

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

Wednesday, March 13, 1991

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 8, 1991, 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 13, 1991, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer  
Janet Calvert  
Tammy Fitch, Vice President  
Herbert Herzberg, Secretary  
Thomas Montgomery  
Keith Parks, Vice President, presiding  
Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services and  
Acting General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: (vacancy in subdistrict 5)  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Mr. Parks said he would like to add two Budget Committee nominations to the agenda, and handed out nomination forms for Duane Faulhaber and Cynthia Pappas.

**BUDGET COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS:** Ms. Calvert said she had talked with Duane  
MOTION Faulhaber, who was interested in serving another term on the Budget Committee. Ms. Calvert  
nominated Duane Faulhaber for a second three-year term on the LTD Budget Committee.  
VOTE Ms. Fitch seconded, and the Board unanimously approved the nomination.

Ms. Fitch informed the Board that Bob O'Donnell did not wish to be reappointed to the Budget Committee, so she would be nominating Cynthia Pappas, who was employed with the Development Services Department for the City of Springfield, had attended the Eugene/Springfield Leadership classes with Ms. Fitch, and was currently active on the Leadership Steering Committee and the University of Oregon alumni association board. Ms. Fitch said she believed that Ms. Pappas would bring a great deal of common sense and a good outside  
MOTION view for the LTD budget process. She placed the name of Cynthia Pappas in nomination for  
a three-year term on the LTD Budget Committee. Mr. Montgomery seconded, and the  
VOTE nomination was approved by unanimous vote.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Mr. Parks introduced Bus Operator Shirley Reed, the March Employee of the Month. He said that Ms. Reed had been hired as a part-time bus

operator on July 13, 1988, and promoted to full-time on December 21, 1989. At the recent awards banquet, she had received her two-year safe-driving award, and an award for exceptional attendance (0-1 day absent in a year). Mr. Parks noted that Transportation Administrator Bob Hunt had said that Shirley was a hard worker and a good driver; had participated in many different District functions, including the Planning Advisory Committee, as a transportation coordinator at special events, and as a member of the Glenwood Toastmasters club; and that her engaging personality works to good advantage in all of her endeavors.

Mr. Parks presented Ms. Reed with her certificate and check. She said she had been "flabbergasted" to find out that she had been nominated, and that she was pleased and honored to have been chosen as Employee of the Month. She said she liked working at LTD, and that everyone in every division was loving and giving and caring, and LTD was a great place to work.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Mr. Parks asked for audience participation not related to the public hearing on fare adjustments. (1) Barbara Clark, of the Sunrise House drug and alcohol treatment center for women, said that most of Sunrise House's clients were indigent. She explained that part of their program included the women finding work and going to school. She said the agency did not have the money for bus passes, so the women had to use the money they earned for their recreation fund by washing cars. She asked the Board to give Sunrise House two passes a month, or a discount on bus travel, so the women could look for work and go to school.

Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services, said that in the past the Board had approved a discount for tokens for certain agencies. This had most recently occurred with a program for the homeless. He said that, as a rule, in the past the Board had steered away from giving outright donations because of the myriad of deserving organizations, and it was hard to set standards to choose between them. He stated that staff were going to bring to the Board a draft policy to help determine how to set standards for worthy causes. He told Ms. Clark that hers was one of those many worthy causes. He said that staff might have a draft policy within the next one or two months, and recommended holding off on any decisions for the time being.

Mr. Brandt asked the location of Sunrise House. Ms. Clark explained that it was affiliated with Buckley House, was located on Jefferson, and that 15 women were in the program. Ms. Calvert asked if any service groups had sponsored Sunrise House. She thought there might be some clubs or organizations that might sponsor them or provide bus passes as part of their fund-raising activities. Mr. Pangborn said he would call Ms. Clark and keep in touch regarding the policy, and that he would also give her some ideas about service groups to contact. Ms. Fitch said that one organization she belonged to provided similar help for the Brethren House, and said it did not take a lot of money to provide bus passes or tokens. She suggested that Ms. Clark check with the Kiwanis, the Lions, and similar clubs to see if one would be willing to sponsor Sunrise House in this way.

