MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

Wednesday, March 4, 1992

Pursuant to notice given at the February 19, 1992, regular meeting and to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 2, 1992, 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, March 4, 1992, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Janet Calvert

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Tom Brand of Marcola said that he and his daughter rode the bus when Marcola had service before, and would like to have it again. He said bus service would give her more of an opportunity to live with him in Marcola, but she was going to school in Eugene and didn't want to drive that far. Mr. Brand said there were more people in Marcola than there were in 1979, and more would ride the bus. He presented the idea of having a bus operator who lived in Marcola bring the first bus into Eugene in the morning, rather than beginning in Eugene and "deadheading" out to Marcola, if that would save the District money. He also thought vans or smaller vehicles might be the answer for Marcola service, and suggested lower wages for the drivers, to save money. He thought that a special bus to LCC or past Weyerhaeuser might carry a lot of people from Marcola, especially if the bus stopped right where they wanted to go, so they didn't have to transfer or walk. He hoped that the District could find a way to offer service to Marcola.

Donna Riddle, Manager of the St. Vincent dePaul Homeless Family Service Center, spoke about the planned change in tokens for non-profit social service agencies. She said she answered the District's survey and had kept in touch with staff about the proposed discount token program. She handed out a letter to the Board, and said she hoped they would understand the impact the proposed program would have on services to homeless families. She said the most problematical issue for her was the limit on tokens. The Homeless Center had always had LTD as a back-up when their van broke down, to transport homeless families from the center to the churches where they slept at night. She said she had not been able to figure out another affordable way to get the families back and forth should the proposed policy go into effect. If the Center had to transport 40 families for one week, they would use their 120 token maximum very fast.

Bus transportation was also important to the children in these families. Use of a youth pass had allowed some to stay in one school. Ms. Riddle said the children had lost their neighbors, friends, possessions, etc., and carried a lot of the stress found in homeless families. When they had to lose their schools on top of everything else, it was a very traumatic situation for them. One child who was too young to ride the bus alone had been in four schools that year, and was falling behind in school and didn't feel as if he belonged anywhere. Ms. Riddle said she had appreciated the partnership with LTD in the past, and hoped that the Board would exempt the homeless program from the new policy, or would create a separate policy for the homeless.

COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE REDESIGN:

Responses to Public Comment on Proposed Service Changes for Fiscal Year 1992-93: Mr. Viggiano called the Board's attention to the proposed service changes on page 4 of the agenda packet for that evening, and discussed staff's responses to comments on the proposed service changes. He said that extended evening service seemed to be very popular among riders. For the 11X route, staff were proposing to keep the two trips that were originally scheduled to be eliminated, instead of two of the trips on the new #I-105 route, at no additional cost. An elderly gentleman had called to express concern about the loss of service on the end of the #13 Centennial Loop. The reasons for the change were explained, and the gentleman found the one-quarter mile walk to the bus stop tolerable, although not preferable.

Mr. Viggiano discussed an analysis of Marcola service found on page 10 of the packet, in which Marcola service was compared with other rural areas served by LTD, in terms of population, rides per day and per capita, service per day, and service productivity. If it were assumed that the Marcola residents' propensity to ride would be about the same as other rural areas, 25 trips for every 1,000 people per day, which would be about 70 trips per day. Staff had used an assumption of four bus trips per day, with a 1.5 hour round trip. Coburg actually had a lower population but a shorter trip, so its productivity tended to be somewhat higher. Traveling only 1.5 miles beyond Marcola would make the service unavailable to those living farther out in the Mohawk Valley, but would also decrease the travel time. The residents of Marcola believed that they would be likely to use the bus more than residents of other rural areas. Mr. Viggiano had received a petition with about 400 signatures, which was a fairly high percentage of the population. However, because of the anticipated low productivity of service to Marcola, staff were recommending that it not be offered at this time. Additionally, Marcola was out of the District's service area, so would have to be brought into the boundaries.

Mr. Brand spoke again from the audience, saying that even if the bus only went to Marcola and not beyond, people would drive into town and park and ride, so that would increase the bus riding population. Mr. Viggiano said that the park and ride concept is one that people do use, and seemed to work best in this community when parking at the destination was difficult or expensive. Mr. Brand said he was concerned about students driving to LCC on a dangerous road from Marcola. If students could get to LCC and back on the bus, it would allow more of them to go to school. He said he had driven to Papa's Pizza and taken the bus from there, because it saved him a lot of money. However, he would have loved to have been able to ride all the way from Marcola.

