

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on January 10, 2002.

## LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, January 16, 2002  
5:30 p.m.

LTD BOARD ROOM  
3500 E. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene  
(off Glenwood Blvd. In Glenwood)

### A G E N D A

Page No.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

Wylie \_\_\_\_\_ Gaydos \_\_\_\_\_ Hocken \_\_\_\_\_ Kleger \_\_\_\_\_  
Lauritsen \_\_\_\_\_ Melnick \_\_\_\_\_ (vacancy)\_\_\_\_\_

**The following agenda items will begin at 5:30 p.m.**

- |      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| III. | PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT   |    |
| IV.  | ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA  | 04 |
| V.   | WORK SESSION   |    |
|      | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) Method of Construction (20 minutes) | 05 |
|      | <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Discussion on FY 2002-03 Pricing Plan (20 minutes)                      | 06 |
|      | <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Discussion on FY 2002-03 Annual Route Review (20 minutes)               | 23 |

**The following agenda items will begin at 6:30 p.m.**

- |      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| VI.  | EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – FEBRUARY 2002           | 25 |
| VII. | AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION                          |    |
|      | ◆ Each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. |    |

VIII.	ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING	
A.	Consent Calendar	26
1.	Minutes of December 19, 2001, Regular Board Meeting (Page 27)	
B.	Election of Board Vice President	40
C.	Date for February Work Session	41
IX.	ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING	
A.	Current Activities	
1.	Board Member Reports	48
(a)	Metropolitan Policy Committee – No meeting	
(b)	BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee – January 8 meetings	
(c)	Statewide Livability Forum – No meeting	
(d)	Board Finance Committee—January 7 meeting	
2.	General Manager’s Report	49
3.	Monthly Financial Report – December 2001	50
4.	Springfield Station Update	61
5.	BRT Corridor Planning Update	62
6.	Budget Committee Nominations	63
B.	Monthly Department Reports	65
C.	Monthly Performance Reports (December 2001)	70
X.	ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING	75
A.	Capital Improvements Program	
B.	Long-range Financial Plan	
C.	Work Session on BRT Vehicles	
D.	FY 2002-03 Service Recommendation	
E.	FY 2002-03 Fare Recommendation	

- F. General Manager's Performance Evaluation
  - G. Budget Committee Appointments
  - H. BRT Updates
- XI. ADJOURNMENT

**Alternative formats of printed material (Braille, cassette tapes, or large print) are available upon request. A sign language interpreter will be made available with 48 hours' notice. The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. For more information, please call 682-6100 (voice) or 1-800-735-2900 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).**

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2002\01\Regular Mtg\bdagenda.doc

## Comparison of Fare Media Prices UNCC Peer Group

Agency	Annual Ridership	Adult Cash Fare	Token or Single Ride Fare	Daily Pass	Adult Monthly Pass	Adult Multi-Month Pass
Santa Barbara, California	7.5	\$1.00	\$1.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
Tacoma, Washington	12	\$1.25	\$1.14	n/a	\$45.00	n/a
Santa Cruz, California	7.5	\$1.00	n/a	\$3.00	\$40.00	n/a
Reno, Nevada	8.3	\$1.25	\$1.25	\$3.75	\$40.00	n/a
Fresno, California	13.5	\$1.00	\$0.85	n/a	\$35.00	n/a
<b>Eugene, Oregon</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>\$1.25</b>	<b>\$1.00</b>	<b>\$2.50</b>	<b>\$35.00</b>	<b>\$85 (3-month)</b>
South Bend, Indiana		\$0.75	n/a	n/a	\$30.00	n/a
Vancouver, Washington	4.9	\$1.00	n/a	\$3.00	\$28.00	\$308 (annual)
Boise, Idaho	1.1	\$0.75	\$0.70	n/a	\$27.00	n/a
Ann Arbor, Michigan	4.3	\$0.75	n/a	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Lansing, Michigan	6.5	\$1.00	\$0.85	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Bakersfield, California	5	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$1.75	\$25.00	n/a
Olympia, Washington	3	\$0.75	n/a	\$1.50	\$25.00	n/a
Spokane, Washington	8.8	\$0.75	\$0.75	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Charelston, South Carolina	3.9	\$1.00	\$0.80	\$3.00	\$22.00	\$28 (40 rides)
Corpus Christi, Texas	6	\$0.50	\$0.50	n/a	\$20.00	n/a
Salem, Oregon	4.3	\$0.75	\$0.75	n/a	\$20.00	n/a

Data collected through transit district Web site information

Median	6.2	\$1.00	\$0.83	\$3.00	\$26.00	
--------	-----	--------	--------	--------	---------	--

## Comparison of Fare Media Prices UNCC Peer Group

Agency	Annual Ridership	Adult Cash Fare	Token or Single Ride Fare	Daily Pass	Adult Monthly Pass	Adult Multi-Month Pass
Santa Barbara, California	7.5	\$1.00	\$1.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
Tacoma, Washington	12	\$1.25	\$1.14	n/a	\$45.00	n/a
Santa Cruz, California	7.5	\$1.00	n/a	\$3.00	\$40.00	n/a
Reno, Nevada	8.3	\$1.25	\$1.25	\$3.75	\$40.00	n/a
Fresno, California	13.5	\$1.00	\$0.85	n/a	\$35.00	n/a
<b>Eugene, Oregon</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>\$1.25</b>	<b>\$1.00</b>	<b>\$2.50</b>	<b>\$35.00</b>	<b>\$85 (3-month)</b>
South Bend, Indiana		\$0.75	n/a	n/a	\$30.00	n/a
Vancouver, Washington	4.9	\$1.00	n/a	\$3.00	\$28.00	\$308 (annual)
Boise, Idaho	1.1	\$0.75	\$0.70	n/a	\$27.00	n/a
Ann Arbor, Michigan	4.3	\$0.75	n/a	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Lansing, Michigan	6.5	\$1.00	\$0.85	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Bakersfield, California	5	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$1.75	\$25.00	n/a
Olympia, Washington	3	\$0.75	n/a	\$1.50	\$25.00	n/a
Spokane, Washington	8.8	\$0.75	\$0.75	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Charelston, South Carolina	3.9	\$1.00	\$0.80	\$3.00	\$22.00	\$28 (40 rides)
Corpus Christi, Texas	6	\$0.50	\$0.50	n/a	\$20.00	n/a
Salem, Oregon	4.3	\$0.75	\$0.75	n/a	\$20.00	n/a

Data collected through transit district Web site information

Average	6.4	\$0.91	\$0.86	\$2.64	\$29.19	
---------	-----	--------	--------	--------	---------	--

## Comparison of Fare Media Prices UNCC Peer Group

Agency	Annual Ridership (Million Rides)	Adult Cash Fare	Token or Single Ride Fare	Daily Pass	Adult Monthly Pass	Adult Multi-Month Pass
Santa Barbara, California	7.5	\$1.00	\$1.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
Tacoma, Washington	12	\$1.25	\$1.14	n/a	\$45.00	n/a
Santa Cruz, California	7.5	\$1.00	n/a	\$3.00	\$40.00	n/a
Reno, Nevada	8.3	\$1.25	\$1.25	\$3.75	\$40.00	n/a
Fresno, California	13.5	\$1.00	\$0.85	n/a	\$35.00	n/a
<b>Eugene, Oregon</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>\$1.25</b>	<b>\$1.00</b>	<b>\$2.50</b>	<b>\$35.00</b>	<b>\$85 (3-month)</b>
South Bend, Indiana		\$0.75	n/a	n/a	\$30.00	n/a
<b>Average</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>\$0.91</b>	<b>\$0.86</b>	<b>\$2.64</b>	<b>\$29.19</b>	
Vancouver, Washington	4.9	\$1.00	n/a	\$3.00	\$28.00	\$308 (annual)
Boise, Idaho	1.1	\$0.75	\$0.70	n/a	\$27.00	n/a
<b>Median</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>\$1.00</b>	<b>\$0.83</b>	<b>\$3.00</b>	<b>\$26.00</b>	
Ann Arbor, Michigan	4.3	\$0.75	n/a	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Lansing, Michigan	6.5	\$1.00	\$0.85	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Bakersfield, California	5	\$0.75	\$0.75	\$1.75	\$25.00	n/a
Olympia, Washington	3	\$0.75	n/a	\$1.50	\$25.00	n/a
Spokane, Washington	8.8	\$0.75	\$0.75	n/a	\$25.00	n/a
Charelston, South Carolina	3.9	\$1.00	\$0.80	\$3.00	\$22.00	\$28 (40 rides)
Corpus Christi, Texas	6	\$0.50	\$0.50	n/a	\$20.00	n/a
Salem, Oregon	4.3	\$0.75	\$0.75	n/a	\$20.00	n/a

Data collected through transit district Web site information

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**Pricing Proposal Summary**

**Effective 7/01/02**

**TYPE OF FARE:**

**Cash Fare**

	<b>Current:</b>	<b>Proposed:</b>
<b>Adult</b>	\$1.25	\$1.25
<b>Youth</b>	\$0.60	\$0.60
<b>Child</b>	\$0.60	\$0.60
<b>Reduced</b>	\$0.60	\$0.60
<b>Senior</b>	\$0.60	\$0.60

**Passes**

<b>Adult</b>		
1-Month:	<b>\$28.00</b>	<b>\$35.00</b>
3-Month:	<b>\$65.00</b>	<b>\$85.00</b>
<b>Youth</b>		
1-Month:	<b>\$14.00</b>	<b>\$17.50</b>
3-Month:	<b>\$32.50</b>	<b>\$42.50</b>
<b>Child, Senior, Reduced</b>		
1-Month:	<b>\$14.00</b>	<b>\$17.50</b>
3-Month:	<b>\$32.50</b>	<b>\$42.50</b>
<b>Day Pass</b>	\$2.50	\$2.50
<b>Tokens</b>		
Adult	<b>\$0.85</b>	<b>\$1.00</b>
Other	<b>\$0.42</b>	<b>\$0.50</b>
<b>Group Pass</b>	4.1%	<b>6%</b>
<b>LCC Term Pass</b>	<b>\$43.00</b>	<b>\$54.00</b>

**RideSource** (Staff Proposal)

	<b>Current:</b>	<b>Proposed:</b>
<b>Regular</b>	\$2.00	<b>\$2.50</b>
<b>Escort</b>	\$2.00	<b>\$2.50</b>
<b>Shopper</b>	\$2.00	<b>\$2.00</b> *
<i>10 Tickets</i>	\$15.00	<b>\$20.00</b>

**RideSource** (STAC Proposal)

<b>Regular</b>	\$2.00	<b>\$2.50</b>
<b>Escort</b>	\$2.00	<b>\$2.50</b>
<b>Shopper</b>	\$2.00	<b>\$2.00</b> *
<i>10 Tickets</i>	\$15.00	<b>\$20.00</b>

\*Round-trip fare

**Sales Outlets**

<b>Passes</b>	<b>Discount</b>	<b>Discount</b>
0-500+	10.0%	10.0%
<b>Token Packets</b>		
0-500+	10.0%	10.0%

Projected Revenues Based on Proposed 2002/2003 Fare Changes

	Annual Sales	Current Price	Revenue	Projected Sales	Proposed Price	Projected Revenue	Difference
Adult Monthly	32515	\$28	\$910,420	29264	\$35	\$1,024,223	\$113,803
Youth Monthly	18092	\$14	\$253,288	16283	\$17.50	\$284,949	\$31,661
Reduced Fare Monthly	5984	\$14	\$83,776	5386	\$17.50	\$94,248	\$10,472
Senior/Child Monthly	2113	\$14	\$29,582	1902	\$17.50	\$33,280	\$3,698
Adult 3 Month	1287	\$65	\$83,655	1158	\$85	\$98,456	\$14,801
Youth 3 Month	2392	\$32.50	\$77,740	2153	\$42.50	\$91,494	\$13,754
Reduced Fare 3 Month	1153	\$32.50	\$37,473	1038	\$42.50	\$44,102	\$6,630
Senior/Child 3 Month	628	\$32.50	\$20,410	565	\$42.50	\$24,021	\$3,611
Adult Tokens	152804	\$0.85	\$129,883	143636	\$1	\$143,636	\$13,752
Reduced Tokens	66696	\$0.42	\$28,012	62694	\$0.50	\$31,347	\$3,335
LCC Term Pass	7200	\$43	\$309,600	6048	\$54	\$326,592	\$16,992
Group Pass Revenue			\$375,000			\$535,800	\$160,800
Estimated Additional Revenue							\$393,308

Media Type	Adult Price	Cost per Trip*	Monthly Cost	Percent Discount
Cash	\$1.25	\$1.25	\$50.00	0%
Tokens	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$40.00	20%
Monthly Pass	\$35.00	\$0.88	\$35.00	30%
3 Month Pass	\$85.00	\$0.71	\$28.33	43%

\* Based on 40 trips per month



## Fare Media Relationships

Media Type	Adult Price	Cost per Trip*	Monthly Cost*	Percent Discount
Cash	\$1.25	\$1.25	\$50.00	0%
Tokens	\$1.00	\$1.00	\$40.00	20%
Monthly Pass	\$35.00	\$0.88	\$35.00	30%
3 Month Pass	\$85.00	\$0.71	\$28.33	43%

\* Based on 40 trips per month

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** DECEMBER FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

**PREPARED BY:** Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** Financial results for the sixth month of the fiscal year are summarized in the attached reports.

