

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, May 18, 1994

Pursuant to notice given to The Register-Guard for publication on May 13, 1994, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, May 18, 1994, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Pat Hocken, President
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary
Kirk Bailey
Rob Bennett
Steve Engel
Tammy Fitch, Vice President
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jennifer Self, Minutes Recorder

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Hocken called the meeting to order.

ROLL CALL: Ms. Loobey called roll.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Hocken made no remarks.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: There was no comment.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Hocken introduced the April Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Ken Kallunki. She noted that he was nominated by a customer who rides the bus regularly. The customer asserted that Mr. Kallunki had a commendable attitude, was always courteous, greeted everyone with a smile, and was never impatient or rude. The Board congratulated Mr. Kallunki, who was presented with a letter from the Board, and a certificate. Ms. Hocken noted that Mr. Kallunki had already received his award check.

Ms. Hocken introduced the May Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Barbara Louvring. Ms. Louvring was nominated by a coworker who rides her bus frequently. The coworker had stated that she was impressed with Barbara's sensitive manner toward customers, her relaxed and easy manner, and her pleasant smile. The Board congratulated Ms. Louvring and presented her with a letter, a certificate, and a bonus check.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING:

MOTION

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Kleger moved, seconded by Mr. Montgomery, to approve the Consent Calendar for May 18, 1994, as presented. This included approval of the minutes of

VOTE the March 16, 1994, work session; the April 20, 1994, special meeting; and the May 4, 1994, special meeting. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

SECOND READING AND ADOPTION, LTD SECOND AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 35, AN ORDINANCE SETTING FARES FOR USE OF DISTRICT SERVICES: Mr. Kleger questioned the dates listed on page 2 of the ordinance (page 53 in the agenda packet). Staff noted that the first date listed for three-month passes at the top of the page should read "7/01/93" instead of "7/01/94." All other dates were correct. Staff explained that previous dates of implementation had been included along with current and future implementation dates.

MOTION Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. Bailey, that Second Amended Ordinance No. 35 be read by title only. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0. Ms. Hocken read the title: "Lane Transit District Second Amended Ordinance No. 35, an Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services."

MOTION Mr. Montgomery moved, seconded by Mr. Bailey, that the Board adopt Second Amended Ordinance No. 35, An Ordinance Setting Fares for Use of District Services, effective July 1, 1994.

Ms. Fitch asked if it was acceptable for the Board to pass the ordinance after having corrected the dates. Stefano Viggiano, Planning Administrator, commented that all but one of the dates listed on page 53 actually were correct, and that the changes in fares had gone into effect the previous year. The corrected date was a minor change and had already occurred, so would not affect adoption of the ordinance.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE (LCC) GROUP PASS: Ms. Hocken commented that this topic was back on the agenda because the LCC administration had decided that they wanted to be involved in the process. The administration had proposed that Ms. Loobey; Ms. Hocken; Peter Sorenson, the Chair of the LCC Board; and Jerry Moskus, the President of the LCC Board discuss a scope of a study that could help create a mutually agreeable decision.

Ms. Fitch asserted that the Board should reexamine the entire group pass program, but that it should not negotiate with one particular group. Ms. Hocken commented that it was not the intent of LTD staff to change the policies of the group pass program. She added that the intent was to discuss other mechanisms for assisting the LCC bus riders, and not for the Board to cut a special deal with LCC. Ms. Hocken continued, saying that the LCC Board was getting third-hand information that LTD discriminated against LCC students, so in response to the LCC Board's letter, the LTD Board sent a copy of the group pass program policies and a copy of the calculations as made.

Ms. Fitch asked if LCC paid the payroll tax for its staff. Ms. Hocken said that it did not, and Ms. Loobey added that, in effect, LCC had been subsidized by the University of Oregon (UO) in-lieu-of taxes.

Mr. Bennett said that he was under the impression that the Board had spent a great deal of time on this issue, and should stick with its current policies. Ms. Fitch stated that the current

policy was based upon replacing the fares. She added that LCC had a higher ridership than the UO, and LCC students felt they were penalized for their current choices to ride the bus.