Ms. Hocken asked about providing service to areas outside the District's boundaries. Mr. Viggiano explained that the Board could enlarge the boundaries. The District's policy had been that inclusion in the service boundaries had to be requested by governing bodies with jurisdiction in the requesting area. The District had received a request from the County Commissioners, so that was why staff had done this evaluation.

Staff were in the process of meeting with Fairmount neighbors regarding the proposed service changes on the Fairmount route. The Donald Street area would have the same level of service as currently, so the gentleman's fears about losing service when he moved in were unfounded. Weekend service to Lowell/Jasper had been requested, but because of low ridership on weekdays, weekend service was not being recommended. Staff had also received a request for weekend service to Coburg, which they believed would not be productive, due to low weekday ridership.

Service to the Westside Post Office had been suggested. It would require a route deviation, and a three-block walk was considered an acceptable distance for access to the system, so that suggestion was not being recommended. Service to the Danebo/Souza area south of Barger and west of Beltline had been requested during the public hearing. Staff believed that this area may warrant bus service, but the street network would make operation of a route to that neighborhood difficult. Staff planned to track development in the area and encourage the City of Eugene to establish a more transit-compatible street pattern in the neighborhood.

LCC students had asked for a River Road to LCC connection. Staff thought that kind of route could be very productive, but were waiting for a decision on a group pass program at LCC. Mr. Montgomery asked how hard it would be to institute that kind of service after implementing a group pass program. Mr. Viggiano said it would be fairly easy to implement, but the students' key concern was cost, so staff had tried to keep costs down by not adding additional service. LCC students currently could get to LCC from River Road, but it was not as fast as a freeway route would be.

Staff had received telephone calls from riders who said that loss of service on South Park Street on the #50 Park would be a hardship for many people, with a long walk to the closest bus stop. Staff were re-evaluating the proposed routing in light of the public comment, as well as a potential operational problem on a turn on the redesigned route.

Finally, staff had received a telephone call supporting the proposed added service on the #67 route during evenings and weekends.

Mr. Viggiano discussed a summary of service changes by geographic sector, showing annual cost. The final staff recommendation was for a 7.3 percent service increase, at an annual cost of $493,000. He explained that this was a larger increase than the District had implemented in the past, partly because ridership had been increasing much faster than service during the past years. Staff believed that these changes were productive and were limited only by the District's financial situation. There were actually another 15 percent of service increases that would be productive for the District if they could be funded. Mr. Parks asked if this was a wish list of service changes that the District might not be able to fund. Mr. Viggiano replied that this only included service that staff believed would meet the District's productivity standards. The community's "wish list" for service was much greater.

Budget Impact of Proposed Service Changes: Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services and Budget Officer, said that Mr. Parks had raised an issue that the District confronted the previous year. Staff had recommended needed service changes, but when the budget was put together, there were not enough resources to meet the demand for service. Mr. Pangborn said he wanted to give the Board a good global picture of the District's finances, so they would know what could be funded in FY 92-93.

He explained that staff looked at three categories when they reviewed service: demand, productivity, and budget. Demand resulted from very valid requests for service, whether those requests were from one person or 100 people, both within and outside the service area. Staff prioritized those requests on the basis of anticipated productivity, because the District had a level of responsibility to provide the most productive service to meet the greatest need and serve the most people within limited resources. Staff were currently preparing a draft budget for FY 92-93, based on discussions at the Board's strategic planning retreat last November. At that time, the Long-Range Financial Plan showed that the District could fund an 8 percent service increase, based on the projections at that time. Since then, significant changes had occurred. First, the Long-Range Financial Plan had assumed no change in federal funding, but the District would actually be experiencing a loss in federal operational funding. The new formula divided funding according to population and population density for all transit districts in areas between 50,000 and 200,000 population. According to the 1990 census, other populations grew, but the Eugene/Springfield area did not. The result of this change was that LTD lost $144,000 out of about $1.3 million, which was a 12 percent decrease in funding that the District had not planned for. That loss equalled about 2 percent in service, figured at $70,000 to $80,000 for each percent of service increase. The Long-Range Financial Plan prepared in November 1991 had also assumed that the economy would start recovering, and that had not really happened, although the payroll tax collections did not reflect a significant decrease. The most recent payroll tax revenues, collected during the Christmas shopping season, were coming in at 5.6 percent, which was fairly good news.