Passenger fare receipts were strong in December and have more than made up the previous year-to-date negative variance. Six-month results are now \$4,300 ahead of budget expectation and 1 percent ahead of the same period last fiscal year. Group pass receipts were soft in December and now lag the budget goal year-to-date by more than \$16,000 due to the closure of technology businesses over the summer. Year-to-date revenue from this source is 3.5 percent below the same period last year. Rate increases for many of the participant contracts effective January 1, 2002, will partially mitigate this negative variance. However, the largest group pass contract, Associated Students of the University of Oregon (ASUO), will not see a rate increase until next fall. At that time, the rate will increase 25 percent.

No payroll tax revenue was anticipated in December, and none was received. The year-to-date negative budget variance remains about \$110,000. Disbursements for the quarter that ended December 31 are due in February. If the revenue trend does not improve, this important resource could show a shortfall in excess of \$300,000 by fiscal year end. LTD has repaid the funds disbursed by the State in error in November.

Self-employment tax receipts are about as anticipated by the budget year-to-date. State-in-lieu receipts are more than \$35,000 ahead of plan for the first six months due to strong enrollment, and therefore employment, at the University of Oregon.

Interest income for December was down as compared with both budget and prior year. The year-to-year comparison continues to show the effect of rate reductions that have substantially reduced earning potential in the last several months. In addition, the current-year budget anticipated the investment of bond or other debt sale proceeds, with earnings spread over the entire fiscal year. No action has been taken on debt financing to date, so debt expense savings offset lower interest earnings to some extent. Debt research and analysis continue. Rates continue to be favorable.

All other General Fund revenue sources are generally as anticipated through December. As previously reported, Obie Communications, which is LTD's bus advertising contractor, has requested renegotiation of its contract in order to reduce the revenue guarantee to LTD. In December, Obie proposed new terms, which are under consideration. LTD has requested detailed financial reports in order to determine the effect of the economic slowdown on local and national advertising revenues. Obie Communications has continued to meet its contractual obligations to LTD while the discussion continues.

Personnel services expenses for administration employees are on track to finish the fiscal year under budget due to restructuring implemented in November. Contract employee wages are over budget year-to-date and likely to finish the current year significantly over budget. The Long-Range Financial Plan (LRFP), currently in development, anticipates this negative variance, and that the first opportunity to make improvements to operating efficiency and any changes to operating schedules will be with fall 2002 service.

The Finance Committee reviewed a draft of the proposed Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) at its January 7 meeting and discussed operating components of the LRFP. As previously reported to the Board, long-term financial health, including the ability to resume transfers from operations to support capital projects, requires that expenditure growth be slowed to rates less than or equal to those of annual revenue growth. Administration staff and materials and services reductions were the first steps in the current year, but the result will not be enough to balance the General Fund in the next three years. As reported to the Finance Committee, staff are now looking at ways to trim \$1,000,000 from fixed-route service in FY 2002-03 through a combination of increases in service efficiency, service changes, and service reductions. The Board Finance Committee will meet again to review the proposed CIP and LRFP, as well as review service options for next year, on February 5. The full Board will consider these items at the February meeting.

Year-to-date materials and services expenditures are down versus budget and prior period due in part to lower fuel costs, but primarily because a significant transfer of excess operating reserves was made to the Capital Fund last year, which was a one-time event. The current-year budget pared planned non-personnel expenses as part of the effort to trim operating costs in anticipation of the slower economy. Additional reductions in this expense category are anticipated. Please note that the recent reorganization has moved some programs to new departments and may temporarily result in reporting anomalies. These anomalies will be corrected when the new financial systems go live in early February and as time permits prior activity restatement.

Also please note that due to unanticipated premium expense and unusually high current-year claims, insurance will be over budget by more than \$300,000 by fiscal year end. This line item will increase significantly next year due to the effect of September 11 events.

Special Transportation Fund expenses are as anticipated through December. It was previously noted that a supplemental budget might be required to complete the transition of this program. It has since been determined that, because all of the additional activity is in the Capital Fund, existing appropriations are sufficient for the current fiscal year.

December Capital Fund expenses also are as anticipated. Progress on individual capital projects will be reported to the Board as separate items.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attached are the following financial reports for Board review:

1. Operating Financial Report - comparison to prior year
2. Monthly Financial Report Comments
3. Comparative Balance Sheets
  - a. General Fund
  - b. Special Transportation Fund
  - c. Capital Projects Fund
4. Income Statements
  - a. General Fund
  - b. Special Transportation Fund
  - c. Capital Projects Fund

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

None

## MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT COMMENTS

January 16, 2002

### Revenue:

- **Passenger fares**, not including group pass receipts, improved in December and are now on budget for the year. Ridership is up 3.5 percent in the most recent twelve months. The group pass program has been affected by downsizing on the part of major participants. Although Hynix has recalled some employees ahead of schedule and may recall additional employees, the company is not expected to resume group pass program participation.
- **Special service** receipts caught up in December. Ridership was up significantly for the Lane County Fair and has been strong through all six University of Oregon home football games.
- **Payroll and self-employment tax revenue** has been reported on the cash basis, as in prior years. After LTD staff questioned the amounts and patterns of year-to-date disbursements from the Oregon Department of Revenue (ODOR), it was determined that \$1,019,649 has been paid to LTD in error through November. This amount has been fully repaid to ODOR. Payroll tax year-to-date receipts are now 1.8 percent below the same period of the prior year. If the local economy does not show improvement, a payroll tax shortfall in excess of \$300,000 could be realized by fiscal year end.

### Expense:

- **Administration personnel** dropped in December after a November increase. The November jump in growth was due to the termination of ten administrative positions, which resulted in payments for accrued leave and severance. This expense category is expected to show a positive budget variance through fiscal year end.
- **Contract personnel** expenses are over budget year-to-date, and show an 11.3 percent increase over the previous year due to contract changes, net service additions, and increased overtime.
- **Materials and services** expenses generally are as anticipated by the budget. There were some timing anomalies in how the budget anticipated expenses by month, and expenses have not been restated for organizational structure changes made in November.
- **Capital** expenses also are as anticipated by the budget. Phase 1 BRT grant funds were obligated before the September 30 deadline.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** This agenda item provides a formal opportunity for Board members to make announcements or to suggest topics for current or future Board meetings.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** WORK SESSION: FY 2002-2003 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW

**PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Development Services Department

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Discuss potential bus service changes that will achieve the District's budget targets.

**BACKGROUND:** The annual route review is a process that allows the District to evaluate the effectiveness and the efficiency of current fixed-route bus service.

Typically, the process involves a number of steps:

- ❑ Input from a number of sources. Bus operators provide valuable information about routes that are having timing difficulties that result in missed transfers. Guest Service staff provide feedback that they have received from customers. Customers comment on transfer and timing issues, and have many ideas for new service.
- ❑ Analysis of options. Planning staff take the information and add their own ideas on efficiencies that can be attained. When all the information is reviewed, the staff prioritizes it according to the available resources.
- ❑ Review by the Board. Additional input is sought from our guests and a final package is brought before the Board. The Board reviews the information and accepts public testimony at two Board meetings in February and March.
- ❑ Integration into the budget. Service changes result in changes in staffing levels that relate directly to the personal services portion of the budget.
- ❑ Implementation occurs in September.

This year's process is somewhat different than processes during the past twenty years. This year the emphasis will be on reductions in service to meet budgetary needs. This is not to say that there will be no changes on the "additions" side of the list. There may be system needs, such as additional peak-hour trips or additional running-time necessary to ensure transfers are made. The final product will be a prioritized list that will provide the Board an opportunity to make reductions in increments of approximately 1 percent. As the magnitude of reductions grows, the

increments may become greater in order to maintain consistency in service.

Due to the potential magnitude of service reductions, staff would like the Board to affirm or provide direction in a number of areas:

1. Rural Service – Staff believe that rural services should be maintained at the current level. Rural service costs are covered through current tax receipts and therefore staff recommend that lifeline levels of service be maintained.
2. Productivity versus Coverage – Does the Board want to maintain the 75 percent productivity, 20 percent coverage, and 5 percent discretionary split in the service hours?
3. Does the Board have a particular interest in seeing changes within one specific service type? These types include:
  - Frequency of service – How often does the bus run?
  - Span of service – How early does the route start and end?
  - Coverage – How far into neighborhoods does the route operate?
  - Day – Is weekday service more important than weekend service?

**ATTACHMENTS:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** BUDGET COMMITTEE NOMINATIONS

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** LTD Budget Committee members are nominated and approved by the Board members and serve for three-year terms. Budget Committee members must reside within the District's service boundaries, but are not required to live in the same subdistrict as the Board member making the appointment.

The terms of Michael Bean, Elaine Guard, and Pamela Papp expired on January 1, 2002. These positions all need to be filled before budget deliberations begin in April. Board members Hillary Wylie, Dave Kleger, and Pat Hocken will be presenting nominations for the Board's consideration at the February 20 or March 20, 2002, Board meeting.

**ATTACHMENT:** LTD Budget Committee Member List

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** BUDGET COMMITTEE NOMINATION

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Reappointment of Michael Bean to LTD Budget Committee

**BACKGROUND:** LTD Budget Committee members are nominated and approved by the Board members and serve for three-year terms. Budget Committee members must reside within the District's service boundaries, but are not required to live in the same subdistrict as the Board member making the appointment.

The terms of Michael Bean, Elaine Guard, and Pamela Papp expired on January 1, 2002. These positions all need to be filled before budget deliberations begin in April. Board members Hillary Wylie, Dave Kleger, and Pat Hocken are charged with presenting nominations for the Board's consideration. Ms. Wylie has chosen to nominate Michael Bean to fill a second term on the Budget Committee, and he has expressed his interest in doing so. His nomination form is attached.

