Special Work Session

re: service planning

5/02/90

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 30, 1990.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
SPECIAL BOARD WORK SESSION

May 2, 1990
6:00 p.m.

LTD BOARD ROOM
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene
(off Glenwood Blvd.)

PLEASE NOTE: A SPECIAL DINNER WORK SESSION ON SERVICE PLANNING WILL BE HELD PRIOR TO THE 7:30 P.M. ADJOURNED BOARD MEETING. THIS WORK SESSION WILL BE ESPECIALLY HELPFUL FOR NEW BOARD MEMBERS; HOWEVER, ALL BOARD MEMBERS ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Andersen______ Brandt______ Calvert______ Fitch______

Herzberg______ Montgomery______ Parks______

III. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

IV. STAFF PRESENTATION ON SERVICE PLANNING

V. ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned Meeting

5/02/90

Public notice was given at the
April 18, 1990, regular meeting, and
to *The Register-Guard* for publication
on April 26, 1990.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
ADJOURNED BOARD MEETING

May 2, 1990
7:30 p.m.

LTD BOARD ROOM
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene
(off Glenwood Blvd.)

A G E N D A

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Andersen______ Brandt______ Calvert______ Fitch______

Herzberg______ Montgomery______ Parks______

III. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (April 18, 1990)

VI. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF GROUP PASS POLICY
(A revised draft policy will be available at the meeting.)

VII. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 18, 1990

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 12, 1990, 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, April 18, 1990, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Calvert called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Fitch was not yet present at the meeting.

BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH: Ms. Calvert introduced the April Bus Rider of the Month, Dorothy Ehli, a nurse at Sacred Heart Hospital who had been riding the bus since 1953. Ms. Calvert said that the bus operators knew Ms. Ehli as a person who was always cheerful, and presented Ms. Ehli with a certificate and LTD key chain. Ms. Ehli commented that she at first thought it would be embarrassing to have her picture on the buses, but that it had been fun to talk with the other riders who recognized her from her picture. She congratulated LTD on the completion of the new facility, and said she had appreciated the gradual expansion of service over the years.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Calvert then introduced Customer Service Representative Jerry Addison, the April Employee of the Month. Ms. Addison had been hired as a part-time employee in 1983 and promoted to full-time in 1989. Ms. Calvert asked Ms. Addison about the "wide range of experience" referred to in her posters. Ms. Addison said she had worked with people for a long time, and that was what she enjoyed most. She added that she was happy to be a part of the LTD team. Ms. Calvert then presented Ms. Addison with a check, certificate, and letter of recognition.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Calvert asked for comments from the members of the audience. There were none.

MOTION

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Andersen moved that the minutes of the March 21, 1990, Board meeting be approved as written. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved by unanimous vote, with Ms. Fitch not yet present at the meeting.

VOTE

ADDITIONAL SUMMER SERVICE TO FERN RIDGE RESERVOIR: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, informed the Board that LTD had been approached by the Youth Development Commission to add additional service during the summer between Eugene and Fern Ridge Reservoir. The Commission was interested in encouraging area youth, many of whom buy the summer freedom pass, to seek activities at locations other than the Eugene Mall.

Currently, buses travel outbound to Fern Ridge at 7:20 a.m., 9:20 a.m., and 3:20 p.m. The last return trip is at 4:38 p.m. The Youth Commission requested an additional trip at mid-day and one returning later in the evening, to create a better summer schedule for spending time at the Reservoir. The evening trip can be added easily, by routing the bus which already travels out Highway 126 around the reservoir to Orchard Point, for an additional half-hour of service. Mid-day, an entire trip would be added, or another 1.5 hours of service.

Mr. Viggiano stated that additional summer service to outlying recreational areas had been requested by various parties numerous times in the past. Therefore, staff were suggesting that the District test this type of service. Staff were also suggesting that the District work with the Youth commission on a joint promotion designed to encourage youths to visit area activity centers, including Fern Ridge, by bus, and to seek a subsidy from the Youth Commission for the additional service. Mr. Viggiano stated that the recommended two hours of service would cost approximately $3,000 for the summer.

Mr. Andersen commented that he thought this recommendation was a very good idea.

Mr. Viggiano said staff would be meeting with the Youth Commission on April 24, to discuss these ideas formally. Ms. Calvert asked about a subsidy from the Youth Commission. Mr. Viggiano said that the Youth Commission actually had no money to subsidize bus service, but might approach Eugene Parks and Recreation for assistance. Mr. Brandt asked if the youth would pay to ride the bus. Mr. Viggiano said that they would, but the fares would not pay for more than 20 percent of the service. Mr. Montgomery asked what would happen if LTD had to pay the entire amount. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, replied that the money to pay for the service through June 30 would come from the current budget, and the balance of the summer would be funded from the FY 90-91 budget.

MOTION Mr. Andersen moved that the Board authorize staff to implement two hours per weekday of additional service between Eugene and Fern Ridge Reservoir during the summer of 1990, and work with the Youth Commission to seek subsidy and assistance with joint promotions. With no further

VOTE discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote. Ms. Fitch was not yet present at the meeting.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE ACT: Ms. Loobey called the Board's attention to materials explaining the Reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act, beginning on page 30 of the agenda packet. She explained that the recently-announced National Transportation Policy of the Bush administration included a 40 percent reduction in Section 9A operating assistance and a codification of local share requirements which would be greater than in current law. For the long term, the Policy would direct further reductions in General Fund revenues (Section 9A) and greater local and state contributions for transit projects.

Since the Policy announcement, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Tri-Met, and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on transportation (JPACT) had responded to the national Policy. Ms. Loobey explained that JPACT included Tri-Met; the Metropolitan Service District; Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington Counties; and the City of Portland, and that the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG) is similar to JPACT in its transportation focus.

Ms. Loobey said that the Executive Committee of the Oregon Transit Association (OTA) was in the process of developing its own policy regarding the National Transportation Policy, in preparation for the reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act for Federal FY 1991. She said that there were several outstanding issues which could be in conflict with ODOT's position on the National Policy, including funding recommendations, as well as comprehensive and integrated transportation systems planning, construction, and implementation.

Ms. Loobey had included several policy statements for the Board's review, beginning on page 31 of the agenda packet. She recommended that the Board adopt those policy statements, in order for her to forward them to the OTA for discussion at its next meeting on April 23.

The Washington state Department of Transportation and transit operators had worked in a collaborative way to establish a single policy position regarding the reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act. That process was used as the model for the OTA discussions for submittal to ODOT. Ms. Loobey said that it would be most effective for the grantee agencies to agree to forward joint policy statements to their Congressional delegation. She added that this had not been done in the past; that highways and transit districts had presented their positions and Congress had to sift between the two.

Ms. Loobey said there is also an organization called the Crescent Coalition, comprised of California, some mid-west states, and Idaho. The Crescent Coalition had already stated what it wanted from the Reauthorization Act; if it was successful, then Oregon would suffer, since the Coalition's calculation formula for highway funds was higher than transit funds. Oregon is a "donor" state, meaning that it contributed more to the federal funding than it received. If the Pacific Northwest states could resolve some of their differences and present a united front, they would be in a stronger position in relation to the Reauthorization Act. The American Public Transit Association (APTA), Tri-Met, and Washington's larger providers all had taken a similar position, but the policy statements in Ms. Loobey's memorandum represented the views of the small operators, and were not totally consistent with where Tri-Met stood on the issues.

Ms. Loobey reviewed the proposed policy statements. Briefly, they were that there be no further erosion in the funding of the Section 9 program; that integrated transportation systems planning and implementation in the state must be consistent with an integrated and collaborative method of determining project priorities and funding, including state and local governments, metropolitan planning organizations, and the transit operators; that the State of Oregon should be recognized and rewarded for its system of land-use planning when seeking federal funding; and that Section 3 funds for bus purchases should be allocated on a formula basis to transit properties of less than one million population. The Section 3 funds, therefore, would be based on a formula rather than a competitive basis.

Mr. Andersen asked about the reason for the conflict between Tri-Met and the rest of the state. Ms. Loobey said that Tri-Met was an urban area with a population of over 1 million. Tri-Met had built and was planning to enlarge its light rail system, so already had access to 40 percent of the funds. She added that an integrated systems policy position with ODOT was begun in the legislature last session (funding for roads with increased gasoline taxes for transit use), through a variety of measures. However, when the time came to consider the Reauthorization bill, ODOT did not include Tri-Met, and did not reflect the legislative position; it also totally ignored the small operators. She said that Tri-Met would like to continue the 40-40-10-10 match (40 percent new rail starts; 40 percent rail rehabilitation; 10 percent one-time capital investment; and 10 percent bus purchase). The smaller operators, however, would like to change the formula or have a little more money allocated to capital. ODOT has traditionally built roads and highways, which is reflective of a philosophical position in Oregon.

Mr. Andersen asked if there was currently a formula for Section 3 funds. Ms. Loobey replied that it was not currently done by formula, and there was nothing to say what would happen to the small operators when the 1991 capital is confined to 10 percent of the total funding package. She said she would like to see that money allocated by some formula, such as by population and population density. Mr. Andersen asked if the Board would be endorsing a specific formula. Ms. Loobey said it would not; that the formula would be an element for negotiations.

MOTION

Mr. Herzberg moved that the Board support the policy statements outlined on pages 31 and 32 of the agenda packet. Mr. Parks seconded the motion. In response to a question from Mr. Parks, Ms. Loobey stated that she did not want to go forward without the Board members understanding OTA's position on this issue. Mr. Andersen said that discussing this issue with the Board was also consistent with discussions held after the last legislative session, regarding the Board's comfort with Ms. Loobey acting as the General Manager of LTD or a representative of the OTA on specific issues.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the motion carried by unanimous vote, with Ms. Fitch now present at the meeting.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Facility Project Update: Mr. Andersen asked about outstanding change orders mentioned in the agenda packet. He wondered if LTD would end up in arbitration over those. Mr. Viggiano said he thought not, since those change orders were for a relatively small amount of money. Mr. Andersen asked about Walt's Concrete. Mr. Viggiano replied that Walt's had filed a claim that the company had incurred extra costs based on the three-month delay in construction. The value of that claim had been withheld from payments to Marion Construction, and LTD instructed Marion Construction to deal directly with Walt's. Mr. Andersen then asked about the mechanism for settling disputes between LTD and the bonding company. Mr. Viggiano replied that the District had withheld payments, so the bonding company would be the one to initiate any legal action, but had not yet done so. The District had incurred $40,000 in other costs, including consultant payments and staff time, and had requested that the bonding company pay those costs. The bonding company had challenged only $3,000 of that amount. The District's response to the bonding company was that approximately $1,000 of the challenged $3,000 should not have been charged because it did not result from the construction delay. The bonding company had not yet replied to that response. In all, the District has retained from the contract 5 percent in retainage, the claim from Walt's Concrete, expenses, and an estimate for liquidated damages.

Ms. Loobey said she wanted to take a moment to compliment staff on the move to the new facility. She said staff had been planning the move for months, and that it was as graceful and elegant as it could have been, for the magnitude of the move, done in just over four days. She added that Bob Hixon, who had moved the administrative staff, said he had never had a move of this magnitude that was as well planned and with staff who were so cooperative and helpful.

Ms. Loobey said the first morning pull-out from the new facility had occurred at 7:30 a.m. on Sunday, April 15, and the first full-service pull-out at 4:30 a.m. Monday. There were ribbons for the buses to go through, muffins and hot cross buns for the employees, and other celebratory events.

She said there were still some little glitches with the facility, but they were all being taken care of. There were still a lot of boxes that were not unpacked, and the process to refinish the desks was underway that week. The buses were running, the telephones were working, and staff were dragging a little from working so hard to do their daily jobs and accomplish the move at the same time. Ms. Loobey said she was pleased with the process and the results for which staff had planned so carefully.

Mr. Brandt asked when LTD would sell the old facility at 8th and Garfield. Mr. Pangborn replied that there were two major issues to be resolved before the property could be turned over to School District 4-J. First, there were eight to ten underground storage tanks, for which LTD ultimately would be liable for any leakage problems at any time in the future. The District would be financially liable to bring the tanks and surrounding area back up to the standard. He said staff were trying to work out a method to know what kind of testing could be conducted so 4-J would hold LTD harmless for future leaks. Staff were also working to find out from 4-J exactly which tanks they would want to use. Mr. Pangborn added that if LTD were selling to a private agency, the District would take out the tanks and sell the property "as is." District counsel for 4-J and LTD were to meet in the next couple of weeks to work out language for the sale to hold LTD harmless.

The second issue was the transfer of the federal share at the federal level. Mr. Pangborn explained that LTD held title to the property, but the federal government, through the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) retained an interest. UMTA was willing to transfer its interest to another federal agency with closer ties to education, so 4-J staff had been working with someone at the Region X Department of Education office to assume that interest. After those details have been worked out, the sale can be completed.

