

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 12, 1989.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

October 18, 1989

7:30 p.m.

McNutt Room,
Eugene City Hall

A G E N D A

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL
 - Brandt_____ Calvert_____ Herzberg_____
 - Montgomery_____ Parks_____ Pusateri_____ Andersen_____
- III. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT
- IV. BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH
- V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH
- VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION
- VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING
 - A. Approval of Minutes
 - B. Acceptance of Audit Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1989
 - C. Construction Retainage Account
- VIII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING
 - A. Current Activities
 - 1. Facility Project Update
 - 2. Eugene Downtown Transit Station Site Selection Committee Update
 - 3. Valley River Center Station Update
 - 4. Gateway Station Update
 - 5. Bus Purchase Update

6. Thank You Letter to All Employees from Board President
 7. List of Countries from Bus Operator's Visitors Book
 8. Special Services Report
- B. Monthly Financial Reporting
- IX. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING
- A. Lane Community College Station Relocation
 - B. Customer Complaints/Compliments
 - C. Move-in and Grand Opening Plans for New Facility
 - D. Eugene Transit Station Site Selection
 - E. Mid-year Budget Committee Meeting
 - F. Special Strategic Planning Meeting
- X. ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA NOTES
October 18, 1989

Page No.

IV. BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH:

The October Bus Rider of the Month is Rex Jemison, Jr., a student at Lane Community College. Rex says that riding the bus affords him an extra chance to study, and that LTD has the cleanest buses and best service he has ever seen. The bus operator who nominated Rex for this award says that Rex is always supportive of LTD, rides often and knows the system very well, and is courteous to operators and other riders.

Rex will attend the meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:

The October Employee of the Month is Greg Evans. He was hired as a part-time Customer Service Center Representative on June 23, 1987, and promoted to full-time on March 14, 1988. Greg is LTD's Loaned Executive to the 1989 United Way campaign, and has been active on several employee committees, such as the wellness committee and the 1989 banquet committee. He is also very involved with organizations in the community, including the NAACP and a citizens group which brought community officials together to talk about gang problems.

When asked what makes Greg a good employee, Customer Service Administrator Andy Vobora said that one of Greg's best qualities is his diplomatic style, which enables him to work well with all the different people who come to the Customer Service Center. He is especially good with the District's handicapped customers; he knows many of them by name and works well with them and their supervisors from other agencies.

Greg will attend the meeting to receive his award and be introduced to the Board.

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the September 20, 1989, regular meeting are included in the agenda packet for Board review and approval.

08

B. Acceptance of Audit Report for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1989:

enclosed
with agenda
packet

Background: Each year, an independent audit of the District's financial statements is performed. Included with, but not in, the agenda packet is a copy of the "Comprehensive Annual Financial Report" for the year ending June 30, 1989, for Board review. Bound copies of the audit report will be

available at the Board meeting. Also included is a management letter from the auditors, Coopers & Lybrand, which summarizes their findings during their examination of the District's financial statements. John Joyce and Mike Kehoe of Coopers & Lybrand will be present at the meeting to answer any questions the Board may have about the report or management letter.

Staff Recommendation: That the Board accept the management letter and audit report as presented by Coopers & Lybrand.

C. Construction Retainage Account:

17

Issue Presented: Should the Board adopt a resolution which allows retainage funds for Marion Construction Company to be deposited in an account that will earn interest on behalf of the contractor, and which authorizes the Board President, the General Manager, and the Director of Administrative Services to sign in the District's name on this account?

Background: In November 1988, the Board approved the use of retainage accounts for Walt's Concrete and Hyland & Sons. Staff are now proposing that a retainage account also be created for Marion Construction Company, the new general contractor for the maintenance/administration facility. The purpose of this account is to retain a percentage of the payments made to the contractor as work is completed throughout the building of the new facility. After a final inspection at the end of the project, any work which did not meet the District's specifications would be corrected before the funds in the retainage account would be released to the contractor.

Included in the agenda packet is a resolution which authorizes the deposit of funds at First Interstate Bank in a retainage account for Marion Construction Company, and authorizes the President of the Board of Directors, the General Manager, and the Director of Administrative Services, in any combination of two, to sign on the account.

Staff Recommendation: That the Board adopt the resolution included in the agenda packet, authorizing the deposit of funds in a retainage account for Marion Construction Company at First Interstate Bank, and authorizing the President of the Board of Directors, General Manager, and Director of Administrative Services, in any combination of two signers, to sign in the District's name on the retainage account for Marion Construction Company.

Results of Recommended Action: A percentage of the progress payments made to Marion Construction Company will be retained until final inspection at the completion of the facility project, in accordance with the District's signed bid documents.

VIII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

A. Current Activities:

1. Facility Project Update: Included in the agenda packet is a staff memorandum which provides an update on progress in the construction of the new maintenance/operations facility. 18
2. Eugene Downtown Transit Station Site Selection Committee Update: A memorandum in the agenda packet discusses the actions of the Downtown Transit Station Site Selection Committee to this date, and outlines actions to be taken in the next two months. An update will be included in the agenda packet each month, and Board action on a final recommendation is expected to occur in December. 19
3. Valley River Center Station Update: A memorandum in the agenda packet explains that construction has begun on the new VRC transit station. A drawing of the station will be available at the meeting for the Board's review. 23
4. Gateway Station Update: Included in the agenda packet is a staff memorandum which outlines the plans and costs for construction of an on-site transit station at the new Gateway Mall. 24
5. Bus Purchase Update: At the meeting, staff will update the Board regarding the purchase of new transit coaches. 25
6. Thank You Letter to All Employees from Board President: At the September meeting, members of the Board suggested that the Board President write a letter to all employees expressing the Board's appreciation for a job well done during a year of high ridership and many special services. A copy of that letter is included in the agenda packet for the Board's information. 25
7. List of Countries from Bus Operator's Visitors Book: In June, the Board members were shown a book which Roger Rix, one of LTD's bus operators, has customers sign when they ride his bus on Saturdays. A list of the countries 26

from which those customers came is included in the agenda packet for the Board's interest.

