

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS WORK SESSION  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

July 10, 1984

Pursuant to notice given at the June 19, 1984 regular meeting and to the Register-Guard for publication on July 5, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, an adjourned work session of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Tuesday, July 10, 1984 at 7:30 p.m. in the offices of Lane Transit District at 8th and Garfield, Eugene.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer  
Janet Calvert, President, presiding  
Janice Eberly, Vice President  
Larry Parducci, Secretary  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Shannon Evonuk, Recording Secretary

Absent: Ted J. Langton  
Judy Nelson  
Glenn E. Randall

**OPENING OF MEETING:** After calling the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. and taking roll, Ms. Calvert introduced Gus Pusateri, the nominee for Ted Langton's position on the Board. She noted that Mr. Pusateri has not yet been approved by the Senate.

**T-2000 UPDATE:** Ms. Calvert turn the floor over to Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, to make the staff presentation on the T-2000 update. Mr. Viggiano then introduced John Replinger of Lane Council of Governments (L-COG), who was there to present a slide show giving an overview of the T-2000 process.

The slide show displayed examples of local traffic scenes and views, including those involving LTD buses and shelters. The narrator for the slide show gave a brief overview of transportation and how it effects everyday life, and discussed areas where improvements could be made. He also gave a short history of the T-2000 Plan, explaining its beginning in 1978 as a long-range transportation plan for Eugene-Springfield. He mentioned that the Plan "established an extremely ambitious goal for increasing transit usage above present rates." LTD improvements, such as the Customer Service Center, were also shown, but the speaker noted that transit ridership remains at 1978 levels. The T-2000 planners are now asking for recommendations and input from the community as to the direction the Plan should take. In doing so, they have produced a "T-2000 Plan Evaluation Report." It was stated that a public hearing on the Plan would be held on July 25 with the Eugene, Springfield and Lane County Planning Commissioners.

The slide show finished, Mr. Replinger continued, giving further information about statistics related to the Plan and to transit. He explained that the planners have projected land use growth, except in light industrial areas. He also described the rate of vehicles per person at being .75 per person now, compared with .4 per person 20 years ago. Much of this is due to more older automobile-driving residents. He noted that average daily trips made have continued to increase despite increased gas prices. He mentioned that transit may be needed to help alleviate overloads in some transportation areas.

Staff Presentation: Mr. Viggiano began his presentation by stating that ridership has stayed at much the same levels as in 1978 due to many factors, including the fact that the District has actually decreased service in the last couple of years. He felt the community view of low ridership expectations is not accurate. He stated that the last five years should not be used to project future trends. It is the staff's feeling that if, for example, a permanent downtown station had been implemented five years ago, as had been hoped, we would have seen a significant increase in ridership by now; in fact, the District has seen an 11% increase just in the past year. He also stated that the last five years have not been typical, and that many projected trends have not developed as expected: projected land use patterns were expected to show more of an increase in density than they have, street congestion has not increased as much as expected, parking costs have not increased but decreased, college enrollment is down, and gas prices have remained stable. All these have an effect on transit usage. Also, the City of Eugene has been reluctant to adopt some of the policies in the T-2000 Plan which would show a positive effect on transit. Mr. Viggiano cited Madison, Wisconsin as an example of a city of the approximate size of Eugene which has implemented many similar policies in the last 15 years as those in the Plan. This has created a situation conducive to transit use which has paid off for the City of Madison.

Mr. Viggiano went on to mention that some goals in the Plan seem to be conflicting; specifically, that free or low-cost, short-term parking is in obvious contrast to the transportation goal. He also cited some positive changes being made in the District, such as the recently constructed shelters; the bus stop signage program; a clean, modern fleet soon to be added; the new logo; and a good public image. These are all investments which will start and continue to pay off.

Mr. Viggiano also stated that the goals in the Plan are so high and so distant that they are difficult to relate to in today's figures. He suggested that five-year goals be established--not only for transit, but for other parts of the Plan as well. As for transit, the goals suggested are as follows: 1990 - 4%; 1995 - 7%; 2000 - 10%; 2005 - 13%. He said that these are still ambitious goals, but more realistic.

Ms. Calvert asked what it is that the Board is expected to do. Mr. Viggiano replied that the Board could recommend a transit goal to the local elected officials. Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, added the Board is not required to take a position, but the staff recommends they do. He said they could review it now and decide at the Board meeting on July 17.

**DIAL-A-RIDE:** Leon Skiles, Service Analyst, introduced Gary Darnielle, who works with Lane Council of Governments (L-COG) to provide staff support to the consortium of specialized transportation providers, a group established through L-COG, and Dave Kleger, who works for Oregon State Vocational Rehabilitation Services, and who has been a long-time advisor to the District on handicapped services issues.

