MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE COUNTY MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

March 4, 1980

Pursuant to notice given to the Register Guard for publication on February 25, 1980, to the Springfield News and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the district, an adjourned meeting of the board of directors of Lane County Mass Transit District was held March 4, 1980 at 7:30 p.m. in the City Hall, Eugene, Oregon.

Present:

Richard A. Booth, Secretary
Daniel M. Herbert, Vice President
Kenneth H. Kohnen, President, presiding
Ted J. Langton, Treasurer
Glenn E. Randall
Carolyn Roemer
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Mavis Skipworth, Recording Secretary

Guests, Lay members of the Budget Committee:
George Baker
Richard Hansen
Mary Lou McCarthy
Ron Schmaedick

News media representatives:

Marvin Tims, Register Guard

Marian Green, Oregon Daily Emerald

Absent:

Robert C. Loomis

Guests, Lay members of the Budget Committee: William Edom Emerson Hamilton

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY PRESIDENT: The chairman introduced two recently appointed staff members, Nancy Matela, Marketing Representative, and Ron Andersen, Service Planner.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Kohnen opened the meeting to public comment and there was no response. He closed that portion of the meeting.

ARCHITECTS' REPORT ON GARAGE/OFFICE FACILITY: Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, advised that property improvements scheduled in Capital Grant III included funding for the consultants currently involved in property review. He introduced Grant Seder and Otto Poticha of Unthank Seder Poticha, Architects.

Mr. Seder reported that his firm was retained to study the district's existing facilities and to assess their adequacy in accommodating future growth; that while immediate concern involved fencing, lighting and location of fueling facilities, it was necessary to determine expansion possibilities.

He showed slides of the present site and facilities and spoke of their inadequacy in the following areas: accommodating the additional buses scheduled for arrival in the fall of 1980; providing parking for employees and the public; adhering to codes and safety; the existing maintenance facility is currently at its maximum capacity; the lack of space for office and support areas; and a need for expansion of fueling and bus washing facilities. He said there were no areas on the property where work could commence on improvements as all space is being utilized, and the entire operation must continue to function during any renovations or additions.

Mr. Seder said his firm concluded that the site, including new acquisitions, is not adequate for the district's future requirements and, with all new construction, is barely adequate for the Fall 1980 fleet. Their recommendations, as an interim solution, would be to continue operation on the present site with the addition of the adjacent properties under negotiation, and to consider acquisition of 8 to 10 acres at another site for future use, with the possibility of retaining the present site as a satellite maintenance facility.

In answer to comment by Mr. Schmaedick of the advantages of straight, drive-through bays over angled bays shown on the presented drawings, Mr. Poticha concurred but advised there would be insufficient room until a new facility was built. Mr. Hansen asked about the practicality of double deck parking in relation to land values. Mr. Poticha said a lower deck had been considered and that at land values of \$8 to \$10 a square foot, double deck parking would be economically feasible.

Mr. Herbert referred to a previous study made of the district's needs and asked if it had been taken into consideration in the current study. Mr. Dallas replied that it had been reviewed but the system was smaller at the time the study was conducted and it was prepared in a short time to meet a deadline for an Economic Development Administration grant application.

Mr. Herbert said it appeared the present site would be inadequate for long range needs but cautioned that all aspects of the operation should be considered in looking to another site. Mr. Dallas agreed and advised that for every eight blocks to or from the present site there would be a \$100,000 annual operating cost difference in 1979 dollars, indicating an advantage of a main facility with satellite facilities for shorter deadheading.

Mr. Schmaedick asked if a determination had been made on the viability of contracting out a portion of the maintenance work. Mr. Dallas responded that the possibility is under review but at the present time there is not a subcontractor in the area with a facility to accommodate buses.

Mr. Schmaedick suggested renting parking space downtown or in one of the parking structures to alleviate the problem of overnight bus parking space. Mr. Poticha spoke of the many activities at night in preparing the buses for the following day's service. He said adjacent lands could be an advantage, possibly being utilized as park'n'ride lots during the day.