Mr. Brandt asked what it would cost for monthly passes. Mr. Pangborn said a monthly pass currently cost \$21, and a quarterly pass cost \$54. That was the retail price, and any Board-approved discount would make the cost even less. In the past, LTD had given between

a 30 percent and 40 percent discount. The program for the homeless bought tokens so they could give out tokens each day. Passes would cost less, but could not be replaced if lost, and could only be used by one person at a time.

Mr. Brandt asked why the program was asking for only two passes. Ms. Clark explained that the job search or school came during the third phase of treatment, so there were normally only one or two people at a time participating in a job search.

(2) Mr. Parks called the Board's attention to a written transcript of a telephone call that day from Paul Maguire regarding additional service for the Coburg/Crescent route. That testimony is attached to these minutes.

**MOTION**        **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Mr. Brandt moved that the minutes of the January 11-13, 1991, and the February 27, 1991, strategic planning work sessions be approved as distributed.  
**VOTE**         Ms. Calvert seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

**FISCAL YEAR 1991-92 PRICING PLAN:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, explained that each spring staff brought a recommendation for fares for the following year to the Board for approval. The changes then were incorporated into the budget for the following year. To develop the recommendation, staff reviewed key economic trends. This year, inflation increased 4.6 percent, and ridership increased 9 percent and was even stronger in recent months. However, payroll tax revenues for the third quarter were fairly flat.

Mr. Viggiano said that the fare policy stated that small increases in the fares should be made incrementally to keep up with inflation. Doing so, he said, seemed to have had a minimal impact on ridership. Also according to the fare policy, increases in cash fares and token and pass costs were to alternate, so that riders would have the option of switching to fare instruments that had not increased in cost. Prepaid fares allowed a cash flow up front, and resulted in a commitment from the purchaser to ride the bus. Prepaid fares also resulted in administrative savings, and eliminated underpayment of cash fares on the buses. On weekdays, only 26 percent of LTD's riders paid by cash, which Mr. Viggiano thought might be one of the lowest percentage of riders paying by cash in the nation. Weekend cash fare percentages were higher, possibly because of the reduced fares on weekends.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were recommending changes in the cash fares for FY 91-92, and summarized the staff recommendations and the reasons behind them. The overall impact of the fare change was summarized on page 32 of the agenda packet. On page 33 was an outline of fare changes that had occurred since 1981-82. The cash fare increases had exceeded the Consumer Price Index (CPI), and passes had lagged behind. Mr. Viggiano said that was part of the District's plan to encourage people to switch from cash to prepaid fares, but that both cash and pass fares probably would increase according to the CPI from then on.

**Public Hearing on FY 91-92 Pricing Plan:** Mr. Parks opened the public hearing on fare recommendations for Fiscal Year 1991-92. Paul Bonney, of 587 Antelope Way, Eugene, asked if it had been decided when the evening fares would go into effect, and if the Senior fare would be 25 cents in the evenings. Mr. Viggiano said the exact time when fares would change in the evening had not been determined. Staff had been talking with bus operators about the

most efficient and easiest time of day to make this change. It would probably be sometime between 6:00 and 6:30 p.m. Evening service began at 6:20 p.m., so that might be the time when evening fares would begin, also. He said that seniors would pay 25 cents as soon as the evening fare started.

**Closure of Public Hearing:** There was no further testimony, and the public hearing was closed.

**MOTION** **Board Deliberation and Decision:** Ms. Calvert moved that the Board approve the changes in cash fares and day pass and freedom pass prices for FY 91-92 as outlined in the staff memorandum in the agenda packet (increase the base cash fare from 65 cents to 75 cents as of July 1, 1991; increase the weekend fare from 30 cents to 50 cents, effective July 1, 1991; decrease the weekday evening fare from 65 cents to 50 cents, effective July 1, 1991; increase the price of day passes from \$1.65 to \$1.95 each, effective July 1, 1991; and increase the price of the summer youth Freedom Pass from \$19.95 to \$21.95, effective June 1, 1991). Ms. Fitch seconded the motion. Ms. Fitch also commended staff for an excellent job. She said she liked the balance with the increase and the decrease in evening fares, so more people would have access to the bus in the evenings.