Mr. Bennett commented that he saw the issue as one of supply and demand, and stated that LTD did not need to discount fares to groups that needed service more than another group. Mr. Montgomery stated that he thought the policy was a good deal for LCC and he did not want to discuss it further with the LCC Board. Mr. Kleger noted that he had no problem with some further discussion with the LCC Board because the LCC Board would then be updated on the issue. However, he stated that it was important to keep in mind that the LTD Board had given LCC a very good offer, and he was not comfortable with going much further without receiving some payroll taxes from the LCC staff. Ms. Hocken stated that part of the discussions would focus on the things that LCC administration could do to encourage bus ridership; for instance, making the students pay to park.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved, seconded by Mr. Bennett, that the staff continue discussions with LCC concerning a group pass program and other marketing and alternative modes promotions.

Mr. Engel noted that because the goal of the program was to increase ridership it made no sense to him that the program did not reward groups that already had high ridership. Mr. Bailey commented that he did not mind having more discussion with LCC if the staff felt committed to doing so, but he stated that LCC knew what the offer was and could make a decision based on that offer.

Ms. Loobey stated that reexamining the group pass program would be a good idea, saying that the purpose of the program was to get more people to ride the bus.

Ms. Fitch stated the UO had helped motivate its students to ride the buses by controlling parking and other aspects of transportation. She noted that private businesses did not have the option of controlling parking to motivate their employees to ride buses. She said that it was important to reexamine the program. She stated that something was wrong when there was no incentive for groups to sign up for the program if they already had high ridership.

Mr. Bennett commented that he did not want to discuss the program further. He stated that if a group already had 100 percent ridership, it was not necessary to give them an incentive to ride the bus.

AMEND Ms. Fitch asked to amend the motion to state that staff continue discussions with the LCC Board and administration concerning a group pass program and other marketing and alternative modes promotions. Mr. Kleger accepted the amendment, as did Mr. Bennett. The motion passed by a vote of 6:1, with Mr. Montgomery voting in opposition.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken stated that there was another suggestion that the Board reexamine the group pass program. She asked for a motion concerning that issue.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved, seconded by Mr. Kleger, that the Board review the philosophical and mathematical issues concerning the group pass program. Mr. Montgomery said that he did not

mind discussing the issue again, but he suggested that it be an agenda item so that it was not brought up in conjunction with another topic.

VOTE

The motion passed by a vote of 6:1, with Mr. Bennett voting in opposition.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

CURRENT ACTIVITIES:

Board Member Reports: Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) and TransPlan Update Symposia Process: Mr. Kleger stated that the Transportation System Improvements (TSI) Task Force was working its way through the policies from the previous TransPlan and consolidating the document by deciding which policies were necessary for the current TransPlan and which ones were obsolete. He stated that the task forces was attempting to shift emphasis away from negative statements and toward positive statements. He stated that the group had already gone through the bicycle facility plans and pedestrian amenities and was beginning to move on to the automobile policies. He added that once the group was finished with those policies, it would go through the existing list of projects and prioritize them in a balanced manner.

In response to Mr. Bailey's question about light rail, Mr. Kleger commented that the group had decided that there was not a strong enough information base to make a decision about light rail and vintage trolley activity. He stated that there was the potential for acquiring a grant from the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) to contract out and do a baseline study of what type of rail transit was practical now and in the future. He said that the results of that study would not be in hand until the winter of 1995.

In terms of high-speed rail, Mr. Kleger commented that the group felt it would be highly beneficial to the community to have it extended to the Eugene area. He said that there was not a lot more the group could do other than propose changes to the existing TransPlan policies that would encourage the development of intermodal connection structures.

Mr. Bailey stated that the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Task Force was working on matching its opportunity areas with business strategies, and planned to have them all matched by the end of June. He stated that he would want to discuss TDM issues in a future meeting. Mr. Bailey said that a mandatory trip reduction situation might occur to meet a requirement of the Clean Air Act. He added that some TDM strategies were mandatory while others were not.

Ms. Fitch stated that the Land Use Task Force had reached consensus on transit corridors. She suggested that the Board approach the Springfield City Council with a positive "thank you" for being receptive to public transit, alternative modes, and land use ideas, such as in working with Sony. She said that it was important to maintain good relations with the City of Springfield because when LTD needed to discuss issues with the Council, the issues would be viewed less as a threat and more as an opportunity.

Ms. Hocken suggested telling the Council about LTD's plan for a Park and Ride at 58th Street and Main Street to try and get the Council on board for that project.

Willamette Valley Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation: Ms. Hocken stated that the consultant had been hired and the committee would be having monthly meetings until November. She said that the next meeting was May 25.

Presentation: LTD Service Overview: Mr. Viggiano stated that he wanted to give the Board an overview of how the LTD service was designed and why it was designed that way.