Mr. Pangborn said that the current market value of the property at 8th and Garfield is approximately $1.1 million, based on two appraisers, one for the school district and one for LTD, who were very close in their evaluations. Mr. Brandt asked if LTD would receive 20 percent of that amount. Mr. Pangborn said the District would first have to deduct the cost of resolving the underground storage tank issue, and would receive 20 percent of the balance. Mr. Andersen asked if the cost was associated with testing and removing, rather than a payment to 4-J to assume liability in the future. Mr. Pangborn said that was correct, and that staff estimated that LTD would receive about $200,000 for the property. He added that the school district was in a financial bind with its capital budget, and may not be able to pay that amount at once.

Ms. Fitch asked about the other 80 percent interest in the property. Mr. Pangborn explained that the federal government had spent the money for 80 percent of the purchase price of the facility. If the school district were to use the property, no money for that portion would change hands, but the federal government would retain its right to that 80 percent. If the school district sold the facility, then the federal government would want to receive its 80 percent.

Mr. Brandt wondered who was insuring the 8th and Garfield property, and if there was special police protection for it. Mr. Pangborn said LTD would insure it until it is transferred to the school district. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, said that a special security agency was checking the facility once a day, and that everything was behind locked gates. He said that there was nothing of real value left, and the most that could happen would be vandalism. Mr. Pangborn said LTD's insurance staff were working with 4-J's insurance staff to be sure the property was properly covered, and that the school district wanted to first make some renovations and move in sometime during the summer.

Mr. Parks asked about the estimated cost to take the fuel tanks out of the ground. Mr. Pangborn said that a preliminary estimate for the larger tanks was $5,000 per tank, assuming there had been no leakage. Each tank has to be pulled out of the ground, cut up, and disposed of in a hazardous waste site. Ms. Calvert asked if the tanks were empty. Mr. Dallas replied that they were empty and tied down so they would not float. The District did not want to fill them with water because then there would be 10,000 gallons of contaminated water to dispose of.

Mr. Andersen asked how the receipt of payment for the property fit into the budget. Mr. Pangborn said the $200,000 had been added to the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) in a four-year payment schedule. He added that, at this point, cash flow was not that urgent for the District; however, LTD would require interest if payments were made over time rather than all at once.

In response to a question from Mr. Parks about a hold harmless clause, Mr. Pangborn said that at some point the school district has some responsibility for leakage, but if the school district couldn't pay the associated costs, LTD would be liable. In order to avoid that possibility, he said, the District could pull the tanks from the ground before selling. Mr. Brandt thought the District could have the tanks certified as environmentally clean, after which time the onus would be on the school district. However, Mr. Pangborn said that under current law the District would be responsible if the current owner were not financially able to correct any problems. Mr. Parks said he would rather get the tanks out of the ground than be responsible in the future. Mr. Pangborn agreed that this would be the safest for LTD, but there would be some cost to the community, because the school district would then need to install tanks. Mr. Viggiano added that the tanks cost about $20,000, plus an installation cost of $20,000. Mr. Pangborn stated that if it were the Board's pleasure that LTD remove the tanks and have no continuing liability, staff would take that action, and wondered if the Board members would like to have District Counsel attend a meeting to discuss this question with them. He said that when Counsel works on the specific language for the sale of the property, indemnification language would also be considered. Mr. Andersen said, however, that if Mr. Pangborn is correct about the federal law, no matter what deal LTD would make with 4-J, LTD would still be liable.

Ms. Calvert said she would like to have staff provide a follow-up on this issue before the process is finalized.

<u>Briefing on Commercial Driver's License and Drug Testing Policies</u>: Ms. Loobey stated that there had been a lot of press about drug testing in the work place, so staff wanted to give the Board an update on both the Commercial Driver's License and drug testing policies of the District.

Mr. Dallas stated that these policies have two goals: to ensure the health and productivity of employees, and to ensure the public safety. He explained that LTD has an Employee Assistance Program, in which the employee can receive initial counseling for substance abuse, family problems, financial problems, or any other problem which may affect an employee's ability to perform his or her job at LTD, at no cost to the employee. The District has also required pre-employment drug testing as part of a complete physical for the last five years. Drug testing for reasonable suspicion or probable cause is also District policy; however, no testing had yet been necessary, and there had not been an accident which staff believe was related to substance abuse.

Mr. Dallas stated that UMTA, which is a branch of the U.S. Department of Transportation, had recently issued new regulations for drug testing of employees in safety-sensitive positions. For LTD, those positions include bus operators and mechanics, and their immediate supervisors. The UMTA regulations include pre-employment testing; reasonable-cause testing; post-accident testing, if the accident results in severe damage or injury; testing upon return to work after a long absence (probably three to six months); and random testing, which is the most controversial and has been challenged legally. Random testing would require that 50 percent of employees in safety-sensitive positions be tested every year. The random selection would be from the entire group, so theoretically one employee could be tested every week.

The new UMTA guidelines apply to large properties beginning in December 1989, and will apply to small transit districts beginning in December 1990. The size of the property is based on the number of buses, and LTD falls into the small property group. The intent of the later implementation date for small properties is to let most of the legal issues be resolved by the large districts first.

After an appeal of the regulations by the Amalgamated Transit Union in Washington, D.C., the Courts rules that Congress did not give UMTA the authority to issue blanket safety regulations. However, Mr. Dallas said he believed that Congress would give UMTA that authority, since authority had already been given to other safety-related industries, such as the Federal Aviation Authority. Transportation Secretary Skinner was seeking that authority, and two bills were already in Congress.

Mr. Dallas then discussed what changes to LTD's current policy would be necessary. First, he said, the goals of LTD's policy were to encourage employees to seek treatment before they had employment problems, and to provide for testing and discipline when performance problems occurred. Staff anticipated that a new policy would be completed sometime during the summer, and would be discussed with the labor union in late summer or early fall.

The elements of the District's program are to provide ongoing employee awareness training; to set clear policies; to offer support for employees who voluntarily seek treatment; to provide discipline for employees with performance problems; and to use accurate testing to establish the facts. As a first step, LTD had joined an employer's consortium through Serenity Lane, and had been offering drug awareness classes for employees and supervisors for the past four months. A co-dependence class was also scheduled to be offered to all employees in the fall.

Ms. Fitch asked the percentage of employees who had sought help voluntarily. Mr. Dallas said that number might be 10 percent in five years, or 2 percent a year.

Mr. Dallas stated that a simple, general policy statement would be needed from the Board in order to comply with the federal requirements, and that a draft policy statement would be brought to the Board in the next few months.

Ms. Calvert asked if drivers who were in a serious accident would be tested only if drug problems were suspected. Mr. Dallas said that they would be tested only if they met the test of reasonable suspicion. Mr. Andersen wondered how drugs were ruled out without the use of drug testing. Mr. Dallas gave an example of a bus accident in which it was not the bus operator's fault, such as a bus being hit by a log truck, or something else which could cause severe damage. He added that the word "severe" had not yet been defined for these purposes, but that these kinds of details were being worked out with employee input.

Mr. Brandt wondered if there was a maximum penalty and if that was made clear to employees. Mr. Dallas said that the maximum penalty would be discharge, and that would be made clear to employees. Mr. Brandt then wondered if an employee could be discharged based solely on the results of the random test. Mr. Dallas said probably not, if performance was not affected. Most likely, he said, the employee would have a last-chance agreement, which might include a treatment program in order to keep his or her job, and tests every so often for the next couple of years. Mr. Brandt asked if the District paid the employees while they were in treatment. Mr. Dallas said it did not; that the employees need to be responsible for their own actions, and that suspension might be appropriate in addition to treatment, especially if there were a related problem such as poor attendance.

In discussing the Commercial Driver's License, Mr. Dallas said that in 1986, Congress passed the Commercial Vehicle Act, and that there are new state requirements for commercial vehicle driver licensing. All of the District's bus operators and mechanics will have to be relicensed by April 1992, but relicensing has already begun, with approximately 10 bus operators taking the test every month. A written exam on basic knowledge, air brakes, and passenger endorsement is required for all who drive commercial vehicles on public highways. For those who are new drivers, have a major moving violation conviction in the last five years, or who have a cited traffic accident in the last two years, a road test is also required.

Commercial drivers will now only be allowed to have one license instead of being licensed in several states, and will have to notify their employers within 30 days of any traffic violation conviction, even for violations in their personal cars. The District has a fee arrangement in which the Oregon Department of Motor Vehicles sends LTD notification of charges of traffic violations. Depending on the severity of the charge, a supervisor will talk with the employee. This is only a discussion session, prior to any conviction.

A CDL can be suspended for one year for a first-offence for driving under the influence of drugs or with a blood alcohol level of .04 while operating a commercial vehicle; for leaving the scene of an accident; or for using the vehicle to commit a felony. A three-year suspension will be given for a first-offence if the driver refuses to take a breath test. A CDL can be taken away permanently for the second offense of any one of the above, or as a result of a felony involving a controlled substance and a commercial vehicle.

Mr. Brandt asked why mechanics need to have a Commercial Driver's License. Mr. Dallas replied that the license is necessary for anyone driving a commercial vehicle on a public street, and mechanics take buses on the street to road test them. At the 8th and Garfield facility, bus cleaners and fuelers had to drive across 8th Avenue, but now they will not leave the property, so will not have to have a CDL.

Group Pass Program: Ms. Calvert stated that this briefing was meant to be a continuation of a discussion held at the last Board meeting. Ms. Loobey said that staff and the Board had been discussing the various aspects of the program since it first was proposed for the University of Oregon (UO). For purposes of the discussion, she said it was important to go back to the premise of why LTD exists--to carry people on the bus. The number of riders indicates whether or not the District is successful in its service planning, marketing, and fare structure. Part of the Goals & Objectives have been community-driven, because the community made the decision to have a public transit district when the private operator folded in 1970. Various urban planning documents have included directives shaping transit, including the modal split found in the TransPlan. Ms. Loobey said that the City of Eugene has a number of policy directives that would encourage the use of transit, but many have not been addressed by the City.

In the community, some direction about the District's role has been established for the urban area, including social issues such as clean air and less use of private automobiles. Ms. Loobey said that the group pass program seems to fit as a part of the overall urbanized goals for the community vis-a-vis transit, and that transit plays a greater role than previously acknowledged. The markets where LTD can achieve those goals are at Sacred Heart Hospital, the UO, the City, etc. Staff have not had a policy that directs the group pass program, and the Board members had recently brought up issues that were not previously been addressed. Therefore, staff had prepared a draft policy which was included in the agenda packet for discussion only, not for final approval. Staff planned to refine the policy based on discussion with the Board, and take it back to the Board for adoption at a later meeting.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff had received inquiries from Sacred Heart Hospital about a group pass program. The hospital's 400 new parking spaces are now full, and they believe that they need 200 parking spaces to serve the new medical offices being built on Hilyard. Employees were being surveyed to determine how many would ride the bus. Because the hospital has extreme parking problems now, the administration would like to begin a group pass program in May. Employees would become used to taking the bus before there is more on-street parking during the summer term at the UO. Then, when the new offices open in the fall, more parking will be available. Staff believe this service could be added without additional buses, unlike the requested group pass program at Lane Community College, which would require additional buses.

Mr. Pangborn said that group pass programs were agreements between LTD and an organization in which transit service would be provided to all individuals in the organization for a set fee. If established according to certain parameters, group pass programs would increase ridership and productivity; maintain or increase service hours (no service hours were added to accommodate the City of Eugene group pass program, but hours were added for the UO); maintain or increase the farebox-to-operating cost ratio; and decrease the cost per trip, because the District would be adding riders but not service.

Mr. Pangborn said that a 20 percent farebox-to-operating cost ratio was average for a transit system the size of LTD. Ms. Fitch asked if the group pass revenue was counted as farebox revenue. Mr. Pangborn said that it was, because the group fee replaced the farebox revenue of those in that group. Mr. Andersen asked for whom the cost per trip was reduced, LTD or the UO. Mr. Pangborn said it was intended to address LTD's cost per trip, because the cost decreased as more people rode the bus. Mr. Viggiano said it would also decrease the cost per trip for programs when more people from those programs rode the bus. As an example, he said that if LTD carried 5 million trips per year, the cost per trip would be $2.00, based on a $10 million budget. However, if the District carried 10 million trips, the cost would be $1.00 per trip, as long as the District was using excess capacity on buses which were already running. Mr. Andersen wondered at what point those lines would cross and go the other way.

Mr. Parks was concerned that the programs would only pay a portion of the expense. Mr. Pangborn said that the District also only charges individual riders a portion of the trip. The term pass price at the UO prior to this program was $44 per term, so the cost to the individuals was reduced. Mr. Andersen said that if everyone rode, the program would be getting more trips for its money. He wondered where the District was willing to draw the line, and said that this program may not be good for LTD internally. Ms. Fitch asked what it would cost the District if LTD expected 20 percent of the student body to ride, but 60 percent actually rode. Mr. Pangborn said that the travel patterns for each group are looked at individually; some may double and some may have a much smaller increase in ridership. If service were added, the group would pay the full marginal cost of the additional service.

Mr. Montgomery asked if LTD made any money when it charged $4.50 per individual per term for the UO group pass program. Mr. Pangborn said that the UO program paid for the entire amount of service increases, even though those increases actually served a larger population than just the UO. Mr. Andersen asked if the UO paid 100 percent of those costs even though it would only pay 20 percent under the farebox-to-operating cost ratio. Mr. Pangborn said that was correct, since service was added to fit their specific needs.