8. Special Services Report: As a result of Board discussion about special services requested by persons and agencies in the community, a list of requests (approved and denied) is included in the agenda packet each month. However, no requests were received this month.

B. Monthly Financial Reporting:

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Quarterly Recap of Division Expenditures | 28 |
| 2. Comparison of Year-to-date Actual Revenues and Expenditures to Budgeted (General Fund) | 29 |
| 3. Comparison of Budgeted and Actual Revenues and Expenditures | |
| (a) Capital Projects Fund | 30 |
| (b) Risk Management Fund | 31 |

IX. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING

- A. Lane Community College Station Relocation: At the November meeting, the Board will be asked to make a decision regarding the relocation of the LCC Transit Station.
- B. Customer Complaints/Compliments: A presentation explaining how customer complaints and compliments are received and handled will be made at the November Board meeting.
- C. Move-in and Grand Opening Plans for New Facility: In November, staff will report to the Board regarding plans for the District's move to the new facility, which is now scheduled for late January or early February. Staff will also inform the Board of plans for the dedication and public grand opening, now scheduled for May 1990.
- D. Eugene Transit Station Site Selection: In December, the Board will be asked to make a decision on the Site Selection Committee's final recommendation for a new site for the downtown Eugene transit station.
- E. Mid-year Budget Committee Meeting: A mid-year meeting of the LTD Budget Committee has tentatively been scheduled for Wednesday, December 6, 1989.

- F. Special Strategic Planning Meeting: A special Board work session will be held in December or January to discuss the District's five-year financial, marketing, and service plans and other strategic planning issues.

X. **ADJOURNMENT**

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 20, 1989

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 14, 1989, 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, September 20, 1989, at 7:30 p.m. at the Eugene City Hall, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: H. Thomas Andersen, Secretary
Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Thomas Montgomery
Herbert Herzberg
Keith Parks, presiding
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Janet Calvert, President
Gus Pusateri

CALL TO ORDER: In Ms. Calvert's absence, Mr. Parks called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBERS: Mr. Parks introduced two Board members who were attending their first meeting. Tom Montgomery lives in Springfield and is filling the position held by Rich Smith until his term expired in December 1988. Tom's term will end December 31, 1992. Tom has B.S. degrees in Anthropology and Biology from the University of Oregon, and has been the manager of the UO fish hatchery since 1982. He has ridden bus systems most of his life. Herbert Herzberg lives in southwest Eugene and is replacing Janice Eberly, whose term also expired in December 1988. His term will end December 31, 1992. Herb has been the president of Field Agent Laborers Local 121 Construction since November 1987. He has served on the LERC advisory board since its inception, served on the CETA board for Lane County during the first three years, and has been a member of the Eugene Bethel Lions Club since 1959.

BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH: The August and September Bus Riders of the Month were present to be introduced to the Board. Mark Nasholm, the August Bus Rider of the Month, is a Eugene native who has been riding the bus for the past 12 years. He is also a ham radio enthusiast and offered his services during the World Veterans' Championships this summer. Mark told the Board that he is legally blind, and needs help boarding or finding a seat once in awhile. He said that all the bus operators, riders, and other LTD employees have been wonderful, and that when he was looking for a house several years ago, he made sure it was on a bus route.

Wanda Mountjoy, the September Bus Rider of the Month, is well known for her outspoken optimism about life, and is apt to defend her bus operators against any negative remarks. She was born in Nebraska and came to Oregon in 1940 and began riding the bus right away. Her husband, Smith, took many pictures of this area in the early 1900's, and some are displayed at the Lane County Historical Museum. Mrs. Mountjoy said that words cannot express how wonderful the bus drivers and everybody have been to her. She said her eyesight is not good enough to drive, so she goes everywhere on the bus. She presented the Board with a packet of pictures from her husband's collection, including one of the *Register-Guard* building on Willamette Street in 1864.

Mr. Parks presented Mr. Nasholm and Mrs. Mountjoy with certificates of appreciation and LTD key chains.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: The September Employee of the Month, Angie Sifuentez, was present to receive her award and be introduced to the Board. Angie was originally hired as a Customer Service Representative on December 6, 1974, and was promoted to Marketing Representative in October 1982. Mr. Parks read from comments in the agenda packet which described Angie as a team player who could be counted on when the chips were down. After receiving her check and award, Angie said she wanted everyone to know that she appreciated all the nice things that were said about her.

MOTION
VOTE **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Mr. Andersen moved that the Board approve the minutes of the June 14, 1989, special meeting; the June 21, 1989, regular meeting; the July 19, 1989 regular meeting; and the August 16, 1989, regular meeting. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

APPROVAL OF FISCAL YEAR 1989-90 SECTION 9 OPERATING AND CAPITAL GRANT APPLICATION: Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, called the Board's attention to pages 26 and 27 of the agenda packet. He explained that Congress had not yet allocated the funds, but LTD expected to receive \$1,215,000 in federal Section 9 capital and operating assistance. The bulk of the money, \$1,075,000, is for operating assistance. An additional \$80,000 will be allocated for spare bus parts, and \$60,000 for the purchase of one-half of a 35-foot bus. Mr. Pangborn explained that this half-bus is part of the total purchase of 25 buses the Board approved three meetings ago. Because UMTA likes transit districts to use Section 9 funds toward bus purchases, this small amount was included in this grant application. Under grant rules, spare parts cannot be purchased as part of the total bus purchase with Section 3 funds, so Section 9 funds were used. The spare parts include two transmissions and two engines. Having these parts allows Maintenance to remove a transmission or engine from a bus to work on it, and replace it with one in good working condition, which means that the bus can get back on the road with as little down time as possible.

The local share for capital funding is 20 percent, and the local share for operational funding is 50 percent. This amounts to a little over \$1 million in local match, for which the District has adequate funding.