Route Structures: Mr. Viggiano stated that there were three alternative routing structures: (1) the grid system; (2) the radial system; and (3) the feeder-trunk system. He commented that the grid system was used mainly in large cities and the routes ran north/south and east/west, adding that it took a high level of service to make the system work well. He noted that the grid system's advantage was that it allowed direct service to most parts of the community, while its disadvantages were that it was impossible to coordinate transfers and it wouldn't work if the city streets were not in a grid formation.

Mr. Viggiano said that LTD used the radial system in the Eugene/Springfield area, with most routes starting and ending in a central point, the Eugene Station. He said that the system's advantages were that it allowed for coordinated transfers, provided excellent service to the city center, and fit the area's street patterns. He noted that the system's disadvantages were that it did not supply direct travel between suburban areas.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the advantages of the feeder-trunk system were that it allowed for coordinated transfers, provided excellent service to the city center, fit the area's street patterns, and allowed for varying route frequencies by type of route. He said that its disadvantages were that it did not provide direct travel between suburban areas and it required many transfers.

Mr. Viggiano stated that LTD operated a modified radial system in the Eugene/ Springfield area. He said that LTD operated several routes on major arterioles, and those routes branched into different neighborhoods, which provided less frequency in the low-density areas and higher frequency in the higher-density areas. He added that LTD used connecting loops wherein a bus route that would normally go out and come back would instead go across and connect to another route, which would create a loop and provide crosstown travel opportunities. He noted that LTD created satellite stations wherein multiple buses would converge and prevent people from having to travel into downtown Eugene when they wanted to travel to another suburban area. Mr. Viggiano stated that LTD provided crosstown routes to areas that needed a high level of service and did not need the downtown riders to fill their capacity.

In response to Mr. Bennett's question about Park and Rides, Mr. Viggiano stated that staff found that it was important to put the Park and Rides in locations that provided express service to downtown. He added that it was important to place the Park and Rides in a location that was far enough out that it saved people driving time, but not so far out that people had to drive in the opposite direction to get to them. He said that staff had learned that those people who use Park and Rides were those who had some driving disincentive when they arrived at their destination, such as a parking charge or parking shortage.

Ridership, Service, Service Area Population: Mr. Viggiano referred members to a graph that represented LTD's ridership and service level from FY 70-71 to FY 92-93. He pointed out that when LTD took over the Emerald Transit System it had very low ridership. Ridership then increased by a large amount in the early 1970's, peaked in the late 1970's, took a dip in the early 1980's, and had been steadily increasing since that time. He noted that the service level reached a high in the late 1970's, and although it had decreased since that time, the service level was approaching its peak and ridership was at an all-time high in FY 92-93.

In response to Mr. Bailey's question about why ridership was higher in FY 92-93 than it was at its peak in the late 1970's but the service level was not as high, Mr. Viggiano said that LTD had become more efficient and service was more productive. He added that LTD had replaced all the 30-foot buses with 40-foot buses.

Service Planning Guidelines: Mr. Viggiano referred members to the list of service planning guidelines in the packet he had distributed, noting that they were developed in 1980. The guidelines were abbreviated as follows:

- * Develop a system of line routes with minimal loops.
- * A timed-meet at the Eugene Station shall be maintained for downtown-oriented routes until the average frequency for routes is 15 minutes or better.
- * The District shall maintain a 60-minute policy headway for all urban routes at all times of the day.
- * Service should be reallocated from areas of low productivity to areas of high productivity.
- * Routes or route segments that have a ridership productivity that is less than two-thirds of the system average for their class of route shall be considered substandard and subject to review and possible modification or elimination.

In response to Ms. Fitch's question about light-rail and trolley possibilities, Mr. Viggiano commented that LTD does have the flexibility to change its routes, and that was good news and bad news. He noted that the advantage of the bus system was that it could change its routes, while the disadvantage of the system was that very few businesses made land use decisions based on bus systems. He added that businesses were more likely to make land use decisions based upon a fixed transit system such as light rail.

Service Characteristics: Mr. Viggiano gave an overview of the route schedules for weekdays and weekends. He referred members to two graphs that depicted the number of buses in service by time of day, and the number of boardings by time of day. He explained that for both service and ridership there were morning peaks and afternoon peaks. He stated that the morning peak was sharper than the afternoon peak because the trips of the commuters and students tended to coincide in the morning but not in the afternoon.

