

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE COUNTY MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT
REGULAR MEETING
December 19, 1978

Pursuant to notice given to the Register Guard for publication on December 14, 1978, to the Springfield News and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the district, the regular monthly meeting of the board of directors of Lane County Mass Transit District was held at the City Hall, Eugene, Oregon on December 19, 1978 at 7:30 p.m.

Present:

Richard A. Booth, Secretary
Jack J. Craig
Daniel M. Herbert, Vice President
Ted J. Langton, Treasurer
Kenneth H. Kohnen, President, presiding
Glenn E. Randall
Fred C. Dyer, General Manager
Mavis Skipworth, Recording Secretary

News media representatives:
Marvin Tims, Register Guard
Tom Jackson, Springfield News

Absent:

Carolyn Roemer

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Clark Cox, member of the Citizens Advisory Committee, suggested that it would be more pleasant for patrons if the front lights were on in the early hours at the Customer Service Center.

Paul Bonney, chairman of Citizens Advisory Committee, commented that the current posters in the interior of the buses appeared more professional.

MOTION

MINUTES: Upon motion by Mr. Booth, seconded by Mr. Langton, the minutes of the November 21, 1978 regular board meeting and the December 12, 1978 adjourned board meeting were approved as distributed.

VOTE

GMA MARKET RESEARCH REPORT: The chairman introduced Mr. Cliff Anderson, representative of GMA Research Corporation, who gave a comprehensive overview of the results of a district wide survey of residents' attitudes, awareness and behavior toward Lane Transit District. He explained the methods of design and analysis used in the research and presented a list of recommendations representing judgments of GMA Research which he said were based upon research results and past experience, noting that those recommendations should be carefully weighed against the system constraints and district insights.

Mr. Anderson presented slides indicating results of the four months of effort and described the focus group interviews conducted for attitude and perception as guidance in making up the survey form. He said the survey was conducted through 391 random telephone interviews, half with bus riders and half with non-riders, over 16 years of age and not employed by the district. He defined the categories used: LTD awareness and use, LTD performance perceptions; attitudes toward transit; population penetration and ridership; rider characteristics; trip purposes.

The recommendations by GMA Research Corporation included: Assume LTD has strong public support as its performance was rated as good or excellent by more than three-quarters of district residents; consider dealing with the "empty bus" problem; consider updating origin and destination information for route planning; build more bus stop shelters; personalize service given by drivers and information staff; coordinate with downtown merchants; consider a well designed downtown transit station; encourage nonriders to try LTD; broaden the current market base; target potential heavy users; consider a shift in media buying; consider allowing advertising on bus exteriors; market the system; approach research systematically.

Mr. Booth asked the cost of the market research program. Mr. Anderson answered that it cost \$13,500 and Mr. Booth commented that it appeared worth the cost. Mr. Craig observed that although there have been squabbles about financing of the district, the public apparently has ignored that issue. Mr. Anderson said the controversy in this area over financing does not seem as apparent as in Tri-Met.

Mr. Booth said while service rating was outstanding, he wondered if a performance question on efficiency might indicate a different opinion.

Mr. Langton spoke of the narrow usage base indicated, and Mr. Anderson advised that 5% of the population contributed to 75% of the rides and said there is a need to market to people who will give heavy usage.

Mr. Herbert said if the object is to increase the number of riders, one way would be to encourage more elderly people to use the system, but noted that this would not greatly increase revenues needed to meet the 25% farebox/operating cost ratio goal.

Mr. Craig asked if there was any indication that a change in headway would attract more customers, and Mr. Anderson replied that people appeared to be more interested in where the bus goes than in the frequency. He stressed the importance of encouraging people by various means who have not ridden the bus to try it once.

There being no further discussion on the report, Mr. Kohnen thanked Mr. Anderson for his presentation.