Mr. Pangborn said that to qualify for a group pass program, organizations would have to have at least 50 employees. This was due to staff's concern about trying to administer small programs, as well as the understanding that larger employers have the largest transportation needs. Mr. Andersen asked about the definition of the word "organization." Mr. Pangborn said an organization would have to have the fiduciary ability to sign a contract and pay the money up front. If a group of 50 people wanted to join together and could pay the necessary amount, and the District could figure out the group's modal split, it may be possible. Mr. Andersen said it would be a lot easier to define the ridership ceiling for a smaller group. He wondered if the UO would be allowed unlimited growth rather than defining a ceiling. Mr. Pangborn said yes, that was the original philosophy of the program. One problem some businesses face, including Sacred Heart, is that the District requires everyone in the organization to be included in the program, but not all those people's schedules can be accommodated by current service.

Mr. Andersen asked if an organization accepts the overall social goals of transit, to meet the needs of the community, it should be understood that even though some of the employees can't ride, the system has value for the rest of the employees or the organization itself, such as the need to build fewer parking garages. Mr. Brandt said he wasn't interested in "doing social things"; rather, he wanted the people who ride the bus to pay for it. Mr. Andersen added that the bottom line would be the same if the cost for those who did ride was increased, rather than paying a lower cost for all employees, including non-riders.

Mr. Pangborn said that the minimum rate for the program is $19 per person per year. Sacred Heart Hospital is the District's second largest taxpayer, so that perspective should be considered. The University pays State in-lieu-of payroll taxes, but the City of Eugene does not. Mr. Andersen asked about offering this program to government or private organizations. Ms. Fitch wondered if, as more groups joined the program, the District could reduce the cost to individuals, such as lowering the cost of day passes, monthly passes, etc. She said the lowest income population was scheduled to pay incremental inflationary increases in individual fares. She added that ridership increased with the group pass program, so LTD looked good, but there were increased costs in the system, with more buses and more servicing of those buses. Mr. Pangborn stated that the people participating in the group programs would have inflationary increases, also. He agreed, though, that a student, by virtue of being a student, was receiving a much better deal for riding than the individual rider, and said this was an inherent problem with the program. He said the larger goal of getting people on the buses needed to be balanced against the equity issues. He added that 50 percent of the District's riders are students, and that they are generally a low income group.

Mr. Pangborn stated that the draft policy did make a differentiation between payroll tax payers and non-payroll taxpayers, because the taxpayers were contributing to the local share of capital and operating costs. The policy included two criteria for all participants, and another two for non-payroll taxpayers. First, the District would require replacement of current revenue. In other words, the organization would have to pay at least the amount that its members were currently paying as individuals. Before beginning the University of Oregon program, a fairly accurate count of the number of riders was obtained through an origin and destination (O&D) study. O&D study information was also available for Sacred Heart and the City of Eugene, and a survey was being done at Sacred Heart as a double-check. Mr. Andersen asked how accurate that information was. Mr. Viggiano said the O&D provides a sample, and staff make assumptions that those employees will fill out or not fill out surveys at the same rate as anyone else. The sample is large, with almost 20,000 completed surveys system-wide.

The second criteria for all groups would be to pay the marginal or incremental cost of any additional service which would need to be added. Mr. Pangborn used a hypothetical situation to explain the difference between the requirements for payroll taxpayers and non-payroll taxpayers. Essentially, the payroll taxpayer would not pay a percentage for increased service, and a formula would be used to determine the portion of additional service in relation to total ridership which a non-taxpayer would pay. Mr. Andersen asked if the formula included an increase in staff time, or fixed overhead. Mr. Pangborn said it did not. Mr. Andersen stated that marketing, planning, administration, and other support functions would all end up doing more work for the same cost or added Full Time Equivalents (FTE). Mark said he had assumed there would be increased overhead, but that costs would increase over time. Mr. Andersen wondered if those costs could be added as they occur. Mr. Viggiano said that staff could use the total cost per hour of $37, rather than the marginal cost of $28 per hour. Mr. Pangborn added that the $10 million which the District pays for the base system is not computed in the formula because those costs are paid whether the group rides or not. He said that the $28 marginal cost includes fuel, mechanics, and bus operators. The $37 takes into effect additional staffing which may be required, such as the additional graphic artist time or CSC staff requested for next fiscal year. Both figures are computed annually.

Ms. Fitch wondered what would happen if the formula worked well the first year, but the group's percentage of system ridership increased in the second year. Mr. Pangborn replied that when the contract was renegotiated, the formula would be recalculated using the larger percentage. However, with the smaller organizations, it may not be necessary to recalculate each year.

Mr. Brandt asked if capital costs were included in the marginal cost figure. Mr. Pangborn said they were not, but were included in the total fixed overhead. Mr. Montgomery wondered if the District would always be a year or two behind in collecting for ridership increases, if the formula were recalculated after ridership increases occurred. Mr. Pangborn said that was correct; the District would absorb the cost and then charge for it the following year. Mr. Andersen wondered what would happen if a large group pass program like the UO program ended. Mr. Pangborn said the District would have to "tool down." The intent, however, is to institutionalize the programs so that doesn't happen.

Mr. Pangborn then explained the capital formula for pricing. The current fleet size (77 buses) is multiplied by the percent of ridership increase, and that number is multiplied by the current cost of a new bus. That number is then multiplied by the percent of local share (50 percent) to find the local cost of one bus, which is then divided by the average life of a new bus (15 years), to find the annual cost for the participants share of the fleet. Mr. Brandt said that the assumption would then be that the program would be in effect for 15 years; if not, LTD would not receive the full cost, or would have to add a new program to make up the difference. Mr. Pangborn said that if the program stopped but the riders stayed in the system, they would pay more as individuals. Another way to look at this situation would be to acknowledge that the District had accumulated some money toward the purchase of a new bus, rather than paying part of an already-purchased bus. In theory, the formula would have to be recalculated every year or two, because the percent of system ridership could change, and the District may want to make inflationary increases in the cost of a bus.

Mr. Brandt said that this formula also ignored concentrations of service, assuming that ridership would be equal throughout the service area. New riders could make up a large percentage of a particular route, and parts of the system would be overloaded faster, so the incremental costs could be a lot greater in a concentrated setting. He thought the District should be careful about that when planning bus purchases or service changes. Mr. Viggiano said that, in theory, some of that should be covered. System-wide increases would not necessarily relate to a particular program, but the program would pay the full marginal cost of direct service increases. Staff would try to anticipate those needs and plug them into the calculations.

Mr. Parks said that what bothered him was that the District was acting as a private company and providing private service to various companies, while acting as a public agency running a transit system on the other hand. Mr. Pangborn said that, if the UO were a private employer, the District would consider the transportation needs and how best to serve that market. Some of the District's resources might be channeled toward one market, such as the UO, but the service is open to anyone. Sacred Heart employees ride to the same destination as UO riders, so the District responded to a transportation need that affected the entire community.

Mr. Brandt wondered why a private business should pay 80 percent so Sacred Heart could get a good deal. Mr. Andersen likened this situation to paying taxes to fix a specific street in the city. Mr. Parks said it appeared to be that way. Ms. Calvert said Harlow and Coburg Roads were widened to get people to Valley River Center, and the property owners along those roads paid for the street widening. Mr. Parks said he hoped the group pass program really caught on, but if it did, he said, LTD would have to explain why it was competing with private business. Mr. Brandt said the taxpayers would still have to pay more money so a handful of businesses could receive the benefit. Mr. Parks added that the payroll taxpayers want to keep LTD's budget down so they can keep their taxes down. He said the Board needed to consider why the District exists and for whom it provides service. Mr. Brandt said maybe the District should select organizations which it believes to be an integral and important part of the community. However, Mr. Andersen thought maybe the program should be open to any organization of at least 50 people, rather than having the District make value judgments about who is important to the community.

Mr. Brandt said he thought this issue needed a lot more discussion, and that the taxpayers would revolt if they saw this projected out on a computer. He said it was a complicated program and would self-destruct in the future. Mr. Parks said that the more people who rode, the tougher it would be on LTD. Mr. Andersen said the program would not need to be marketed, since people were already making requests to LTD. Ms. Loobey said the marketing efforts would be made toward group members, as in helping them with trip planning.

Mr. Pangborn said that the District's mandate was to get as many people as possible on the buses. However, Mr. Brandt thought the mandate was to provide a good transportation system, or else the system would be free if the goal was to have everyone riding. Mr. Parks said that 20 percent of revenue for a farebox-to-operating cost ratio didn't sound good on a profit statement. Mr. Pangborn likened transit to a library or the police department in that regard.

Mr. Brandt said that if costs were not increased, but ridership increased, the program would self-destruct. He said the service could not work on an 80/20 split forever and keep the community happy. Mr. Pangborn said the payroll taxpayers were split on the issue, and that staff struggle with the equity issue daily. For example, service to the Jessen loop is expensive to operate for the number of riders. Mr. Montgomery said a group pass program with a business in the Jessen area would aide the Jessen residents by subsidizing their service.

Mr. Brandt said it was good to be talking about the group pass program policy, because not enough time had yet been spent working through the issues. He said something was still not adding up for him.

Mr. Andersen wondered why the estimated cost for LCC would be $345,000, which seemed to be a lot more than $19 per year per student. Mr. Viggiano said that the farebox revenue from LCC is high because of high ridership, so the cost to replace that revenue, plus the additional service and other costs, would be $16 per quarter per student, or $64 per year per student. Mr. Pangborn said that the District would also have to add extra service to accommodate more riders, and LCC is a long way away.

Ms. Calvert left at this point in the meeting. Mr. Parks assumed the role of presiding officer.

Ms. Loobey said that Sacred Heart Hospital is a taxpaying organization and already subsidizes the entire system, so the non-taxpayer part of the formula would not apply to Sacred Heart.

Ms. Fitch asked if any calculations that fell below $19 per person per year would be increased to that as a minimum. Mr. Pangborn said that Sacred Heart's program calculated at $15 or $16 per year without extra service, so would pay the $19 minimum. Until ridership increased that much, the hospital would be contributing to the rest of the system.

Ms. Loobey stated that Sacred Heart was already subsidizing the cost of capital and service through taxes, so the only outstanding question was whether all their employees would be included in the program, or not. Mr. Andersen asked if LTD could say no to a group pass program at Sacred Heart. Ms. Loobey wondered if the Board would want to say no, and if there was a real need to do so.

Mr. Brandt said he didn't think the District had the right cost yet. He thought it was too good to be true, and wanted to be sure the costs had been worked out on all the scales that could occur. Mr. Parks suggested having a provision for increasing the cost of the program if a certain number of employees ride, such as 5,000 at the UO. Ms. Loobey said the UO pays the marginal cost of additional service for that particular program. However, Mr. Montgomery remarked that the District was always in a catch-up position in collecting for those costs.

Mr. Andersen wondered if the Board would have to or should be making decisions regarding every group pass program. He said he would like to determine the policy so that staff could make those decisions. Ms. Loobey informed the Board that Sacred Heart would like to begin a program on May 1, but staff had made no agreement, pending further discussion and a decision by the Board. If the Board did not meet again until May, the staff would be in a position of not responding to Sacred Heart, the second largest payroll taxpayer in the community. Mr. Brandt wondered, however, if it would be in the District's best interest to rush into a decision.

Mr. Andersen reiterated that he did not want to be making individual decisions on everyone who applied for a group pass program. If the Board set a policy, staff could decide based on how an organization fit into the formula. Ms. Fitch stated that availability within the system to handle the program should be the primary consideration. Ms. Loobey said that staff were looking at the potential ridership of groups in relation to the availability of service. That is why LTD can't serve LCC until the fall of 1991. However, she said, the District does have the capacity to absorb what staff anticipate will be Sacred Heart's ridership.

There was some discussion about meeting again to discuss this issue before May, or returning to Sacred Heart to say that staff are not ready to respond. Ms. Loobey thanked the Board for the good discussion that evening, and suggested that the Board adjourn to a time before the next monthly meeting in order to maintain the momentum from that evening's discussion. She added that staff had hours of internal debate about the policy and what it means for LTD. Mr. Brandt said he would like to see staff put the projections on the computer to see what happens as the program grows. He was also concerned about charging a program the cost of buses over a 15-year period, since the District cannot pay for them incrementally. He said the District needed to be sure it didn't get into a situation that was too good for a few people but not for everyone who asked because it couldn't buy enough buses.

Ms. Fitch said the Board needed a policy, but she wasn't sure it was essential with Sacred Heart. However, Mr. Brandt and Mr. Andersen thought the policy should come first, to explain why LTD would say yes to some programs and no to others. Mr. Andersen said he thought the policy was a good one, although it had some language problems he would like to address later. Mr. Brandt said he could be convinced of a program in which groups fit into the current available service and the District never added incremental buses for programs. He said he hadn't understood that LTD would have to do that for the UO. Ms. Loobey said this was a complicated issue. The District's role is to provide a viable alternative to the automobile and make it convenient for people. However, if the system becomes filled to capacity, LTD can't offer a convenient alternative without adding more capacity.