Mr. Skiles gave a short history of Dial-A-Ride, originally known as Dial-A-Bus, and of the resulting specialized consortium, of which the District is a provider. L-COG has contracted the services through Special Mobility Services (SMS). When the District was operating the service, the cost of the program was \$400,000 per year; we are now providing to the consortium \$100,000 per year for essentially the same amount of service. Mr. Skiles explained that the budgeted amount the District has been providing to SMS is not proving to be enough at this early stage. He said there are three options now available to the District: 1) Keep the funding level at \$102,900 for FY 84-85; 2) Maintain the current service level by increasing the consortium funding level by about \$18,000 for FY 84-85; and 3) Maintain the current service level by increasing the funding level by \$9,000 through December 1984. Staff is recommending the third option. The early certification process should be completed by then, and some of the elderly people who are physically able to use fixed route service but are having a difficult time in shifting to fixed route service from the Dial-A-Ride service should be able to make the transition by that time.

**SITE STUDY:** Mr. Pangborn introduced Eric Gunderson, with Wilson, Bryant, Gunderson, Seider Architects. Mr. Pangborn then started his presentation by pointing out that the Capital Improvements Program originally included a site study. In the past ten years, the District has concentrated its efforts on services to the passengers. As a result, the building site for the District has been put in the background, and we are beginning to outgrow the site. We originally asked for in our federal capital improvements grant monies for a site study. Mr. Pangborn explained that the original \$30,000 asked of the Board was a "guesstimate" of the cost of the study. After looking more into the issue and hiring a qualified architectural firm, a more realistic sum of \$65,000 is now being brought before the Board for approval. After investigation, that sum is considered to be consistent with similar studies recently being done. A lot of transit districts are asking for site study money, so the federal government is requiring specific justification before granting money for capital projects. Mr. Pangborn proposed that we shift the bulk of the funds from "infrastructure improvements." He explained that would mean losing three bus turnouts. He said that we can usually get Public Works to pay for turnouts--we only have to pay for them if we are in a hurry. He said further, from the staff's perspective, in the long term the site study is going to be much more important to the District. The total cost to the District would not change--it would simply mean a reallocation of money we already have, and the federal government will still support the District at 80%.

There was a strong feeling expressed from the Board that District staff already possess the expertise needed for at least the initial stages of the proposed study. Phyllis Loobey, General Manager, pointed out that the staff are not specialists in the tasks envisioned here--they do not have the time nor the expertise

in this area. It is a complex and substantive project. She also noted that they will have strong input into the study. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, added that many of the action he had been working on for staff already included much time involved in the site study. Mr. Pangborn noted that we could get funding easier from the federal government if we contract out for this. He also mentioned speaking with representatives from other transit districts who had recently conducted site studies--including one who had conducted their own, whose advice was to get experts to do the work. Ms. Calvert noted that it had certainly been helpful in the example of the jail. Ms. Loobey stated that outside experts can also give us a more objective view. Ms. Eberly expressed a word of caution about too much studying, and suggested we take a careful look at what we do, and noted her confidence in the abilities of District staff. Mr. Parducci agreed with her on those counts. Mr. Dallas pointed out the proposed study represented one percent of the expected cost of the potential site. Mr. Gunderson expressed his agreement with the concept of over-study. He believes the proposed site study contains elements of flexibility which will go beyond the requested 20-year expectation of the potential site.

**URBAN SERVICE:** Mr. Pangborn explained we recently received word from Oregon Public Transit that Section 18 grant monies were available. Upon hearing of this, staff decided to apply for funds to support a service for a nearby area which would utilize some innovative ideas involving "trunk routes." They chose Junction City, which is one area in which we can very easily tie in with existing urban service, and one which already has a strong trunk ridership.

Mr. Skiles explained that the proposed project would consist of two types of service, a local fixed-route system and a demand responsive system, which would connect with the already existing trunk route connecting Junction City and Eugene. The District would contract out the service through L-COG to SMS. Staff is asking for authorization from the Board for the cost of a van and needed assets for the van to enable handicapped passengers to use it. He said the federal government would pay for 50% of the service costs, and 80% of the administrative costs. The program would cost the District \$10,000 initially, then \$20,000 annually. He reiterated this would be a good opportunity to use new techniques. It was asked by Ms. Calvert if the program did not work, would we own the purchased van; Mr. Skiles replied we would. He added that staff will want to involve Junction City businesses in the promotion of this new service.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** Ms. Loobey briefly informed the Board that 821 Totally Transit passes had been sold so far. She also stated she would be out of town next week for a General Managers Seminar; Mark Pangborn will be acting General Manager in her absence.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Board Secretary