

**MINUTES
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE**

A meeting of the District's Facilities Subcommittee met on Monday, November 5, 1984 in the Lane Transit District conference room at 12:00 noon.

Present:

Board Members: Janet Calvert
Janice Eberly
Larry Parducci

Chamber Representatives:
Bruce Hall
Jim Ivory

Staff Members: Tim Dallas
Mark Pangborn
Stefano Viggiano
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Consultants: Eric Gunderson
Bill Seider

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the preliminary findings of the consultants hired by the District to perform a study to determine the District's operating facilities needs now and in the future, and to evaluate the appropriate size and configuration of those facilities.

Mr. Dallas detailed the history of the District's Capital Improvements/ Replacement (CIP), including bus replacement. He mentioned that the District soon would be receiving nine additional buses to put less mileage on the 300 and 400 series buses, which had been bought used. Those older buses will be kept because parts can still be obtained, and the District wouldn't receive much money if they were sold. They will be used for charters and special service. Other parts of the CIP included land and buildings and transit stations. Two important points he wanted to make were a breakdown of what the District has been spending for capital expenditures, and staff's expectation that capital funds will continue to be funded primarily by the Federal government. Mr. Pangborn mentioned that there are two formulas for Federal funding--80/20% and 75/25%. The District has been assured of at least a 75% Federal funding base for capital projects. Mr. Dallas stated that staff do not anticipate any State participation in the local match, but in the past, the State has paid one-half of the local share. Typically, the Federal government has

been funding operating facilities, and other properties in this general area have built new facilities in the recent past. Most of the investment in the CIP has been made in rolling stock, and fairly regular bus replacement is scheduled to occur after 1991.

Several budget processes, federal grant processes, and studies will be involved before the entire process is finished. Only preliminary decisions are being made at this point--to show a direction, with no specific actions being taken.

The Subcommittee will be making a report to the Board in January, looking for agreement to look ahead. The next step would be to look at sites.

Eric Gunderson, Architect, gave an overview of the current study. He explained that the firm of Wilson Gunderson Bryant Seider was chosen as the lead firm for the study. ECO Northwest, economic consultants, is doing forecasting on bus ridership. Fleet Maintenance Consultants will be helping design a bus fleet maintenance facility.

The key issues are: (1) why consider a new facility?; (2) how do you forecast the future and facility size?; (3) how much time will it take to plan?; (4) what are the priorities for new facilities?; (5) how much land and building are needed?; and (6) what is the next step? Mr. Gunderson listed several indicators to help with those decisions. New Gillig buses, which are larger and harder to park, will be arriving in the near future. At that time, the District will have ten additional buses and will have to lease space on which to park them. The District is short of office space now, and in addition to the congestion on the property for parking the buses, there is congestion during bus cleaning, fueling, etc., at night, and additional "man hours" are required to drive the buses around to the proper positions to perform all those duties.

Mr. Gunderson then discussed the economic forecast prepared by ECO Northwest. Considerations in the forecast were ridership, fleet size, and facilities, as well as variables affecting ridership in the future, such as population, employment, cost, and convenience. He handed out some materials showing a range of predictions for the future. The recommended model shows growth only when the population and local economy grow. The model was tested with 15 other transit districts, and shows 136 buses by the year 2005. This model is a conservative approach, and includes a peak fleet with 15% spares and 15% reserve fleet. The District presently uses 52 buses during peak hours, and is parking 88 total buses. Employment growth is predicted to be at 3.2%. Mr. Gunderson stated that flexibility is crucial in whatever plan is chosen, due to the difficulty in predicting the future. He went on to say that by 1990 the CIP calls for 12 more buses, one-half of which may be articulated, so more room will be needed for maneuvering and parking. The District needs to begin immediately to deal with the long-term growth with other than a "bandaid" approach.

Mr. Pangborn mentioned that the additional lot which the District leased to park the overflow buses has a 90-day cancellation clause, which would leave LTD 90 days to find another place to park buses. Mr. Dallas showed how the operational costs of inefficiencies caused by the present overcrowding on the lot are beginning to add up. He said that the saving of three General Service workers over the next 20 years would save the District \$1.5 million.

Mr. Gunderson then discussed the priorities for buildings and properties. A plan for 2005 has been developed, with some flexibility. Growth is planned in phases, when it is needed. The ideal size for a bus maintenance facility is 160 buses; growth above that would occur in satellite facilities. The satellite concept places bus drivers and buses in the geographical areas of their runs and shortens the "deadhead" time (time when the driver is taking the bus from the shop to the beginning of the route, and vice versa). The present land use needs would be planned for 160 buses and the facilities would be planned for the needs in the year 2005. Facilities would be designed for the lowest possible operating cost, with savings in labor costs as the facilities become more efficient to use. Another priority is a careful review of the needs for a maintenance facility. Staff interviews were to be held to determine anticipated growth across the property, including manpower and equipment needs and a diagram of proposed space needs.

The District presently has 4.14 acres. The land requirements for the year 2005 are anticipated to be about 10 acres. As the system grows, it will take less land and staff to serve the public more efficiently. Ms. Calvert wondered if the District was planning to continue to perform all of its own maintenance. At this point, it is. Processes and possible cost savings will be reviewed during the study of space and equipment needs. Mr. Pangborn mentioned that a lot depends on scheduling problems and the inability to take the equipment off the property for some repairs. Mr. Ivory thought that if some things would cost less if done by District employees, then the District ought to plan for that. Although the up-front expenses might be higher, they would be recovered over time. Mr. Dallas stated that the District might not need a full-blown subcontracting study, but more of an explanation of why things are being done a certain way, especially those things that are common practice but possibly not understood by the community. Ms. Eberly and Ms. Calvert thought that staff would be the most qualified to pick the areas to concentrate on for subcontracting, and should go ahead with the obvious.

