

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE COUNTY MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT

The board of directors of Lane County Mass Transit District met on May 20, 1975 at 7:30 P.M. at the City Hall, Eugene, Oregon.

Present:

Richard A. Booth  
Jack J. Craig, Treasurer  
W. Gene Davis  
Daniel M. Herbert, President, presiding  
Kenneth H. Kohnen, Vice President  
Glenn Randall, Secretary  
Ruth Shepherd  
Fred C. Dyer, General Manager

Mavis Skipworth, administrative secretary, served as recording secretary for the meeting.

Reading of the minutes of the meeting of April 15, 1975 was dispensed with as copies had been distributed to all members of the board. On motion duly seconded, the board voted to approve the minutes as distributed.

EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES: Mr. Dyer reported on the status of legislative bills: HB 5046, which would provide the local share for 25 buses, has been referred back to the sub-committee of Ways and Means; HB 2146 subjecting banks and financial institutions to payroll tax, appeared to be meeting no objection; HB 3078/5066, state employer subject to payroll tax, will not be acted upon; and HB 2890, income tax, had passed to the House from the revenue committee with amendments. Mr. Kohnen advised that these amendments include taxing non-residents on any income from sources within the district that is subject to income tax. Mr. Herbert requested Mr. Kohnen and Mr. Bryson to analyze the amendments and express their technical opinion of whether or not the income tax bill, as amended, would be workable and report to the board and legislative committee.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Without objection from the board, Mr. Herbert moved ahead in the agenda to the opportunity for public participation.

Robert Blizzard, 1732 Barton Drive, advised that six persons from LCC were in attendance. He expressed their interest in the status of the demand-response vehicles and reaffirmed their commitment of support for obtaining these vehicles. He expressed concern regarding a news release of May 4, 1975 by Ed Kenyon of the Register Guard, which he believed indicated the Associated Consultants, Inc. would be assuming the responsibility for service to the physically limited in this area. Mr. Dyer expressed regret for the misunderstanding and said he believed the article was meant to indicate a response from the private sector to serve the transportation needs of the physically limited.

Annette McConnell, 595 Main Street, asked what long and short term goal the district has for the physically limited. Mr. Dyer responded that it has a concept of a system through transfer stations that will make possible a total integration with the entire system; that this is a long range projection as the technology is not yet developed. He added that the intermediate goal would be a demand-response system with service to select destinations. Mr. Blizzard asked if the district's planning department had researched the demand-response systems developed by Santa Clara County in California, New York City and others for the physically limited. Mr. Rynerson replied that the staff is aware of 75 or 80 demand-response systems in the country and the district plans to model its system on a combination of several.

Joanne Peterson, 1877 Burl, spoke of the junior high and high school students in wheelchairs being transported to school by parents who would be interested in door to door service.

Mr. Blizzard asked that the physically limited be included to look at any new specially equipped vehicles being shown. Mrs. Shepherd asked about the potential for positive input by citizen participation. Mr. Herbert responded that citizens have an opportunity to give input at board meetings, as well as at the Citizens Advisory Committee meetings, and that the board is continuing and emphasizing that communication between staff and the people having this particular interest. Mr. Dyer said the staff has a list of individuals and agencies with whom they have liaison.

DISTRICT 4J TRANSPORTATION: The board was advised that School District 4J has inquired of the district what the impact of additional student ridership on the system would be and whether a student discount fare could be established as the school district will not be able to furnish bus transportation to junior high and high school students residing within two miles of the school. Mr. Rynerson said approximately 800 students would be involved, and about 500 of these could easily be accommodated by the district. Mr. Dyer said the staff recommends following the lead of Tri-Met in giving general transportation to students, possibly using Tri-Met's formula of a 28½% discount and students being issued an I.D. card to display to the driver. He added that the location of most of the schools is in the opposite direction that most commuters travel in the morning; the bus would take students outbound and bring commuters inbound, and the midday on-board peak is not as great and could accommodate the extra passengers. Mr. Randall moved that the staff be authorized to investigate and present alternatives for student transportation for consideration by the board. The motion was duly seconded and discussion followed. Mr. Booth expressed the opinion that the district should not be asked to pick up any expenses from the school district by offering a discount fare and would suggest making no reduction. Mr. Dyer advised that this would be only for going to and from school and for only this age group; that this could also include Springfield or any other community needing the service. Mrs. Shepherd stated that the district serves as transit planners and should look at this for its positive values of introducing a segment of the population to public bus transportation and perhaps their families would follow. Mr. Craig noted that student riders could become adult riders. The question was put and carried.

OPERATIONS: Ridership for the month of April was discussed and Mr. Booth requested that the board receive a report on the ridership of the zone routes. Mr. Rynerson told of a proposed change in ridership counting that will become effective June 1. Mr. Herbert asked the planning department to give the board

any available information on external service ridership at the June meeting.

PLANNING: Mr. Herbert presented the Transit Development Program draft, a copy of which had been distributed to board members. He suggested that David Rynerson briefly cover the various sections and that the board members then study it individually so specific questions may be brought up at an adjourned meeting. Mr. Rynerson gave a brief introduction of the TDP through the table of contents, and the tables, graphs and illustrations. He explained displayed maps of Bus Rapid Transit System development for 1975, 1980, and 1990-2000. He advised that many groups are listed under the planning requirements that will also study this program after the overview by the board, and will give their suggestions for any revision in June.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Minutes of the April 7 and May 5, 1975 meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee were distributed for board information. Mr. Paul Bonney identified himself as a member of the CAC and Mr. Herbert thanked him for attending.

FINANCE AND BUDGET: Mr. Dyer advised that farebox revenues are running 15% behind the working budget projection. This was attributed to the route changes of March 31 affecting patrons' transportation patterns and a lack of understanding the new system. He said the district should keep this in mind when making future alterations. Mr. Davis advised that he had received three calls from people who believed the new suburban routes created less service for the urban area. Mr. Booth spoke of the possibility of people having less money to spend on transportation because of the present economy.

It was moved and seconded that bills be allowed in the amount of \$134,362.98. Mr. Davis expressed concern about the amount of \$21,790.25 listed for Advertising Services and promotion, noting that it exceeded the budget category. The staff explained that there have been heavy printing expenses for schedules for the new system, and the patrons have used the supply as it became available. Mrs. Shepherd suggested there be guidelines of staying within a certain amount of a budget category and Mr. Herbert said the board will consider making a statement of policy regarding expenditures exceeding budget categories. The question was asked and carried with Mr. Booth abstaining.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Herbert introduced Edward Rubey, a certified public accountant, who presented to the board copies of a press release he recently presented to the news media. Mr. Rubey assured the board that the Chambers of Commerce are not opposed to the district and that they are aware that the area needs a good transportation system, but they do feel that certain service areas are being overemphasized to the detriment of others. He added that, as the representative of that portion of the public subsidizing it with the payroll tax, they would like to feel that the district would listen to them when it prepares its new budget.

ADJOURNMENT: As the board was unable to meet within the next three days to make comments on the TDP, Mr. Herbert received authorization from the board to distribute copies to the budget committee and Citizens Advisory Committee in its present form. The meeting was adjourned to 7:30 A.M., Thursday, May 29, 1975 in the Eugene Hotel.

*Mavis Skjovvick*  
Recording Secretary  
*Glenn E. Randall*  
Secretary