**ATTACHMENT:** Nomination for Budget Committee—Michael Bean

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move the following resolution: LTD Resolution No. 2002-002: It is hereby resolved that Michael Bean is reappointed to the LTD Budget Committee for a second three-year term, beginning immediately and ending January 1, 2005.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2002\01\Regular Mtg\BC nom summary-Bean.doc

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** December 19, 2001
- ITEM TITLE:** BOARD MEMBER REPORTS
- PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board
- ACTION REQUESTED:** None
- BACKGROUND:** Board members have been appointed to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), and on occasion are appointed to other local or regional committees. Board members also will present testimony at public hearings on specific issues as the need arises. After meetings, public hearings, or other activities attended by individual Board members on behalf of LTD, time will be scheduled on the next Board meeting agenda for an oral report by the Board member. The following activities have occurred since the last Board meeting:
1. **Metropolitan Policy Committee:** MPC meetings are held on the second Thursday of each month. LTD's MPC representatives are Board members Hillary Wylie and Gerry Gaydos. The January 10 MPC meeting was canceled. MPC last met on December 13, 2001, and is scheduled to meet again on February 14, 2002.
  2. **BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee:** Board members Gerry Gaydos, Pat Hocken, and Hillary Wylie are participating on LTD's BRT Steering Committee with members of local units of government and community representatives. The three LTD Board members also meet separately as the Board BRT Committee. At the Board meeting, they can provide a report on the January 8 Board BRT Committee and BRT Steering Committee meetings. The Steering Committee is scheduled to meet again on February 5, 2002.
  3. **Statewide Livability Forum:** Board member Virginia Lauritsen is participating on a statewide committee called the Livability Forum, as one of 12 participants from the Eugene/Springfield area. The committee has been meeting once every six months, and last met in April 2001. There is no report this month.
  4. **Board Finance Committee:** The Board Finance Committee (Chair Pat Hocken, Gerry Gaydos, and Virginia Lauritsen) met on January 7 and will have a report for the full Board at the February 16 meeting.
- ATTACHMENT:** None
- PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** CORRESPONDENCE

**PREPARED BY:** Ken Hamm, General Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**ATTACHMENTS:** The attached correspondence is included for the Board's information:

- ◆ ???

At the January 16, 2002, meeting, staff will respond to any questions the Board members may have about this correspondence.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, December 19, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 13, 2001, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, December 19, 2001, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Rob Bennett, Vice President  
Hillary Wylie, President, presiding  
Patricia Hocken  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Virginia Lauritsen, Secretary  
Robert Melnick  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Gerry Gaydos

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT/ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:**

•Ms. Wylie stated that this was Rob Bennett's last Board meeting and that there would be a special recognition of Mr. Bennett later in the meeting. •Mr. Kleger noted that his term on the Board officially would end at the end of the month, and he would be continuing in service until an appointment was made for his position. He had applied for reappointment and, although he felt he had had his turn, if no other qualified candidate was found, he would be willing to continue to serve for another term. •Ms. Wylie shared with the Board an invitation from Mayor Torrey to the Eugene State of the City address on Wednesday, January 9, at 4 p.m. at the Hult Center, and an invitation to the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) appreciation dinner on Thursday, January 17.

**WORK SESSION—SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM:** Special Transportation Program Administrator Terry Parker introduced Fred Stoffer, the general manager of Special Mobility Service (SMS), a regional paratransit service provider with its main offices in Portland. She also introduced David Braunschweiger, the local program manager in the Eugene SMS office, and Jan Aho, a member of the Special Transportation Advisory Committee, who served as the program manager for the Families with Special Needs program at Pearl Buck.

Ms. Parker said that she wanted to provide the Board with an overview, or the "big picture," of the Special Transportation Program, rather than addressing a specific issue or question. She said it was a growing, dynamic program that was affecting the budget because of its growth, so it was timely to provide more information for the Board.

Ms. Parker said that when the program transferred from LCOG to LTD the previous July, she was able to better see the program as a whole, as a family of accessible services, rather than as

individual programs. She used a PowerPoint presentation to describe these services, and provided a history of the services and funding. She explained in-district and out-of-district services, and described the range of services available, from the fixed-route services for the most independent persons with disabilities, to the door-through-door services for the least independent. She stated that since the early 1980s, LTD's Special Transportation Program basically had responded to two needs in the community. One was that there were more people in the community at a more frail level who needed transportation, especially as people became de-institutionalized as a result of a new emphasis on enabling people with disabilities to live in the least-restrictive environment, resulting in more and different housing arrangements. The other was the need to create a range of options for people, in order to create the most independent setting in terms of transportation, similar to changes in the housing environment.

Ms. Parker also discussed the DMN Enterprise Report, *Assessment and Review of the Lane Transit District ADA Mandated Paratransit Services and Associated RideSource Services*, which had been distributed to the Board. It reviewed the things RideSource did well, and what could be done to be even more productive and gain some efficiencies in the system. The report showed that RideSource did not have too many problems, and already did more than most systems in terms of putting many pieces together for a comprehensive package of services and funding. In fact, LTD's RideSource system was a model for other systems. However, Ms. Parker was interested in knowing where to concentrate her efforts next, so received some suggestions from the consultant, David Norstrom. Suggested areas to focus on included demand management, since demand recently had been increasing; reviewing contracts and fares with other agencies to be sure those were not increasing demand; more special routes and coordination of routes, especially to the most frequent destinations; trip reduction; consistent eligibility; better reports and regular analysis; and improved efficiencies, particularly through the operating policies. Ms. Parker was working with SMS on ways to be even more efficient in providing trips.

Ms. Parker currently was working on three projects: Willamalane Senior Center collaboration with RideSource to reduce duplication of service; Oakridge service coordination and a possible vanpool; and the potential for service routes to frequent destinations.

Ms. Wylie asked about costs that had increased by about one-third, versus ridership increases of about 8,000 rides since 1997. Ms. Parker explained that the driver pay rates had been below \$8 an hour and turnover had been high. During a five-year period, the rate had been increased to \$10 per hour, and some benefits had been added. She said that the Board would not see the same kind of increase in the current economy.

Mr. Bennett said that the executive summary talked about RideSource's lower productivity than the peer group average. Ms. Parker said that RideSource did some grouping of rides, but not enough. Service routes were about that very thing: finding places where a lot of people were going to go on their own time, unlike medical appointments, and grouping those trips; that is, finding frequent destinations that have patterns and providing incentives for people to change their behaviors to use those grouped trips, rather than scheduling individual trips.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Kleger if this all made sense to him. Mr. Kleger said that it did. He said that incremental improvement had been going on for the entire life of the program, and that LTD did much better than the comparators around the country because LTD continued to be vigilant. Ms. Parker added that a decrease in productivity also had to do with mileage, since RideSource now had more destinations in the northern part of the service area and to the west, all

within the last few years. She noted that due to the high use of the fixed-route service by people with disabilities, RideSource served riders with more needs and who were likely to be less capable than riders in similar programs around the country.

The Board thanked Ms. Parker for her presentation and her work. Mr. Melnick commented that the scope of what Ms. Parker was doing was impressive. Mr. Hamm stated that he had worked with a number of organizations and private contractors, and he thought the partnership that LTD had with Special Mobility Services as the RideSource provider was exceptional. He said that SMS was a positive partner. He congratulated them for winning the bid to continue to provide the service, and said that he looked forward to continuing the partnership.

The work session ended at 6:25 p.m. Ms. Wylie called the meeting back to order at 6:38 p.m. after a brief break.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Richard Williams, the January 2002 Employee of the Month. Mr. Williams had come to LTD after 20 years' experience with BTA in San Jose, as an operator, supervisor, and instructor. Mr. Johnson described Mr. Williams as a great driver with compassion for his passengers. Mr. Williams had received several nominations for this award. The most recent nomination was from a rider, who appreciated Mr. Williams' extra efforts in getting off the bus and retrieving a tote bag that she had left at the bus stop,

Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Williams with a pin, a monetary award, and a certificate of appreciation. Mr. Williams said it was a real honor to be selected as the Employee of the Month; with so many hardworking people at LTD, he was honored to be nominated among such a great crew.

**SPECIAL AWARD:** Mr. Johnson also introduced Bus Operator Gary Bennett, whose actions led to the quick arrest of the primary suspect in a murder (stabbing) that had occurred. Officers from the Eugene Police Department presented Mr. Bennett with a Citizen Service Award, which read:

On December 10, 2001, a homicide occurred in the city of Eugene. The suspect was quickly identified but fled the scene to avoid apprehension. Using the suspect's description given to you by the Eugene Police Department, you located the suspect in the area of Roosevelt Blvd and Bethel Drive. You immediately notified police and your observations provided them with the suspect's location. Because of your quick decision to become involved, a dangerous individual was apprehended. In recognition of your outstanding observations and willingness to assist police, we present you with this Citizen's Service Award (signed, Chief James Hill).

The officers said that the man arrested had recently been released from jail where he had been serving time for attempted murder for a previous stabbing. They were very glad to have been able to get him off the streets very quickly, as they believed him to be extremely dangerous.

Ms. Wylie also presented a certificate to Gary Bennett, which read:

Lane Transit District Appreciation Award to Gary Bennett—In appreciation for your attention to duty, outstanding teamwork, and service to the community for your role

in apprehending a suspect wanted by the Eugene Police Department on December 10, 2001.

She congratulated Mr. Bennett and also presented him with a monetary award from LTD. Mr. Bennett thanked the Board and Police Department, stating that while he was appreciative of the recognition, he was just doing his job and that this award really should be a team award since many people were involved in the situation, including supervisors/dispatchers who took the message and request for help from EPD and relayed the information to the bus operators, the arresting officer, and those who were on the scene of the murder. He said he just made a phone call, and asked everyone to join him in applauding the officers who put their lives on the line every day to make the community safer for everyone.

Mr. Hamm added that while he agreed that the team effort in this situation was very good, Mr. Bennett's performance was above the normal duties of a bus operator. He said that for a driver to make the extra effort to pay careful attention to the messages received, remember the details of the description of a suspect, and then watch for this person, with all of the other things that a driver must attend to, was extraordinary. Therefore, the District had wanted to recognize Gary Bennett for his individual efforts in this instance.

**SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF BOARD MEMBER ROB BENNETT:** Ms. Wylie noted that this was Rob Bennett's last meeting as an LTD Board member. She said she wanted to celebrate him as a Board member and stated her respect for him. She was pleased and honored to have served with him, and always counted on him and appreciated his input, as well as the fact that he was willing to make telephone calls, go to meetings, or do whatever else was asked of him. She said that the District would miss him terribly, and thanked him on LTD's and her own behalf. She presented him with the traditional wooden bus, and asked Mr. Hamm and the other Board members for comments.

Mr. Hamm, in representing the interests of the staff as a whole, told Mr. Bennett that his vision, commitment, spirit, and staying the course on things he believed in all were invaluable, and part of the reason that LTD had some success as a District. He said that Mr. Bennett had driven LTD to achieve things that it maybe would not have achieved otherwise. He said that Mr. Bennett was appreciated and that the District would miss him, but also would rely on his presence in the community and his continued commitment to the vision he had helped set.

Mr. Kleger wanted to express his personal appreciation for the last eight years. He said it had been a delight to work with Mr. Bennett, and he appreciated the fact that Mr. Bennett could disagree agreeably. He also appreciated Mr. Bennett's constant forward looking, and thanked him very much.

Ms. Hocken thanked Mr. Bennett that for a marvelous job of bringing to the Board an appreciation for good business practices and a community vision.

Mr. Bennett said that he had been in community service a long time and had gotten a lot of value out of it. He believed that people got more out of the process than they gave. He said that the LTD Board was no exception; he had had an opportunity to meet and work with people with many different backgrounds and perspectives, and who had lent him a lot of wisdom. He said that when he first came on the Board he did not think the staff would be as good as they were; he had worked over the years in the private sector and thought staff would be adequate and not



impressive, but he was very glad to be wrong. With the important issues and initiatives that LTD had been trying to make happen, he said, it would not work without a staff who were really good. Also, while doing what he could in the community as a board member, he needed staff backup. He complimented the staff as a whole, and several staff members individually, including Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn, Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano, Finance Manager Diane Hellekson, and Service Planning & Marketing Administrator Andy Vobora. He said that he had been fortunate not only with other Board members, but also with staff who had tried to support him in what he tried to accomplish. He was hopeful that the things the Board believed to be important would carry on and be successful.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Ms. Wylie asked for comments from any member of the audience. There were none.