Because of these changes, a more realistic service increase would be between 6 and 8 percent. Mr. Pangborn said it was possible to go above 6 percent, to the requested 7.3 percent, depending on the other demands in the budget, including inflation, cost of parts, etc. Any recommended service increases would be based on the District's ability to maintain that service in future years.

At its strategic planning retreat, the Board had discussed several issues of fiscal accountability. First, the Board instructed staff to prepare a Long-Range Financial Plan which kept the tax rate under .6 percent for the first three years, and which did not use any reserves for five years (such as the contingency, the payroll tax fluctuation reserves, etc.), and which also addressed service demands through a Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) process. Mr Pangborn said that staff would know by the March 18 Board meeting how close the District could come to funding a 7.3 percent service increase. Because 7.3 percent was the outer limit that the District could fund, Mr. Viggiano had not presented a list of proposed service increases beyond 7.3 percent.

Mr. Billings asked about the effect of the loss of federal funding in the current and following years. Mr. Pangborn stated that the District had always taken the position that it was better to be conservative when projecting revenues and expenditures, and that the current budget was not in trouble. Tamara Weaver, Finance Administrator, said that current payroll tax collections were beyond what was budgeted. There was a lot of doubt about the payroll tax last year, so the District used considerable restraint in its budgeting process, and would face no immediate fiscal problems. Mr. Billings asked if, in addition to the increased payroll tax collections, there was generally enough flux in a budget of $11 million or so that the District could handle the expected loss of federal funds feasibly, if not easily. Ms. Weaver said she believed the District would have over $700,000 or $800,000 more than budgeted for the current year.

<u>CENTRAL AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY (CATS) LETTER</u>: Ms. Loobey explained that at the last meeting, the Board had reviewed a preliminary discussion paper of the CATS Citizen Advisory Committee. On page 27 of the agenda packet was a draft letter from the Board to the Citizen Advisory Committee, which represented the District's response to the discussion paper. Ms. Fitch said that the letter expressed the Board's concerns, and that Mr. Viggiano had done a wonderful job of drafting the letter.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved that the Board send the letter found on page 27 of the agenda packet to the Central Area Transportation Study Citizen Advisory Committee. Mr. Billings

VOTE seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

<u>LOW INCOME DISCOUNT TOKEN PROGRAM</u>: Mr. Pangborn stated that the Board had already approved this program, but asked that staff bring back program guidelines and criteria before the program was implemented. He said that Ms. Riddle, who spoke at the beginning of the meeting, highlighted the issues staff had struggled with and attempted to address. The District was being approached by individual programs to try to address some of the real transportation needs they had for their programs. Each program was a little different, but all had funding problems, unmet client needs, etc. The individual agreements regarding discounts were difficult to administer.

Staff then looked at one overall approach to attempt to meet the largest need. Unfortunately, the new program did not meet some of the individual needs, and staff struggled with whether and how to provide exceptions. The recommended program is equitable and allows equal access. Ms. Riddle said she had been purchasing day passes for trips that would take ten tokens. Mr. Pangborn explained that discounted pass programs were expensive to the District because it could not control the number of rides. If discounts on passes were to be allowed, the District would need a way to limit its liability. When selling tokens, the District can know that each token is just one ride and not transferrable for other rides. Tokens were easier to administer and distribute, and if someone lost one token, it would not be as big a loss as losing a pass.

Mr. Pangborn said he would be the first to admit that this did not meet all the needs of all programs, but believed it was equitable to those involved, and the simplest for LTD to administer.

Mr. Parks asked if the qualifying programs were in part sponsored by other organizations. Mr. Pangborn discussed the qualifications listed on page 31, and said the programs had to maintain 501(c)(3) status in compliance with federal and state requirements for private non-profit organizations, and had to serve low income individuals as defined by federal standards. The programs also could not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, marital status, family relationship, or disability. Agencies would apply to United Way, who would verify their qualifications. No governmental entities would be able to qualify. The programs would have to distribute tokens only for the reasons listed on page 31, and would be audited annually. The primary purpose of the organizations would have to be serving low income persons.