**VOTE** There was no further discussion, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

**1991 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW AND FIVE-YEAR SERVICE PLAN:** Mr. Viggiano called the Board's attention to three documents in the agenda packet. He stated that the route and schedule changes proposed by staff were not very different from those described on February 20, 1991, for the public hearing. The first 11 items discussed on page 38 of the packet were changes recommended to address running time problems. Items 12-18 were recommendations for service expansion. The total cost of all 18 changes for FY 91-92 would be \$246,700, with an annual cost of \$342,800.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff were asking the Board to approve the updated Five-year Service Plan. The first year of the plan included the annual route review recommendations for the following fiscal year. Years two through five included recommendations for service changes which might happen, but would be finalized for approval each year for the following fiscal year. Very few changes were proposed for FY 91-92 because staff were recommending that the District perform a comprehensive route review, or comprehensive service redesign, in FY 92-93. The 3 percent service increase included 1 percent to address operational issues and 2 percent for service expansion, which was consistent with projected employment growth for the community. Costs for the changes would be included in the budget for the following year, so the Board and Budget Committee would have another chance to discuss the recommended service changes.

Mr. Viggiano explained that system ridership had increased 70 percent since 1982, but service had only increased 25 percent. The District's excess capacity had been used to absorb the ridership increases, but Mr. Viggiano warned that at some point ridership and service increases would have to be about the same.

The Service Policy provided information about service standards. It was included in the agenda packet because it was referenced in the Five-year Service Plan.

Ms. Fitch said she was happy to see the expansion of Dial-A-Ride as the first priority. She described the changes as viable and necessary, as well as required by federal mandate.

**MOTION** Ms. Fitch moved that the Board approve the Five-year Service Plan for Fiscal Year 1991-  
**VOTE** 92. Ms. Calvert seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

**FISCAL YEAR 1991-92 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM:** Mr. Pangborn called the Board's attention to a summary on page 68 of the agenda packet. He explained that the costs for the first year of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) were known, and future years included estimates of costs for anticipated expenditures. The Board was asked to approve the CIP for FY 91-92 only. Staff were asking for tentative approval of the CIP so it could be included in the budget for FY 91-92.

Ms. Fitch asked about the possible additional bus purchase on the current contract for new buses. Mr. Pangborn explained that, after learning that the Urban Mass Transportation Administration might have additional capital money available, Ms. Loobey had talked with UMTA Administrator Brian Clymer about the possibility of using previously over-matched local dollars as the local share for 18 additional buses on the current purchase agreement with Gillig. Mr. Clymer had indicated that this might be possible, and asked LTD to put together a grant application, which Mr. Pangborn would be doing soon. He had made no promises, but if this purchase were possible, it would change the CIP for future years, by reducing future bus purchases. Mr. Pangborn said that everything in the CIP was based on sufficient funds for a 25 percent local match. If the Surface Transportation Assistance Act reauthorization bill changed the percent of local match required, that would also change the CIP in future years.

Another uncertainty in the CIP was the construction of a new transit station in downtown Eugene. Staff had included funding in the CIP in order to begin the project if it were approved by the Board. If the District found a location and received approval for federal funding, the CIP would be revised with the correct budget amounts. For FY 91-92, \$2.5 million was included for the Eugene Station. It would take at least three years to complete the project, and the dollar amount or the year the project started could change.

In another category, money was included to fund the clean-up at the 8th and Garfield facility. The District needed to determine what underground pollution had occurred and clean it up. No geological study had been done yet, so \$250,000 had been budgeted.

For the first time, a contingency of \$50,000 had been included in the CIP. Mr. Pangborn explained that in the current fiscal year, the District had to fund capital items that had not been budgeted in the CIP. A contingency would give the District some flexibility for such occurrences in future years.

Expansion of the transit station at the University of Oregon would include a split station, with another section on another block, and some improvements on Franklin Blvd. Federal funding would provide 75 to 80 percent of the total \$3.4 million included in the CIP.