**MOTION**        **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved LTD Resolution No. 2001-043: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for December 19, 2001, is approved as presented." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the November 16-17, 2001, Special Board Meeting/Strategic Planning Work Session; minutes of the November 19, 2001, Special Board Meeting; and the minutes of the November 21, 2001, canceled Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Hocken asked to make one small correction on page 8 of the November 19 Board minutes, in the fourth paragraph. She believed that the sentence, "Mr. Swank said that LTD's financials would change the least of any entity that the District was associated with" should be changed to read ". . . of any entity that the auditors were associated with." Mr. Kleger and

**VOTE**        Mr. Melnick accepted the amendment, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**SPECIAL SERVICE POLICY REVISION:** Mr. Vobora noted that at the Board's November strategic planning retreat, they had discussed this change as a possible revenue-generating strategy. Staff then discussed it with the Board Finance Committee, who told Mr. Vobora to move ahead. The recommended language change would allow the District to charge events for the extra costs associated with those events that required a great deal more effort to implement. Ms. Hocken, as Finance Committee chair, said she thought it was a move in the right direction to recover costs for large-scale events, and that this change would affect from five to ten events. Mr. Vobora said that he was working with Finance to develop a rate for each large group on an individual basis. The main four events affected by the change would be the Lane County Fair, the Oregon Country Fair, and University of Oregon (UO) football and basketball. He had talked with each agency about a change. This change did not affect the District's fare ordinance.

**MOTION**        Ms. Hocken moved LTD Resolution No. 2001-044: "It is hereby resolved that the Lane Transit District Special Service Policy be amended to reflect a pricing structure that establishes the Community Service rate as a base and that additional costs be charged for events exceeding this

**VOTE**        rate." Ms. Lauritsen seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous voice vote, 6 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**SPRINGFIELD STATION DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE:** Ms. Wylie noted that a revised page 29 of the agenda packet had been handed out, with a corrected recommended committee membership list. Springfield Station Project Manager Charlie Simmons explained that at the August meeting, the Board had approved the formation of a Springfield Station Design Review Committee. The Springfield City Council had appointed Councilor Tammy Fitch to the committee, and the Historic Commission had named John Tuttle. He said that an agreement had been

reached with the design team, and it was expected that work would begin on this project after the first of the year.

Ms. Wylie said that she would ask Councilor Fitch if she would be willing to chair the committee.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-045: The LTD Board of Directors hereby approves the recommended list of persons for membership on the Springfield Station Design Review Committee." Mr. Kleger seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous voice vote, 6 to 0, with Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**APPOINTMENT TO BRT STEERING COMMITTEE AND BOARD BRT COMMITTEE:**

Mr. Viggiano noted that this had been on the agenda for the November Board meeting but postponed because Ms. Wylie had not been present. Ms. Wylie explained that Mr. Bennett would be leaving the committee, and she and Ms. Hocken would remain. She said she had asked Ms. Hocken to chair both the Steering Committee and the Board BRT Committee. She also planned to talk with Mr. Gaydos to see if he would have the time to serve as the third Board member on these two committees. She stated that frequently the LTD Board committee had to meet with staff, and it was her opinion that the chair of the Steering Committee should be at those meetings, so it made the most sense to her to have a Board member act as chair of both committees. She added that she would miss Mr. Bennett, who had a tremendous amount of passion for bus rapid transit, on these committees.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING**

**Commuter Solutions Program Report:** Mr. Hamm noted that the Commuter Solutions program provided the framework for the relationship between LTD and the other partners, including Lane County and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, regarding transportation demand management (TDM) issues. An advisory committee, a subcommittee of the Transportation Planning Committee, oversaw the function, which was funded by a state grant of Section 5307 formula funds. The entire 11 percent local match historically had been paid by LTD. With the District's current budget shortfall, and because LTD did not have total control over the project even though it paid the entire match, Mr. Hamm had asked Commuter Solutions Program Manager Connie Bloom Williams to talk to the partners about dividing the match into fourths. He said that transportation demand management was a big part of the TransPlan. If the three other partners did not contribute a share of the match, LTD would have to decide if it wanted to continue paying the entire match. Staff believed that the partnership was important. LTD historically had housed Ms. Williams and another staff person at the District. Even though her position was funded by the grant, Ms. Williams was an LTD employee for all intents and purposes; for instance, she was part of LTD's benefits program.

Mr. Hamm explained that when the District was making staffing reductions as part of the budget cutting measures, the position that supported Ms. Williams was cut from the budget. The advisory committee had decided that it wanted to fund a second position from the grant, so it could move ahead with its TDM agenda. Therefore, the committee recommended adjusting the grant expenditures in order to add a TDM assistant position.

Mr. Bennett asked who was on the advisory committee. Ms. Williams called the Board's attention to a chart on page 40 of the agenda packet. Each TPC member agency was represented by a staff person on the committee.

Ms. Hocken asked if the subcommittee was recommending that the grant budget be adjusted. Mr. Hamm replied that the former position increased LTD's participation beyond the match amount, and LTD no longer could afford that, so had eliminated that position. The committee now would be reallocating some grant funding to a lower position within its own budget structure. Ms. Hocken asked if the District's general fund subsidy would be eliminated from the budget and not increased again. Mr. Hamm stated that, beginning in FY 2002-03, LTD's commitment would be only its contribution to the match.

In response to a question from Ms. Lauritsen, Ms. Williams explained that the new position would be reclassified to a lower classification, and that the benefits would be included in the grant funding. She added that if the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) cut the STIP funding for TDM, there would be no program and the partners would be responsible for implementing TDM strategies in TransPlan. She had been planning to discuss the local match with the TPC on December 13, but that meeting had been canceled, so they would be discussing this at a later date.

Ms. Williams then provided an update of what was occurring with the TDM program. She said that the planning goals for the strategic plan had been refined to parallel what was happening in TransPlan, and discussed the six major goals included on pages 33 through 39 of the agenda packet. The six major regional goals were to increase participation in alternative modes; advocate for use of parking management strategies; implement TDM strategies in congested areas; create a TDM infrastructure supported by regional jurisdictions; effectively use resources to advance the Commuter Solutions program goals, including finding new funding sources; and to put some energy and focus into public involvement, keeping other jurisdictions and special interest groups informed. The planning goals fell into four areas: technical assistance and services; education and awareness; research; and issues around policy, whether local, state, or related to federal tax incentive proposals. Services through the program included carpools, vanpools, bus pass programs, biking and walking promotions, use of transit vouchers, promoting and educating about telecommuting, education and creative work schedules, management and promotion of Park & Rides, guaranteed ride home programs, parking management, marketing, and research. Ms. Williams said that she was very enthusiastic about the possibilities for what could happen when bringing together planning, land use, incentive programs, and smart business practices, all based on philosophies of improving the quality of life. She believed that there was a lot of potential in this program, and that there were some great partners in the community.

Ms. Williams introduced Tom Schwetz of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG), who had been involved in TransPlan from the beginning. He discussed LCOG's new TGM grant that will look into how to implement the TDM strategies in TransPlan. He stated that TDM policies had been in TransPlan and earlier plans for a long time, including a former carpooling program. He added that if it were not for the TDM program, the community would not have its current awareness about TDM, nor the TDM policies in TransPlan.

Mr. Bennett said that he had always had questions about the effectiveness of Commuter Solutions and whether it had warranted that sort of budget, but had not spoken out more about it because it was not being funded from LTD's general fund budget, but was being funded by a source who thought it was an important initiative. Even with some success in vanpools and

carpools, he had a hard time determining the cost-benefit. He said that this was the first time he had seen Goal 2 regarding parking management, which he thought was highly controversial. If he were to remain on the Board, he said, he would make a big issue out of that goal. He thought that Springfield had no interest in it at all, and that it probably was low on Lane County's agenda. He was glad that there was more partner involvement now, if that was the direction the community was going to go.

Mr. Schwetz said that Mr. Bennett was correct, and that one of the reasons there was interest in making this truly regional was that the local area needed to anticipate ODOT's dropping some form of the program. He said that if there was policy interest on the part of the partners, they needed to start looking at not only part of the match, but some substantive funding. He said he would guess that there would be controversy associated with many of these goals, but particularly the second one, and that Mr. Bennett probably was right that there was not a lot of interest in parking management in Springfield.

Ms. Lauritsen said that maybe someone should ask Springfield. She thought that they would be very interested because they were talking about putting in extra parking and the City Council was interested in attracting people, not penalizing them. Mr. Schwetz replied that his comments were related to the TransPlan discussion regarding the proposal for the goal related to parking prices, and there was vociferous opposition on the Springfield Council. He said that this was meant to be broader than that pricing category, but that, at a general level, the region needed to be ready to take on more responsibility both in terms of policy guidance and actual funding of the program for the next couple of years.

Mr. Bennett asked Mr. Schwetz if he thought the policy could be effective enough so that LTD and others should get behind it. Mr. Schwetz said that it had potential. Unfortunately, he said, there had been a lot of efforts across the country and it was difficult to sort out what was working and what was not. Staff needed to better assess the performance of what the local area would get out of this goal. He said that this was the information they would need in order to encourage ODOT to maintain its level of support.

Ms. Hocken asked if it was anticipated that the results of the TDM study would be the basis for more specific TDM strategy updates as part of TransPlan. Mr. Schwetz said that was correct. Ms. Hocken then wanted to clarify that it would have to go through the community process and get agreement by the adopting agencies. Mr. Schwetz said that the project needed to be completed over the next two fiscal years and it was anticipated that a review of TransPlan policies would be a year later, but this was meant to feed into that process. Most of the information about the TDM program was in the STIP request, which was a four-year plan, and TransPlan had a 20-year plan, so they were trying to look at a more detailed plan. Ms. Hocken said she thought it would be exciting if someone could figure out what TDM strategies would get more people to ride bus rapid transit (BRT).

Mr. Hamm said he had talked with Ms. Williams about how to measure the success of this program and determine the outcomes for the investment, such as knowing how many people were making the change to ride the bus.

Ms. Williams then discussed various reports and other aspects of the program. She said that performance measures would be a big part of the program, in coordination with LCOG and ODOT. She noted that the Corvallis-to Eugene, Eugene-to-Corvallis, and Eugene-to-Salem vanpools had

saved 1,027,956 vehicle miles traveled on an annual basis. The challenges facing the program were state funding reductions and the reduced staffing available to meet the strategic plan objectives.

In response to Mr. Bennett's comments about Goal 2, Ms. Hocken said that it did not appear that the recommendation was to get into areas that were real controversial. Overall, she said, the TransPlan goal was to go with incentives rather than disincentives for TDM, and she said that she did not know that the LTD Board had said it was supportive of disincentives (as listed in the goals). She thought that maybe someone from LTD should review the goals to make sure LTD was not agreeing to something that the Board had not approved. Ms. Williams said that her perspective was that listing parking strategies meant that conversations would occur about what worked and did not work, what the conflicts were, etc. She thought the role of education and enabling conversations to occur on a regional basis was an important one, even if each entity had a different strategy. However, Ms. Hocken thought that the goal was to advocate for the use of parking management strategies, which was different than educating. Ms. Williams said that the program advocated for the positive ones, such as preferential carpool parking.

Ms. Hocken repeated her request that, since the Board was not asked to adopt the goals but was asked to review them, someone should go back and review the language in that goal to see if it made sense in terms of what the organization had committed to.

Mr. Melnick said he thought the Board should walk through all the goals, even if just to affirm them. Ms. Wylie said that if the Board was supporting them, it needed to approve them, and thought that the Board should compare these with what was in the TransPlan. Ms. Lauritsen asked if the parking management goals were required; Ms. Williams replied that they were not.