Mr. Parks asked if the group pass program was discussed at the goal-setting session, which he had missed. Ms. Loobey said goals for system ridership and productivity were discussed, but not the group pass program.

Mr. Andersen asked what Sacred Heart's reaction would be if told the District needed another month to make a decision. Mr. Pangborn said the hospitals problem wouldn't go away in that time. Mr. Montgomery asked if Sacred Heart would be considered at the $28 or $37 level. Mr. Pangborn said it would be neither, since Sacred Heart is a payroll taxpayer.

MOTION

Ms. Fitch moved that the Board adjourn to Wednesday, April 25, 1990, at 6:00 p.m. to continue the discussion and the rest of the agenda items. The motion was seconded. Mr. Brandt said he was not in favor of meeting then. He thought the discussion would take more time than that, since the Budget Committee meeting was scheduled for 7:30 p.m. that same evening. It was determined that Mr. Herzberg and Ms. Calvert could not attend on April 25. The motion failed 4 to 2, with Andersen, Herzberg, Brandt, and Montgomery voting in opposition, and Ms. Calvert no longer present.

VOTE

New Letterhead Look: Mr. Andersen asked if Marketing would still need to spend money on consultants after the addition of more graphic artist time in-house. Mr. Bergeron said it would be necessary for the kind of design work involved in the letterhead update, for example.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Brandt said he didn't mind a dinner meeting; he just didn't want to have another meeting at 6:00 p.m. when the Board is already having meetings every week. Mr. Montgomery said he was in favor of a special work session, but thought it would take longer than the time available on April 25.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Brandt moved that the meeting be adjourned to 7:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 2, 1990, in the LTD Board Room. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion, which then carried 5 to 1, with Mr. Herzberg voting in opposition and all others in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

H. Thomas Andersen
Board Secretary

POLICY ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GROUP PASS PROGRAMS
May 2, 1990

DRAFT

This policy establishes procedures and policies to be used in the implementation of group pass programs.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

Group pass programs are agreements between the transit district and an organization whereby transit service is provided to all individuals in the organization for a set fee. If established according to the parameters set out in this policy, group pass programs will:

* Increase ridership and ridership productivity (rides per service hour);
* Increase service hours;
* Maintain or increase the farebox to operating cost ratio; and
* Decrease the cost per trip.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

The establishment of these programs is based on the premise that increased use of transit, as a replacement to the single occupancy vehicle, is a goal established by our community because it will provide numerous benefits. In order to meet that goal, LTD should aggressively pursue fiscally responsible programs that increase use of the bus, particularly in areas with traffic congestion, parking or air quality problems, or where there is a transportation needed that can be effectively addressed with public transit.

POLICY

Qualifying Organizations

The District will consider any organization, **public or private**, for a group pass program if it: **1.** Includes at least 50 individuals, **and 2. Is financially capable and legally empowered to enter into a contract with LTD and meet the financial obligations dictated by that contract**. The group pass program will normally apply to all members in the organization, although exceptions to this rule may be made on a case by case basis. Exceptions would only be granted if the exempted individuals do not have ready access the bus system (such as work shifts that are not served by the bus schedule or work sites outside of the LTD service area), and as long as the criteria of the pricing section of this policy are met. **LTD will consider qualifying organizations on a first come/first serve basis, only if LTD has the service and equipment capacity to serve that organization.**

HANDOUT
LTD BOARD MEETING
05/02/90 HANDOUT

Pricing

Revenue from organizations that participate in the group pass programs will be computed according to whether or not an organization contributes to the LTD payroll tax. All organizations participating in the group pass program will provide revenue that meets the following two criteria:

* Replacement of the revenue from the individuals of the organization that would have been realized if the group pass program were not in place;

* The incremental cost of additional service that is instituted by the District to directly respond to increased ridership resulting from the group pass program;

In addition, for those organizations that do not contribute to the LTD payroll tax the following two revenue requirements must also be met:

* A percentage of the **fully allocated** *[marginal]* cost of system-wide service increases in the same percentage that the organization's projected ridership growth is to the total system ridership; and

* A percentage of the amortized cost for expanded fleet in the same percentage as the organization's ridership is of the total system.

A minimum price for the group pass program will be established (in Fiscal Year 1990-91, the minimum price is $19.00 per person per year, with planned annual inflationary increases). The per person price for the organization will be either the minimum price, or the total of the four items listed above, whichever is greater.

Term of the Contract

Contracts will normally be for a one-year period, with annual renewals. Yearly evaluation, at a level appropriate for the size of the organization, is to be conducted of each group pass program prior to renewing the contract to determine if the pricing criteria are still being satisfied.

Wherever possible, the District will seek to have the group pass programs institutionalized in order to reduce the possibility of programs becoming discontinued from one year to the next. This is obviously of greatest concern with the larger group pass programs which require significant capital and operational **investment and** expenditures.

Operational Issues

Group pass participants are to have photo identification that is easily verified by the bus driver. The photo identification may be either the organization's, in which case it must have an LTD validating sticker, or issued by the District. In either case, the cost of issuing the photo identification will be borne by the organization. Participating organizations will be responsible for administering the program within their organizations.

Marketing

The District will provide trip planning assistance for the individuals of a group pass organization. Marketing of the service to individuals of a group pass organization will be conducted where it is determined to have a significant impact on ridership.

Regular Meeting
5/16/90

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 10, 1990.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
REGULAR BOARD MEETING

May 16, 1990
7:30 p.m.

LTD BOARD ROOM
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene
(off Glenwood Blvd.)

A G E N D A

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Andersen______ Brandt______ Calvert______ Fitch______

Herzberg______ Montgomery______ Parks______

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. Service to the Jessen Area

Note: The following two agenda items will be moved to the end of the meeting, so other staff will not have to wait during the Executive Session. After the Executive Session, the Board will need to return to regular session to discuss the Board Salary Committee's recommended salary and benefits package for the General Manager for FY 90-91.

C. 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.

D. Board Salary Committee Recommendation

VIII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

A. Current Activities

1. Lane Community College Station Update
2. Grand Opening Report
3. Buses on a Reopened Willamette Street/Eugene Downtown Retail Task Force
4. Customer Information Systems Research Presentation
5. Downtown Eugene Transit Station Site Selection Committee Update
6. Meeting with Lane County Commissioners
7. Business After Hours, June 27, 1990
8. Letters Regarding LTD's Grand Opening Events
9. Transit Board Members Seminar
10. Special Services Report

B. Monthly Financial Reporting

IX. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING

A. Adoption of Fiscal Year 1990-91 Budget

B. Buses on an Opened Willamette Street

C. Gateway Station Update

D. District Response to Petition Regarding #67 Coburg/Crescent

NOTE: ITEMS VII.C AND VII.D WILL BE MOVED TO THIS POINT IN THE MEETING. AFTER THE EXECUTIVE SESSION, THE BOARD WILL NEED TO RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION TO DISCUSS THE BOARD SALARY COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED SALARY AND BENEFITS PACKAGE FOR THE GENERAL MANAGER FOR FY 90-91.

X. ADJOURNMENT

IV. BUS RIDER OF THE MONTH:

The May Bus Rider of the Month is not one rider, but a special group of riders from Condon, Edison, Eastside-Willard, and Magnet Arts/Jefferson schools. They are described by their bus operators as great bus riders and lots of fun, who also always help new students who are riding the bus.

Many of the students will attend the meeting to receive their certificates of appreciation.

V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:

The May Employee of the Month is Inside Cleaner Venda Stubbs. Venda was hired as a part-time employee on April 17, 1988. She has been described as an excellent worker with a good sense of humor, who builds employee morale through dedication to her job and superior attendance.

Venda will attend the meeting to receive her award and be introduced to the Board.

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A. **Approval of Minutes**: The minutes of the May 2, 1990, adjourned meeting are included in the agenda packet for Board review and approval. 08

B. **Service to the Jessen Area**: 17

Issue Presented: Should the Board eliminate some, but not all, of the bus trips to the Jessen area, as outlined in the staff memorandum in the agenda packet?

Background: At the March 1990 meeting, the Board approved all elements of the service recommendations for FY 90-91 except the proposed elimination of service to the Jessen Drive area. Staff were directed to consider alternatives to the elimination of service and bring a revised recommendation to the Board.

Included in the agenda packet is a staff memorandum which outlines a proposal to eliminate some afternoon trips to the Jessen area. The trips to be deleted are the three which have the most problems maintaining their schedules, resulting in missed transfers in downtown Eugene.

Page No.

Staff Recommendation: That the Board approve the following adjustment of service, with an approximate cost increase of $600 per year: (1) the 2:05 p.m., 3:05 p.m., and 4:05 p.m. trips on the #44 Echo Hollow would turn around at Echo Hollow Plaza rather than traveling to the Jessen area; and (2) the 3:50 p.m. trip of the #53 Junction City would deviate, on demand, to drop off passengers in the Jessen area.

Results of Recommended Action: All trips up to and including the 1:05 p.m. trip from the Eugene Transit Station would serve the Jessen area, as well as the 5:05 p.m. and 6:05 p.m. trips. Staff would inform area residents of the change in service, and would continue to monitor service in the Jessen area.

Note: The following two agenda items will be moved to the end of the meeting, so other staff will not have to wait during the Executive Session. After the Executive Session, the Board will need to return to regular session to discuss the Board Salary Committee's recommended salary and benefits package for the General Manager for FY 90-91.

C. 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

D. Board Salary Committee Recommendation 19

Issue Presented: Should the Board approve an increase in the General Manager's salary and benefits package and authorize the Board President to sign a contract extending the General Manager's employment through FY 90-91?

Background: The Board Salary Committee (Janet Calvert, Tammy Fitch, and Thom Montgomery) recently met to discuss the General Manager's performance appraisals for the period March 1989 through February 1990, and related salary and benefit adjustments. On May 16, the Salary Committee will make a recommendation to the Board for adjustments to the General Manager's base salary and benefit package for FY 90-91 based on those evaluations.

A letter from the Salary Committee chairman is included in the agenda packet. It states the Committee's recommendation for FY 90-91 and includes a comparison to current salary and benefit provisions. A copy of the employment agreement also will be included for the members of the Board.

Page No.

Board Salary Committee Recommendation: That the Board authorize the Board President to sign a contract extending the General Manager's employment through FY 90-91; and that the Board approve, as compensation to the General Manager for services rendered to the District during FY 90-91, an increase of 4 percent in base salary, for an annual rate of $59,488; a monthly automobile allowance of $200; and a one-time payment equalling 11 percent of base salary, or $6,544, for an additional benefit program to be determined by the General Manager.

VIII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

A. Current Activities:

1. **Lane Community College Station Update**: In February, staff discussed with the Board plans to rebuild the transit station at Lane Community College. At the meeting, the architect for this project, Ken Nagao of Nagao Pacific, will present drawings of the new station. 20

2. **Grand Opening Report**: Included in the agenda packet is a staff memorandum which discusses the three grand opening events held on May 3, 4, and 5, 1990. 21

3. **Buses on a Reopened Willamette Street/Eugene Downtown Retail Task Force**: A staff memorandum in the agenda packet discusses action being taken by the Eugene Downtown Retail Task Force to improve the vitality of downtown Eugene. Also included are the Task Force's Redesign Principles, which currently imply prohibition of LTD buses on a proposed opened Willamette Street. Staff believe that access to an opened Willamette Street is necessary for several reasons, which are discussed in the staff memorandum. No Board action is required at this time, but further discussion and/or action may be required at the June Board meeting. 22

4. **Customer Information Systems Research Presentation**: During the last two years, the LTD Marketing Division has conducted market research studies on customer information aids, including bus stop signs, system maps, and the Rider's Digest. Staff will present their findings and recommendations at the May meeting.

5. **Downtown Eugene Transit Station Site Selection Committee Update**: A staff memorandum provides information about the Public Information Session on the downtown site selection process, which was held on May 9. 27

Page No.

6. **Meeting with Lane County Commissioners**: The Lane County Commissioners have invited representatives of LTD to meet with them to discuss the Downtown Eugene Transit Station Site Selection Process and, more specifically, the Butterfly Lot. Staff are preparing a presentation for the meeting, and the Board President will be invited to attend. Other interested Board members are welcome to attend, as well.

7. **Business After Hours, June 27, 1990**: LTD has been invited by the Springfield and Eugene Chambers of Commerce to host a joint Chamber Business After Hours at the new facility from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m. on June 27, 1990. Staff are in the process of planning this event, and Board members are invited to attend.

8. **Letters Regarding LTD's Grand Opening Events**: Included in the agenda packet are several letters received in response to invitations to the District's Dedication Ceremony and Major Employer Preview. 28

9. **Transit Board Members Seminar**: Additional information regarding the next APTA Board Members Seminar is included in the agenda packet. Tom Andersen has expressed an interest in the seminar. Other Board members who wish to attend should contact Jo Sullivan to make the necessary arrangements. 31

10. **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 since the last report.

