

MINUTES OF BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING

LANE COUNTY MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT

February 26, 1980

Pursuant to public notice to the Register Guard for publication on February 15, 1980, a meeting of the budget committee of Lane County Mass Transit District was held at the City Hall in Eugene, Oregon, on February 26, 1980 at 7:30 p.m.

Present:

Board Members

Daniel M. Herbert, Vice President  
Kenneth H. Kohnen, President  
Ted J. Langton, Treasurer  
Robert C. Loomis  
Glenn E. Randall

Phyllis Loobey, General Manager

Mavis Skipworth, Recording Secretary

Appointed Members

George Baker, Chairman, presiding  
William Edom  
Mary Lou McCarthy, Secretary  
Ronald Schmaedick

Absent:

Richard A. Booth, Secretary  
Carolyn Roemer

Emerson Hamilton  
Richard Hansen  
Shirley Minor

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD: The chairman introduced the members of the board and the budget committee. He advised that the meeting had been scheduled as a workshop for review of the initial draft of the Transit Development Program (TDP) and to give the staff direction toward preparation of a more finished document. He stressed the importance of the planning document as a basis for policy and budgetary decisions.

MOTION  
VOTE

ELECTION OF OFFICERS: Upon motions, duly seconded, George Baker was elected chairman and Mary Lou McCarthy was elected secretary by unanimous votes.

1980-83 TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PRELIMINARY DIRECTION: The general manager introduced staff members present who had been involved in the preparation of the preliminary draft TDP and requested direction for further development of the document as to format, service standards and route evaluation criteria.

Jane Willson, Marketing Representative, emphasized the importance of the TDP as a public communication document, noting that the goals have been condensed to a broad statement of purpose for clarity and are followed by performance objectives to provide a measurement tool for the board and staff in moving toward the T-2000 plan for this area.

Ellen Bevington, Planning Administrator, said service standards will be given more prominence in this year's update and a policy framework will be established to determine the most equitable distribution of resources, with route evaluation criteria providing a balance for judging if a route is successful.

Mr. Baker said he favored the route review criteria as it has in the past been difficult to determine whether certain routes were productive or not.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: Clark Cox spoke in favor of the income tax ballot measures and said there is a need for even more buses than projected. He suggested the TDP could serve as a valuable tool in determining where routes are most needed.

BUDGET COMMITTEE DELIBERATION: Mr. Herbert commended the staff on the evaluation performance criteria and expressed interest in the relationship it would have to service standards. Ms. Bevington explained that it would be possible to determine on a neighborhood basis how much service can be made available, that productivity can be measured through the criteria with resulting modifications or revisions of routes measuring as substandard. She said marketing and open hearings would be included in any revision process.

Mr. Herbert remarked that in previously serving new areas, low ridership and higher costs have been experienced. Ms. Bevington replied that the service standard of 1/4 mile would be a commitment to serve new areas as they develop and that as productivity is monitored, judgments could be made on waiting for their maturity.

Responding to question by Mr. Edom of a process whereby the public could trigger a route evaluation of an area they believed being overserved or underserved, Ms. Bevington said the district has in the past been responsive to petitions and public input but the process could now be formalized.

Ms. McCarthy asked if routing standards would set regular 15 minute headway service through the campus. Ms. Bevington said there would probably have to be a choice of 15 minute frequency through the campus or the transfer selection desired by the neighborhoods included in the routes. She advised that in committing to the service standards included in the TDP document, the district would be committing to a program of service increase.

Mr. Schmaedick expressed approval of measuring productivity of the routes, setting priorities, and making decisions through the process of the evaluation criteria. He spoke of his concern that not more attention was being given to coverage in neighborhood areas, that people who live in certain areas find their routes are circuitous and go downtown and not throughout the neighborhood area or crosstown. Ms. Bevington replied that while crosstown routes traditionally do not do as well, as ridership grows the district will move toward a transit beltline with express type of routes for the main destinations, which would develop a link to neighborhood routes.

Mr. Schmaedick suggested laying out a system of quadrants to serve neighborhoods, thereby eliminating the need for school buses, and when coverage criteria for a neighborhood has been met, to then develop interconnections to different areas.

Mr. Dallas referred to the service standards and measurable objectives, saying he believed they provided the flexibility to respond to the type of service people desire, possibly through measurements of total riders per vehicle hour. Mr. Powis said market research could also determine the type of service that would be most effective.

Mr. Herbert spoke of his support for the bus rapid transit system with multi-nodes included in the T-2000 plan and in the district's long range planning. He said progress toward that plan should be monitored. Dr. Loomis observed that with the current energy crunch, the district should perhaps update its long range planning and move faster toward the goal.

In reply to question by Mr. Baker of the required size of a system to serve the nineteen nodes listed in the T-2000 plan, Mr. Shinn said that about 240 buses would be needed. He added that the Riviera transfer center will allow crosstown travel connectors and the proposed TDP includes implementation of direct peak hour service to the University from South and West Eugene and the Ferry Street Bridge area. Mr. Dallas cautioned that due to limited resources, it is necessary to set priorities of where to make additions as the system grows.


Mr. Kohnen remarked that the TDP will be reflected in the budget process and suggested the progress toward the long term goals could be referenced in the document.

Mr. Schmaedick reiterated his opposition to duplicating bus systems and encouraged implementing one integrated transportation system for the area with less emphasis on routes and the downtown area, and to move into traffic corridors with transfer points. Dr. Loomis concurred that school buses perform a duplication of service that the district could provide, with great savings to the school districts. Mr. Schmaedick suggested the staff could prepare an analysis of savings the school districts would realize from such a system, and added that it would be more economical for the school districts to subsidize bus passes for the students. Mr. Kohnen recalled that previous studies have been conducted on coordinating services and said one problem found was that the greatest increase of patronage would be at peak hours. He said consolidation should be reconsidered as conditions change.

Mr. Herbert said he would like to see the short term planning in the TDP indicate a movement toward the intermediate and long range plan.

Ms. Loobey thanked the committee for its input and positive response and said the staff will further analyze the transition to directness of travel and the progress being made toward the T-2000 plan.

The meeting was adjourned.

  
Secretary