**BRT PHASE 1 AND SPRINGFIELD STATION:** Mr. Pangborn used a PowerPoint presentation to discuss Phase 1 construction, including the design process and team, project scope, project schedule, and project budget. Parsons Brinkerhoff would act as the project engineer, with three main subcontractors: Harriet Cherry of WBSG as the lead architect; Chris Hemmer for civil and street design; and Jim Hanks for traffic engineering. There also was an internal "BRT strategy" team of LTD staff, as well as the BRT Steering Committee and the Board BRT Committee. There would be phased design and construction in four corridor sectors: Eugene Station to East 11<sup>th</sup>/Franklin (in cooperation with the City of Eugene), East 11<sup>th</sup>/Franklin to Interstate 5 (in cooperation with the City of Eugene and ODOT), I-5 to the Willamette River bridge in Glenwood, and the Willamette River bridge to the Springfield Station (both in cooperation with ODOT, the City of Springfield). Mr. Pangborn stated that working with different jurisdictions required different standards for signal control, etc., so LTD and those jurisdictions were working toward common standards. This became more difficult with ODOT's requirements for metric measurements and Eugene's requirements to use English measurements.

The scope of the project was four miles and would include two miles of exclusive busways, one mile of mixed, and one mile of intersections along the corridor. There would be seven to eight stations; a bus signal priority system, including 19 existing traffic signals and 4 to 6 new ones; and six BRT vehicles.

Mr. Bennett wondered about the political aspect of saying that when LTD had signal prioritization, that intersection was considered to be essentially under LTD's control. Otherwise, it appeared that LTD had only 50 percent exclusive busways, and he did not think that told the whole

story. Mr. Viggiano said that this definition would result in 65 percent exclusive busways (not 75 percent, because the intersections in Glenwood would be in mixed traffic).

Mr. Bennett said he thought the provision of exclusive busways in Glenwood was extremely important, and that commitment for future busways had been made to LTD. He did not know how legally enforceable this was, but he said it was very important not to forget about that, and he did not want LTD to go to the next phase without this aspect. Mr. Pangborn said that part of the requirement was to design the station with exclusive busways as a precursor to the rest. Mr. Bennett said that north of the junction with Harlow and Pioneer Parkway it would be very difficult to get exclusive right-of-way, so he would talk about that as a strategy and not give it up. He thought that was the key to the future of BRT. Mr. Pangborn agreed that it was the key to the system running effectively over time.

Mr. Pangborn explained that the project scope did not include all Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) software and hardware. The intent was to build the capability into the system, with the opportunity for build-out later.

Design issues included the issue of English versus metric measurement systems and separate design standards in the two cities and the state; a vehicle selection and guidance system; preparation for ITS enhancement; historic trees; and the use of existing or replacement pavement. He said that given what was known currently, the total budget for Phase 1 was \$13.8 million. Mr. Kleger mentioned in comparison that the Portland streetcar project published budget figures of \$42 million to \$68 million. Mr. Pangborn added that the schedule was to build Phase 1 in 2002-04 and to test the system in the summer of 2004.

Mr. Bennett asked if LTD would be responsible for automobile traffic management during construction. Mr. Pangborn said that it would be. There were other issues to coordinate as well, such as ODOT's resurfacing of two bridges to Springfield in the summer of 2003. Mr. Melnick said that LTD should try to avoid even perceived pain from inconvenience to auto drivers, which could affect the success of future segments and phases.

Mr. Melnick commented that the project timeline showed several segments occurring at one time, and he thought there was some argument that those should be overlapping. Mr. Pangborn agreed, stating that one argument for bringing the contractor on board early was to ask how to phase the project segments.

Mr. Pangborn said that the timeline showed a Board decision on buses by the middle of the next year. When building light rail, he said, there was a six-month testing period, so staff had scheduled that at the end of BRT construction, sometime in the spring or summer of 2004.

Ms. Hocken said that with the Eugene Station construction, the Board Eugene Station Committee met once a month to discuss the project, budget, etc. She wondered if that was planned for this project, and if the BRT Steering Committee or the Board BRT Committee would be used for this purpose. Mr. Pangborn said that this was under consideration.

Facilities Maintenance Administrator Charlie Simmons next discussed the Springfield Station construction project. The current station had been at 5<sup>th</sup> and "B" Streets since 1980, with four bus bays and a current need for six. Mr. Bennett asked what would happen to the current station when the new one was completed. Mr. Simmons said that LTD would bring it back to its original design

and it would be up to the City to use it however it wanted to, since it was the City's right-of-way. Mr. Hamm wanted to be sure that LTD protected an interest there because that site might be needed with the future system.

Mr. Simmons discussed the site for the new station, on the south side of "A" Street, which he described as the perfect site for the future BRT segment on Pioneer Parkway. He showed the current conceptual design for the station, and discussed the design and project schedule and the project scope and budget. The potential project budget was \$6.8 million. The project budget had been divided into three scenarios: basic needs; basic needs plus a guest services center (GSC); and basic needs, a GSC, and joint development. He discussed the costs for those three options. Design issues included whether or not to include public restrooms, a Park & Ride, joint development, and/or a Millrace Park and bridge (which were not included in any budget estimates).

Mr. Simmons also discussed the decision-making process, which would include the staff technical advisory committee (TAC), the Design Review Committee (DRC), and the LTD Board. He asked the Board if they wanted to put parameters on the decision-making process. Mr. Hamm clarified that Mr. Simmons was asking if the Board wanted to dialog with staff on the design issues in particular, such as whether they felt strongly one way or another about having amenities such as public restrooms or a Park & Ride in the initial design. Staff did not want to spend design money if certain aspects would not be included. He said that staff wanted to introduce those ideas that evening for a future discussion with the Board.

Mr. Melnick said he was not convinced that those were the only design issues. He said that the District had hired a design team, and would rather have them work with the TAC and DRC to work through those issues and bring back an informed opinion to the Board, so that the Board had good information before making decisions. Ms. Hocken said, however, that she did not want the DRC to make recommendations to the Board and have the Board respond negatively because the DRC had started from the wrong assumptions. She did not know if the Board was ready to give a full charge to the Design Review Committee yet. She suggested a range for budget discussions.

Mr. Melnick suggested possibly having an in-depth review at every Board meeting, so issues could be reworked at that point and the Board would be woven into the process all along.

Mr. Kleger said that the project was the Board's primary responsibility, whether through the Board Committee or full Board, and that prioritization within the budget needed to be said up-front to the DRC, as well as the statement that the Board would exercise its responsibility to do that.

Mr. Melnick thought that the Board's responsibility to complete an excellent project within the budget. Mr. Kleger said he just wanted to make it clear that the budget and an excellent project were equally important.

Mr. Simmons said that there was only about a two-month period for master planning, and he was a little concerned about having time to come back to the Board with every step.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff had a position on including public restrooms. Mr. Simmons said that facilities managers didn't like public restrooms, but from a community standpoint, he was concerned with the problems caused by not having them, especially when the site would be fairly isolated from other public services. In Santa Cruz, California, joint development with McDonald's

had provided restrooms at McDonald's. Mr. Bennett thought that joint development in Springfield might come later. Mr. Simmons suggested that the station might be able to open with a small GSC and restrooms with a key, in order to maintain control over use. He added that public restrooms probably were a good thing, but added operational costs.

**Board Member Reports:** Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC): Ms. Hocken reported that as a result of adding the West Eugene Parkway Project, TransPlan had to include \$88 million that had not been included originally. Programming had to be revised and other projects had to be moved from a 20-year period to the futures list. She said that the constrained list and futures list could be adjusted every three years. BRT Steering Committee: Ms. Hocken said that the committee would meet on January 8.

**Monthly Financial Report:** Ms. Hellekson said that as written in the report, there was nothing unexpected to report. Passenger fares were down, but when cash fares were raised, a certain decline was expected. Ridership was up 4 percent, but revenue was down somewhat. Football special services had not yet been billed. The payroll tax revenue essentially was flat from the previous year. Ms. Hellekson said that if it did not go down further, LTD was positioned to survive the recession. Administrative salaries were slightly over budget, but the November termination of ten administrative employees meant that this category should recover quickly. Wages for union employees were more of a concern, so staff were looking carefully at opportunities to improve efficiencies and reduce overtime. This work would carry over into the budget development process.

Mr. Bennett asked if there were comprehensive service redesign (CSR) changes that were not budgeted. Ms. Hellekson said that they were budgeted but the issue involved more than that. Staff were trying to make better assumptions of the average number of hours an operator would drive for the number of hours of service on the road to come up with the correct number of operators. She said that the true inefficiencies in the system were about 20 percent. Mr. Bennett asked how she rated the odds of going lower. Mr. Hamm shared that this percentage was below (better than) the industry standard, and that inefficiencies could be from report time, stand time, deadhead time, and a number of other elements. Staff thought they could reduce expenses by \$100,000 with certain improvements, especially through run-cutting efficiencies and managing operator time better. He explained that the District did not make major changes in the winter and summer operator bids, so major savings would occur after the fall bid in 2002. He had asked LTD's operators to share their ideas about finding efficiencies in the system. Mr. Kleger commented that the drivers he had talked with were very much in favor of this.

Ms. Hellekson said that the good news was the savings of about \$250,000 in fuel costs. The bottom line was that, because the District had deferred most of the capital transfer and eliminated administrative positions, there would not be a budget problem in the current year. However, the long-term projections showed that there would be problems, and the operating fund would have to contribute to the capital plan if LTD wanted to continue its current capital plan.

**Board Correspondence:** In referring to a letter to the Board, Ms. Hocken asked why the flags had been removed from the buses. Mr. Hamm said that the District originally had just used the paper flags reproduced in *The Register-Guard*, and when they became tattered they were pulled off the buses. Staff had talked about using flag deals, but that might open the door for other kinds of things, and LTD did not want to get involved in adding a lot of decals or symbols for



different groups. Mr. Kleger thought that some of the original paper copies had blocked some drivers' views.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Ms. Wylie again thanked Mr. Bennett for his service on the LTD Board. There was no further business, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

---

Board Secretary

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** BRT CORRIDOR PLANNING UPDATE

**PREPARED BY:** Stefano Viggiano, Planning and Development Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None. Information and discussion only.

**BACKGROUND:** **Springfield Corridor**

LTD staff continue to work with the City of Springfield on the corridor planning process. Staff are beginning to meet with businesses along the corridor, and will be meeting with Peace Health officials later in the month.

**Eugene Corridor**

On January 7, 2002, the Eugene Planning Commission met to discuss a recommendation for selection of the next BRT corridor in Eugene. LTD staff recommended the selection of the Coburg Road corridor, while City of Eugene staff did not express a corridor preference. The Planning Commission voted 6 to 1 to recommend that the City Council select the Coburg Road corridor. The Planning Commission also approved a motion to recommend that the City Council encourage LTD to make service enhancements to the Highway 99 corridor in anticipation of future BRT service along that corridor.

The BRT Steering Committee discussed this issue on January 8, 2002. The Committee voted unanimously to support the Planning Commission's recommendation of the Coburg Road corridor.

The Eugene City Council will consider the corridor selection on February 25, 2002. Once the Eugene Council has acted on the issue, the matter will be brought to the LTD Board.

**ATTACHMENTS:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** CONSIDER DATE FOR FEBRUARY WORK SESSION

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Consider date for work session in February

**BACKGROUND:** Board Activity Calendars are provided for Board members to track LTD-related meetings and activities. It is likely that a work session will be required in February, in addition to the regular monthly meeting. The Board has designated the Monday before the regular Wednesday meeting as its preferred time for special meetings/work sessions. However, in February 2002, that work session would fall on the Presidents' Day holiday. Past Boards have elected to hold the work session on the Tuesday before the regular meeting, but there is no requirement that a work session be on a particular day. Staff ask that the Board members consider their calendars and select a day and time for a work session in February. It also would be helpful for staff to know when Board members will be out of town or otherwise unavailable during these months.

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** After considering the time required for the work of the Board in February, staff will determine whether a work session will be necessary. If it is, the meeting will be scheduled at the Board's preferred time and notice will be given to the public.

