a different way in the future.

Mr. Runyan wondered if the amount of coverage over the facility had been addressed; i.e., small shelters, complete coverage, etc. Ms. Loobey stated that this is a design issue, and staff had only looked at it in the sense of checking to see if there is enough room in the Butterfly Lot, etc. Mr. Pangborn said it had been determined in the criteria that the new station should have at least as much coverage as the current station.

Mr. Runyan commented that it is probably easier to cover an off-street site than an on-street facility, so an important consideration will be what is important to patrons.

Ms. Eberly expressed her concern about the source of funds, and what the City's part in this issue will be. She said the City has a vague willingness to discuss the funding with LTD, but there have been no assurances. Ms. Loobey stated that the City's participation would not be held to tax increment financing, since the City has Federal Aid Urban funds it could dedicate. She added that staff will pursue whatever funds might be available from the City, and that it has been consistent in all joint staff discussions that LTD anticipates there will be participation by the City, just as at 10th and Willamette.

Ms. Calvert was concerned about the planning of five new parking structures and how that conflicts with transit goals. She wondered if the Board could address that issue in any way. Mr. Pangborn said that, as the city grows, LTD should continue to receive some of that growth in dependent and choice riders. He thought it was fair to say that the Eugene Development Department staff think differently than LTD does in terms of moving people around in the downtown area. Ms. Loobey commented that there might be a point sometime when the Board wishes to remind the City Council of the goals in the transit element in the Metro Plan. She said the policies there have been largely ignored over time by all local units of government.

POLICY ON PRIVATIZATION: Mr. Pangborn called the Board's attention to the proposed policy on privatization which had been written for approval by both LTD and the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG), since the two agencies operate under the same federal regulations. L-COG had not yet seen the draft policy, but if they do change it, they will only change the parts that apply to L-COG's planning role in the process. If they were to recommend changes in other areas, it would be as a recommendation to the LTD Board.

Mr. Pangborn stated that the policy primarily requires LTD to actively select comments from private transportation providers. This would be a standing committee organized and staffed by LTD just for that purpose. All comments by the committee would be advisory in nature. In discussing section 4.3 on page 17 of the agenda packet, Mr. Pangborn explained that subcontracting must be legal and must not adversely affect other elements of the system, and private providers must meet appropriate service standards. He added that the words "will consider subcontracting" should take the place of "will subcontract." The policy will be sent to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) for approval, or revision, if necessary.

Mr. Runyan asked how UMTA would monitor the program and about the relationship between the LTD and L-COG advisory committee. Mr. Pangborn explained that there would probably be two advisory committees, but LTD and L-COG would try to meld them together into one, if possible. It would

probably not be possible to have the committee be L-COG's responsibility, although there will need to be cooperation between the agencies, and staff will try to minimize the amount of work involved. He added that LTD would want to maintain the responsibility for record keeping, etc., in order to be certain of having the proper records in order to qualify for federal grant money.

Ms. Loobey stated that UMTA cannot condition the awarding of grants or set quotas for privatization, although quotas had been set earlier. APTA proposed that bus properties with 100 or fewer buses would not have to comply with privatization requirements. She said that the chances of this being approved in Congress at that time were slim, and that if a reauthorization bill was not approved in the next week, nothing would probably be done until the first of the year, which would allow APTA the opportunity to try once more for the Small Operators provisions.

Ms. Loobey also stated that the subcontracting of service for Coburg was previously lost in arbitration, and the District is currently in arbitration concerning the subcontracting of service in Junction City. No decision will be made until after the first of the year. This decision will have a major impact on the District's ability to look at opportunities for subcontracting where lower cost service can be provided. She added that the Amalgamated Transit Union is fighting the privatization issue in Congress.

Mr. Runyan asked about subcontracting bus maintenance. Ms. Loobey replied that LTD looked at this area very closely six years before and again recently. Mr. Pangborn explained that some parts of bus maintenance are presently subcontracted, such as upholstery, major body work, bus painting, etc. The only transit properties that might be subcontracting out all maintenance are those with only two or three buses; no one else at this time has found it feasible or cost effective to do so.