Ms. Loobey reminded the Board that the Section 9 grant application is an annual process and that these funds are apportioned to specific transit

districts. Section 3 funds, however, are discretionary, so LTD competes with other properties for those funds.

Public Hearing on Section 9 Operating and Capital Grant Application:

Mr. Parks opened the public hearing on the District's application for federal Section 9 capital and operating funds. There was no testimony from the audience, and the public hearing was closed.

Board Deliberation and Decision: Mr. Andersen asked what percent loss would be caused by Gramm-Rudman. Mr. Pangborn said it would be about 5 percent, or \$50,000. Mr. Andersen then moved that the Board authorize the General Manager to submit a grant application for Section 9 federal operating and capital funds through the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, in the amount of \$1,075,000 in operating assistance and \$140,000 in capital assistance, for Fiscal Year 1989-90. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion. With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote.

MOTION

VOTE

ELECTION OF BOARD VICE PRESIDENT: Mr. Parks explained that Janice Eberly, who was no longer a member of the Board, had been the Board's Vice President. The Board was being asked to elect someone to fill this position until the regular elections are held. In December, elections will be held for all four Board offices, for two-year terms which will begin in January 1990.

Mr. Andersen nominated Keith Parks to fill the position, noting that Mr. Parks was the only experienced Board member who was not already an officer. Mr. Montgomery seconded the nomination. Mr. Andersen moved, seconded by Mr. Brandt, that the nominations be closed. Mr. Andersen then moved that the secretary be instructed to cast a unanimous ballot for Mr. Parks as Vice President, to complete Ms. Eberly's term which ends December 31, 1989. The motion was seconded and Mr. Parks was elected by unanimous ballot.

MOTION

VOTE

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Facility Project Update: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, informed the Board that since the memorandum on page 28 was written, a new mechanical subcontractor was on the site and learning about the project. The mason was still not on the project, but Mr. Viggiano understood that was basically because that subcontractor was busy with other work, and the LTD masonry work was not on the critical path at that time. Mr. Herzberg asked what was included in the masonry work. Mr. Viggiano replied that it was just the brick work.

Marion Construction of Salem, the new general contractor for the project, at first estimated project completion for December 31, 1989, but that date will likely change because the mechanical subcontractor has not been on the project until now. The new completion date was thought to be sometime in January 1990, but that date would not be known for another week or so.

Mr. Parks asked if the new Board members were familiar with what had happened with the original general contractor on this project. Mr. Herzberg and

Mr. Montgomery had attended briefings about the District and its operations, so were familiar with the project.

Mr. Andersen wondered if it would be possible to recover staff time as well as direct costs from Fireman's Fund. Mr. Viggiano said that staff have been keeping track of their time, and would submit a claim for the additional time spent on the project. Since June, Mr. Viggiano had spent approximately 10 percent of his time on the project, but all together, the cost for staff time probably amounts to less than \$10,000.

Mr. Viggiano said that some months ago, the Board toured the new facility, which was 40 to 50 percent completed at that time. A lot more work has been completed since then. The sheet rock is up in the rooms, so it is now easier to get a better sense of the layout of the facility. He offered to schedule a couple of tours to meet the Board members' schedules, because he thought they would find the facility interesting at this stage of development. The Board members who were present scheduled a tour for 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 26.

Eugene Downtown Transit Station Site Selection Committee Update: The Committee is comprised of three LTD Board members, Janet Calvert (Committee Chair), H. Thomas Andersen, and Peter Brandt; one Eugene City Councilor, Rob Bennett; one Eugene Planning Commissioner, Gerry Gaydos; and one Eugene Downtown Commissioner, John Brown. Mr. Brandt informed the Board that the Committee had met three times, and that good progress had been made. The Committee so far had developed objectives and criteria for possible sites for a new Eugene Transit Station, as well as deciding how those sites would be evaluated. Approximately 17 initial sites had been narrowed to five, based on some criteria which showed that the eliminated sites did not meet the overall objectives of what the Committee and the District are trying to accomplish. For example, some were too far from the city center, some were on-street sites, etc.

Mr. Brandt handed out maps showing where the original and final sites are located. He explained that the existing site was included in the final five sites for comparison purposes, but does not meet the criteria of having an off-street site. The other final sites were #4, the butterfly lot; #6, the Greyhound lot; #13, the future City Hall lot; and #17, the elections lot, located on the north side of 6th Avenue, between 5th and 6th.

The next step the Committee will take will be to apply the criteria, in order to determine the one or two most promising sites and further investigate their availability, suitability, etc. Mr. Brandt said he was sure that everyone on the Committee had his or her own opinion about which site would be the best, so choosing the final site could be a difficult process. He explained that the list of objectives and criteria is basically related to finding a site that is close to downtown; close to where the greatest ridership is; has good access; includes costs which are in relation to the benefits received; is off-site; and has long-range potential.

Mr. Brandt said that, in his mind, the most important criterion is to look at mixed-use possibilities, in order to develop the transit station in combination with another development such as an office building or the Greyhound bus

station, and share the cost. He added that the Committee's work so far is very preliminary but moving along fairly well.

Mr. Parks asked if this was an advisory group and, if so, to whom. Mr. Brandt said this was an advisory group to LTD. Mr. Parks asked if public input hearings would be scheduled. Ms. Loobey replied that there will be opportunities for public input, including public hearings. Mr. Brandt added that staff from the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG), various departments in the City of Eugene, and LTD were all doing the work for the Committee, and that he thought it was a well-coordinated effort. Mr. Parks said he thought it would be good if this joint venture could continue through the public hearing process.

Mr. Andersen said he would echo much of what Mr. Brandt said. He was pleased at the cooperation at this level among the governmental groups. He thought the appointed officials all seemed to be moving toward the same goal, and thought they would not be moving in any way that is adverse to the LTD Board. Mr. Brandt thought that problems might arise after the site is selected, if there are residents or business owners who object to the transit station being in a certain place.