MOTION
VOLE

Mr. Langton moved to accept the market research report prepared by GMA Research Corporation. Mr. Craig seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL: Distributed to board members were copies of a letter from Richard Bryson, dated December 13, 1978, recommending that the board seek clarification on the legality of the district contracting to private industry either by amendment of the legislation or by a court opinion, although he believed the latter could result in personal liability for the directors. He proposed that the board authorize the submission to the legislature of some amendment to ORS 267.200(3) that would clearly indicate the legislature's intentions. He said an opinion from the Attorney General, under ORS 180.060, would appear to not give protection to the district's general manager or directors. Mr. Kohnen observed that to implement legal counsel's suggestion, the board would need to rescind the action taken at the last meeting to seek an opinion from the attorney general on this issue as stated in Section I, subsection 3 of the Transit Act ORS 267.000.

MOTION Mr. Craig said he believed the board's action was proper and the Attorney General's opinion would be helpful. He moved to postpone rescinding the previous action of November 21, 1978, and to notify all the board members of this discussion. He said he was disturbed that it was again put in the agenda. Mr. Booth concurred and said he was disappointed that the staff did not follow through. Mr. Craig said he would be willing later to vote on any legislative changes. Mr. Langton asked Mr. Craig if he would feel comfortable if the Attorney General's opinion allowed contracting to private industry. Mr. Craig said he would, although legislative changes could be sought through a unified effort with Tri-Met.

Mr. Langton said he believed an opinion should immediately be sought from the Attorney General. Mr. Herbert concurred that it could be a pre-condition to further action, but said he would not feel comfortable going ahead with contracting if the district's legal counsel does not believe it is legal.

Mr. Craig suggested the board should study the options and try to make some decisions at this meeting or the next, and submit legislation; that there could possibly be discussion between the general managers of the district and Tri-Met to determine what is in the best general interest.

Mr. Craig's motion failed for lack of a second.

MOTION Mr. Herbert moved the board recommend that the law include the words "or with any private person, firm or corporation" and that the manager be asked to take this recommendation to the Oregon Transit Association and report back to the board. Mr. Craig seconded the motion.

Mr. Booth asked that the motion include taking whatever action would be necessary to get the issue into legislative committee. Mr. Herbert said it could adversely affect the district's credibility if the staff were directed to pursue it if were not recommended by OTA. In following discussion concerning the timeline necessary to submit proposed legislation, Mr. Booth spoke in favor of early submittal to the legislature and Mr. Herbert suggested that it could possibly be introduced but not actively supported.

VOTE The question was put on Mr. Herbert's motion and carried unanimously.

MOTION Mr. Craig moved to ask a member of the district's legislative delegation to introduce as a bill the Bill for an Act included as Pages 12, 13 and 14 in the distributed agenda material. The motion was duly seconded.

AMENDING MOTION Mr. Herbert moved to amend the motion to introduce it into the Senate and advise them that the district would like to defer hearings on it until advice from the Oregon Transit Association is received. Mr. Langton seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

VOTE The question was put on the main motion as amended and it carried unanimously.

TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM UPDATE: Mr. Kohlen presented a proposed calendar of meetings spanning the interval from the TDP draft publication to board adoption of the budget. It was the consensus that the schedule would be acceptable.

A staff memo was distributed to board members describing alternative strategies for achieving a higher percentage of farebox revenue/operating cost ratio and the staff requested board direction in determining which strategy

should be built into the TDP. Mr. Kohnen proposed that the issue be deferred to an adjourned board meeting on January 9, 1979, and Mr. Booth concurred, stating that it would give more time for study. Mr. Booth asked that no other topic be included at that meeting.

Mr. Herbert said the information presented was relevant and interesting but not what the board had requested; that the board should receive a set of activities showing what has to be done to achieve a 25% ratio. He referred to an earlier meeting when a specific motion passed calling for alternatives to achieve a 25% ratio. He suggested a fare increase could be considered to coincide with new buses being put into service. He requested that the staff also prepare a direction reflecting aggressive marketing efforts and a fare raise coordinated with service improvements such as new buses, equipment, shelters, or whatever other things might result from the current market research. He explained that he wished for the board to receive, in addition to the 25% ratio alternatives, a coordinated set of service improvements that go as far as the staff can reach over a three year period and an indication of what the farebox ratio results from that program would be.

