

New File



Lane Transit District
P. O. Box 7070
Eugene, Oregon 97401
(541) 682-6100
Fax: (541) 682-6111

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on Monday, January 26, 2009.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
BOARD SERVICE COMMITTEE
Thursday, January 29, 2009
3:00 p.m.-4:30 p.m.**

**LTD BOARD ROOM
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene
(off of Glenwood Boulevard)**

Public testimony will not be heard at this meeting.

AGENDA

-
- I. CALL TO ORDER
 - II. ROLL CALL *Towing:*
Evans _____ Eyster _____ Necker _____
 - III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES *Selects of Comm. Chair.* 1
 - IV. PRIORITIZING POTENTIAL SERVICE ADDITIONS AND POSSIBLE CAPITAL PROJECTS 6
 - V. ADJOURNMENT

MINUTES

Lane Transit District
Board Service Committee
Wednesday, September 2, 2008

Present: Mike Eyster, President, Lane Transit District Board of Directors
Will Mueller, Service Planning Manager
Andy Vobora, Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing
Ken Augustson, Service Planner
Ruth Linoz, Service Planner
Heather Lindsay, Service Planning Associate
Angie Sifuentez, Marketing Representative
Cosette Reeves, Marketing Representative
Tom Schwetz, Planning and Development Director
Stefano Viggiano, Assistant General Manager
Mark Pangborn, General Manager
Ed Necker, Lane Transit District Board Member
Greg Evans, Lane Transit District Board Member
Terry Parker, Accessible Services Program Manager

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL – Mr. Eyster called the meeting to order and took roll.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Mr. Eyster determined there were no corrections to the minutes and they were approved as submitted.

2009 SERVICE REDUCTION ANALYSIS – Mr. Vobora reported that staff had been working hard to achieve the budget goal of a 15 percent reduction. He said the draft proposal would be presented at this meeting, as well as modified proposals reflecting various levels of cuts. He continued by saying that meetings with the public would begin the following week, with individual meetings, a booth at the Eugene Celebration, at Fiesta Latina, and a general open house at Customer Service in early October. These meetings would precede the official public hearing on October 13, where the final proposal would be presented. Final adjustments would be made before the second public hearing in November.

In response to a question regarding the effect of fluctuating fuel prices on the proposal, Mr. Vobora responded that when long-range financial plans had been discussed, fuel prices and the state of the economy were considered. At that time a pessimistic-to-optimistic range was outlined in terms of how deep the cuts would need to be made. He said that by October there would be a better understanding of tax receipts for the next quarter, giving a fuller financial picture. He explained that staff had built some flexibility into the analysis for that reason.

Mr. Mueller introduced a document titled, "2009 Annual Route Review: Proposed Service Reduction/ Redesign, September 2, 2008." He explained details of the first option of the Tier 1 proposal, which offered a 15.1 percent reduction of service by deleting bus routes from several categories: express routes where alternative methods of transportation were available, school routes prohibited by new Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations, low productivity

routes, and routes which would be covered by new corridor routes. He emphasized that this proposal would delete the routes designated as the *Breeze*.

Responding to a question from Mr. Evans regarding the new FTA regulations, Mr. Mueller explained the ruling regarding public buses competing against private school bus operations. He said that LTD had testified that they did not compete with school bus service because their yellow school bus operations were with school districts, not private companies. He noted that most likely any type of school service, such as that provided by LTD, would be prohibited under new regulations.

Mr. Mueller next described the second option of the Tier 1 proposal, which would keep the *Breeze* route running, while lessening the proposed cuts to 11.9 percent.

Mr. Mueller then highlighted the Tier 2 proposal, which offered additional cuts extending above the 15 percent mark. He remarked that the cuts on the Tier 2 level would be more "painful" cuts, including eliminating service on certain days, as well as other cuts.