Mr. Herzberg asked if the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was involved in this process, because the EPA sometimes created stumbling blocks. Mr. Montgomery wondered if the EPA should be involved earlier instead of later in the process. Ms. Loobey replied that the issues the EPA might be interested in would be either noise or air pollution, and that the Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority (LRAPA) would be the direct contact agency for sole source pollution, and the District would have to obtain some sort of a permit. Also, the project would have to meet federal noise abatement regulations.

Valley River Center Transit Station: Ms. Loobey called the Board's attention to a staff memorandum on page 30 of the agenda packet. At the June Board meeting, the Board approved spending \$125,000 to construct a transit station at Valley River Center (VRC). One issue facing the District at that time was that going out to bid for a separate contract to construct the station would have increased the time and possibly the cost of construction. However, by leasing the station from VRC, the station can be constructed in conjunction with the VRC improvements being made now. According to the terms of the contract with VRC, LTD will lease the station for 20 years for an advanced lump sum payment of \$125,000, which is not quite the full cost of construction. If, after 20 years, a new lease is negotiated, it would be consistent with lease agreements with any other station, such as at the new Gateway shopping center. VRC has agreed to pay the additional costs which are not covered by LTD's budgeted amount of \$125,000.

Mr. Andersen wondered about the phrase, "if a new lease is negotiated." Ms. Loobey explained that the transit station is a specialized use, and staff believe that VRC wants LTD at the shopping center, so it is unlikely that LTD would not be able to negotiate a new lease. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, added that if Valley River Center wanted to build a new store where the transit station is before the 20-year lease expires, VRC would have

to work with LTD to find a new place for the transit station, and VRC would be obligated to replace the station.

Year-end Performance Report: Joe Janda, MIS Administrator, discussed the District's second year-end performance report, in which the District's performance in several key areas was compared with performance in FY 87-88. Mr. Janda stated that FY 88-89 was a record year for the District in all areas. Ridership increased 15.6 percent compared to the previous year, and reached a record high of 4.4 million passenger trips. He explained that passenger trips measure a continuous trip, including transfers. The main reasons for this ridership increase are (1) the UO prepaid pass program, in which students pay \$4.50 per term for unlimited ridership on the system--last year, 750,000 student trips were taken on the system, and about 10 percent of the ridership increase can be attributed to this program; (2) service adjustments; and (3) general growth in the population of three to five percent per year.

Mr. Andersen wondered how the District arrives at its goals for each year, and what the projections are for FY 89-90. Mr. Janda said the goals are projections based on the previous year, and that staff are projecting a 5 percent ridership increase over FY 88-89. The UO program has had one year of maturity, so increases there are not expected to be as great.

Mr. Parks asked if prepaid programs were offered to the City, County, or other entities. Ms. Loobey said that staff were working with the City and County toward similar programs.

In discussing service, Mr. Janda said that since 1979-80, there has been a slight decline and then a gradual build-up of service. By making minor adjustments and some enhancements, the District has taken an incremental, gradual approach to service. Mr. Andersen noted that service is behind ridership, and wondered if an increase in service should be expected. However, Mr. Janda said he thought ridership follows service. Mr. Brandt commented that the best situation is for ridership to increase while service stays "flat." Mr. Janda said that, currently, the service level is almost 12 percent lower than service at the last time of high ridership in 1979-80.

Mr. Janda explained that productivity is the measure of total person trips per schedule hour. In 1988-89, productivity was at 20.3 person trips, the highest level ever. This means that for every hour of service, 20.3 person trips were made on the system.

Mr. Janda then talked about bus fares. He said that fares, service coverage, and service frequency all affect a person's decisions regarding whether or not to ride the bus. In 1979-80, ridership was at an all-time high. When fares were nearly doubled at the end of that year, ridership dropped dramatically, calling attention to the sensitivity among customers regarding fares. Ms. Loobey added that the District learned a lesson, that fares cannot be left low for a long time and then increased dramatically. Instead, LTD has been increasing fares incrementally, by increasing the cash fare at one time and the next time increasing the cost of purchasing passes and tokens. Since beginning this

practice, the District has not seen the loss of ridership when increasing fares. Instead, riders will change to the cheapest fare mechanism for them.

Mr. Janda then discussed performance measures in the Transportation division. Road call down time was described as the number of minutes a bus is off schedule because of mechanical failure or an accident. Another bus is dispatched, and down time is measured from the time the dispatcher gets the call to the time a bus is back in service and on time for that route. Last year, schedule down time was decreased by 8.1 percent, which Mr. Janda said was a tribute to the working relationship between the Maintenance and Transportation divisions in responding to these situations and getting a bus back in service.

Absenteeism measures the percent of bus operators who are absent as a result of illness or injury. That trend has also been downward over time. Mr. Janda explained that every one percent drop in absenteeism results in a cost savings of approximately \$20,000. Illness cannot be controlled, but a wellness program has been implemented at the District to encourage employees to be more proactive with their health. An incentive program has also been implemented to encourage attendance. Mr. Andersen said he understood that it was made easier to achieve the incentive cash awards and that absenteeism had then dropped off. Mr. Janda said that was correct. Mr. Montgomery asked about the relationship between the money spent and the money saved to decrease absenteeism. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, replied that the ratio is somewhere around three to one; that is, if the District spent \$25,000, it would expect to save \$75,000.

Fleet maintenance performance indicators include miles between mechanical road calls, fuel miles per gallon, and oil miles per quart. Mr. Janda said there had been a 7.2 percent increase in number of miles traveled. The District's buses travel roughly 3.25 million miles a year, or almost 9,000 miles each day. The average bus travels 165 miles on a weekday. Mechanical road calls are measured when a bus is actually pulled out of service. In FY 88-89, this figure decreased from 8,000 miles between road calls to 3,500. However, the Maintenance division recently implemented a new computerized fleet management system, and the way in which mechanical road calls are reported has changed. In the future, Mr. Janda said, staff will have a much more accurate data base.