Mr. Viggiano stated that a typical route would run every half hour from morning until about 6:00 p.m., and then it would drop to every hour. He noted that some routes were peak-hour routes only, and some routes stopped running completely in the evening.

Ms. Fitch asked if staff had done projections about whether or not LTD could handle the impact of both 4J School District students and LCC students riding the buses at the same time. Mr. Viggiano commented that staff had done a detailed analysis of the 4J ridership on a trip-by-trip basis in order to determine where LTD would have to add some additional trippers.

Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Viggiano's opinion about providing 15-minute headways for all routes. Mr. Viggiano stated that LTD would be looking at doubling its costs if it provided that amount of service. He added that he did not think it would be a productive increase because of the branching system where, at times, there were ten-minute headways for some service. He said that on some corridors, ten-minute service was provided by a couple of routes.

Performance Measures: Mr. Viggiano stated that he divided the performance measures into three categories: (1) ridership and ridership productivity; (2) service level; and (3) efficiency. For ridership and ridership productivity, the key measure was passenger trips. The other three measures were as follows: trips/rides per schedule/revenue hour; trips/rides per schedule/revenue mile; and trips/rides per capita. Under service level there were three measures: annual hours of service; service hours per capita; and transfer rate. Under efficiency there were five measures: schedule inefficiency; run cut inefficiency; cost per service hour; cost per trip; and farebox recovery ratio.

Comparison Data: Mr. Viggiano referred members to a table that compared LTD's service with that of other Northwest transit systems. He stated that LTD provided just over one hour of service per person in the service area, which compared to an average of .8 of an hour for the Washington systems and .6 of an hour for the Salem and Medford systems. He added that LTD carried more passengers per hour than the Washington average and the average of Medford and Salem combined. He noted that LTD was more efficient in providing service hours per employees than both Washington and Medford and Salem combined. Mr. Viggiano stated that a better measure of performance was the operating cost per hour, because the equation included the costs for work that is contracted out, whereas the service hours per employee did not include contracting hours.

Ms. Fitch asked about the difference between revenue service hours and total service hours. Mr. Viggiano stated that 11 percent of total hours paid to bus operators were nonrevenue hours, which included the time a bus operator spent performing safety checks on the bus or operating the bus on "deadhead" routes. Tamara Weaver, Finance Administrator, added that there was an additional 18 percent that was benefit time, so the total nonrevenue hours paid out was 29 percent.

Director of Administrative Services Mark Pangborn referred members to a table that helped clarify the question about productivity levels. He stated that Ms. Weaver had taken the audited numbers from the year-end audit and divided it by the actual number of schedule hours, and came up with a cost. She then showed the number with risk costs added and without those costs

added. Mr. Pangborn noted that both charts were examples of how staff were beginning to measure productivity levels.

Service Summary: Mr. Viggiano referred members to a table that depicted where LTD was currently and where it might be in ten years. He noted that LTD predicted that it would increase its service span only minimally, while the corridor frequency would increase to six buses per hour. He added that LTD wanted to increase service to 400,000 hours per year and ridership to 10 million trips per year. He stated that the projections were ambitious and it would take cooperation between LTD and the community to accomplish the goals.

Mr. Engel left the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Mr. Bennett commented that there needed to be a tremendous outreach program to the community in order to accomplish LTD's goals. He asserted that the LTD Board and staff ought to be prepared to say what was important to them if they wished to accomplish these goals.

Executive Training for the Board: Ms. Loobey stated that if any members wanted to participate in the Pacific Program, they should inform staff, and the details were on page 68.

Board Strategic Planning Process: Ms. Loobey stated that the Tri-Met Strategic Plan and the Boulder Strategic Plan in their packets as examples of strategic planning approaches. She said that one of the Board members had asked that the Board begin to schedule its retreat time. Ms. Hocken noted that Board members would be polled within the next couple of weeks as to what dates they would prefer, possibly in October. Mr. Bailey stated that he would prefer the third or fourth week in October for the retreat because he planned to participate in the Pacific Program which was in early October.

Ms. Loobey said no other agenda items required action, but she recommended that the Board conduct an executive session.

MOTION

EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(d): Ms. Fitch moved, seconded by Mr. Bailey, that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations. The motion passed unanimously, 6:0. The Board moved into executive session at 9:45 p.m. Ms. Hocken left the meeting at 10:15 p.m.

VOTE

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION AND ADJOURNMENT: The Board returned to regular session at 10:20 p.m. There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned.


Board Secretary