**ATTACHMENT:** Board Activity Calendars, January through June 2002

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** CONSENT CALENDAR

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Approval of Consent Calendar Items

**BACKGROUND:** Issues that can be explained clearly in the written materials for each meeting, and that are not expected to draw public testimony or controversy, are included in the Consent Calendar for approval as a group. Board members can remove any items from the Consent Calendar for discussion before the Consent Calendar is approved each month.

The Consent Calendar for January 16, 2002

- ◆ Approval of minutes: December 19, 2001, regular Board meeting

**ATTACHMENTS:** (1) Minutes of the December 19, 2001, regular Board meeting

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the Board adopt the following resolution:

LTD Resolution No. 2002-001: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for January 16, 2002, is approved as presented.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** BRT CONSTRUCTION METHOD SELECTION

**PREPARED BY:** Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager  
Jeanette Bailor, Purchasing Administrator

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None. Information and discussion only.

**BACKGROUND:** Construction manager/general contractor (CM/GC) is a project delivery method for construction projects. A single firm, referred to as a CM/GC, is selected during the design process by a competitive procurement that is primarily qualifications-based. This firm is a general contractor and will give input during the design process to enhance the design work. The CM/GC works as part of a collaborative team with Lane Transit District and the design team during the design process, providing value engineering, constructability review, scheduling, estimating, and other related services.

An additional administrative process is required to use the CM/GC method of contracting. The Oregon Public Improvements Statute, ORS 279.015, requires all public improvement projects to be procured by competitive bid. As a result, all CM/GC projects require the public agency to develop findings that the alternative procurement process is unlikely to encourage favoritism or substantially diminish competition and will meet the findings requirements of ORS 279.011(5). These findings will have to be given at a public hearing and a resolution must be passed by the LTD Contract Review Board to allow a Request for Proposal (RFP) for this method of construction.

**ATTACHMENTS:** None. A summary of CM/GC information will be given in a PowerPoint presentation

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



**Lane Transit District**  
P. O. Box 7070  
Eugene, Oregon 97401

(541) 682-6100  
Fax (541) 682-6111

## MONTHLY DEPARTMENT REPORTS

January 16, 2002

### GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

*Linda Lynch, Government Relations Manager*

#### IN CONGRESS

Congress returns to session January 23. Members of Congress are touring the state – Senator Wyden was in Eugene January 7 – or are on vacation. Washington-based staff also has been in the state, checking on pet projects, including the Springfield Station.

It is expected that District Board members and staff will have time with Congressman DeFazio in late January to discuss funding for future phases of bus rapid transit.

Locally, LTD and partner agencies are preparing for a lobbying trip to Washington, D.C., during the first week of March. LTD staff will continue to coordinate this effort this year.

#### IN SALEM

Governor Kitzhaber released a proposed all-cut budget to meet the \$720 million to \$900 million anticipated gap between state revenues and expenditures this biennium. His proposal includes cutting the \$500,000 for the RideSource facility that Lane Transit District was awarded as part of the add-on to the state Department of Transportation budget in the final bill of the legislative session. The original commitment to LTD of \$1.2 million remains, but it is unlikely that the District will see that \$500,000 this biennium. ODOT remains committed to the project, however, and funding for the project should continue next biennium, depending on legislative budget decisions.

LTD Board President Hillary Wylie has been part of discussions among local officials with state legislators regarding proposals for the special session. That session is still expected to occur in early to mid-February.

## **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

*Stefano Viggiano, Planning & Development Manager*

### **WINTER BID**

The Planning staff has completed scheduling and run-cutting for winter bid service changes. Timetable information is being updated in the form of a printed "Update" that will be inserted into remaining Rider's Digests and in electronic form on the LTD web page. Proofreading of these materials is currently under way and will conclude in mid-January in order for printing to take place in late January. Staff will provide an update of scheduling and run-cutting efficiency at the January meeting.

### **SYMANTEC EXPRESS SERVICE**

Symantec employees greeted the new year in their new building in the Gateway area. LTD service was operating on the first morning and 21 employees took advantage of the service. Ridership continues to grow and we are hopeful that more employees will take advantage of the express service and leave their cars at home. The service consists of two morning and two evening trips that are timed to meet the major shifts at the site. Service operates from the Lane County Fairgrounds Park & Ride, stops at the Eugene Station, and then travels non-stop to the facility. Trip times are very competitive with driving. Symantec continues to participate in the group pass program, so employees ride free to and from work. Additionally, LTD is funding a van pool program for Symantec. Two vans began operating on the first day. One van travels from Cottage Grove with a stop in Creswell, while the second van travels from Bethel-Danebo with a stop at the River Road Station. We are hopeful that the employees and the company will see the value in vanpool service and that eventually they will partner with LTD in sharing the cost of the program. Ridership information will be available in February.

### **SACRED HEART PURCHASES ADDITIONAL SERVICE**

Sacred Heart Hospital will begin purchasing additional 75x service when winter bid service begins February 18. The 75x is fully paid for by Sacred Heart and currently offers 37 trips each weekday. The service links the Lane County Fairgrounds Park & Ride to the hospital with express shuttle service. This service is open to the general public.

### **UO FOOTBALL FINAL TALLY**

Football shuttle ridership began with a flurry when ridership for the first two games exceeded the 7,000 mark for the first time in history. The September 11 incident dampened ridership considerably for the next home game, when the total dropped to under 6,000. Ridership for the final three games hovered just above the 6,000 mark, which brought the season average to 6,500. This is only a 3 percent gain over 2000 and was certainly disappointing. Operations from the new location became easier each week and the cooperation of the Laidlaw operators helped immensely in the later games. A big “pat on the back” is due all LTD operators and operations staff who worked very hard to see that the service worked well. Total revenue from this year’s effort included more than \$60,000 in fare revenue and nearly \$90,000 in subsidy from the University of Oregon.

### **YOUTH PASS SALES**

After showing relatively no growth during the first five months of the fiscal year, youth pass sales were up 7.3 percent for the month of December.

### **COMMUTER SOLUTIONS STRATEGIC PLAN**

As a follow-up to the concerns expressed at the December 2001 Board meeting, the Local TDM group changed the wording in Goal 2 of the Commuter Solutions Strategic Plan to read “Consider Use of Parking Management Strategies in selected areas throughout the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.” The local TDM group will schedule a time to review the strategic plan with the Board.

### **COMMUTER SOLUTIONS FUNDING ISSUES**

A letter was sent from LTD General Manager Ken Hamm to Eugene and Springfield city managers and the Lane County administrator, requesting equal funding commitments for the local match for the Commuter Solutions Program. The issue was discussed at a January 11, 2001, meeting of the Springfield/Eugene/Lane County (SEL) CEO group. Linda Lynch represented LTD at this meeting in Ken Hamm’s absence.

### **SPECIAL TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM**

At its December meeting, the Special Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) decided upon:

- (1) Recommendation for the FY 2002-2003 Pricing Proposal Plan for RideSource fares
- (2) Response to the report prepared by consultant David Norstrom
- (3) Discontinuation of a trial calling service to try to reduce “no-shows” on RideSource

The STAC generally supported increases in RideSource cash fares and ticket book prices, but not without consideration of adding more RideSource grouped service at lower fares and creating a Reduced Fare Program for low-income riders.



Response to the report submitted by David Norstrom assessing RideSource services was generally favorable. The Committee agreed that pursuing demand management strategies was an important key in trying to keep growth in check. Developing special service routes similar to the RideSource Shopper was encouraged, along with using fare management as a way to induce riders to use these less-expensive ride options. The amount of the proposed fare increase for regular service was a concern because of other service and benefit cuts for the population served by RideSource. Paratransit trip reduction (eliminating the need for the trip through the use of home deliveries, for example) was seen as having the potential to reduce some trips on RideSource but did not address the social need for people to get out into the community. There was some skepticism about the efficacy of this strategy. Managing demand by grouping trips by geographic zones was of interest. The Committee was skeptical about the recommendation to revamp the eligibility process without first trying to focus on specific concerns rather than imposing more restrictive procedures systematically.

The calling service used to give verbal notice to riders of trips for that day will be discontinued. The rate of no shows did not change with the use of the services. The amount of information that could be communicated to the rider and the start time for daily calls were limitations. Several riders responded negatively to receiving the calls.

## **TRANSIT OPERATIONS**

*Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager*

### **2001 IS A GREAT YEAR FOR SAFETY**

Operations' 2001 accident statistics have been tallied and both total accidents and preventable accidents decreased from the previous year. There were 116 total accidents in 2001, compared with 134 in 2000. The number of preventable accidents decreased, as well. There were 53 preventable accidents in 2001, compared with 60 in 2000. This is a great tribute to the training staff and the bus operators for their professional operation. The improvement in their safety record shows that they do put safety first.

### **GENERAL MANAGER'S AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE**

Another indication of the excellent performance of LTD's bus operators is that 22 of them received the General Manager's Award for Excellence. This means that they had no accidents and no missed time, and qualified for the service excellence award. To have more than 10 percent of our workforce perform at such a high level is outstanding. They all will receive some special recognition for their efforts.

## **MAINTENANCE SERVICES**

*Ron Berkshire, Maintenance Manager*

There is no Maintenance Services report this month.

## **FINANCE AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

*Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager*

The monthly finance and performance reports are included elsewhere in the packet.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES**

*David Dickman, Human Resources Manager*

There is no Human Resources report this month.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** ELECTION OF BOARD VICE PRESIDENT

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant/Clerk of the Board

**ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Board elect a vice president to complete the two-year term vacated by Rob Bennett, beginning immediately and ending July 1, 2002

**BACKGROUND:** In accordance with ORS 267.120(1), the Board of Directors must elect from among its members, by majority vote, a president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer, to serve two-year terms. Elections were held in June 2000 for two-year terms ending July 1, 2002. At that time, Rob Bennett was elected vice president. Mr. Bennett is no longer an LTD Board member, leaving the position of vice president vacant. The current officers are Hillary Wylie, president; Virginia Lauritsen, secretary; and Dave Kleger, treasurer.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I nominate \_\_\_\_\_ to complete the current term of LTD Board Vice President, beginning immediately and ending July 1, 2002.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** FEBRUARY 2002 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **FEBRUARY 2002 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Due to unforeseen circumstances, the selection and announcement of the February Employee of the Month will have to be delayed. Both the February and March Employees of the Month will be introduced to the Board in February.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** FEBRUARY 2002 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** **FEBRUARY 2002 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** General Service Worker Stanley Carruthers was selected as the February 2002 Employee of the Month. Stanley was hired by the District on October 19, 1973, as a shopkeeper. In 2001, Stanley earned an award for 23 years of being a Safe Worker. Stanley was nominated for this award by his co-workers in the Fleet Services Department, who appreciate that he is a dedicated, hard worker and a very nice person. Comments by his co-workers included: "always willing to help if asked; a pure joy to work with; his kind gestures amaze me; always friendly, happy, and has a smile on his face."

When asked what makes Stan a good employee, Fleet Services Supervisor Don Swearingen, as Stan's supervisor, said:

Stan is always very positive and thoughtful of the people he works with. Because of his many years at LTD, his job knowledge is a great asset to Fleet Services. Stan is highly thought of by his co-workers as a person and employee. Everyone is very glad that he was selected as the Employee of the Month and can think of no one more deserving of the award than Stan!

Fleet Services Supervisor Ernie Turner added:

The thing that makes Stan so unique is the pride he takes in doing even the little things that might seem unimportant. He shows by his actions that he cares about the quality of his work and that his position here at LTD is a vital part of our department. On a more personal note, the qualities that Stan brings to the workplace are his great sense of humor and his ability to get along with his co-workers, even when he gets teased (since he usually is the one to initiate it).

Our congratulations to Stanley on his selection as the February 2002 Employee of the Month!

**AWARD:** Stanley will attend the January 16, 2002, meeting to be introduced to the Board and receive his award.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** WORK SESSION: FY 2002-2003 PRICING PLAN

**PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Development Services Department

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Discuss pricing plan recommendation and provide direction to staff.