Mr. Rynerson, Director of Planning, observed that a strategy achieving the 25% ratio might not be the same as the farebox ratio from a coordinated set of service improvements. Mr. Herbert concurred, adding that achieving a 25% ratio could possibly result in a very big loss in the amount of service provided to the community and he would not want that; but that he believed there was a direction to pursue in a program that would result in a higher ratio than present which would include a fare raise, marketing, and other elements that the staff could determine.

Mr. Langton said he would like to receive a step by step program covering a three year period. He expressed the opinion that the proposals received smack of coercion in that service cuts would be necessary. He asked that a coordinated program be prepared which approaches the 25% goal with a positive and realistic attitude, rather than throwing cold water with the presented alternatives.

Mr. Booth concurred, saying the material addressed only decreasing the budget and not productivity increases. He said he would look upon this as a challenge from board to staff to throw away preconceptions and try to increase productivity, examining new goals and find new ideas to achieve 25% or better, giving better service at the same time. He said perhaps consideration could be given to changing frequency and 1/4 mile goal to point to point geographical goals.

Mr. Rynerson asked if the board wanted alternative coordinated three year programs or a single coordinated three year program, and Mr. Herbert said he wished to see alternatives in order to make choices as to what would be included in the TDP. Mr. Booth said he wanted a three year program with one year increments to evaluate progress at the end of one year.

MOTION

APPOINTMENT OF BUDGET OFFICER: Mr. Booth moved that Phyllis Loobey be appointed budget officer for the fiscal year 1979-80. The motion was duly seconded and carried unanimously.

VOTE

WORKER'S COMPENSATION: Mr. Kohnen reviewed action taken at the last meeting on Worker's Compensation and advised that the staff subsequently recommends reconsideration to approve the Guaranteed Cost Plan for the following reasons: 1) the maximum premium cost would be guaranteed, 2) there would be no surcharge penalty, and 3) cash savings or rebate would not be dependent upon dividend declaration.

Mr. Langton commented that SAIF had done a poor job for the district and needed to be pushed to work actively for the benefit of the district.

MOTION Mr. Herbert moved to rescind the motion of December 12, 1978 which retained the current SAIF insurance program. Mr. Craig seconded the motion and it
VOTE carried unanimously.

MOTION Mr. Herbert moved the board adopt the Guaranteed Cost Plan described in the agenda material of December 12, 1978 for the calendar year 1979 and that the internal performance goals as listed in that agenda material be included.
VOTE The motion was duly seconded and carried unanimously.

MOTION QUANTITATIVE OBJECTIVES CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: The minutes and summary of recommendations of the November 15, 1978 meeting of the Quantitative Objectives Citizens Advisory Committee were presented for board approval. Upon motion duly seconded the minutes and measurable indicators described therein were accepted.
VOTE

Mr. Herbert asked that the other members of the board committee receive the information and be advised of the January 9, 1979 meeting.

Mr. Randall entered the meeting and apologized for his delay in reaching the meeting because of business commitments.

BUDGET COMMITTEE NOMINATION: Mr. Langton advised that he will submit the name of a budget committee nominee at the January meeting.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE: Minutes of the December 12 CAC meeting were presented for board information. Mr. Kohlen suggested that because of low attendance, the status of the Citizens Advisory Committee should be reviewed at a future board meeting and a decision made as to whether increased involvement should be sought, the committee should be abolished, or ad hoc committees should be substituted. Mr. Craig said he believed the board should take more interest in the committee; that it would be worthwhile to broaden the committee and stimulate attendance. Mr. Randall asked if the committee was a statutory requirement and the chairman said he would look into it.

MONTHLY REPORTING: Regular monthly reporting was presented for Finance and Budget, the Marketing Division, Ridership, and Operations.

CONFERENCE ON BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS: An Orientation Handbook published by the Governor's office was distributed for board information.

OREGON TRANSIT ASSOCIATION: The board was advised that Mr. Roger Martin has been selected as lobbyist for the Oregon Transit Association.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned to January 9, 1979, 7:30 p.m. in the Eugene City Hall.



Secretary