B. **Monthly Financial Reporting**:

1. Comparison of Year-to-date Actual Revenues and Expenditures to Budgeted (General Fund) 33

2. Comparison of Budgeted and Actual Revenues and Expenditures

   (a) Capital Projects Fund 34
   (b) Risk Management Fund 35

Page No.

IX. ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING

A. **Adoption of Fiscal Year 1990-91 Budget**: Adoption of the Fiscal Year 1990-91 budget approved by the Budget Committee will be scheduled for the June 20, 1990, Board meeting.

B. **Buses on an Opened Willamette Street**: At the June meeting, the Board may be asked to take a position regarding buses traveling on a reopened Willamette Street.

C. **Gateway Station Update**: A report on the new Gateway Transit Station will be made to the Board in June, after the station opens.

D. **District Response to Petition Regarding #67 Coburg/Crescent**: Staff are in the process of researching and responding to a petition regarding service on the #67 Coburg/Crescent. That response will be included in the June agenda packet for the Board's information.

NOTE: ITEMS VII.C AND VII.D WILL BE MOVED TO THIS POINT IN THE MEETING. AFTER THE EXECUTIVE SESSION, THE BOARD WILL NEED TO RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION TO DISCUSS THE BOARD SALARY COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED SALARY AND BENEFITS PACKAGE FOR THE GENERAL MANAGER FOR FY 90-91.

X. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

Wednesday, May 2, 1990

Pursuant to notice given at the April 18, 1990, regular Board meeting and to *The Register-Guard* for publication on April 26, 1990, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, an adjourned meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, May 2, 1990, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present:	H. Thomas Andersen, Secretary Peter Brandt, Treasurer Janet Calvert, President, presiding Tammy Fitch Thomas Montgomery Keith Parks, Vice President Phyllis Loobey, General Manager Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary
Absent:	Herbert Herzberg

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. Ms. Calvert informed the Board that an action item, approval of a resolution regarding underground storage tanks at 8th and Garfield, needed to be added to the agenda. She asked the Board to convene first as the LTD Contract Review Board to discuss the resolution.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Calvert asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board. There was no response.

MEETING OF THE LTD CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the Board move into a session of the LTD Contract Review Board. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, explained that the need to discuss the disposition of the underground storage tanks at 8th and Garfield had come to staff's attention that day, and that the District needed to take two actions. First, he said, an environmental assessment was needed so the District would know for sure about its liability, to make sure that solvents had been properly disposed of, and to see if there were other tanks in the ground that staff weren't aware of. Someone needed to be hired to perform this work. Staff also wanted to take all but three of the underground storage tanks out of the ground; in other words, to remove eight of the 11 tanks. This would also involve taking soil samples to be sure there had been no underground leaks. After that, the District would be able to assess where it stood with the remaining three tanks. Mr. Pangborn said that the State had indicated that with an environmental assessment, the District's liability could be limited. Since the State

Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is the enforcement arm of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), this should ensure federal as well as state limitation of liability.

Mr. Pangborn reported that the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) wanted the District to take care of the underground tank issue as quickly as possible, since the property at 8th and Garfield had been vacated.

The District had two choices for removal of the tanks and soil assessment. First, it could go out to bid for the lowest responsive bidder, or it could contract with Russ Fetrow Engineering, the firm managing the environmental assessment. Russ Fetrow's bid was \$24,000, which was determined to be a very competitive bid. Federal and State requirements require the District to go out to bid at \$25,000. District Counsel Randall Bryson said that since Fetrow's bid was near the limit, the Board should pass a resolution stating that an emergency existed and that the District needed to move ahead with this process.

Mr. Montgomery asked how long it would take if the District went out to bid. Mr. Pangborn replied that it would take a minimum of three to four weeks to prepare the bid package, accept bids, and make the decision, and then two weeks after that to remove the tanks.

Mr. Brandt asked if the school district wanted eight tanks. Mr. Pangborn said it did not. He explained that in a preliminary assessment done by Russ Fetrow Engineering, LTD's tanks were found to meet standards until 1993. After that time, they would have to be upgraded, and would then meet standards until 1999, when new standards were expected to be in effect. Since 4-J would have to spend money to upgrade the tanks, and did not need the eight tanks slated for removal, staff would prefer to take them out of the ground now. However, the school district would like to keep the three 20,000 gallon tanks because they are so expensive to replace.

Because the Board was concerned about the possibility of continuing liability, staff thought it better to take out eight of the tanks and have District Counsel meet with the DEQ about removing any liability from LTD. The school district offered to pay the difference to take out the three tanks later, if that needed to be done. Mr. Pangborn explained how costs would compare if LTD were to sell the property on the open market. As an example, he said that if the property were worth \$1 million, LTD would receive 20 percent, or \$200,000. Assuming it cost \$100,000 to perform the environmental assessment and take the tanks out, the sale price would be \$900,000. Taking the \$100,000 off the top, the \$900,000 sale price would be apportioned at 80/20 percent. UMTA would receive \$720,000 and LTD would receive \$180,000. LTD has told School District 4-J that LTD wants to receive 20 percent of the fair market value out of the sale of the property, and 4-J had agreed to that.

Mr. Brandt wondered if the school district could require under its policies that LTD go out to bid for this work. Mr. Pangborn said it could not, and wanted LTD to move ahead.

Ms. Loobey said the principal reasons for not going out to bid were to avoid the delay caused by the bidding process; to avoid the additional staff time caused by working with someone not already familiar with the situation, as Fetrow was; and to avoid additional liability from working with two contractors instead of only one.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Contract Review Board recommend to the LTD Board of Directors that the resolution to declare an emergency and enter into a contract with Russ Fetrow Engineering to perform underground storage tank decommissioning and soil assessment be accepted. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion, which then passed unanimously. The Contract Review Board then voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting of the LTD Contract Review Board and return to regular session.

VOTE

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION: The LTD Board moved back into regular session at 7:55 p.m.

RESOLUTION REGARDING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK DECOMMISSIONING AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT: Mr. Parks asked if there were any problems with approving this resolution, since it was not on the published agenda for the meeting. Mr. Pangborn said the Board was allowed to declare an emergency and add it to the agenda at the meeting. Mr. Parks then asked if hiring Fetrow was a vested interest of the School District, since he already represented them. Mr. Pangborn stated that there were only a few engineers who performed this kind of work, and his bid for the work was considered very competitive, and was actually $1,000 below the legal requirement for going out to bid.

Mr. Pangborn said there were two parts to the work to be performed. First, Fetrow would hire someone to decommission and remove the tanks; would monitor the process, and would then certify that it had been done properly and test the soil. He added that when three tanks are left, there may be a different process, and the Board could still choose to remove those tanks, also. This contract would not deal with those remaining three tanks. Ms. Fitch asked if LTD had received a letter from the DEQ or other federal body asking the District to move ahead immediately with this process. Mr. Pangborn said the request had come during a telephone call from the UMTA regional representative.

Ms. Fitch asked if the District would know if there were problems after the removal of the eight tanks. Mr. Pangborn said LTD would know if there were problems with those eight tanks, but would still have to perform additional tests on the remaining three tanks. Mr. Parks said this process could go on and on. Mr. Brandt said that as long as the school district paid for 80 percent of the process, he didn't care.

MOTION Mr. Parks moved that the Board of Directors, based upon the findings of the LTD Contract Review Board, declare an emergency and issue a contract with Russ Fetrow Engineering to perform underground storage decommissioning and soil assessment.

VOTE Mr. Montgomery seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

MOTION **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**: Mr. Andersen moved that the minutes of the April 18, 1990, regular meeting be approved as written. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion, and the minutes were

VOTE approved by unanimous vote.

GROUP PASS POLICY: Mr. Pangborn distributed an amended draft Group Pass Policy for the Board's discussion. Instead of using the marginal cost for non-payroll taxpaying organizations, the higher, fully-allocated cost had been used. The fully-allocated cost included all costs of doing business, including lights, heat, salaries, etc., which were divided into the total number of service hours.

In discussing the District's capacity for the group pass program, Mr. Pangborn said that, in the short term, it is on a first-come/first-served basis. However, in the long term, there is limited utilization and limited membership. He used the University of Oregon (UO) as an example. The UO has 21,000 participants (18,000 students and 3,000 faculty and staff). Before the group pass program began, UO ridership averaged 1,050 a day. After the program was implemented, UO ridership doubled. Out of 21,000, there are still only 2,100 riders. Mr. Pangborn said this lack of a "stampede" to ride the bus was reflective of how much the community, and especially the UO, is tied to automobiles, bicycles, and walking. He added that students are probably the most price sensitive of all riders, and would be the ones to take advantage of a good deal.

Mr. Pangborn said that as far as staff could tell, a doubling within a bus-riding population was probably optimistic. The UO ridership did not seem to be growing any more, but that situation could change if circumstances changed, such as a large increase in the price of parking.

Mr. Parks asked how many buses LTD had to buy in response to the UO group pass program. Mr. Pangborn explained that LTD did not have to buy buses specifically to respond to that service. Three buses had to be added to peak hour service, so the District had purchased used buses from Tri-Met to respond to a concern regarding the District's dwindling spares ratio. Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, added that two Tri-Met buses were now being used in peak hour service; one of those had been used for only a short time. Ms. Loobey stated that the spares ratio had decreased to 10 percent when the three buses were put into peak hour service, but that a district should have a ratio of 20 percent. She said that part of the purchase of buses from Tri-Met was due to the UO service, but part was due to the low spares ratio, so the Tri-Met buses could be used for back-up.

Mr. Parks said that before LTD purchased the Tri-Met buses, he had received a telephone call from Ms. Loobey informing him of an emergency situation. He said the low ratio had scared staff so much that something had to be done, and now staff were adding more and more group pass programs to the system. Ms. Loobey explained that staff had anticipated that the UO group pass program would not be approved by the students for another year. However, staff anticipated the greater ridership and made sure the UO was paying the cost of additional service. Having to put three additional buses into peak hour service made the spares ratio so low that the District wouldn't have been able to handle service if there were some kind of catastrophe. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, added that at that time LTD was still in the process of obtaining funding for additional buses, and that funding was still uncertain. The District needed the Tri-Met buses as a relief valve in case the new buses didn't come through or ridership was higher than expected.

Mr. Parks asked about additional groups being added to the group pass program. Ms. Loobey said the City of Eugene had recently been added, but its employees were more spread out throughout the system, because UO riders were more concentrated in certain housing areas. The City program was not expected to cause LTD to need more buses in peak hour service. Mr. Parks then asked how many people would be in the Sacred Heart Hospital program. Mr. Viggiano said there were 1,611 non-graveyard shift employees, with another 900 on the graveyard shift. Mr. Brandt said he heard on the news that evening that LTD was going to adjust its routes to add later service for Sacred Heart. Mr. Pangborn said that KEZI-TV had done a special on Sacred Heart and had interviewed Ed Bergeron, LTD's Marketing Administrator. The District's position, and what Mr. Bergeron had said, was that staff were willing to provide service for the group pass program, but the Board was deliberating on a policy for the group pass program, so nothing had been decided. Ms. Calvert commented that Sacred Heart had said providing the program for employees would be the same cost as maintaining a parking lot.

Ms. Fitch asked how many Sacred Heart employees currently rode the bus. Mr. Viggiano said that the Origin and Destination (O&D) survey showed 150 rides a day, but that was done before the new parking garage was finished. Since that time, about half had switched back to their cars. Mr. Pangborn said that Sacred Heart was interested in the group pass program because it needed 200 more parking spaces or another solution to the parking problem. Mr. Brandt said the hospital could increase the cost of parking to pay for the program. Mr. Viggiano said that Sacred Heart employees had been surveyed the previous week, and staff would look at that data before determining what current ridership is.

Ms. Loobey said that when Sacred Heart was building the parking garage, it made arrangements for two shuttles, one provided by Dorsey from the Fairgrounds, and one provided by LTD from River Road Transit Station. At that time, LTD had 150 Sacred Heart riders, or 300 rides, per day.

Mr. Brandt asked what the UO paid for the group pass program. Mr. Pangborn said the UO paid $250,000 per year for the students and $40,000 for faculty and staff. The farebox revenue from students had been $190,000 before the program; to that, the cost of extra service (three tripper buses) had been added.

Mr. Brandt wanted to know the cost for 2,100 riders on the system. Mr. Pangborn said the University paid the State In-lieu-of Payroll Tax. The UO was asked to replace the revenue for the 1,050 students who were riding each day, or $190,000. The District added approximately $55,000 worth of service, determined by taking the number of hours added by $27 per hour. Mr. Brandt said the District had left $90,000 on the table; if LTD was maintaining its ratio, it would have to receive $400,000. Mr. Pangborn said that if all those riders had ridden individually, LTD would have received $400,000; however, those additional students had no plans to ride the bus before the group pass program was implemented. The District had told the UO that if the program paid for the additional costs, LTD would let those additional riders on the system. He added that the fact that the cost per rider decreases is what makes the program attractive. People who do not ride are paying for those who do.

Mr. Andersen said that people who buy monthly passes are banking on the fact that they will ride at least a certain number of times a day. Mr. Viggiano said that the UO service made the farebox-to-operating cost ratio go up, and that the program is paying the full marginal cost of providing the extra service that the UO required.