**BACKGROUND:** In February 2001 the Board adopted revisions to the fare policy. The policy retains many of the tenets that exist to guide the Board in systematically evaluating changes to the District's annual pricing plan. The fare policy is attached for the Board's review.

In July 2001 the District implemented its single-largest fare increase since 1980. Cash fares rose 25 percent. This increase appears to have had some impact on ridership; however, no formal research has been conducted to confirm this belief. Evaluation of ridership data shows a slowing of ridership growth on weekdays and declines in ridership on weekends. These effects can be seen prior to the implementation of the CSR changes in September. Therefore, it appears that the cash fare increase has had a negative effect on ridership. It is important to recognize that large changes in fares will affect purchasing habits and ultimately ridership. These influences generally are spoken of in terms of elasticity. While elasticity will vary from district to district and between fare media types, research has shown that for every 10 percent increase in fares, a decrease in ridership of 4 percent can be expected. The 2002 proposal has applied elasticity factors that follow these findings.

As a result of Board Finance Committee discussion in December 2001, a pricing plan proposal has been prepared. Instead of proposing an increase in the adult pass price from \$28.00 to \$30.00, which was the price anticipated in the five-year plan, staff now propose an increase to \$35.00. Other pass prices (excluding the day pass) would change proportionately. Additionally, upon direction from the Finance Committee, the proposal recommends an increase in the adult token fare from \$0.85 to \$1.00. A change to the token fare would not normally be recommended at the same time as a change to the pass prices; however, this change is recommended to bring uniformity to the discounting structure that exists between fare media types. This relationship is illustrated at the bottom of

Deleted:

Deleted: ul

the attachment titled "Projected Fare Revenues." The new proposal is summarized in Attachment II to this document.

The primary reason for being aggressive with this proposal is to address the District's need to generate additional revenues. The recommended changes are anticipated to increase revenue by approximately \$393,000 in FY 2002-03. It is possible that the additional revenues will allow the District to be more conservative when evaluating service reductions as a part of the Annual Route Review.

At their December 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Special Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) agreed to support consultant David Norstrom's proposal to increase RideSource fares, with a request that the LTD Board of Directors accept these recommendations:

- (1) LTD develops grouped-ride opportunities for RideSource users at reduced fares in order to improve productivity and to give riders less-expensive options for some of their trips; and
- (2) LTD adds a Reduced Fare Program for RideSource riders who meet low-income guidelines as established through other service programs, such as Food Stamps and/or the Low Income Energy Assistance Program.

The RideSource Shopper is a grouped service and operates at a reduced fare. Expanding the Shopper and providing more such service is a priority. The STAC's first recommendation is supported by LTD staff.

Formatted

Members of the STAC expressed their concern for people who are on fixed incomes who do not have commensurate increases in Social Security and other benefits to match inflation and out-of-pocket medical expenses. Creating a Reduced Fare Program for RideSource was equated to having reduced fares for seniors and people with disabilities on fixed-route service. The fixed-route reduced fare criteria are based on age and disability, while the proposed criterion for RideSource is income. An income-based fare reduction on RideSource could lead to a call for a similar program on the fixed route. The reduced rate would need to provide enough of a cost incentive to encourage riders to use less-expensive group trips or LTD bus service whenever possible.

The suggested cash fare and ticket prices for RideSource and RideSource Escort represent a 50-cent increase per trip. There is no proposed change for the RideSource Shopper, in order to encourage more people to use the service. The proposed cash fare reaches the maximum allowed under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

LTD staff support the fare increases and pursuing more grouped trips on the RideSource Shopper, but are hesitant to propose the addition of a reduced fare program to the Pricing Plan that would go into effect July 1,

Formatted

2002, without further study. With the time and resources available to devote to the project, it would be difficult to address important issues, such as:

- Having no easy way of computing the cost of a Reduced Fare Program without conducting an income survey for those who pay by cash and tickets
- Creating an eligibility threshold for reduced fare that is both simple and fair
- Satisfying confidentiality requirements
- Considering implications for fixed-route service
- Creating more grouped trips, which needs to take precedence as a potential means of reducing costs, given LTD's current budget

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

A public hearing on the proposal scheduled for the regular Board meeting on February 20, 2002. The first reading of revised Ordinance 35 (which sets fares and prices) will occur at the February meeting. A final public hearing and adoption of the proposal is scheduled for March 20.

It will be possible for the Board to direct staff to make changes in the proposal before the ordinance is revised, should the Board wish to do so.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- (1) Fare Policy
- (2) Draft FY 2002-2003 Pricing Plan Proposal
- (3) Fare Pricing History and Five-year Projection
- (4) Projected Fare Revenues Worksheet
- (5) Fare Pricing Comparison with UNCC Peer Group

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

Deleted: ¶  
¶  
¶



# Fare Policy

---

The fare policy is used to provide direction in making decisions about changes in the District's fare structure. The policy is composed of objectives and guidelines. The objectives indicate the general goals the District's fare structure should achieve. The guidelines provide more specific direction on the various aspects of a fare structure. The intent of each of the guidelines is further explained in a discussion section that follows each statement.

This Fare Policy applies to both the fixed-route and RideSource systems. Unless otherwise stated, objectives and guidelines apply to both systems.

## OBJECTIVES

1. To promote fixed-route ridership by making the fare structure attractive to users
2. To improve the farebox recovery ratio
3. To improve the efficiency of fare collection
4. To promote equity of fare payment among patrons

## APPLICATION

This policy applies to all recommendations for changes to the fare structure.

## GUIDELINES

1. *Recommendations for changes in the fare will be developed by LTD staff. Decisions on fare changes are made by the LTD Board of Directors, and require an amendment to an ordinance. A public hearing is required for any change in fares. Changes to the RideSource Fare also will include review by the Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee.*

Typically, fare change decisions are made over the course of three Board meetings. At the first meeting, an informational presentation to the Board and a public hearing are held. The first reading of the ordinance is held at the second meeting, and the second reading and approval of the fare ordinance occur at the third meeting.

2. *When making recommendations for changes to the fare, staff will consider the inflation rate, ridership and revenue trends, local economic trends, trends in automobile-related costs such as gas, service changes, the value of the service to the rider, market conditions and opportunities, the District's financial situation, the District's goals and objectives, and Board policy.*

Deleted: ,

This policy statement lists the most important factors to be considered in making recommendations for changes to the fare structure. The list of factors to be evaluated is not meant to be exclusive; other factors will need to be considered from year to year. It is further recommended that staff develop and maintain a ridership model in order to more accurately predict the effects of changes in the fare structure.

3. *Increases to the Group Pass rates will be based on guidelines included in the Group Pass section of this policy.*
4. *The RideSource fare should exceed the fare of the fixed-route system to reflect the higher cost of a RideSource trip and to encourage use of the fixed-route system.*

RideSource, a demand-responsive, curb-to-curb service, has a much higher cost per trip than LTD's fixed-route service. Establishing a higher cash fare for RideSource than for the fixed-route system will help to compensate for the higher cost and encourage riders who may have a choice between systems to use the fixed-route service. By law, RideSource fares cannot exceed twice the fixed-route fare.

5. *Increases in the farebox recovery ratio should be pursued primarily by improving the ridership productivity of the system and by improving internal operating efficiency.*

There are three ways to improve farebox recovery ratio: by increasing the fare (in real terms); by improving internal operating efficiency; and by improving ridership productivity. Attempts on the LTD fixed route to improve the recovery ratio by increasing the fare by an amount substantially greater than the inflation rate have proven unsatisfactory. Ridership decreases have almost offset the increase in the average fare, yielding only small gains in revenue and significant ridership loss. Improvements in internal operating efficiency should be pursued whenever possible. Improvements in ridership productivity are likely to provide the greatest potential for a significant improvement to the farebox recovery ratio. If the average fare remains stable (in real terms), a 10 percent increase in ridership productivity would achieve a 10 percent improvement in the farebox recovery ratio.

Unlike the fixed-route system, significant increases in RideSource rides do not provide significant additional income to offset costs. Encouraging use of the RideSource Shopper and providing incentives for grouping trips may improve productivity but would not have a substantial impact on the farebox recovery ratio. Due to the significant fare subsidy on RideSource, efforts should be made to maintain a minimum farebox recovery ratio and maintain the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) maximum fare, once attained.

6. *Prepayment of fares on the fixed-route system shall be encouraged. Accordingly, passes and tokens should be priced below the cash fare.*

Prepayment of fares benefits the District in a number of ways: It improves the cash flow situation; it guarantees ridership and revenue by the customer; it reduces the chance of non-payment or underpayment; and it speeds boarding. Prepayment mechanisms also tend to encourage increased ridership by customers since the cost of the ride is not required at the time the decision to take the ride is made. It is recommended that monthly passes be priced at 25 to 30 times the cash fare, and that tokens be priced at 75 percent to 90 percent of the cash fare. Passes should, on a per-ride basis, be discounted more than tokens, since they are more effective at increasing ridership and are a more efficient fare mechanism from an

internal operating standpoint. It should be noted that RideSource does not use either passes or tokens since there should not be an incentive to ride RideSource more frequently. However, RideSource provides ticket books for riders at a discount that is reviewed annually to encourage ease of boarding for customers, and to offer a non-cash alternative to riders.

7. *Increases to the base fixed-route fare generally should not exceed 25 percent within a year. Increases to the RideSource fare should not exceed 50 percent and no more than one increase should be implemented each year until reaching the allowable ADA maximum of twice the LTD adult cash fare.*

This policy directs that changes in the fare be incremental in nature to avoid large "catch-up" increases. The District's experience has been that large fare increases (even though occurring less often) have a substantially more negative impact on ridership than smaller, more frequent fare increases.

Large fare increases on RideSource do not seem to have a significant impact on ridership. However, RideSource has a more "captive" ridership and fare increases should not be unduly burdensome, especially since many of the riders have low incomes. Once the ADA maximum fare of twice the fixed-route adult cash fare is attained, additional fare increases would occur only when the LTD adult cash fare increases.

8. *Recommendations for fare changes will be developed prior to the budget process each spring for the following fiscal year.*

Given the dynamic nature of ridership, budgets, and other factors that affect fares, it is necessary to consider changes in the fare on a yearly basis. This policy ties the recommendations on fare changes to the budget process, as well as to decisions on major changes in the service that result from the Annual Route Review. This policy does not preclude making unprogrammed changes to the fare in mid-year if unforeseen conditions warrant.

9. *Changes in the fare structure should be implemented on the first day of a month, preferably in July or September.*

Since LTD ridership changes significantly at the start and end of summer, these are good times to implement changes to fares. Pass price increases during the school year when LTD ridership is highest are more visible and therefore may result in a greater loss of ridership.

10. *Fare promotions can be used to attract new riders to the fixed-route system.*

Fare promotions have been shown to be a cost-effective method of attracting new users to the system at a very low cost per trip. Surveys indicate that many of those attracted by free or reduced fares are not regular bus riders. The process to be followed in fare promotions includes an analysis of the proposal, a marketing plan for the promotion, and a post-project evaluation. The extent of the analysis, marketing plan, and evaluation would be based on the scale of the promotion. RideSource fare promotions shall be designed to switch riders to the LTD fixed route and to increase RideSource productivity.

11. *Discounted fares may be used to encourage ridership during traditionally low-demand periods.*

The District has had very good success in generating additional ridership in low-demand times through fare reductions. The cost per trip generated by the fare reductions has been much lower than for other options available to the District.

- 12. *Fare payment options that effectively attract a different market segment or encourage increased use of the bus by current riders shall be developed. The fare payment options should be made conveniently available to customers.*

The District currently offers customers the choice of paying cash or using tokens, monthly passes, or day passes. Each of these fare payment options is attractive to a different segment of the market. Other fare payment options that attract additional riders, increase bus use among current riders, or are more convenient forms of current options should be investigated and, if feasible, implemented. Convenient access to all fare payment options will tend to make the system more attractive to customers and thus will increase ridership.