In summary, Mr. Gunderson stated that the existing facility is presently working well, although somewhat inefficiently and at capacity. He added that all the programs reviewed that day were working documents and were subject to ongoing review and refinement. The next step, he said, would be to refine the program, including staff and community concerns. Subcontracting would be reviewed to decide if all work should be done on the property, or what might be subcontracted. Increments for growth would be reviewed in conjunction with construction phases, as

well. The recommendations from those review processes would be ready for review by the LTD Board of Directors at their January 15 meeting. After Board approval, site and cost studies would begin.

Ms. Calvert asked about the Eugene Downtown Plan and the possible need for the District to spend money on downtown facilities. Mr. Pangborn replied that priorities would be set along the Downtown Plan's timeline. Any new facilities would be a year or so down the road, after the federal grant process, design time, etc.

Mr. Dallas if the Subcommittee thought the right questions had been asked in the direction of finding answers for future population and transit use. He said the facility and land size would be dependent on how much maintenance would be done in-house. He then asked how the District should start to propose these issues in the community, after discussion by the LTD Board in January. No cost figures are yet available, but he thought the project would cost \$6 to \$8 million, and the District should take time to present the issue carefully to the community.

Ms. Eberly asked about costs for the body shop, paint shop, etc., as well as parking to handle the new buses. She wondered how much it would cost to go somewhere else and build a new facility, as opposed to staying in the same place. Mr. Dallas replied that those questions would be answered in the second phase of the study, which would study the present site and three alternate sites and would compare them to see what makes the sites viable. The present phase included looking at how much more land and facility space the District needs, and the second stage will look at how much that will cost. He asked how the Subcommittee felt about the study approach that was being used, and Mr. Pangborn mentioned that the model had been worked backward and with 15 other transit districts. Mr. Dallas stated that the study had taken a conservative approach, but one which would not become obsolete, because it included the option for satellite facilities. Mr. Hall mentioned the possibility of light rail and other options in the future, and Mr. Ivory thought the District was on the right track as long as the plan is flexible and can react to real situations.

Ms. Calvert asked about the study recommendations and the T-2000 goals. Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, stated that the T-2000 goals (3% in 1990; 5% in 1995; and 8% in 2000) were ambitious goals which were actually double the best-case goals in the study. In response to a question about why other cities had better modal splits, it was stated that, in spite of the downtown center, the University of Oregon, and the state offices in the downtown core, Eugene has outlying areas with less opportunity for growth and ridership. The economist didn't think the overall area was viable at this time and recommended no change in the percentages, only in the population. Mr. Viggiano added that staff did not agree with some of the goals set by the economist. He gave the example of the 3.2% growth rate, although District ridership had grown 10%

the previous year and 7% so far this year. However, with the options for satellite facilities if they prove to be necessary, staff were comfortable in going with the 3.2% goal. Mr. Gunderson wondered if the T-2000 goal should be stressed more. Mr. Dallas said staff had considered that, and were taking the conservative approach because they wanted to be sure the District can use any facilities that are built. Mr. Viggiano added that it is staff's hope that the community takes a more viable approach with transit and community goals and support. Those things were not taken into account by the economists. Mr. Dallas stated that the economists thought transit usage might go down with increased population, but LTD staff thought increased population might have an effect on the need for transportation, with reduced parking downtown, etc.

Mr. Dallas stated again that the Board and the Facilities Subcommittee would be reviewing the report in January, and asked for guidance from the Subcommittee on presenting the report to the community. Mr. Ivory offered to work with the Eugene Downtown Association, the development department, and the Board of Directors of the Eugene Chamber of Commerce. He thought that networking through those organizations would be beneficial for the District. Mr. Dallas wondered how much about the project the community would want to know, and Ms. Calvert wondered about letting the community know that the District is looking ahead toward future needs. Mr. Ivory thought LTD should make a statement of present operation at capacity and the cost of waiting to make the necessary changes. He thought the District had a positive picture to paint, since it was not in the position of losing money each year. Ms. Eberly wondered about the need to go public with large amounts of information at this time. She thought the District should show how it is assessing future needs with a conservative approach, but she thought there wasn't much other information available at this time. She said she would not be ready to answer some questions until the District got into Phase 2.

Mr. Ivory thought that networking should begin with key community players at this time. Mr. Hall talked about letting those people know about the needs for present and long-range plans, and thought that general information should be provided now so they are not surprised later. He saw no need to mention a dollar figure at this time. Ms. Eberly mentioned talking to members of some of the various downtown groups and the two Chambers before the January Board meeting. Mr. Ivory thought the District could make a small presentation to the Downtown Commission on a Tuesday morning, and a two or three person delegation could meet casually with the Eugene development people, including John Porter, Elaine Stewart, and Bob Hibschan.

Mr. Dallas thanked the Subcommittee members for their time and direction. A second meeting of the Subcommittee was set for Wednesday, December 19 at noon in the District conference room. The purpose of the second meeting was to review the recommended plan before review by the Board of Directors in January.

Minutes, LTD Board Facilities Subcommittee Meeting
November 5, 1984
Page 6

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Sullivan", is written above a horizontal line.

Recording Secretary