Ms. Calvert asked if there would be no federal funding to help with the clean-up at 8th and Garfield. Mr. Pangborn replied that there would not, but there might be some cash back. After the property was cleaned up, LTD could sell the property and use the proceeds to offset the clean-up costs. The District originally only invested about 20 percent of the cost, so 80 percent of the proceeds from the sale of the property should return to the federal government. However, discussions were underway with the UMTA attorney to determine if LTD could take the clean-up costs off the top of the sale. Mr. Pangborn said he would argue that if LTD put \$100,000 into the clean-up, that would be value that was put into the property. Currently, the property was unsellable because the sale would not be authorized by the Department of Environmental Quality.

Mr. Brandt asked why School District 4J, which wanted to purchase the property, could not clean it up, or whether LTD could just give the property back to UMTA. Mr. Pangborn said the school district did not want it if it were not cleaned up, and UMTA wouldn't take it back. Mr. Montgomery asked about just letting the property sit the way it was. Mr. Pangborn explained that a clause in the grant when LTD bought the property was that it had to be in transit use; if it weren't, LTD would have to pay back all the money to the federal government. He added that he did not know yet what the final clean-up costs would be. If they exceeded LTD's investment in the property, the District would need to decide its next step. The \$75,000 already invested in the clean-up basically was spent to take the empty fuel tanks out of the ground. Mr. Parks asked if some of the tanks had been there as long as 40 or 50 years. Mr. Pangborn said LTD had put in some of the tanks, and some had been installed by Cummings Diesel before LTD purchased the property. However, LTD had bought the property before the current environmental regulations were issued. In the area near LTD's old facility, there were about three superfund sites, and a number of known underground toxic releases. This was not an uncommon occurrence in an industrial area.

Mr. Brandt asked if School District 4J would be just assuming the property through the federal grant process, or would be purchasing it. Mr. Pangborn said the school district planned to purchase LTD's local share, and UMTA would transfer its share to the Department of Education. The school district was still interested, if the property were cleaned up. If the school district decided not to buy the property, LTD would still have to clean it up to sell it to a private developer. Mr. Pangborn said there were a variety of state and federal regulations LTD would have to meet in order to sell the property. Mr. Brandt asked if LTD was limited in what it could charge the school district for the property. Mr. Pangborn said it was not; LTD could charge the school district the total cost of the clean-up if it wanted to, and it would still be a good buy for 4J because they would receive 80 percent of the property through a federal grant.

Mr. Brandt asked what the property was worth. Mr. Pangborn said it had been appraised at \$1.1 million without the liability or assets of the clean-up. The school district's appraiser estimated within \$50,000 of LTD's price. The assessed value almost was equal to the value of LTD's investment, including both the purchase price and the improvements.

Ms. Fitch asked about improvements to the women's locker room in Maintenance. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, explained that when the new facility was designed, projections were made on the ratio of men to women employees. Since that time, however, LTD had hired a number of women into Maintenance positions, and the locker room was already at

capacity. As a related issue, he also mentioned that the District had to put handles on the engine doors so the women could close those doors.

Ms. Fitch asked about replacing current computers at \$25,000. Mr. Pangborn said that five years ago the District's first computers were basic IBMs, and the District currently had a variety of computers. The long-range computerization plan called for IBM 386 "clones" for all current purchases. When computers were replaced, the older ones were passed down to other staff positions. The computer program replacement plan used five to seven years for the mechanical life of a computer. Repair of one of the original compact portables would cost the District \$2,000, but a new 386 could be purchased for \$2,400. Ms. Calvert asked about a "Bearcat scanner." Mr. Pangborn explained that Bearcat was a brand name. Mr. Dallas added that it was a portable scanner unit to be used for snow detours and other similar kinds of service. The District could listen to police, fire, and public works messages without telephone contact.

Ms. Calvert asked how almost \$4 million translated into the budget. Mr. Pangborn said that amount was included in the budget because the District had to pay the total cost, or total purchase price, of capital items out of the capital budget. However, of that amount, 75 percent would be from federal funding and 25 percent from local revenues. LTD paid the total amount, then billed UMTA for its percentage.

Mr. Brandt asked if the District would actually spend \$2 million on the Eugene Station next year, or was just building up the capital fund for the facility. Mr. Pangborn said it was possible that LTD could purchase property by the spring of 1992. The \$2 million might be an optimistic estimate of what the property might cost, but if it were not budgeted for FY 91-92, that would move the project out another year. He said that the District did have a capital reserve of almost \$1 million that would cover the first year's expenses, but LTD also needed to accumulate money for future years. He said the CIP as presented was staff's most conservative or optimistic approach.