Mr. Parks asked if the federal and state standards would apply equally to LTD and other transportation agencies such as taxis. Angie Sifuentez, Marketing Representative, said that the agencies would have to be private non-profits, and that the state regulations were stricter than federal regulations. Mr. Parks asked if there were any legal requirements to have this program. Mr. Pangborn replied that there were none. The only federal requirement was that LTD provide half-price fares to riders with disabilities or who were elderly. Mr. Parks commented that the District was then offering this program based on Board policy that it wanted to participate. Mr. Pangborn agreed that this was so. At this point, he said, the program was purely a community service, and that was why staff wanted to limit the cost to the District.

Mr. Parks said that last time the Board discussed discounts for the Homeless Center, they hoped there would be a long-term solution to the housing and transportation problem, but there evidently wasn't. Ms. Riddle said the Center had purchased a $1,200 van that was repaired by the churches. Sometimes it took three van loads to take all the people from the Center to the church. They had been using the bus primarily to help people seek employment, to help children get to school or people to medical and other appointments, and to try to get people back into permanent housing. It was not used for recreation, and clients were encouraged to use the bus during off-peak hours when they could. She said that when their clients were looking for housing or employment, they were clean and neat, and had good behavior on the bus.

Mr. Parks asked how the regulations or criteria would impact other groups. Mr. Pangborn said that the District had only provided this kind of benefit for three agencies, and the discounts on any fare instruments, including passes, were all different. He added that all would receive less of a discount under this program than they were currently receiving.

Mr. Brandt questioned how much the program would really cost. Mr. Pangborn said he could not figure it closely because staff did not know what the demand would be, and there was a possibility that some programs could not afford to buy tokens even at the discount rate. Ms. Hocken said that if the agencies were limited to 120 tokens each per month, it would take at least 40 agencies to reach the limit if all the tokens were used. She was concerned about the administrative ease, and wondered if fewer agencies, maybe 20, should receive more tokens. However, Mr. Pangborn wondered how those 20 agencies would be chosen.

Ms. Hocken suggested that the second item be removed from Program Outline, because it dealt with United Way and not this program.

Mr. Pangborn said that Ms. Sifuentez had found a broad range of services to others than just the homeless when she surveyed local agencies. Staff tried to structure the program so LTD's administrative costs were low. Tokens would be sold in rolls, in bulk, and a letter of certification from United Way would be required. The program would require some staff time, but it would be no different from what staff were already doing.

Mr. Billings wondered if staff had a plan for determining the program's success; possibly looking at the demand and what worked and didn't work after six months. Mr. Pangborn said that staff had planned to review the program after a year, but could do so after six months. Because agencies would have to apply to United Way for certification, that would be a way to determine how much interest there was in the program, and what those agencies thought their demand would be over time.

Ms. Fitch asked how much the original three agencies were purchasing in other than tokens. Ms. Riddle said the homeless center was buying 100 day passes at a time, which lasted about two and a half months. They also purchased two adult monthly passes and maybe five youth passes. The adult passes were used only when someone was employed, to help them get to work and save their money to get into permanent housing. Ms. Sifuentez said these programs bought in bulk and tried to stretch their purchases as long as possible, since they received a greater discount for buying in bulk.

Ms. Fitch asked how long the application process would take. Ms. Sifuentez said the program would probably be ready to accept applications by May, and it would probably take about a month to qualify. The actual program might start in June or July. She thought that maybe 40 to 48 agencies would apply. The tokens normally cost 55 cents each in groups of five, but that cost would be increasing to 65 cents. The discount program offers 50 percent off the cash fare of 75 cents, so the token discount price would be 37.5 cents. Mr. Brandt asked how 4,500 tokens would be given out each month. Ms. Sifuentez said they would be handed out in rolls, or in bulk. Mr. Pangborn said staff figured the cost of the program on the difference between 37.5 cents and 65 cents. The District had already been giving away $300 monthly in fare instruments through Catholic Community Services and United Way, which had proven to be a vital program in the community. He said the District's maximum loss would be $15,000 if every token sold every month. The question was whether these would be off-peak or new riders. The District could give away $15,000 in free fare instruments but there was a greater and greater demand for service.