Fuel miles per gallon and oil miles per quart are decreasing primarily because the fleet is aging and the buses have traveled more miles.

Mr. Andersen asked how staff assess complaints and compliments. Mr. Janda stated that complaints are written and distributed to the appropriate division for resolution, but staff's suspicion is that they under-count compliments. For instance, staff receive compliments in daily conversations but have a tendency not to report them. However, if staff hear complaints, they are reported so that there can be some review and resolution. As an example, Mr. Dallas said that Mr. Andersen had told him that Mr. Andersen's children were having some trouble on the bus. Mr. Dallas filled out a complaint form in order to research the problem; however, if Mr. Andersen had paid the District a compliment, Mr. Dallas would have been less likely to write that up.

Mr. Janda next discussed revenue and operating cost measures, found on page 36 of the agenda packet. Table VII on that page shows the farebox-to-operating cost ratio, or the percent paid for by the customer, back to the inception of the District. This ratio increased from 19.5 percent to 20.2 percent last year. Passenger revenues increased 14.6 percent in 1988-89, to \$1.7 million, following an upward trend since 1982-83. Last year, 58 percent of fares were prepaid, by the use of passes, tokens, day passes, and the UO subsidy program, and the remainder was paid by cash. Cash fares decreased from 46 percent to 42 percent. This use of prepaid fares is encouraged, because they are easier to administer and because people are more likely to ride if they have passes or some prepaid instrument.

Operating cost is defined as the cost of doing business, including overhead. Operating costs increased 7.5 percent last year, due to salary increases, additional employees to implement the new service, and inflationary adjustments. The farebox-to-operating cost ratio, which increased 3.6 percent last year, has been fairly stable over time, ranging from 18.6 to 22 percent, in spite of increasing operating costs. In comparing base fares adjusted for inflation from 1978, the 8.9 percent decrease in adjusted base fare is a significant accomplishment.

Two important performance measures at the Customer Service Center (CSC) are total calls received and the lost-call rate, shown on page 37 of the agenda packet. In 1988-89, the CSC experienced a 22 percent increase in calls, and made a significant improvement in the number of calls which were not lost. The CSC staff achieved a rate of 4 percent lost calls in a record year for number of calls received.

Safety and risk management measures are shown in table IX on page 37 of the packet. Miles between preventable accidents is defined as the number of miles between accidents which could have been prevented by the driver. Total system miles have been increasing over time. The average miles traveled between preventable accidents increased by 3.8 percent to 104,500 in FY 88-89. This represents about one preventable accident every 12 days. In FY 89-90, the District will be emphasizing defensive driving. The number of preventable accidents is normally lower directly after the employees go through defensive driving courses, so the number of preventable accidents is expected to drop again this year. Total liability claims increased by 32 percent, from 83 to 110. Workers' Compensation claims stayed the same, at 30 for the year.

Mr. Janda closed by saying that FY 88-89 was a strong year for LTD, due to increasing ridership and the general health and stability of the community, as well as more efficient service being offered to the community.

Mr. Brandt suggested that the Board President post a letter to all employees expressing the Board's appreciation of the employees' efforts to achieve the results just discussed by Mr. Janda. Mr. Andersen agreed, saying the employees should be proud of these results.

Transit Development Plan: Mr. Janda gave copies of the new Transit Development Plan (TDP) to the Board members, and offered to send copies to anyone

in the community the Board might suggest. He explained that requirements for receiving Section 9 funds used to require a yearly planning document. Now the TDP is more of an internal resource document for staff, but is also sent to the Chambers of Commerce and the public library, among others. Mr. Pangborn added that UMTA still requires a planning document, but is less stringent about what is included in it. Three- to five-year plans are included, as well as other materials which are more resource materials for staff than they are planning documents. The TDP is a compilation of LTD's operating statistics and plans. Mr. Brandt suggested that the TDP be sent to *The Register-Guard* and the *Springfield News*. He also asked who paid for the TDP. Ms. Loobey replied that the document was produced internally on the District's computer network.

Farewell for Former Board Members: Ms. Loobey said that Ms. Calvert and one or two other Board members had asked about having a farewell reception for three Board members whose terms had expired. She asked the Board's preference in doing so. Mr. Parks suggested having something before a Board meeting, but especially before the dedication of the new facility; he suggested a party for those who spent so much time planning the new facility. Mr. Brandt thought it would need to be a separate function, rather than at the beginning of a Board meeting, to be meaningful. Mr. Andersen suggested that Ms. Loobey and Ms. Calvert decide what would be the best way to recognize the outgoing Board members.

Results of State Legislative Session: Mr. Andersen asked what had happened to the transit legislation that Ms. Loobey had reported on at the June meeting. Ms. Loobey replied that everything passed except the tire and battery tax.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Andersen moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion, and the meeting was duly adjourned at 9:10 p.m.


Board Secretary



October 18, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator
RE: New Facility Update

The pace of construction has improved during the last few weeks as subcontractors have increased their staffing levels at the site. Marion has still not provided a new schedule for the completion of the project, although one is expected at any time. Once the new schedule is available, a more accurate move-in date can be set.

Work completed during the past month includes the installation of most of the overhead doors in the maintenance building; installation of some light fixtures and some cabinet work in the administration building; and completion of site paving, including sidewalks.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Stefano Viggiano', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Stefano Viggiano
Planning Administrator

SV:ms/sjh



October 18, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator
RE: Update on the Downtown Transit Station Site Selection Committee

The Downtown Station Committee met on October 3, 1989, to review options for mixed-use development at each of the various sites and to briefly discuss the citizen involvement process.