Mr. Pangborn said that he understood Saturday service volume and expense to be approximately twice that of Sunday service. He noted that the Tier 2 chart indicated only about 1.5 percent additional savings for eliminating Saturday service over Sunday service. Mr. Mueller agreed to check these figures to make sure they were correct.

Mr. Mueller presented a chart called Weekday Ridership Statistics, showing the boardings per revenue hour of different bus routes. He then introduced several system redesign maps, detailing frequency of weekday mid-afternoon service, those service segments proposed for deletion, and specific cuts proposed for various geographical areas.

Mr. Evans asked if specific analysis had been done regarding adverse impact on compliance with Title 6. Mr. Mueller responded that staff had met with the group who did the system analysis for the previous Title 6 report in 2006. He explained that when the new system is proposed, this group would research how minorities and low income people would be impacted.

Mr. Mueller stated that if the *Breeze* route was deleted, the current 30-foot *Breeze* buses could be used on connector routes. When detailing the Springfield routes, he described the difficulty of planning service for Springfield because buses there are allowed only on streets designed for heavier vehicles. He noted that on some streets, buses were allowed to run, but bus stops could not be placed there.

Mr. Eyster asked if the planners had looked at simply eliminating certain stops, based on the number of boardings. Mr. Vobora responded that the stops themselves would usually be rearranged when one stop was eliminated, and the distance would be split between the stops that remained.

Mr. Eyster remarked that it would be a hard choice in some cases between considering riders who were totally transit-dependent, though their particular route was unproductive, versus a route that had a lot of daily activity. Mr. Mueller agreed, explaining that a lot of routes are under pressure at this point. He expressed concern about the design of new routes being accomplished on time.

Mr. Pangborn pointed out that because a route is productive does not mean that it does not serve transit-dependent people. He added that there would just be more transit-dependent people on a productive route than on an unproductive route.

Mr. Mueller agreed. He added that someone had asked how it was fair that Route 11 had 10-minute frequency of service, while service would be cut to their neighborhood. He stated that the reason it was fair was because of the high ridership on Route 11.

Mr. Vobora remarked that one of the challenges was incorporating specific service standards into LTD's service policy. He said that most of the standards were currently already met, such as how buses were assigned, so that there was no discrimination in terms of where certain amenities and best buses were used. However, he continued, it also was suggested that there should be a specific coverage standard for the community, which had been moved away from by LTD as productivity had increased and resources grew tighter. He surmised that once the redesign was completed, if 80 percent of households were covered within one-quarter mile, this could be called the coverage standard.

Ms. Parker said that another aspect of ridership that had been monitored was the number of ambulatory and wheelchair riders who had been turned away. When frequency of stops slowed, and there were only two bays on the bus for wheelchairs, then wheelchair riders or those with other mobility devices often had to wait 30 minutes or longer for service pickup. She added that if a bus was full except for a wheelchair bay still open, bus drivers would sometimes tell the wheelchair rider "Bus full," because of the time it would take to empty the bus of standing riders to load the wheelchair rider. When time was an issue, wheelchair boardings presented problems.

Mr. Evans asked if riders standing in a wheelchair bay would get pushed off the bus if a wheelchair user wished to board. Mr. Parker responded that the FTA Office of Civil Rights would say that a rider with a mobility device always had priority for the wheelchair bay.

Ms. Linoz expressed concern about reduced service levels also reducing bus peak numbers. She wondered what would happen with a low peak number and an occasional need to pull out 52 buses to run Duck shuttles. Her concern was that the University of Oregon needed to make accommodations for their parking requirements, including alternative coverage that LTD had provided in the past. She wondered what would happen if LTD could not satisfy the needs of UO.

Mr. Mueller felt that football service was a problem and basketball service even a bigger problem.

Mr. Vobora noted that rural routes had not been changed much, except for Route 92, where trips taking the UO crew team to the lake to work out would be eliminated. It was felt that this service could be chartered. He asked for any suggestions for planning for the public meetings.