**MOTION** Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the Fiscal Year 1991-92 Capital Improvements  
**VOTE** Program as presented. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion, and the FY 91-92 CIP was approved by unanimous vote.

**PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1991-92 STRATEGIC GOALS:** Mr. Dallas said that, with consultant Jeff Luke, the Board had decided that it was not as important to have a strategic plan as it was to have discussions on strategic issues. Staff had attempted to summarize the planning done by the Board, beginning on page 75 of the agenda packet. No action was required by the Board. Rather, the materials were given to the Board as a reference and background for discussing strategic issues in the future. Also included, on page 80, was a copy of the staff-level work on strategic planning, which had been going on more or less parallel to the Board work. Mr. Dallas handed out a sheet which summarized the seven key three-year issues identified by staff, in priority order. They were slightly different from the Board's issues, but represented the management plan to implement what staff had been hearing from the Board. Those seven issues, along with the one-year strategic goals identified by staff for FY 91-92, provided the basis for staff action plans and the resulting FY 91-92

proposed budget. During a voting process, staff selected the Eugene Station as the number one priority, and revenue issues as the second highest priority for next fiscal year.

Mr. Dallas said that, overall, the conclusions reached in the Board and staff processes had seemed to be pretty much "in sync." In a couple of areas where they were not, the staff goals were rewritten as a result of Board discussions. Mr. Dallas offered to present this material in a reference document for the Board during the budget process. Ms. Calvert wondered if the materials would be available for the seven Budget Committee members not on the Board. Mr. Parks thought it would be helpful for those Committee members to receive this information before the first budget meeting. Ms. Calvert thought that the Board's list might be somewhat disjointed, and the staff's votes on priorities might not be necessary. Mr. Brandt wondered why the Budget Committee needed this information at all. He thought they would not be able to relate the goals discussions to the budget numbers, and it was too much information for the short budget process. Mr. Parks said this information would be in the budget justification, anyway. Mr. Dallas said the information could be included as background materials without a presentation, and Ms. Calvert said it should be noted that these were the District's priorities. Mr. Dallas added that all this information was subject to review and modification as part of the budget process, and so far staff did not know project costs. Mr. Pangborn stated that, as a matter of course, the Board or staff had not gone through the staff action plans with the Budget Committee. Ms. Calvert said she did not wish to see the staff action plans as part of the Budget Committee information.

Mr. Dallas said it seemed an understatement when the discussions by staff and the Board were boiled down to seven or eight programs, but reiterated that these were the framework of strategic issues that the Board and staff would be aware of when considering individual issues, such as the Eugene Station.

**BUDGET TRANSFER:** Mr. Pangborn explained the three reasons that unexpected capital expenditures were expected to exceed the amount budgeted for capital for FY 1990-91. There were additional expenditures for planning the Eugene Station; the clean-up at 8th and Garfield had been approved by the Board but not budgeted; and reconstruction needs at the new facility had mistakenly not been included when the budget was prepared the previous year. Fuel prices had dropped, so it appeared that LTD would end the year with a surplus in that category. Therefore, staff recommended that the Board approve the transfer of \$130,000 from the General Fund to the Capital Fund.

**MOTION** Ms. Fitch moved the approval of the resolution on page 85 of the agenda packet, reducing the General Fund Contingency Account appropriations by \$130,000, and increasing appropriations in Capital Expenditures in the Capital Fund by \$130,000. Mr. Montgomery

**VOTE** seconded the motion, and the resolution was approved by unanimous vote.

**CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE CENTRAL AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY:** Mr. Pangborn explained that the City of Eugene would be conducting an update of the Central Area Transportation Study (CATS). The study would focus on the downtown Eugene area and, among other things, would examine long-term parking needs and availability and strategies to increase use of alternative transportation modes. A number of organizations, including LTD, were selected to participate on the project. Planning Administrator Stefano



Viggiano would be participating on a staff team, and the City had requested that an LTD Board member participate on a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), along with representatives from the Eugene City Council, Eugene Planning Commission, Downtown Commission, the University of Oregon, Sacred Heart Hospital, the Eugene Chamber of Commerce, the Bicycle Committee, Downtown Eugene Incorporated, and neighborhood groups. It was anticipated that deliberations would begin in May, with meetings once per month for the remainder of 1991.