As you know, there are five locations under consideration for the downtown transit station. Some of these locations will be considered for mixed-use development, some for a transit station only, and some as either a mixed-use development or a transit station. The current list of sites to be considered is as follows:

1. Existing Station, transit only
2. Greyhound lot, transit only
3. Greyhound lot, mixed-use with commercial/parking
4. Butterfly lot, transit only
5. Butterfly lot, mixed-use with commercial/parking
6. City Hall lot, mixed-use with City offices
7. Elections lot (1/2 block), mixed-use with commercial/parking
8. Elections lot (3/4 block), mixed-use with commercial/retail/parking
9. Elections lot (full block), mixed-use with commercial/retail/parking

The existing station, which is on-street, can only be considered as a transit station without mixed-use development. The Greyhound lot and the Butterfly lot will be considered as either transit stations or in conjunction with a commercial (office) development, probably with parking. The City Hall lot and the various configurations of the Elections lot will be considered only as mixed-use development. The City Hall site is reserved for future expansion of City offices, and thus cannot be considered without that office development. The Elections lot, which is separated from the center of downtown by 6th and 7th Avenues, would not compete well with other sites as a transit-only development.

The proposed citizen involvement process is outlined on the attached memorandum to the Citizen Involvement Committee (CIC). The CIC reviewed the proposed

Board of Directors
Downtown Station Committee Update
October 18, 1989
Page 2

process on October 12, and found it appropriate. As indicated in the memorandum, the public input phase will occur after the Site Selection Committee has made a recommendation on a site(s), and before action on the recommendation by the Lane Transit Board, the Downtown Commission, the Eugene Planning Commission, and the Eugene City Council. The major elements of the process include public service announcements, an article in *The Register-Guard*, a mailing to downtown businesses, a community forum on the issue, and public hearings. Special efforts will be made to solicit comments on the issue from bus riders.

The next Site Selection Committee meeting is scheduled for November 14, 1989, to review the scoring for each of the sites. Prior to that meeting staff from LTD, L-COG, and the City of Eugene will meet to develop recommended scores. Committee members, and other LTD Board members, are invited to attend all or part of that work session. It will be held on October 20, 1989, in the Washburne Building Conference Room, 72 West Broadway, Eugene, between 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.



Stefano Viggiano
Planning Administrator

SV:ms:js

attachment

M E M O R A N D U M

10/04/89

TO: Citizen Involvement Committee

FROM: Planning and Development Department, Lane Transit District

SUBJECT: Eugene Transit Station Site Selection Analysis - Citizen Involvement Program

Background

The Lane Transit District Board and City of Eugene have jointly initiated a study to determine and analyze a range of siting alternatives for relocation of the existing transit station. The current LTD transit station is located along a four block section of 10th Avenue between Charnelton and Oak Streets. Increases in ridership, operational difficulties, and concerns about the long-term viability of the current station have prompted the commission of this study.

The study, which is being conducted by the Lane Council of Governments, will evaluate individual sites in the downtown area for future use as a downtown transit center. The study proposal, as agreed to by the City and the LTD Board, includes an analysis of the potential for mixed use development on the selected site.

In July, a steering committee was formed to guide the development of the study. The steering committee is composed of three members of the Lane Transit District Board, one Downtown Commissioner, one Planning Commissioner and one City Councilor. The committee has met four times since July in settings open to the public. The study is projected to be completed in December, 1989, at which time the steering committee will be dissolved.

Citizen Involvement Plan

The steering committee will conclude their service with a recommendation on a preferred site for a new downtown transfer station. That recommendation will be forwarded to the LTD Board, Downtown Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council for their approval.

Following the transmittal of that recommendation, a formal citizen involvement process will be initiated. A variety of techniques will be employed to notify transit users and the public-at-large about the study, the various alternatives considered, and the final recommendation. Among those techniques are the following:

1. Lane Transit District will create a series of public service announcements to notify the public about the study and opportunities to comment on the alternatives and recommendation.

2. Lane Transit District and the City of Eugene will jointly prepare a mailing to all downtown businesses whose customers or employees could be affected by the relocation of the transit station. The mailing will describe the purpose of the study and the implications of relocation on the development of a stronger transit system.
3. Since the study's inception, the Register-Guard has expressed an interest in following its development. Lane Transit District staff will attempt to interest the Register-Guard in running a feature article on transit station relocation and broader transit issues.
4. Lane Transit District and the City of Eugene will sponsor a community forum to share information on relocation alternatives with the public. The forum will inform interested citizens about key findings of the study and will enable staff and decision-makers to engage citizens in discussions about the long and short-term implications of transit station relocation. A process for capturing and recording citizen's comments on the proposal will be developed prior to the forum for transmittal to the various decision-making bodies.
5. As part of the study, L-COG has agreed to prepare a Downtown Transit Center Concept paper in draft and final forms. Draft copies will be made available to the public at LTD offices, the downtown transit center, the Eugene Planning and Development Department, the Permit Information Center, Lane Council of Governments and various downtown businesses.
6. Notices of the public forum and public hearings on the relocation will be posted on advertising reader-boards inside LTD busses and within the 10th Avenue transit center. In addition, a graphic display showing relocation alternatives and final recommendation will be prepared and will be displayed at the downtown transit center and later used for the public forum.

Following this phase of public involvement, each of the affected boards, commissions and the City Council will be required to approve the final recommendation. It has been suggested that LTD and City staff convene a single public hearing to be attended by all representatives from all four affected bodies. A joint public hearing would enable to the public to comment one time on the proposal rather than attending four meetings to allow their opinions to be heard. Each of the approving bodies could take testimony at this joint hearing but could delay approval until some point after the hearing date. The idea has some merit and will be pursued by staff.

Action Requested

Review and approve the Citizen Involvement component of the LTD Transit Center Site Selection Study.



Lane Transit District

P.O. Box 2710 Eugene, Oregon 97402 Telephone: (503) 687-5581

October 18, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Micki Kaplan, Transit Planner
RE: Valley River Center Transit Station

Construction of the new Valley River Center (VRC) transit station is underway. As you may recall, the station will be located at the west end of Valley River Center, in front of Mr. Kay's restaurant. The new station is scheduled to be completed by November 15, 1989.