Mr. Eyster asked that the schedule be sent to all committee members. He also asked that the current schedule and the proposed changes be shown graphically in different colors, perhaps side by side.

Mr. Pangborn suggested using PowerPoint, with perhaps three slides showing current levels, proposed cuts, and the new schedule.

Mr. Viggiano suggested highlighting in red the runs being eliminated.

Mr. Necker requested further orientation regarding changes in his subdistrict before the public meeting.

Mr. Vobora reiterated the timeline for the various upcoming meetings. On Monday, October 13, and Monday, November 10, public hearings would be held, and the Board would take action at the Wednesday, November 19, Board meeting. Service implementation would occur in September 2009.

Mr. Pangborn clarified that the Board could push the decision out to the December 17 meeting, if necessary.

Mr. Eyster asked if the committee wished to meet again. Mr. Vobora responded that the committee could meet once again before the October 13 public meeting, bringing together information gathered at earlier public meetings.

Mr. Evans asked if activist groups would be contacted so that they received full notice regarding the open meetings. Mr. Vobora stated that they would be duly notified. Mr. Evans also suggested briefing the Lane County legislative delegation, county commissioners, and city councils.

Mr. Necker noted that the Disability Services Advisory Council would have a legislative meeting on October 18. Mr. Viggiano said the county's legislative delegation would be at the meeting on September 25. He was not sure whether these issues would be raised at that meeting, but they would be updated about the LTD meetings that were scheduled.

Mr. Evans also suggested that Lane County legislative delegation should be given a briefing on the final proposal before their session began in January.

Mr. Mueller asked that the information presented at the meeting be considered over the next several days by all present. He told the group that any ideas or concerns could be e-mailed within the group, since there would be a short time to finalize details of the proposals before the public meetings occurred. He requested feedback regarding whether to keep the *Breeze* routes.

Mr. Eyster felt there would be no need to continue the *Breeze* route with EmX running as it had been.

Mr. Evans suggested that it would be important to get other coverage out in the neighborhoods to lead into neighborhood connector services.

Mr. Evans questioned if street improvements might be possible in Springfield to make more bus service possible. He wondered if perhaps the City of Springfield could apply for federal grants through the Federal Transit Administration and Highways for road improvement.

Mr. Viggiano added that integrated transportation also was being researched at the state level. He said that there currently was little money available for roads.

Mr. Pangborn asked if there was any likelihood of relief from the legislature that could be factored into the proposal. Mr. Viggiano replied that it would be next spring before it would be known. Mr. Pangborn said that if funds were granted by the Oregon Legislature for the elderly and handicapped, some of the General Fund money being used for paratransit could be recaptured.

Mr. Necker noted that if the proposed cuts worked well enough, reserves could be rebuilt. Mr. Pangborn agreed that building reserves would be very important, as they currently were very low.

Mr. Evans questioned how the reduction would affect the work force. Mr. Vobora responded that the rough numbers of 15 percent would translate to approximately 30 bus operators. The bus operators would be laid off rather than reducing work hours. Mr. Evans expressed hope of having an idea soon regarding reduction of bus operators. Mr. Vobora responded that research currently was being done on how layoffs would be handled. He said information would be presented at the Board retreat regarding options for layoffs versus early retirement for some people.

When asked about the date of the Board retreat, Mr. Pangborn said it would be held in November or early December.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Eyster adjourned the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

(Recorded by Judy Burton)

AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING: January 29, 2009

ITEM TITLE: **Prioritizing Additions to Bus Service Plan**

PREPARED BY: Andy Vobora, Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing

ACTION REQUESTED: Discussion and comment on priorities for potential service additions

BACKGROUND: As the current economic conditions continue to be evaluated, and as the District learns more about potential new revenue from local, state, and federal sources, LTD staff have begun a process to prioritize bus service that could be restored in the 2009 service package.