**MOTION** Ms. Calvert moved that the Board appoint Ms. Fitch to serve on the Citizen Advisory Committee for the Central Area Transportation Study. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion.

**VOTE** There was no further discussion, and the motion carried 4 to 1, with Ms. Fitch abstaining.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Budget Committee and Board Meetings:** Mr. Parks stated that the first Budget Committee meeting would be held on April 10. Mr. Pangborn said it would be unlikely that the budget would be adopted at the first meeting, and staff hoped to have a short Board meeting before the second budget meeting on April 17.

**Payroll Revenues:** Mr. Brandt asked about a statement in the newspaper that LTD's revenues were off. Mr. Pangborn explained that the third quarter had shown an interesting phenomenon with payroll tax collections. Third quarter collections, received by LTD in February, were actually from the October, November, and December payrolls. This quarter had provided the highest collection of the four quarters during the last several years, and during the last two years, this quarter was much higher than the other three quarters. Staff were still reviewing what happened this year, but the first quarter collections increased 8 percent over the same quarter a year ago. The second quarter was also up 8 percent, but the third quarter was down 5 percent, which was a 13 percent difference in payroll between the second and third quarter of the current fiscal year. The District had never experienced those kinds of differentials, so staff asked the Oregon Department of Revenue (DOR) what had happened, as well as for a print-out of the top 200 taxpayers. It was discovered that LTD had not received the tax revenues from some of the major retailers, so the DOR was tracking that.

Mr. Pangborn said that LTD made projections for the following fiscal year based on projections for the fourth quarter. The District was still ahead of the budgeted amount for payroll tax revenues, but only by a very small amount. Tamara Weaver, Finance Administrator, explained that if the fourth quarter revenues remained flat, revenues would be less than budgeted. The District's cash flow was not even throughout the year, and if the fourth quarter remained flat, revenues would be at \$6.7 million. Mr. Montgomery asked about peaks in relation to other quarters. Ms. Weaver said that the fourth quarter would remain the lowest if the quarters stayed in proportion.

Mr. Parks asked if LTD paid the Department of Revenue. Mr. Pangborn replied that LTD paid the DOR \$200,000 per year for its services in collecting the payroll tax and taking care of delinquent collections. All state taxes were collected through the use of one form. He added that staff thought there was a computer problem, that payroll taxes were collected but not allocated to LTD. However, staff and the DOR had not yet resolved that problem. Tri-Met's collections were up 8 percent. In the past, Tri-Met had on occasion received some of

LTD's payroll tax revenues, but their collections were constant this year, so that was unlikely in this instance.

**ADJOURNMENT:** It was moved and seconded that the meeting be adjourned. With no further discussion, the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

attachment

March 13, 1991

TO: LTD Board of Directors

FROM: Paul McGuire, LTD bus rider, 946 Coburg Road, Eugene, in telephone conversation with Transit Planner Micki Kaplan

RE: TESTIMONY REGARDING 1991 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW:  
Route #67 Coburg/Crescent

Paul McGuire, an LTD bus rider, called to support the 1991 Annual Route Review staff recommendation to expand service on Coburg Road during weekday evenings and on weekends. Mr. McGuire wants more service on Coburg Road during weekday evening, Saturday evening and Sunday, on the #67 Coburg Crescent route. Mr. McGuire is unable to drive a car, and is dependent on LTD for mobility. Mr. McGuire wanted to attend the LTD Board of Directors meeting tonight, but was unable to because his bus route, the #67 Coburg/Crescent does not run in the evenings.

According to Mr. McGuire, the distance to the closest #66 bus stop is far and the crossing is hazardous because he uses a power wheelchair. Mr. McGuire currently has no other transportation options available. If the #67 Coburg/Crescent route operated more frequently, particularly on week nights and Sundays, he would ride the bus and be able to go places.