Mr. Brandt asked what the District would do if 6,000 more people from the UO wanted to ride the bus. Mr. Pangborn said a situation like that would create a "rub." For instance, if there were a fuel crisis and more people rode the bus, LTD could go immediately to capacity and beyond. That kind of situation, he said, would affect the entire community, not just LTD. The District would then have to discern the greatest need for service and what capacity was available to meet that need. Mr. Brandt asked if having a contract with a group obligated the District to add service. Mr. Pangborn said it did not, but the net effect could be that the group would drop the program if LTD could not meet its service needs.

Mr. Brandt said the program definition should include (1) an increase in ridership and productivity; (2) a decrease in the farebox-to-operating cost; and (3) maintenance of the farebox revenue. However, he said he did not agree with the fourth part of the definition, to increase service. Mr. Viggiano explained that when service hours were added because of the UO program, the UO paid the full marginal cost of those hours, and that was the intent of the proposed policy. Mr. Brandt thought, however, that the intent of the program should be to increase ridership and productivity on existing service. Ms. Loobey said that a growth in ridership does result in increases in service hours. Mr. Montgomery said that this kind of program had basically the same effect as putting an add on television.

Ms. Calvert said that in her eight years on the Board, she had not had one personal contact or seen one person come before the Board to complain about the payroll tax, but she had heard complaints because the buses were not full. She thought the District could be in a better place with the taxpayers when the buses were full. However, Mr. Brandt thought the taxpayers were still paying 80 percent and giving away free service in the group pass program. Ms. Calvert and Ms. Fitch commented on the indirect benefits from the program, such as cleaner air.

Regarding the minimum price of the group pass program, Ms. Fitch said she would like to make sure that the District did have a cushion between the cost of the program and the minimum charge to the group. She felt there was a comfort factor if the group's costs were in the $14 or $15 range but the minimum price for the group was $19. She thought the group would be getting a good deal and LTD would not be "giving away the ship." She suggested that if the District received enough money from these programs, it could put some of it into more tokens for those who need bus service but can't afford to ride.

In response to a question from Mr. Brandt, Mr. Viggiano said that UO students only pay for the program for three quarters, not for summer term. Some of the UO service is taken out of service during the summer because of lower ridership. There was also some discussion about whether or not Sacred Heart Hospital should pay for graveyard employees if those employees were unable to ride because no service was available to them.

In response to another question, Mr. Pangborn said that the City of Eugene was paying $20,900 for its employees. When the City signed the contract for its group pass program, the draft policy was not in place, so the City was not asked to pay additional costs as a non-payroll taxpayer. However, Ms. Loobey said, the City does pave the streets LTD runs its buses on.

Mr. Andersen asked if the fee for the group pass program was scheduled to increase by inflation only. Mr. Pangborn said that was correct for the UO, but for new groups, the cost to replace the farebox revenue, the cost of additional service, and the additional charge for non-payroll taxpayers would all be added together, and the group would pay the minimum charge or more. Mr. Andersen asked if the same minimum price would be used for all groups. Mr. Pangborn said that it would, according to the draft policy. Mr. Andersen said he thought the dollar amount for the minimum fee should be left out of the policy; that the policy should say only that a minimum amount would be established. Mr. Brandt suggested that a minimum amount should be set for each group by the Board, but Mr. Andersen thought that was an administrative function for staff, rather than a policy decision for the Board.

Mr. Brandt divided the $10 million annual budget by 4.2 million trips a year to arrive at a cost per trip of $2.27. He said that if 200 Sacred Heart riders rode twice a day, five days a week, 45 weeks a year (allowing for vacations, holidays, etc.), the cost to Sacred Heart should be $204,000, based on the $2.27 cost per trip. However, Mr. Pangborn said, the District charges a cash fare of only $.65, and the rest of the cost is subsidized; the $2.27 per trip assumes no subsidy. Mr. Brandt asked why the payroll taxpayers should pay 80 percent of Sacred Heart's employees' rides when the taxpayers were already paying a major share of service. Mr. Pangborn replied that if LTD managed the program correctly, it shouldn't cost the taxpayers more money. There is capacity on the buses for the programs; if the buses reach capacity, the affected group would pay the cost of adding service, assuming it is already a subsidized service. The District will also be adding service for the community whether or not groups are added to the program.

Mr. Brandt thought the argument was a good one until service was added. Then, when the District reaches capacity and has to buy buses, the taxpayers will be required to pay for those who are getting the additional service. Although the policy says groups will pay for additional service, Mr. Brandt did not think it would work that way. He thought the groups would be part of what caused the service to fill up, but would not be charged.

Ms. Loobey said the District's Capital Improvements Plan showed that LTD would buy expansion buses in the future. If the group pass programs were wildly successful, she said, that planned purchase would occur sooner. She said that if a group participant was not a taxpayer, it would have to contribute to the fully-allocated cost of providing the service, but Sacred Heart Hospital does pay the tax and already helps buy every bus the District has. Mr. Pangborn said it comes down to whether the payroll tax is a basic subsidy for service or some sort of user fee. He said that in other communities where transit is supported with a sales tax, it is a simpler arrangement because the entire community pays and the entire community receives service. However, it is more complex for LTD because 5,000 taxpayers subsidize the service, for the good of the community. Ms. Calvert commented that the second largest payroll taxpayer (Sacred Heart Hospital) is already saying it is willing to pay an additional fee for a group pass program. Mr. Viggiano said that the cost to replace lost farebox revenues for Sacred Heart is $15 per year per employee. Their minimum charge would be $19 per year per employee, so LTD would be making $4 per year on each employee; possibly some of that money could be set aside for future service. If every person in the community were in a group pass program and LTD received $19 for each person, it would total $3.8 million. The District currently receives $1.8 million in farebox revenues, so that amount would double. Mr. Pangborn said that in the last seven years, ridership has increased by 50 percent, but service has only increased by 18 percent. He added that there is still a fair amount of capacity in the current service.

Mr. Brandt said he was only in favor of this program if more service and routes were not added, and if the Annual Route Review did not result in a recommendation for more service and routes because there were so many riders. He said he was willing to approve the groups on a one-by-one basis, but he did not want to add 20 more groups this year, and wanted to be fiscally fair to the taxpayers. Mr. Montgomery said no one had yet paid any more tax money than they previously paid, and that when buses are full and LTD can no longer add groups to the group pass program, it could just "back up" from the group pass program. The District could always end the group pass program and no longer need to add service. Ms. Calvert said, however, that the groups would be paying for the additional service, and that she assumed staff would be smart enough to anticipate the costs for the next year.

Mr. Brandt said he thought the program was okay at that point--if the taxpayers didn't pay additional taxes, the District did not add costs, and the programs resulted in the benefit of taking cars off the road.

Ms. Calvert said she hadn't heard concern from the public that the UO was getting a good deal. Mr. Brandt said the UO was different from Sacred Heart Hospital. If medical costs increased, maybe the public would be paying another percentage so Sacred Heart employees could ride the buses. Mr. Brandt wanted the policy to state that the District would not increase its costs or service hours as a result of group pass programs. He wanted the program to use only existing capacity. However, Ms. Loobey, Ms. Calvert, and Ms. Fitch thought that wasn't possible.

Ms. Calvert said the Board was covering no new ground; that opinions had been expressed, and it was time to draw the discussion to a close.

In response to a question from Ms. Fitch, Mr. Viggiano said that the contracts had a 30-day termination clause. If for some reason there were a real problem with the program, either LTD or the group could end the contract with 30 days' notice.

MOTION Mr. Andersen moved to amend the draft group pass policy by (1) deleting the parenthetical reference to the dollar amount for the minimum price per person per year; and (2) changing the statement, "The group pass program will normally apply to all members of the organization, although exceptions to this rule may be made on a case-by-case basis. Exceptions would only be granted if the exempted individuals do not have ready access to the bus system (such as work shifts that are not served by the bus schedule or work sites outside of the LTD service area), and as long as the criteria of the pricing section of this policy are met" to read, "The group pass program will apply to all members in the organization." Ms. Fitch seconded the motion. Mr. Andersen said he made the motion to amend the policy because although he fell on the opposite side of Mr. Brandt's concerns, but felt his motion addressed some of Mr. Brandt's concerns. Also, in the case of Sacred Heart, the parking lots were full and LTD was giving the hospital a good deal. Mr. Andersen felt it was cheaper for Sacred Heart to pay for the extra 900 employees than to build another parking lot. His third reason for the amendment was that he believed that there were already people in group pass programs who could not use the bus because of their shifts or other circumstances. Those organizations have had to pay for those employees, so changing the requirements now would mean that Sacred Heart would receive a better deal than everyone else already on the program. He thought this also showed the danger of ad hoc approval of groups rather than adhering to a common policy.

VOTE There was no further discussion about the proposed amendment. Mr. Andersen's motion passed on a vote of 5 to 1, with Mr. Brandt voting in opposition and all others in favor.

MOTION VOTE Ms. Fitch moved that the group pass policy be approved as amended. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion, and the policy was approved on a vote of 5 to 1, with Mr. Brandt again voting in opposition and all others in favor.

May Board Meeting: Mr. Pangborn informed the Board that the opening of Willamette Street would be back on the agenda for discussion at the May Board meeting. The Board may be asked to take a position at that time.

Presentation by Board President: Ms. Calvert said she remembered that Ms. Loobey had once said she wanted a large salt water aquarium in her office. Now that the facility was completed, Ms. Calvert wanted her to have a substitute for that aquarium, and presented Ms. Loobey with a goldfish in a fish bowl.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Andersen moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded by Mr. Montgomery and the meeting was unanimously adjourned.

Board Secretary

Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470

(503) 741-6100
Fax (503) 741-6111

May 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator

RE: Service to the Jessen Area

Background

At the March 1990 meeting, the Annual Route Review was presented to the Board for review and approval. The Board approved all elements of the Annual Route Review except the recommended elimination of service to the Jessen Drive area in northwest Eugene. The Board directed staff to consider options to the elimination of service, and to bring the issue back for resolution.

Analysis

Staff have collected additional data on ridership in the Jessen area from both automatic passenger counters and on-board surveys, and have discussed the issue again with the Planning Advisory Committee. The data tends to support earlier findings: Ridership to or from the Jessen area is about 20 trips per day (about 10 round trips per day), and some bus schedules, particularly in the afternoon, have considerable difficulty maintaining their schedules.

The Jessen service now operates once per hour on weekdays and Saturdays, and does not operate evenings or Sundays. The revised recommendation is the elimination of some, but not all, bus trips to the Jessen area. Specifically, the 2:05 p.m., 3:05 p.m., and 4:05 p.m. trips from the Eugene Transit Station would **not** travel to the Jessen area, but would, instead, turn around at Echo Hollow Plaza. All trips up to and including the 1:05 p.m. trip from the Eugene Transit Station would serve the Jessen area, as well as the 5:05 p.m. and 6:05 p.m. trips. In addition, the 3:50 p.m. trip of the #53 Junction City would deviate, on demand, to drop off passengers in the Jessen area.

The three trips to be deleted are those which have the most problems maintaining their schedules. The 5:05 p.m. trip, although operated during a period of heavy congestion, returns to the Eugene Transit Station at a time when there is little opportunity for transfer; thus, it will not greatly inconvenience riders if it is late.

The net effect of these changes is the reduction of service in the Jessen area from the current 12 bus trips per weekday to 10 bus trips per weekday (nine by the #44A and one by the #53). Jessen area riders will have some gaps in service--there will be no service between 1:05 p.m. and 3:50 p.m., and between 3:50 p.m. and 5:05 p.m. At other times the service will be no different than it is now. The trips that are to be deleted carry approximately four to eight rides per day, or 20 to 40 percent of the existing ridership from the Jessen area. It is hoped that some of those riders can make use of the 3:50 p.m. trip on the #53, and that the others can plan their schedules to use either the 1:05 p.m or 5:05 p.m trips.

There will be a small cost increase as the result of these changes. The #53 Junction City will require an additional five minutes on the 3:50 p.m. trip to accommodate the deviation to the Jessen area. This is expected to cost approximately $600 per year. The deviation will also cause some additional travel time for non-Jessen riders traveling on the #53.

Staff will continue to monitor service to the Jessen area. Future changes to address running time problems may be necessary. However, every attempt will be made to maintain service to Jessen, and to work with the City of Eugene to improve vehicle access to the neighborhood.

Staff Recommendation

That service on the #44A Echo Hollow be adjusted as described in this memorandum.

Stefano Viggiano
Planning Administrator

SV:ms:js

Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470

(503) 741-6100
Fax (503) 741-6111

May 17, 1989

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Tamalyn Fitch, Chairman, Board Salary Committee

RE: General Manager's Salary and Benefits and Contract Renewal for 1990-91

The Salary Committee met on May 2, 1990, to discuss the employment-related performance of the General Manager from March 1, 1989, through February 28, 1990. The Committee also discussed salary and benefit provisions and contract renewal for the General Manager for the 1990-91 fiscal year.