A drawing of the new transit station will be posted in the McNutt room during the October 18 Board meeting. Board members are also encouraged to go to VRC to see the new station during construction. I would be happy to tour the construction site with any interested Board members. If you are interested in such a tour, please contact me at 687-5581.

Micki Kaplan

Micki Kaplan
Transit Planner

MK:ms:js



October 18, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Andy Back, Transit Planner
RE: Gateway Transit Station Update

The District is in the process of developing plans for construction of an on-site transit station at the new Gateway Mall in Springfield. The project is included in the District's approved Capital Improvements Program.

Recently, General Growth (the developers of the mall) approved the District's conceptual design of the transit station. Unthank, Poticha, and Waterbury, the District's architects working on the station design, should complete working drawings for the transit station by early November. Construction of the transit station should take place over the next few months. The estimated construction costs are \$80,000.

Target and Sears, the two main anchors for the new mall, are currently open. However, the rest of the mall is not planned to be open until the spring of 1990. Service now operates on Gateway Boulevard in front of the mall. The two routes that run on Gateway, the #12 Harlow and the #15 LCC/Gateway, will, once the mall is open, travel on the mall site and serve the new transit station. This service will provide the mall with direct bus access from several neighborhoods in both Eugene and Springfield, as well as the Eugene Transit Station and the Springfield Transit Station.

Andy Back/jp
Andy Back
Transit Planner

AB:ms:js



Lane Transit District

P.O. Box 2710 Eugene, Oregon 97402 Telephone: (503) 687-5581

September 28, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Employees
FROM: Janet Calvert, President,
Board of Directors
RE: Thank You for a Job Well Done

At the September 20, 1989, Board of Directors meeting, the Board members heard a report which summarized the District's major achievements from July 1, 1988, through June 30, 1989. Some of the key performance areas measured throughout the year were ridership, service, fare payment, revenue, and operating cost. In all areas, the District either met or exceeded its targeted objectives, and in some cases set all-time records. This continued an eight-year trend of increasing ridership, more efficient allocation of service, and more effective utilization of District resources in providing service to the community.

After hearing this report, the members of the Board requested that I write a memorandum to all employees to express the Board's appreciation for a job well done. It is very rewarding to know that LTD is experiencing ridership increases when other transit districts across the country are struggling with declining ridership. The Board members appreciate the many positive efforts made by LTD's employees this year, during times of harsh weather conditions, special events, and record-breaking ridership.

Again, on behalf of the Board of Directors, thank you all for a job well done.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Janet Calvert".

Janet Calvert
President, Board of
Directors

js



October 18, 1989

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
RE: List of Countries from Bus Operator's Visitors Book

Some of the Board members will recall seeing a "visitors book" kept by one of LTD's bus operators, Roger Rix. On Saturdays, Roger asks his bus riders to sign a book, and he has signatures and comments from people from all over the world. This book was passed around for the Board to look at during a meeting last spring.

Now Roger has prepared a list of the countries in which these visitors live. The list is included in the agenda packet in order to show the Board that our bus operators truly are ambassadors to the world.

Phyllis

Phyllis Loobey
General Manager

PL:js

attachment

plbd1018.jhs

LIST OF COUNTRIES
FROM
ROGER RIX'S VISITORS BOOK

ARGENTINA
AUSTRALIA
AUSTRIA
BANGLADESH
BORNEO
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COLUMBIA
COSTA RICA
CYPRUS
DENMARK
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
ECUADOR
EGYPT
EL SALVADOR
ENGLAND
ETHIOPIA
FIJI
FINLAND
FRANCE
GREECE
HAITI
HUNGARY
ICELAND
INDIA
INDONESIA
IRAN
ISRAEL
ITALY

JAPAN
JORDAN
KOREA
LEBANON
MALAYSIA
MEXICO
NEPAL
NETHERLANDS
NEW ZEALAND
NICARAGUA
NIGER
NORTH YEMEN
NORWAY
PAKISTAN
PANAMA
PERU
PHILIPPINES
POLAND
SCOTLAND
SINGAPORE
SOMALIA
SOUTH AFRICA
SPAIN
SWEDEN
SWITZERLAND
TAIWAN
THAILAND
U. S. A.
U. S. S. R.
VIETNAM
WALES
WEST GERMANY
ZIMBABWE

QUARTERLY RECAP OF DIVISION EXPENDITURES

AS OF 9/30/89
25.0% OF YEAR COMPLETED

DIVISION	EXPENDITURES YEAR TO DATE	ANNUAL BUDGET	CURRENT MONTH	REMAINING BALANCE	PERCENT EXPENDED
ADMINISTRATION	98,443	361,900	25,961	263,457	27.20%
MGMT INFO SVCS	25,275	119,200	9,642	93,925	21.20%
FINANCE	51,269	220,700	15,320	169,421	23.23%
PERSONNEL	21,639	85,500	5,148	63,861	25.31%
SAFETY & TRAIN	21,007	112,620	7,635	91,614	18.65%
MARKETING	143,404	525,600	82,139	382,196	27.28%
PLANNING	49,878	210,300	14,560	160,422	23.72%
CUSTOMER SVC	64,018	255,350	24,935	191,332	25.07%
TRANSPORTATION	1,094,266	4,565,300	354,341	3,481,034	23.75%
SPEC. TRANS.	113,706	438,400	46,827	324,694	25.94%
VEH. MAINT.	484,127	2,229,150	167,272	1,755,023	21.62%
FACILITIES OF NONDEPARTMENT	54,992 0	240,271 1,377,659	13,265 0	185,279 1,377,659	22.89% 0.00%
GENERAL FUND	2,212,023	10,751,950	767,046	8,539,927	20.57%
CAPITAL PROJ.	762,452	2,719,200	601,300	1,956,748	28.04%
RISK MGMT.	359,318	903,300	14,290	543,982	39.78%
TOTALS	3,333,793	14,374,450	1,382,636	11,040,657	23.19%