With many revenue discussions continuing and the outcome uncertain, staff believe it is important to have a plan ready to act upon quickly. Expedience is necessary because service planning staff are working hard to create the new routes that are part of the service redesign. Major shifts in this plan will be difficult to implement as deadlines for materials production and completion of planning milestones occur between March and May. The Service Advisory Committee (SAC) met to discuss possible increases in funding and to prioritize a list of potential additions or changes to the adopted service redesign package. The ranking lists are attached for your review. The first ranking process forced SAC members to prioritize the top 12 most important additions to service. Staff then asked committee members to select additions to service that totaled no more than 4 percent of service hours. The final ranking allowed committee members to select additions totaling 8 percent of service hours. Staff will present the results of these ranking processes, and they will ask the Board to comment on whether these priorities ring true with what the Board values and what the Board heard during the community input meetings.

Staff will provide an overview of the potential federal stimulus funding and how these funds might be divided between needed capital improvements to the maintenance building and operational funding that could restore reserves or be funneled into service additions.

ATTACHMENTS: Ranking sheets

RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION: **Staff will be prepared to host community open houses or public hearings as needed.**

PROPOSED MOTION: None

Annual Route Review 2009

Possible Add-Backs

Item	%	Priority	Comment
15-min. from 1200-1730	3.59%	_____	
15-min. from 0900-1730* (current 15 = 1400-1730)	8.97%	=====	*a little less because of 60-min. cycle time of 66/67 between 0830 & 1030
Restore 3x, 7x & 8x	1.03%	_____	(3x = 0.52% -- 7x = 0.27% -- 8x = 0.25%)
Restore Breeze (includes 66/67 savings)	3.27%	_____	
Do 25/73 vs. 24/28	1.00%	_____	
Add 10 peak trips of #73	0.57%	=====	
Restore current 41/43 service (includes 15-min. peak service)	2.20%	_____	
Restore current 51/52/55	0.93%	_____	
Current #76 except clockwise routing on Bailey Hill/Oak Patch	1.30%	_____	
#76 same -- but peak hour only (12 trips)	0.62%	_____	
Make #78 year-round & add four new trips	0.57%	_____	
79x evening service (1900 - 2200)	0.18%	_____	
Keep 30-minute headway on #81 in summer	0.28%	_____	
Keep Saturday service on #81	0.11%	=====	
Keep summer service on #85	0.36%	_____	
Restore school trips on #13, #41, #51 & #67	0.23%	_____	

Annual Route Review 2009

Possible Add-Backs SAC Vote 2

Item		%	4% Priority	8% Priority	Item
a	15-min. major corridor frequency from 1200-1730 (current = 1400-1730)	3.59%			a
b	15-min. major corridor frequency from 0900 - 1730 (current = 1400-1730)	8.97%			b
c	Restore 3x & 8x to original winter bid proposal	0.77%			c
d	Restore Breeze to 15-minute daytime frequency (includes 66/67 savings)	3.27%			d
e	Restore Breeze to 30-minute daytime frequency (includes 66/67 savings)	1.24%			e
f	Do 25/73 versus 24/28	1.00%			f
g	Add 10 peak trips of #73	0.61%			g
h	Restore current 41/43 service (includes 15-min. peak service)	2.20%			h
i	Restore current 51/52/55	0.93%			i
j	Current #76 except clockwise routing on Bailey Hill/Oak Patch	1.30%			j
k	#76 same -- but peak hour only (12 trips)	0.62%			k
l	Make #78 year-round & add four new trips	0.57%			l
m	79x evening service (1900 - 2200)	0.18%			m
n	Keep 30-minute headway on #81 in summer	0.28%			n
o	Keep Saturday service on #81	0.11%			o
p	Keep summer service on #85	0.36%			p
q	Restore school trips on #13, #41, #51 & #67	0.23%			q
r	Contingency	1.00%			r
s	Restore slimmed down 3x/8x	0.50%			s
t	Restore current 18/19	1.06%			t

Name _____