Committee Recommendation: The Committee recommends approval of the following salary and benefits package for the General Manager for Fiscal Year 1990-91: a 4 percent increase in base salary, for a total base salary of $59,488; a one-time grant of 11 percent of base salary to be used for additional benefits as determined by the General Manager, for a total grant of $6,544; and continuation of the $200 monthly automobile allowance. Following is the comparison to current salary and benefit provisions:

	89-90	90-91
Annual Salary	$57,200	$59,488
Fringe Benefit Supplement	6,032	6,544
Car Allowance	2,400	2,400
Total	$65,632	$68,432

The Committee also recommends that the Board authorize the Board President to sign a contract extending the General Manager's employment through fiscal year 1990-91.

Tamalyn Fitch

Tamalyn Fitch
Salary Committee Chairman
TF:js

Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470

(503) 741-6100
Fax (503) 741-6111

May 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Paul Zvonkovic, Transit Planner

RE: Presentation of Plans for the New LCC Transit Station

In February, the Board was updated on plans to rebuild the transit station at Lane Community College at its current location. Since that time, Ken Nagao of Nagao Pacific was hired as the architect for this project. At the May Board meeting, Ken will present drawings of the new station and answer questions about the design.

The District will go out to bid for a contractor for this project at the end of May and should be able to award the bid in June. Construction should commence in late July, with final completion set for September.

Please contact me at 741-6100 if you have questions or comments regarding this project.

Paul Zvonkovic

Paul Zvonkovic
Transit Planner

PZ:ms:js

Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470

(503) 741-6100
Fax (503) 741-6111

May 16, 1990

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Ed Bergeron, Marketing Administrator

RE: Glenwood Facility Grand Opening Events

Last week, the District hosted several events to mark the completion of our facility construction project. The community interest generated by our new Glenwood headquarters afforded LTD a golden opportunity to educate our guests regarding transit operations and service issues, as well as the facility itself.

On Thursday, May 3, LTD hosted a special lunch and preview tour for representatives from 35 of Eugene-Springfield's largest employers. The meeting featured a video presentation which addressed six commonly-asked questions about LTD's facility project, operations, and service. The questions had been secured in advance from among the attendees.

On Friday, May 4, the facility was formally dedicated with a flag-raising ceremony featuring Congressman Peter DeFazio. Approximately 85 local dignitaries, LTD vendors, and employees enjoyed refreshments and facility tours after the event.

Saturday, May 5, was highlighted by a day-long Community Open House at the facility. Over 400 visitors were treated to refreshments, displays, a video presentation, and tours conducted by LTD employees.

We are very encouraged by the public's enthusiastic participation in our grand opening events, and have responded to several subsequent requests for special tours in the weeks ahead. For example, the Eugene and Springfield Chambers of Commerce have requested that LTD host a joint Chamber Business After Hours on June 27, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. Approximately 300 Chamber members and guests are expected to attend. A committee of LTD staff volunteers has already been formed to develop plans for the event.

Activities such has these play a key role in supporting the District's efforts to communicate with key constituencies. Staff are working to ensure our continuing ability to accommodate the community's interest in LTD's operations, while avoiding any adverse impact that such an "open door" policy could have on the District's operating efficiency and effectiveness.

Ed Bergeron/js

Ed Bergeron
Marketing Administrator
EB:ms:js

Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470

(503) 741-6100
Fax (503) 741-6111

May 16, 1990

MEMORANDUM

TO: LTD Board of Directors

FROM: Ronnel Curry, Marketing Representative

RE: Eugene Downtown Retail Task Force

The Eugene Downtown Retail Task Force, a committee comprised of retailers, property owners, and community members which reports to the Eugene Downtown Commission, is currently producing three working documents to improve the vitality of Downtown Eugene. These include a Tenant Mix Plan, Property Owner's Agreement, and Downtown Redesign Principles (attached), which will guide the rehabilitation of Downtown. The latter involves the issue of opening the mall to north and south vehicular access. Currently, the Redesign Principles imply prohibition of the LTD buses on a proposed opened Willamette Street. However, LTD staff believe that access is necessary to provide convenient service for current and future riders, to allow direct access for the disabled community, to save operating costs, and to be consistent with City-endorsed plans.

WHY LTD WANTS ACCESS TO WILLAMETTE:

1. Riders and potential riders desire convenient and efficient service. Buses operating on Willamette Street would save riders travel and walking time. As our research confirms, routes offering minimal walking distances enhance the viability of transit as an alternative to the automobile.

2. One of the Redesign Principles reflects the Retail Task Force members' desire to provide access to persons with disabilities (see A,9 on the attached). Yet, prohibiting buses runs counter to this direction. LTD provides between 2,000 and 3,000 trips per month to people using wheelchairs. This does not include the non-lift riders with handicaps that affect their mobility, such as the visually impaired, developmentally disabled, and the elderly. Staff believe that these riders desire the same convenience as those persons without disabilities who would be able to operate their own vehicles on a reopened Willamette Street.

3. Denying bus access could increase LTD's operating costs. For example, depending on the route, a bus could save approximately two minutes in travel time and $5,000 to $7,500 annually with access to Willamette.

4. City and County transportation plans support the increased use of alternative modes of transportation. The denial of bus access directly conflicts with these policies.

The Retail Task Force will be completing its work by the end of June. Its recommendations will be taken to the Downtown Commission and Eugene City Council in July. A public participatory process is scheduled for August through November. During this process, the Council wants the public to comment on a variety of proposed designs. In December, the Council will make final design and election decisions. The project is currently scheduled for the March 1991 ballot.

Staff will continue to work with the Retail Task Force and the Eugene City staff on this issue. Board action is not required at this time, but further discussion and/or action may be required at the June Board meeting.

Ronnel Curry /js

Ronnel Curry
Marketing Representative

RC:ms:js

attachment

DOWNTOWN REDESIGN PRINCIPLES
May 1990

A. General Principles

The redesign should:

1. Be consistent with and support the approved Tenant Mix Plan.

2. Incorporate a large public involvement, public information component to allow interested persons to participate in design and to attempt to achieve community consensus.

3. Retain pedestrian orientation with wide sidewalk areas, allowing for full merchant and pedestrian zones.

4. Improve vehicle access to and circulation in the greater downtown, considering future needs.

5. Increase safety and perceived safety.

6. Be designed to accommodate increased future density.

7. Planned in phases so that it can be implemented incrementally.

8. Address the needs of the downtown employee market.

9. Accommodate access for people with disabilities at least at the current level.

B. Public Plaza

Redesign should:

1. Expand the public plaza and orient it more toward Park Blocks,

2. Pay attention to adjoining retail and commercial uses that would activate plaza.

C. Limited Vehicle Access Elements

Redesign should:

1. Create shared north/south access for pedestrians, bicycles and automobiles.

2. Be convertible to allow street closure, expanding the plaza space for major events.

3. Be reversible to allow permanent closure in the future if desired.

4. Consider a variety of options regarding the scope of access, one-way, two-way, and make a recommendation.

5. Present recommendations for Olive Street, with and without traffic, one-way or two-way, options for existing water feature. (Changes to Olive will be phased to follow relocation of the transit station.)

6. Keep West Broadway between Charnelton and Willamette closed to vehicular traffic.

7. Present options on whether East Broadway should be opened or remain closed to vehicular traffic, examining the impact on the plaza.

8. Consider whether buses can be accommodated on north/south streets, without destroying pedestrian orientation.

D. <u>Comfort Level for Users</u>

Redesign should:

1. Include public restrooms.

2. Consider compatibility with transit, including the transit station site.

3. Discourage or prevent heavy truck use of north/south access routes.

4. Include on-street short-term loading bays.

5. Consider other parking issues.

6. Support consideration and creation of a downtown mall shuttle loop with vehicles scaled appropriately to an area with primary pedestrian use.

E. <u>Specific Design Proposals</u>

1. Design of fixtures should be consistent with existing elements on West Broadway, between Charnelton and Willamette, and other existing desirable elements,

2. Improvements should be of the highest quality materials and appearance.

3. New water features should be considered.

4. Edges and zones should be considered. Make them dynamic, varied, colorful.

5. Design should be sensitive to the unique characteristics and issues of the Aster Building and the Atrium building.

A basic assumption is that the success of revitalizing downtown is dependent on several factors, one of which is the implementation of the Tenant Mix Plan. It is in turn assumed that the implementation of the Tenant Mix Plan requires a redesign which improves access. As one component of an overall strategy for the revitalization of downtown, the redesign should contribute to an improvement in the economic and social health and vitality of downtown Eugene. An evaluation process and measurement criteria will be established to determine the economic and social impact of the redesign.

Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401-0470

(503) 741-6100
Fax (503) 741-6111

May 16, 1990

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator

RE: Downtown Station Site Selection Update

The Public Information Session on the downtown station site selection was held on Wednesday, May 9, 1990, at the Eugene Conference Center. Approximately 60 people attended the session. Some of the people had a specific interest in seeing that a particular site was or was not selected, while others came to see what the options were and did not have a preconceived opinion about the sites.

The session was set up with separate displays for the mixed use concept and each of the possible station locations. Comments were collected on flip charts that were located with each display, as well as at a comment table at the end of the displays. Attendees were also asked to complete a brief survey.

The District has also received a number of letters regarding the site selection from interested persons, as well as written comments from people visiting the display at the Customer Service Center and the Eugene Permit and Information Center. All comments will be made available for review by the Site Selection Committee.

It is expected that the Committee will meet sometime near the end of this month or the beginning of June. One issue that will likely be brought to the Committee is whether the 8th and Willamette site should be included as an option. That site has been suggested by several people commenting on the alternative sites. The 8th and Willamette site was not originally included in the study because the Pankow development was planned for that site when the study began and because the City had indicated a preference for more intensive development of that site than just a transit station. Now that the Pankow development is no longer a consideration and the option of a mixed use project is under consideration, perhaps 8th and Willamette should be reconsidered. Should the site be added, the planned schedule for the site selection would have to be adjusted somewhat.

Stefano Viggiano
Planning Administrator

SV:ms:js

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Urban Mass
Transportation
Administration**

REGION X
Alaska, Idaho, Oregon,
Washington

915 Second Avenue
Federal Building
Suite 3142
Seattle, Washington 98174

April 23, 1990

Janet Calvert
President, Board of Directors
Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Dear Ms. Calvert:

I have received your kind invitation to participate in the dedication ceremony for Lane Transit's new facility on May 4, 1990. Unfortunately, due to an extremely tight travel budget, I will not be able to attend. I regret this very much, as the highest satisfaction in working with UMTA comes in visiting the projects the agency has funded and seeing the fruits of all the grant recipients' hard work.

All of the people in the Region 10 office, and elsewhere in UMTA, congratulate you, your fellow board members, Phyllis and all the staff at LTD on your accomplishment. We are certainly glad to have been able to assist you.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Ebersole

Terry L. Ebersole
Regional Manager

cc: UMTA Western Area Director

R. C. PAPÉ
PRESIDENT

May 7, 1990

Ms. Phyllis Loobey
General Manager
Lane Transit District
P. O. Box 2710
Eugene, OR 97402

Dear Phyllis:

Congratulations on completing Lane Transit District's new Administration and Maintenance facility. Having toured this new facility and visiting with your enthusiastic team of employees gives us insight on why LTD is a national leader in mass transit.

Thank you again for the lunch and opportunity to visit with other Board members and employees at LTD. Your pride and enthusiasm was well displayed. As neighbors, we are pleased to welcome your operation to the Glenwood area.

With kindest personal regards, we remain

Very truly yours,

Randy

Randy C. Pape'

RCP:sw

Office of the President

Lane Community College

May 8, 1990

MAY 10 1990

Ms. Phyllis Loobey
General Manager
Lane Transit District
P.O. Box 7070
Eugene, OR 97401

Dear Phyllis:

Congratulations on your beautiful new facilities! I was very impressed with the planning and thought that went into the facility and equally impressed with the answers that you provided about the choices you made during the construction.

Thank you for the nice luncheon and tour, and good luck in your new facilities.

Sincerely,

Larry J. Warford, Ph.D.
Executive Dean

cc: Jerry Moskus

4000 East 30th Avenue • Eugene, OR 97405-0640 • (503) 747-4501
An affirmative action/equal opportunity institution

American Public Transit Association
1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Phone (202) 898-4000
FAX (202) 898-4070

Jack R. Gilstrap
Executive Vice President

TO: APTA Transit System Board Members

FROM: Jack R. Gilstrap, Executive Vice President

DATE: May 1, 1990

SUBJECT: 1990 Transit Board Members Seminar, July 29th - August 2nd, Charleston, South Carolina

It is my pleasure to personally invite you to participate in APTA's seventh Transit Board Members Seminar to be held this year in beautiful Charleston, South Carolina, July 29th - August 2nd at the Omni Charleston Place.

Through the past seven years, this seminar has come to represent the leading opportunity for transit's policy makers to come together and discuss their role and responsibilities. The chance to exchange problems and ideas with peers from across the country has been heralded by the seminar's participants as a unique and rewarding experience. Ask anyone who has attended -- the meeting is a highlight of the Association's professional development events.