Ms. Fitch said the reality with the $300 in fare instruments per month given out through Catholic Community Services was that it was not nearly enough for the need in the community, and the tokens did not make their way to enough agencies. Mr. Brandt wondered about giving $15,000 more in tokens away and not worrying about administering a discount program. The people receiving the tokens received them because they needed them, not just because they were free. Mr. Pangborn said staff approached the program from the idea that if the cost for the tokens were shared, the qualifying agencies would have greater accountability for the tokens. Additionally, the District would not be giving away service the payroll taxpayers were paying for. The District was not a social service agency, but saw the great need, so staff thought the proposed program was a reasonable approach. Mr. Billings said he preferred to see some contribution on the part of the agencies. Mr. Pangborn added that the District could spend twice as much and still not meet the need in the community.

Ms. Loobey said the District probably received 100 requests each year for specific programs and kinds of assistance. At least with this program, the District would have some guidelines, and might not be constantly bombarded with those requests.

MOTION Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve implementation of the Low Income Discount Token Program as presented. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion, and Mr. Brandt called for the

VOTE question. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. Fitch said she would like to see a report on how the program was working after six months, including whether the program was meeting the needs of the different groups. She said the Board needed to know if the program did not work.

SALARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Ms. Fitch, Board Salary Committee Chairperson, said that the Salary Committee discussed a 4 percent increase for administrative salaries at great length. The Committee members thought a comprehensive salary survey would be good to do, but did not recommend it for next fiscal year, based on the uncertainties surrounding Measure 5 and the community. Ms. Hocken asked about the effect of a 1 percent increase in contributions to a defined benefit plan. Ms. Fitch explained that the District did not belong to the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS), and LTD's percent of contribution to its own retirement plan was much lower than the PERS contribution. Last year, there was some concern that the District would be required to change to PERS, and LTD's contribution would have to increase 12 percent of covered payroll. At that time, the decision was made to slowly increase the District's contribution to retirement. Because of an exemption in state law, the District will not be required to change to PERS, but a slow increase in retirement contributions was still seen as desirable, especially when trying to hire from outside the District.

MOTION Mr. Billings moved that the Board approve the employee salary and benefit compensation package for FY 92-93 as outlined in the agenda packet. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion.

Mr. Brandt wanted to clarify that Board approval was only for the purposes of budgeting, and would still need to be approved in the budget. Ms. Hocken asked about contract wages. Ms. Loobey said that this recommendation was only for administrative staff, and that the Union contract would expire the following year. However, Union and administrative employees would be receiving comparable increases in FY 92-93.

Ms. Fitch called for the question. The motion to approve the administrative employee compensation package recommendation for FY 92-93, as outlined in the agenda packet, was

VOTE approved by unanimous vote.

FINANCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Board Finance Committee had met the previous day to discuss three issues. Mr. Brandt, Finance Committee Chairman, said that the question of why the District should approve a second deferred compensation carrier had originally been raised at a Board meeting. It was determined that the Board was responsible for those funds, and the Finance Committee concluded that it would be inappropriate to allow a multitude of investment carriers, because the one offered currently included seven investment choices. The Committee concluded that the District would have to be more thorough in the study of the existing plan. Staff were developing a set of criteria for Board adoption at the March 18 meeting, so the Board would meet the "prudent man" rule in utilizing a certain investment house. The Committee was not asking the Board to take any action that evening.

Ms. Fitch asked if the District carried officers' and directors' liability insurance. Mr. Brandt said that it did, but the Board would not be liable in this case unless malfeasance could be proven. Ms. Loobey said the Board was protected by state law. Mr. Brandt said that staff and the Finance Committee had learned a lot during this process, and the final criteria would be fairly thorough. He added that he thought it would be an administrative nightmare to have a variety of choices for deferred compensation programs.