The chairman called for a ten minute recess. Following the recess, the meeting reconvened.

TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: Ms. Loobey introduced staff members who would be participating in the presentation of the draft Transit Development Program (TDP). She advised that suggestions from the meeting of February 26th had been incorporated into the document for further discussion and additional material was included on programming for FY 1980-81, as well as an overview of programming for fiscal years 1981-82 and 1982-83.

Jane Willson called attention to the addition of numbers with the objectives to give measurable figures and to the inclusion of Facility Capacity as a goal, with transfer of Employee Performance to other areas of the document.

Ellen Bevington noted insertions in routing standards toward providing direct routing whenever possible as requested by Mr. Schmaedick, revisions addressing Mr. Herbert's concern of monitoring progress toward the T-2000 plan in the annual route evaluation, and further clarification of the public input process.

Mr. Schmaedick expressed his disapproval of bus rapid transit systems using transit stations where buses have to pull in and park for transfers as they are too time consuming for patrons. He said he visualized a system where buses could pull over to a provided bus stop along the shoulder of the road and transfer passengers. He suggested routing standards should specify minimized disruption of business activities by not taking up parking spaces in front of stores.

Replying to question by Mr. Hansen if the district is currently on target toward the T-2000 plan, Ms. Bevington said the system is carrying about 3% to 4% of the total trips which is higher than anticipated, but that people are starting to use public transit because of external factors over which the district has no control.

Ms. Bevington gave a comprehensive explanation of programming for FY 1980-81, including initiating the route review process earlier for greater public input and a service design of six sectors for improvements to be made on a neighborhood basis. She said priority has been given to improving service in four neighborhood sectors. She advised that 29 accessible buses will be included in the fleet, stating that a study is currently underway for phasing out the Dial-A-Bus service and possibly replacing it with curb-to-curb taxi or Medical Services as many people will be unable to use the new accessible buses.

Mr. Schmaedick remarked that as transit demand increases, the district will need to provide a rapid service to move people in a hurry and there will be a necessity for some type of curb-to-curb service for the elderly and slower moving patrons.

Ms. Bevington then described a proposed fare policy necessary to achieve the desired farebox/operating ratio while increasing vehicle hours to meet ridership demand.

Paul Shinn described capital improvements scheduled for FY 1980-81, stressing the necessity of accomplishing those improvements to meet the demands put on the system and to achieve the district's goals. The board was advised that the recent award of \$750,000 from UMTA, originally scheduled for additional buses,

will be included in a Capital Grant IV application due to the urgency of acquiring property and improving facilities. Mr. Langton questioned why the board had not been requested to formally approve purchase of the property and was advised that negotiations are still underway.

The staff reviewed departmental programming for the coming fiscal year. Mr. Dallas spoke of several areas needing specific attention: accomplishment of the proposed 20% increase, requirement of 30 to 35 additional operators as well as a clerical specialist to expand field supervision, upgraded facilities for the Maintenance Division to accommodate the larger fleet, and an evaluation of the efficiencies of the new lifts with a maintenance program to keep them 100% reliable.

Ms. Loobey summarized the information covered in the document and discussion. She reiterated that the district is internally feeling the stress and strain of additional ridership, the deteriorating condition of the fleet and the inadequacy of the facilities. She said these areas cannot be postponed; that there is a demand to which the district must respond while playing catchup for the past four years of postponed capital improvements. She cautioned that there is an artificial lid on ridership during peak hours as customers are lost when passed by.

Mr. Kohnen advised that public testimony will be sought on the TDP and further discussion will be held at the March 18 regular board meeting.

Mr. Hansen asked for an explanation of the role of the budget committee in the TDP process. Mr. Kohnen explained that the TDP is a policy document to be adopted by the board and the budget committee is serving in an advisory capacity to provide input on those policy decisions.

Mr. Booth stated that he believed the productivity goal should take precedence over the coverage goal. Mr. Dallas suggested that could be addressed on an individual route basis with a judgment decision.

The meeting was adjourned.

Secretary