LANE TRANSIT
 COMPARISON OF YEAR-TO-DATE ACTUAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES TO BUDGETED
 GENERAL FUND
 FOR THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1989 (25.0% OF YEAR COMPLETED)

	YEAR-TO-DATE ACTIVITY	YEARLY BUDGET	VARIANCE	
			FAVORABLE AMOUNT	(UNFAVORABLE) %
REVENUES				
Operating Revenues:				
Passenger Fares	390,910	1,260,000	(1,469,090)	-78.98%
Charters	68,919	72,700	(3,787)	-5.21%
Advertising	19,448	80,200	(60,752)	-75.75%
Miscellaneous	1,266	2,000	(735)	-36.73%
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUES	480,537	2,014,900	(1,534,363)	-76.15%
Non-Operating Revenues:				
Interest	101,114	160,000	(58,886)	-36.80%
Payroll Taxes	1,549,247	6,541,000	(4,991,753)	-76.31%
Federal Operating Assistance		1,075,000	(1,075,000)	0.00%
State In-Lieu-Of Payroll Taxes	120,628	619,500	(498,872)	-80.53%
State Special Transportation	60,156	331,300	(271,144)	-81.84%
Section 18 Operating		10,250	(10,250)	-100.00%
Other		0	0	
TOTAL NON-OPERATING REVENUES	1,831,144	8,737,050	(6,905,906)	-79.04%
TOTAL REVENUES	2,311,682	10,751,950	(8,440,268)	-78.50%
EXPENDITURES				
Administration:				
Personal Services	156,290	667,100	510,810	76.57%
Materials and Supplies	37,296	122,270	84,974	69.50%
Contractual Services	24,045	110,550	86,505	78.25%
Total Administration	217,632	899,920	682,288	75.82%
Marketing and Planning:				
Personal Services	145,154	594,700	449,546	75.59%
Materials and Supplies	30,762	189,550	108,788	57.39%
Contractual Services	31,384	207,000	175,616	84.84%
Total Marketing and Planning	257,300	991,250	733,950	74.04%
Transportation:				
Personal Services	1,080,386	4,509,500	3,429,114	76.04%
Materials and Supplies	3,866	22,100	18,234	82.51%
Contractual Services	113,721	472,100	358,379	75.91%
Total Transportation	1,197,973	5,003,700	3,805,727	76.06%
Maintenance:				
Personal Services	275,072	1,139,200	864,128	75.85%
Materials and Supplies	214,347	1,141,321	926,974	81.22%
Contractual Services	49,699	198,900	149,201	75.01%
Total Maintenance	539,119	2,479,421	1,940,302	78.26%
Contingency		200,000		
Transfer to Capital Projects	0	767,959	767,959	
Transfer to Risk Management	0	409,700	409,700	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,112,023	10,751,950	8,539,927	79.45%
EXCESS (DEFICIT) OF REVENUES OVER EXPENDITURES	199,659	0	(10,280,196)	

LANE TRANSIT
 COMPARISON OF BUDGETED AND ACTUAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
 CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
 FOR THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER ENDING 9/30/89 (25.0% OF YEAR COMPLETED)

	YEAR-TO-DATE	YEARLY BUDGET	BALANCE
RESOURCES			
Beginning Fund Balance	3,556,823	1,815,296	1,741,327
Revenues:			
UMTA Section 3-Buses		2,127,000	(2,127,000)
UMTA Section 3-Facility	537,951		537,951
UMTA Section 9-Buses		98,000	(98,000)
UMTA Section 9-Capital	24,728		24,728
UMTA Section 18-Buses		360,000	(360,000)
UMTA Section 18-LCC	3,300	96,000	(92,400)
Federal Highway Admin			0
Transfer from Gen'l Fund		767,959	(767,959)
Total Revenues	566,279	3,448,959	(2,882,630)
TOTAL RESOURCES	4,122,902	5,264,255	(1,141,353)
EXPENDITURES			0
Locally Funded:	7,263	2,408,000	2,408,722
UMTA Funded:			
Planning Administrator			0
Construction Representative	12,093		(12,093)
Systems Analyst			0
Benefits	2,209		(2,209)
Computer Software	5,630		(5,630)
Office Equipment	7,189		(7,189)
Maintenance Equipment	15,947		(15,947)
Bus Stop Improvements	9,387	120,000	110,313
Land & Buildings	699,327		(699,327)
Buses		2,585,000	2,585,000
Bus Related Equipment	556		(556)
Service Vehicles	256		(256)
Miscellaneous			0
Total UMTA Funded	752,893	2,705,000	1,952,107
FHWA Funded:			
Bus Stop Improvements	0		0
Total FHWA Funded	0	0	0
Contingency	0		0
Capital Lease Principal	0,291	14,200	11,910
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	762,452	5,127,200	4,364,749
ENDING FUND BALANCE	3,360,450	137,055	3,223,395
RESERVE FOR FUTURE CAPITAL EXPENDITURES		137,055	137,055

LANE TRANSIT
 COMPARISON OF BUDGETED AND ACTUAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
 RISK MANAGEMENT FUND
 FOR THE MONTH OF SEPTEMBER ENDING 9/30/89 (25.0% OF YEAR COMPLETED)

	YEAR-TO-DATE	% ACTIVITY	YEARLY BUDGET	BALANCE
RESOURCES				
Beginning Fund Balance	411,850	88.84%	463,600	51,750
Revenues:				
Transfer from Gen'l Fund	0	0.00%	409,700	409,700
Interest	8,908	29.69%	30,000	21,092
Total Revenues	8,908	2.03%	439,700	430,792
TOTAL RESOURCES	420,758	46.58%	903,300	482,542
EXPENDITURES				
Administration	1,050	25.00%	4,200	3,150
Worker's Compensation	220,000	92.44%	238,000	17,997
Liability Program	124,868	19.37%	644,700	519,837
Miscellaneous Insurance	13,402	91.72%	16,400	2,998
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	359,318	39.78%	903,300	543,982
ENDING FUND BALANCE	61,440		0	61,440