The second issue discussed by the Finance Committee was the new requirement that payroll taxpayers pay the payroll tax on deferred compensation. This requirement came to Mr. Brandt's attention after the state sent a letter to payroll taxpayers. Tri-Met in Portland got this requirement written into law when determining what constituted wages for purposes of the payroll tax, and LTD had to abide by the new law. The Board had no say in it. Legal counsel advised that LTD had to collect this tax because it was written into law. The Finance Committee recommended that staff send a letter to taxpayers telling them that LTD did not have anything to do with passing this law. The letter would apologize but say that the District had to follow the law. An example of a letter drafted by attorney Craig Smith was handed out to the Board.

Additionally, the Finance Committee determined that the District should try to overturn this requirement in the next legislative session. Mr. Brandt said it was difficult to calculate and would make people upset more than it would do any good. Ms. Hocken commented that these employers would have a different wage for withholding than for the LTD transit tax, so it would be confusing. Mr. Brandt added that it ruined changes in software for withholding that payroll taxpayers had made.

Mr. Brandt said that the Department of Revenue did not send out the letter about the increase in LTD's payroll tax in a timely manner; rather, the letter was held to send with a later mailing, to save postage. The Department of Revenue had LTD's information in plenty of time to inform the taxpayers, but now taxpayers were upset with the District because of the late notice. Mr. Brandt said he wondered how good the District's tax collections would be; he thought a lot of people would not be paying the correct amount for the first quarter collections, especially since the tax rate was no longer printed on the form sent to taxpayers.

Mr. Brandt said that the letter would be an extra cost for the District, but the Finance Committee recommended it be sent because it was a sensitive matter that affected a lot of people. Ms. Hocken asked about a mailing list. Ms. Loobey said staff had asked the Department of Revenue for mailing labels, so the District could send the letter itself.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the District send the proposed letter to the payroll taxpayers and instruct the General Manager to proceed with trying to amend the law to exclude LTD during VOTE the next legislative session. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which then carried by unanimous vote.

The third issue discussed by the Finance Committee was the need for the Board to select an auditor for the next audit. Coopers and Lybrand would be on the fifth year of a five-year contract, so it would be the last year they could perform the audit without the District going out for proposals under federal guidelines. The District already had a range of fees under which Coopers and Lybrand would perform the audit.

MOTION Mr. Brandt moved that the District select Coopers and Lybrand to perform the District's independent audit for the year ending June 30, 1992. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken asked about the range of fees. Ms. Weaver said the fees were very low, around $11,000. Mr. Brandt added that Coopers and Lybrand had done a good job; they were thorough, complete, and timely.

VOTE There was no further discussion, and the motion to select Coopers and Lybrand as the District's independent auditors for the year ending June 30, 1992, carried by unanimous vote.

Ms. Hocken left at this point in the meeting.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Ms. Loobey explained that the three-year issues and related one-year goals developed by staff for FY 92-93 were included in the agenda packet for the Board's review and comment. Also included for the Board's information were the Operations Summary Report and a memo outlining some of the provisions of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991.

Board Member Report/Lobbying Trip to Washington, D.C.: Mr. Billings briefly discussed the lobbying trip to Washington, D.C., in which he and Ms. Loobey had participated. Eight organizations were represented: LTD, the University of Oregon, Lane Community College, EWEB, School District 4J, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, and Lane County. The Washington, D.C. lobbyist firm had arranged approximately 50 visits with committee people, senators and representatives, etc., for interested parties. The news from Washington from a mass transit point of view was not promising, but he was glad he was there to hear it. The District did receive a commitment for some help from Senator Packwood.

Ms. Loobey said the District received a favorable reaction to funding the second $3.5 million and the next bus purchase from all but the staff person in Congressman AuCoin's office. She stated that the Eugene/Springfield delegation was always well-received by the congressional delegation, especially because they went at one time with joint effort on a wide range of issues. She said she and Mr. Billings had been able to meet with key staff members of the House transportation and appropriations committees. Mr. Billings said he was impressed that the lobbyists seemed to know the staff people and had an ongoing relationship with them.

Mr. Parks thanked Ms. Loobey and Mr. Billings for their work in Washington, D.C.

Second-Quarter Performance Report: Mr. Billings commented that the ridership productivity figures were amazing. Mr. Parks commented about the UO group pass, and Mr. Viggiano said that UO students comprised about 20 percent of the District's ridership.

ADJOURNMENT: Ms. Fitch moved, seconded by Mr. Billings, that the meeting be adjourned. There was no further discussion, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Board Secretary