Ms. Eberly moved that the Board adopt the proposed policy on privatization. After being seconded by Mr. Brandt, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

#### ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

APTA Awards: Ms. Loobey showed the Board several APTA AdWheel awards recently presented to LTD by the American Public Transit Association. She explained that each year, properties across the country submit specific categories of their advertising campaigns, such as print, broadcast, etc., to independent judges. This year, LTD won a first-place award for television for the Freedom Pass commercials; a first-place award for newspaper advertising for the Get Carried Away Christmas ads; a second-place award in the Transit/Outdoor category for the Free Fare During the Fair bus sign; and Honorable Mention in Transit/Outdoor for the Get Carried Away bus sign. Ms. Loobey explained that LTD competes with other properties of the same size, of which there are 364, and said that no other transit district received as many awards as LTD. Mr. Pangborn added

that the District's advertising agency, Cappelli Miles & Wiltz, has been very creative in its advertising campaigns for LTD. The Board members complimented staff for their success in this area.

Facility Project Update: Ms. Loobey distributed a memo written by Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, and stated that one result of the Value Engineering and Peer Review process was a recommendation to replace fueling in place with the more traditional service and clean system using a fuel island. Fueling in place would be more expensive to implement and maintain than was originally projected. Using a fuel island concept increases the noise and activity on the property through the evening hours, and staff are presently researching two alternatives for mitigating the sound. One alternative would be to move the entire facility to front on Glenwood Boulevard, and would require a different kind of land purchase and set-up on the property. A second alternative would be to construct a sound-reducing barrier between the facility and the neighboring residential area. Staff used an updated site plan to explain the possible changes to the Board.

Monthly Financial Reporting: In response to a question, Karen Rivenburg, Finance Administrator, explained that, although it appears that the District is behind in the year's budget for passenger boarding improvements, there are grant moneys that are available which are not spent. Mr. Pangborn stated that the District had been placing new shelters, which are easier to maintain and more attractive, at high use stops, and was planning to move the older shelters from those stops to others. However, the City of Eugene building department now says that the old shelters do not meet the City's building codes, so LTD is involved in protracted discussions with them. In the past, the City has been lenient on the codes, but is now enforcing them.

Dr. Smith wanted to know if staff anticipated that payroll tax revenues would continue to be lower than expected. Ms. Rivenburg replied that it is still early in the fiscal year, and staff would have a better idea about the payroll tax in November. The District only receives payroll tax revenue four times a year, and none was received in September. In November, LTD will have received payroll taxes for half of the current fiscal year.

Quarterly Ridership Summary: Ms. Loobey handed out the quarterly ridership summary, which had not been finalized before the packet was distributed.

Quarterly Operations Summary: Mr. Brandt wondered why there were more breakdowns between miles this year. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, replied that there had been electrical problems with starting the new buses, and the starters are now being reengineered.

Ms. Loobey commented that farebox revenue is 6.2 percent higher than last year, person trips are up 6.4 percent, and productivity is up 3.5 percent. She added that staff are very pleased with this positive

report. Ms. Calvert asked about ridership during the Lane County Fair. Mr. Pangborn replied that during the Fair, the District experienced the highest ridership day in its history.

Future Budget Committee Meeting: Ms. Loobey stated that a Budget Committee meeting was being planned for the evening of the next regular Board meeting, November 19. Mr. Pangborn added that staff believe the budget will be pretty much on target. Mr. Brandt suggested sending a letter to the Budget Committee, stating the budget situation, rather than holding a meeting. Staff said they would talk to the Budget Committee Chairman, John Watkinson, about the possibility.

Oregon Transit Association Conference: Ms. Loobey distributed to the Board members a memo regarding an Oregon Transit Association Conference to be held at the Red Lion in Springfield on October 26-28. All Board members were invited to attend all or part of the conference.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Brandt moved, seconded by Ms. Eberly, that the meeting be adjourned. With no further discussion, the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

bdmn1015.jhs