The 1990 seminar is no exception. Located this year in historic and resilient Charleston, South Carolina, the program features a mixture of the professional skills and industry knowledge needed for board members to do their jobs. The line-up of sessions includes the following:

- An interactive and highly insightful presentation by Dr. W.K. Childress of the Cooper Management Institute on the reaching of consensus in conflict. Dr. Childress will examine the process and dynamics of group decision making at the board level, and delve into the types of personalities that impact on winning in conflict.

- "The Board Member's Agenda" - a roundtable look and discussion of the important issues in transit policy making, and the future impact of those topics on transit's future.

- "Transit's New Constituency - Building Coalitions and Community Involvement" - an overview and participatory session outlining the efforts of Transit-NOW, the coalition building effort on behalf of major increases in funding for public transit. How APTA and you are involved in this major advocacy and education activity will be described and discussed.

Other sessions will feature a look at the general manager - board relationship; an update on what is happening in labor settlements and the push for alternative fuels; and the popular "Peer Session", where you ask the questions and the answers come from your fellow board members. Add to this the opportunity to interact with your peers from across the country over dinner or at the hospitality suite and you have the makings of a meeting that has become unique to APTA's transit board members.

If you register for the seminar by June 15th, the cost is only $450; after that date, the registration fee is $495. Included with this letter is the reservation envelope for the Omni Hotel at Charleston Place. Please send this form back to the hotel no later than July 5th in order to receive the APTA room rate. Reservations after this date will be subject to room availability. I urge you to act now.

If you have any questions about the meeting or the program, please contact APTA's Director of Training and Professional Development, Thomas Urban, at 202-898-4053. APTA's seventh Transit Board Members Seminar promises again to be a special event, and we look forward to seeing you in Charleston this summer.

Remember: July 29th - August 2nd. It's your own meeting, so I hope you'll be there.

Jack R. Gilstrap

LANE TRANSIT

COMPARISON OF YEAR-TO-DATE ACTUAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES TO BUDGETED

GENERAL FUND

FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL ENDING APRIL 30, 1990 (83.3% OF YEAR COMPLETED)

	YEAR-TO-DATE ACTIVITY	YEARLY BUDGET	VARIANCE OVER(UNDER)	% RECEIVED/ EXPENDED
REVENUES				
Operating Revenues:				
Passenger Fares	1,549,056	1,860,000	(310,944)	83.28%
Charters	85,537	72,700	12,837	117.66%
Advertising	66,245	80,200	(13,955)	82.60%
Miscellaneous	36,360	2,000	34,360	1818.02%
TOTAL OPERATING REVENUES	1,737,199	2,014,900	(277,701)	86.22%
Non-Operating Revenues:				
Interest	297,281	160,000	137,281	185.80%
Payroll Taxes	5,306,932	6,541,000	(1,234,068)	81.13%
Federal Operating Assistance	1,075,000	1,075,000	0	100.00%
State In-Lieu-Of Payroll Taxes	443,851	619,500	(175,649)	71.65%
State Special Transportation	240,884	331,300	(90,416)	72.71%
Section 18 Operating		10,250	(10,250)	0.00%
Other	160	0	160	
TOTAL NON-OPERATING REVENUES	7,364,107	8,737,050	(1,372,943)	84.29%
TOTAL REVENUES	9,101,306	10,751,950	(1,650,644)	84.65%
EXPENDITURES				
Administration:				
Personal Services	546,813	667,100	(120,287)	81.97%
Materials and Supplies	94,575	122,270	(27,695)	77.35%
Contractual Services	83,074	110,550	(27,476)	75.15%
Total Administration	724,462	899,920	(175,458)	80.50%
Marketing and Planning:				
Personal Services	494,307	594,700	(100,393)	83.12%
Materials and Supplies	155,938	189,550	(33,612)	82.27%
Contractual Services	126,653	207,000	(80,347)	61.18%
Total Marketing and Planning	776,898	991,250	(214,352)	78.38%
Transportation:				
Personal Services	3,618,030	4,509,500	(891,470)	80.23%
Materials and Supplies	12,954	22,100	(9,146)	58.62%
Contractual Services	352,263	472,100	(119,837)	74.62%
Total Transportation	3,983,247	5,003,700	(1,020,453)	79.61%
Maintenance:				
Personal Services	919,573	1,139,200	(219,627)	80.72%
Materials and Supplies	816,671	1,141,321	(324,650)	71.55%
Contractual Services	152,561	198,900	(46,339)	76.70%
Total Maintenance	1,888,805	2,479,421	(590,616)	76.18%
Contingency		200,000	(200,000)	0.00%
Losses/Gains	(1,600)		(1,600)	
Transfer to Capital Projects	125,000	767,959	(642,959)	16.28%
Transfer to Risk Management		409,700	(409,700)	0.00%
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	7,496,812	10,751,950	(3,255,138)	69.73%

LANE TRANSIT
COMPARISON OF BUDGETED AND ACTUAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND
FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL ENDING 4/30/90 (83.3% OF YEAR COMPLETED)

	YEAR-TO-DATE	YEARLY BUDGET	VARIANCE OVER(UNDER)
RESOURCES			
Beginning Fund Balance	3,593,978	1,815,296	1,778,682
Revenues:			
UMTA Section 3-Buses		2,127,000	(2,127,000)
UMTA Section 3-Facility	846,342		846,342
UMTA Section 9-Buses		98,000	(98,000)
UMTA Section 9-Capital	278,398		278,398
UMTA Section 18-Buses		360,000	(360,000)
UMTA Section 18-LCC	7,124	96,000	(88,876)
Federal Highway Admin			0
Transfer from Gen'l Fund	125,000	767,959	(642,959)
Total Revenues	1,256,864	3,448,959	(2,192,095)
TOTAL RESOURCES	4,850,842	5,264,255	(413,413)
EXPENDITURES			
Locally Funded:	975,066	293,000	682,066
UMTA Funded:			
Construction Representative	18,332		18,332
Benefits	3,811		3,811
Computer Software	41,601		41,601
Office Equipment	47,212		47,212
Maintenance Equipment	16,503		16,503
Bus Stop Improvements	101,072	120,000	(18,928)
Land & Buildings	1,259,044		1,259,044
Buses		4,700,000	(4,700,000)
Bus Related Equipment	21,144		21,144
Service Vehicles			
Miscellaneous	800		800
Total UMTA Funded	1,509,519	4,820,000	(3,310,481)
FHWA Funded:			
Bus Stop Improvements			
Total FHWA Funded	0	0	0
Contingency	0	0	0
Capital Lease Principal	134,296	14,200	120,096
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,618,881	5,127,200	(2,508,319)
ENDING FUND BALANCE	2,231,961	137,055	2,094,906

LANE TRANSIT
COMPARISON OF BUDGETED AND ACTUAL REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
RISK MANAGEMENT FUND
FOR THE MONTH OF APRIL ENDING 4/30/90 (83.3% OF YEAR COMPLETED)

	YEAR-TO-DATE	% ACTIVITY	YEARLY BUDGET	VARIANCE OVER(UNDER)
RESOURCES				
Beginning Fund Balance	411,850		463,600	(51,750)
Revenues:				
Transfer from Gen'l Fund		0.00%	409,700	(409,700)
Interest	18,917	63.06%	30,000	(11,083)
Total Revenues	18,917	4.30%	439,700	(420,783)
TOTAL RESOURCES	430,767	47.69%	903,300	(472,533)
EXPENDITURES				
Administration	2,582	61.49%	4,200	(1,618)
Worker's Compensation	206,348	86.70%	238,000	(31,652)
Liability Program	194,964	30.24%	644,700	(449,736)
Miscellaneous Insurance	20,829	127.01%	16,400	4,429
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	424,723	47.02%	903,300	(478,577)
ENDING FUND BALANCE	6,044		0	6,044

EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT AND PHYLLIS P. LOOBEY

This is an Employment Agreement made and entered into on _____________, 1990, by and between the Lane Transit District and Phyllis P. Loobey.

The Board of Directors of Lane Transit District (hereinafter the Board) is authorized pursuant to ORS 267.200(5) to enter into contracts on behalf of Lane Transit District and to appoint and fix the salary of the General Manager.

Therefore, in consideration of the terms and conditions of this agreement, the parties agree as follows:

Section 1: Duties and Responsibilities.

(a) Lane Transit District (hereinafter the District) agrees to employ Phyllis P. Loobey as General Manager, and Phyllis P. Loobey (hereinafter the Manager) hereby accepts such employment upon the terms and conditions set forth in this agreement.

(b) The Manager shall have, and agrees to perform in good faith, the duties and responsibilities of General Manager. As such, the Manager shall maintain her office at the headquarters of the District, and shall:

1) Have full charge of the acquisition, construction, maintenance, and operation of the transit system of the District.

2) Have full charge of the administration of the business affairs of the District.

3) Enforce all ordinances adopted by the Board.

4) Administer the personnel system adopted by the Board, and, except for officers appointed by the Board, appoint, discipline, or remove all officers and employees, subject to ORS 267.010 to 267.390 and the rules of the Board.

5) Prepare and submit to the Board within 30 days after the end of each fiscal year a complete report of the finances and administrative activities of the District for that preceding fiscal year.

6) Keep the Board advised as to the needs of the District.

7) Prepare all plans and specifications for acquisition of equipment or construction of improvements or facilities for the District.

8) Cause to be installed and maintained a system of auditing and accounting which shows completely and at all times the financial condition of the District.

9) Devote her entire working time to the business of the District. The Manager's participation in civic and charitable affairs is deemed to be business of the District within the meaning of this provision.

10) Perform such other duties as the Board requires by resolution.

11) Attend the meetings of the Board and may participate in its deliberations, but has no vote.

Section 2: Term.

This employment shall continue as long as mutually agreeable to both parties. The Manager may be removed by the Board only by an affirmative vote of the majority of the members.

Section 3: Termination/Suspension.

(a) Before the Manager is removed, she shall upon demand be given a written statement of the reasons for her removal. If requested, she shall be given an open hearing at a meeting of the Board before the final vote for her removal; however, the Board may by resolution suspend her from office pending a hearing. The action of the Board in suspending or removal of the Manager, if approved by a majority of the members of the Board, may be reconsidered by the Board, but is otherwise final and not subject to appeal.

(b) The parties agree to give each other written notice of termination. Notice of termination given by the Manager to the District shall be effective at the date specified therein, which date shall be not less than 90 days after the date of service of the notice. Notice of termination given by the District to the Manager, if termination is for the Manager's job-related criminal activity or job-related willful misfeasance, can be made effective immediately; otherwise, it shall be made effective at the date specified therein, which date shall be not less than 90 days after the date of service of the notice. The District agrees to give written notice of any suspension to the Manager.

Section 4: Compensation.

(a) As compensation for the services rendered to the District during the fiscal year 1987-88, the Manager shall be paid a base salary at an annual rate of $_______, a monthly automobile allowance of $_______, and a one-time payment of $_______ for an additional benefit program, to be determined by the Manager, payable in accordance with the District's regular payroll procedures. Said compensation shall be subject to modification from year to year hereafter by mutual agreement. In addition, the Manager shall be entitled to the fringe benefits which are generally available to other employees of the District, including, without limitation: hospital; surgical, medical, dental, or other group health insurance; life insurance and disability benefits; holidays; sick leave; vacation; travel insurance; severance pay plan; and participation in the Lane Transit District pension or retirement program.

(b) The Manager shall be entitled to full compensation and benefits during periods of suspension.

(c) Compensation and benefits received by the Manager from other parties after notice of termination or suspension, for services performed for other parties during the period of 90 days after notice of termination or during periods of suspension, shall reduce the compensation and benefits to which the Manager shall be entitled under this agreement.

Section 5: Expenses.

The District shall reimburse the Manager for reasonable and necessary business expenses of the Manager incurred in the performance of the duties and responsibilities set out in this agreement, upon presentation, in accordance with the District's normal practice, of reasonably detailed statements of expense for which reimbursement is claimed.

Section 6: Indemnification.

To the extent permitted under the laws of the State of Oregon, the District shall indemnify and hold harmless the Manager from any liability, cost, or expense arising out of the Manager's actions as General Manager of the District, except for any criminal activity or willful misfeasance.

Section 7: Assignment.

This agreement is personal to the Manager and cannot be assigned to any other person.

Section 8: Entire Agreement.

This agreement represents the entire agreement between the parties and supercedes any prior agreements or understandings, whether oral or written.

Section 9: Amendments.

This agreement cannot be changed or terminated orally and may be modified only by a written agreement executed by both parties.

Section 10: Notices.

Any notice to the District under this agreement shall be given to the President of the Board of Directors at the President's latest address as shown by the records of the Executive Secretary of the District. Any notice to the Manager under this agreement shall be given to her at her latest address as shown on the records of the Executive Secretary of the District. Notices shall be deemed given when delivered in person or within two business days after being mailed by certified mail at the United States Post Office in Eugene or Springfield, Oregon, with postage fully prepaid and addressed as hereinabove specified.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned have executed this agreement in duplicate on this _____ day of ________________, 1990.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

____
General Manager

By _________________________
President, Board of Directors