

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
LANE COUNTY MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

February 9, 1982

Pursuant to notice given at the February 2, 1982 adjourned meeting, an adjourned meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane County Mass Transit District was held on February 9, 1982 in the McNutt Room, Eugene City Hall, at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Peter M. Brandt  
Janet Calvert  
Janice Eberly, Secretary  
Kenneth H. Kohnen  
Ted J. Langton, President, presiding  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Polly Nelson  
Glenn E. Randall, Vice President/Treasurer

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Mr. Langton explained that the Transit Development Program (TDP) is a short-term statement of goals and objectives for the District which the staff use in preparing the budget and action plans for the next year. He added that circumstances may force the District to change parts of the TDP.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: There was none.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF DISTRICT GOALS, 1982-1988: Mr. Langton called the Board's attention to page 17 of the TDP for FY 81-82 through FY 83-84, to the goals and objectives that had been adopted by the Board and applied to the years in question. The TDP would now be updated to include FY 84-85.

Ms. Loobey stated that the process was being approached differently this year in order to involve the Board much earlier in the process to make the TDP more Board-directed. She explained that in the past the staff had created the entire TDP in draft form and given it to the Board, and have at times had to rewrite large portions of the draft. She said the staff would give the Board a brief summary of where the District is now and how much progress had been made on last year's goals. Another more detailed summary would be given at the beginning of the budget process for the Board and lay budget committee members.

Paul Shinn, Director of Administrative Services, introduced Nancy Matela, a Marketing Representative who had been acting as a management analyst for the last several months. He said she would most likely be the author of the TDP. He then handed out a one-page summary of performance objectives adopted in Fiscal Year 1980-81, and said that data on how well the District is doing this year will be ready for the next Board meeting. He did, however, briefly summarize the District's performance. He stated that ridership will not approach the 3.7 million goal, due to a decrease in ridership continuing later in the year than anticipated. He said that the District is exceeding the productivity goal, is still below projections in cost per person trip, slightly below in funding, about the same in coverage, and the same in facility capacity. Denied trips due to overloads will be over the goal this year because of the first few weeks of the new system, before service adjustments were made. Regarding the safety goal (miles between accidents), he stated that it had increased from two or three years ago and it is not realistic to expect it to go above 38,000 miles and stay there. In public support, he said, we are below the performance objective but slightly above last year.

Turning to the agenda packet, Mr. Shinn stated that staff are not "married" to those goals for the most part, but submitted them in order to give the Board a starting place for discussion. He said that additions to this year's objectives are on page 4, with the fare policy being a major change. He stated that staff believe the fixed schedule of fare changes is not appropriate and would like, for the remainder of this year, to come up with a policy for the review of fares and the fare structure, tying them in with gas prices, etc.

Mr. Langton commented that all of the goals may have been valid two or three years ago, but should be considered in light of current conditions.

In response to a question from Mr. Kohnen, Mr. Shinn explained that price segmentation means looking at prices that are different by time of day or by the market, such as charging 5¢ to 10¢ extra during peak hours, when people who will have to pay can usually afford it, or discounts for special groups, or a zone system, in order to increase bus use or revenue generated by a specific market.

In discussing the District's 15-year goals, Ms. Calvert suggested that a sixth goal be added to address the issue of incorporating metro area goals, which would be updated several times within a 15-year period.

Mr. Kohnen then asked a question regarding the term "choice riders," which actually means "riders with a choice." He thought it could be interpreted as a discriminatory policy against faithful ridership (those who ride now out of necessity) and asked that it be reworded.

Mr. Shinn then explained that the District had never addressed the financial base in the TDP, but staff thought it should be considered if the District were going to be put on a sound financial footing. The main thrust, he said, is to broaden the tax base in the first four years. Ms. Calvert thought it was too specific to be a one-year goal.

In explaining subsidies from user groups, Mr. Shinn used the example of the current pass program at LCC, where LCC gives the District a direct payment to

help subsidize a program to help their students use our services. Mr. Langton suggested using the term "to seek cooperative projects" rather than the word "subsidy."

Rather than saying "shelter money for future use," Mr. Kohnen suggested saying "set aside" or "accumulate."

Mr. Shinn stated that staff believe that Federal funding may drop to the point where it is not worth the trouble--that it may cost the same to meet the Federal regulations as the money received. Ms. Loobey explained that the District can set aside Federal funds in a Capital Reserve Fund, to use up to two years after the period in which we were eligible for those funds. However, a true cash surplus could affect Federal money.

In explaining the goal regarding land use planning which is favorable toward mass transit, Ms. Matela said that land use planning intentions are good but staff want to prod local governments into following up their intentions with action. It was suggested that the goal be reworded to be more straightforward and then put into the Year One goals.

Regarding performance objectives on page 7 of the agenda packet, Mr. Shinn stated that in the past that District had set numbers but had not prioritized these goals. The staff, he said, would like to see them prioritized better so they would know what to trade off if the need arose. Staff had placed ridership and public support above the other objectives for the first year, and in the second year had shifted the emphasis to the farebox-to-operating-cost ratio.

It was suggested that objectives for service per capita (a measure of how good the service is for an area--coverage per population, etc.) and overhead costs be separated into two separate goals.

In response to Mr. Langton's concerns about dropping the emphasis on the fare-box ratio, Ms. Loobey explained that it is only one measure of the system and it was not the staff's intent to not control the cost and become more efficient. Rather, she said, when staff and the Board look at those costs, there are other measures that are also important to make sure there is a balance.

In explaining goals for capital improvements on page 8, Mr. Shinn stated that this was the least departure from the TDP, and that there was a good description on page 67 of last year's TDP. He said that passengers had been requesting schedules at bus stops; hence, the goal for expanding information displays. He said staff also wanted to look at any way the District could combine service with the school districts, not just in carrying children. It was suggested that a statement to that effect be added to the site analysis for maintenance facility goal.

In discussing the objectives for service levels and priorities found on page 9 of the agenda packet, Ms. Loobey said that the District will cut administrative costs by not having major changes in the service as often. She explained that in the past we have changed the service three or four times a year, which costs the District \$20,000 to \$30,000 each time. Additionally, in the second goal on that page, it was decided that the words "high ridership growth potential" would be more specific to the goal than "high growth areas."

Mr. Shinn pointed out a significant change from the status quo in the public relations goals on page 10, which is to increase the profile of the Board in the public eye. There would also be a change in the marketing effort, so that the Marketing staff would have more time to spend on getting people onto the bus.

It was suggested that the goal to gradually increase farebox percentages, on page 11, be rewritten to make it more clear for lay readers.

Mr. Shinn stated that goals for employee relations, found on page 12 of the packet, had not previously been addressed in the TDP.

In discussing the goals for administration of staff on page 13 of the packet, Mr. Shinn stated that these goals would be less vague when the division action plans have been written. It was suggested, however, that the two-to-five-year goal be rewritten to make it more clear.

Mr. Shinn stated that the suggested changes would be made for the February Board meeting, and the Board will be asked to review/change/adopt the goals. Then the nine divisions will develop objectives and programs for either the February or March meeting, and from those objectives and programs they will develop their budgets, and these goals will become more specific. Ms. Calvert suggested that the Board see a brief description of what is included in each division.

MOTION  
VOTE

With no further discussion, Ms. Eberly moved and Mr. Brandt seconded that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting was duly adjourned on a unanimous vote at 9:15 p.m.

  
Secretary