- 13. *The design and number of fare payment instruments shall consider the ease of enforcement by bus operators and ease of understanding by customers.*

Bus operator enforcement of fares is necessary to ensure adherence by customers to the fare policies. The ease of enforcement is dependent upon the design of the fare payment instrument and the quantity of different fare payment options available. These two factors should be considered when making decisions on the implementation of a new fare option or the redesign of an existing fare instrument. Fare enforcement programs should be evaluated periodically to ensure that they are appropriate.

**MAINTENANCE**

The Finance Department will monitor application of this policy as it relates to cash fares, tokens, and standard passes, and propose revisions as necessary.

- 
- ATTACHMENTS: FARE MEDIA DONATIONS GUIDELINES  
FARE DISCOUNTS (PRIVATE NON-PROFIT AGENCY PROGRAM) GUIDELINES  
SSI RECIPIENT DISCOUNTS GUIDELINES  
WHOLESALE DISCOUNTS GUIDELINES  
GROUP PASS PROGRAM GUIDELINES

REVISED: 4/18/01

## Fare Media Donations

---

### **OBJECTIVE**

The District offers fare discounts for purposes of joint marketing promotions and to support community activities. Donations will occur in the form of fare media and gift certificates. Examples include, gift certificate to local school fundraising events and the donation of bus passes to organizations, such as Mobility International, that host delegates who come to our community to learn about accessibility.

### **APPLICATION**

The following guidelines apply to all fare media donations.

### **PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

Donations of both fare media and gift certificates will be handled through LTD Guest Services. Any community group may request a donation. The LTD Marketing Manager or the Guest Services Supervisor will review the request and determine the benefit to the District. Upon approval, the Guest Service Supervisor will prepare a gift certificate or instruct Guest Services staff to issue the appropriate fare media. Authorization for free fare media must be given in writing (email), by the Guest Services Supervisor or an LTD manager. Requests for fare media to be used for internal employee displays may be authorized by an LTD Marketing Representative.

### **MAINTENANCE**

The Marketing Manager is responsible for a semi-annual report of donations. This report will be forwarded to the LTD General Manager for review.

## **Fare Discounts**

### **Private Non-profit Agency Program**

---

#### **OBJECTIVE**

The District offers private non-profit agencies the opportunity to purchase LTD fare media at a 50 percent discount. This discount is granted in recognition of a community need for transportation services for individuals and families who are working with these agencies to seek employment, housing, and medical services.

#### **APPLICATION**

This policy applies to any private non-profit (501-3-c) agency who wishes to purchase fare media from LTD.

#### **PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

Eligibility determination is conducted through the United Way of Lane County. Agencies wishing to participate may complete the necessary application at the local United Way office. Upon successful certification, agency staff may call LTD Guest Services to place a fare media order.

Agencies are eligible for a 50 percent discount toward the purchase of \$300.00 of fare media per month. In order to maintain the purchasing power of the agencies, the \$300.00 maximum will adjust annually as LTD increases fares.

In order to fill the gap for individuals and families who are not connected with a local agency, LTD will donate \$300.00 of fare media per month to Catholic Community Services. This amount is set and will not be adjusted annually.

#### **MAINTENANCE**

The Guest Services Supervisor is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to this policy. A semi-annual report of program use will be produced by the Guest Services Supervisor and will be forwarded to the LTD General Manager for review.

## SSI Recipient Discounts

---

### OBJECTIVE

The District offers a reduced fare monthly pass price to Social Security Insurance recipients. This program recognizes that there are individuals in our community who do not qualify for reduced fare status based solely on their disability, but who are mentally disabled and are receiving SSI payments.

### APPLICATION

This policy applies to all individuals who are SSI recipients and who are not eligible for reduced fare certification based upon the need for specialized training or special accommodation for a physical disability.

### PROGRAM GUIDELINES

LTD offers a 50 percent discount on the purchase of adult monthly passes to individuals who are SSI recipients and who are working with a case worker at Senior and Disabled Services. Qualification is determined by SDS case workers, who have evaluated their clients according to the LTD reduced fare certification guidelines, and have determined they do or do not qualify for reduced fare status. SDS staff forwards a list of qualified clients to LTD Guest Services on a monthly basis. This list is used by Guest Services staff to process the sales of the discounted passes.

### MAINTENANCE

The Guest Services Supervisor is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to the SSI discount program. An annual report of SSI pass sales will be prepared by the Guest Services Supervisor and forwarded to the General Manager for review.

## Wholesale Discounts

---

### OBJECTIVE

The District offers private retail sales outlets and public agencies a wholesale discount on the purchase of fare media. This discount recognizes that these organizations play an important role in the distribution of fare media to LTD customers.

### APPLICATION

This policy applies to all private retail outlets that LTD chooses to contract with for the sales of fare media. All public agency purchases will be issued according to the same discount structure.

### PROGRAM GUIDELINES

LTD offers a 10 percent discount on the purchase of fare media for private retail sales outlets and public agencies who purchase fare media for their customers and clients. All tokens are pre-purchased by the organizations, while monthly passes will be consigned.

### MAINTENANCE

The Guest Services Supervisor is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to the wholesale discount program.

---

Adopted 2/85  
Revised 6/86  
Revised 6/87  
Revised 2/98  
Revised 2/01

Q:\REFERENCE\BOARD PACKET\...FARE POLICY.DOC  
Q:\REFERENCE\BOARD PACKET\2001\02\REGULAR MEETING\FARE POLICY REVISED.DOC



## GROUP PASS PROGRAM

---

### OBJECTIVES

A Group Pass Program is one in which the cost of transit fares is shared by a group. All persons within the group receive the transit benefit whether or not they actually use the service. The employer enters into an annual contract for services with LTD. In this way, the cost per person for the service is significantly reduced, and ridership within the group can be expected to increase significantly.

Group pass programs attempt to:

1. Increase ridership and ridership productivity (rides per service hour);
2. Maintain or increase the farebox to operating cost ratio; and
3. Decrease the cost per trip.

The establishment of these programs is based on the premise that increased use of transit, as a replacement to the single-occupancy vehicle, is a goal established by our community because it will provide numerous benefits. In order to meet that goal, LTD should aggressively pursue fiscally responsible programs that increase use of the bus, particularly in areas with traffic congestion, parking or air quality problems, or where there is a transportation need that can be effectively addressed with public transit.

### APPLICATION

The following guidelines apply to all group pass programs established by the District.

### PROGRAM GUIDELINES

#### *Qualifying Organizations*

The District will consider any organization, public or private, for a group pass program if it:

1. Includes at least 10 individuals
2. Is financially capable and legally empowered to enter into a contract with LTD and meet the financial obligations dictated by that contract. The group pass program will apply to all members in the organization.
3. LTD will consider qualifying organizations on a first-come/first-served basis, only if LTD has the service and equipment capacity to serve that organization.

#### *Pricing*

Revenue from organizations that participate in the group pass programs will be computed according to whether or not an organization contributes to the LTD payroll tax and to group size. All organizations participating in the group pass program will provide revenue that meets the following two criteria:

1. A base rate per employee per month will be levied on individuals within the organization. The base rate will be increased annually by the rolling average of operating costs realized by the District. The base rates are:  

Taxpayers -	\$3.00 per employee per month
Non Taxpayers -	\$3.50 per employee per month

Rates effective January 1, 2002
2. The cost of additional service that is instituted by the District to directly respond to increased ridership resulting from the group pass program

*Term of the Contract*

Contracts will normally be for a one-year period, with annual renewals. Yearly evaluation, at a level appropriate for the size of the organization, is to be conducted of each group pass program prior to renewing the contract to determine if the pricing criteria are still being satisfied.

Whenever possible, the District will seek to have the group pass programs institutionalized in order to reduce the possibility of programs becoming discontinued from one year to the next. This is obviously of greatest concern with the larger group pass programs, which require significant capital and operational investment and expenditures.

*Operational Issues*

Group pass participants are to have photo identification that is easily verified by the bus driver. The photo identification may be either the organization's, in which case it must have an LTD validating sticker, or issued by the District. In either case, the cost of issuing the photo identification will be borne by the organization. Participating organizations will be responsible for administering the program within their organizations.

*Marketing*

The District will provide trip planning assistance for the individuals of a group pass organization. Marketing of the service to individuals of a group pass organization will be conducted where it is determined to have a significant impact on ridership.

**MAINTENANCE**

The Service Planning Manager is responsible for monitoring and making recommendations for modifications to this program.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** ITEMS FOR ACTION/INFORMATION AT A FUTURE MEETING

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Executive Assistant

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None at this time

**BACKGROUND:** The action or information items listed below will be included on the agenda for future Board meetings:

- A. **Capital Improvements Program:** The Fiscal Year 2002-03 CIP will be brought to the Board for approval at the February 20, 2002, Board meeting.
- B. **Long-range Financial Plan:** The Fiscal Year 2001-02 Long-range Financial Plan also will be on the agenda for the February 20, 2002, Board meeting.
- C. **Work Session on BRT Vehicles:** A work session on bus rapid transit vehicles will be scheduled for February 20, 2002.
- D. **FY 2002-03 Service Recommendation:** A review of the proposed FY 2002-03 service adjustments will be scheduled for February 20, 2002. Public hearings on proposed service adjustments will be scheduled for the February 20 and March 20, 2002, regular Board meetings. The Board will be asked to approve the final service package at the March 20, 2002, Board meeting.
- E. **FY 2002-03 Fare Recommendation:** A public hearing and approval of the recommended pricing plan will be scheduled for the February 20, 2002, regular Board meeting. The first reading of the amended fare ordinance will be scheduled for the March 20, 2002, meeting, and the second reading and adoption will be scheduled for April 17, 2002.
- F. **General Manager's Evaluation:** The Board Human Resources Committee will develop a recommendation for evaluation of the General Manager's performance in early 2002.
- G. **Budget Committee Appointments:** The terms of three LTD Budget Committee members expired on January 1, 2002. Their

nominating Board members will make nominations to fill those positions before LTD budget deliberations begin in the spring of 2002.

- H. **BRT Updates**: Various action and information items will be placed on Board meeting agendas during the design and implementation phases of the bus rapid transit project.



# LTD General Manager's Report

## January, 2002

Prepared by Mark Pangborn, Assistant General Manager

### Future Dates to Remember

January 18, 2001	Springfield Chamber of Commerce Annual Awards & Installation Banquet
January 23, 2002	Eugene Chamber of Commerce Celebration of Business
February 18 or 19	Board Work Session
February 20, 2002	Regular Board Meeting
March 2-7, 2002	Lane County "United Front" Trip to Washington, D.C.

### General Manager

Ken Hamm and Ron Berkshire currently are in Europe for an in-depth review of the European alternatives for a BRT vehicle. They will be visiting bus manufacturers in the Netherlands and France. The manufacturers have buses in production that appear to meet many of the criteria for BRT buses that LTD has established. A full report of their findings will be made at the February 2002 Board meeting.

### Breeze

All six AVS buses are now being operated on the Breeze route. The buses are in an alternating schedule with two 30-foot Gillig buses. This has allowed staff to produce specific timetable information illustrating which trips have greater capacity for guests who use mobility devices and for ambulatory guests. Staff continue to work with the disabled services advisory committee on issues of accessibility. Terry Parker is heading up these efforts, which we hope will result in a mutually beneficial outcome for the group and LTD. There have been a number of complaints related to the accessible capacity and the difficulty in boarding and deboarding the AVS buses for some guests. Terry also is working with Fleet Services staff on ideas for internal modifications, which should make these processes easier for all LTD guests. The first of the new-color AVS buses returned from the paint shop and it looks very good. Additional buses will be rotated to the painter during the next month. Logo decals are on order and installation will begin during the third week in January. The Breeze "package" should be complete in early February.

### Holiday Service

LTD operated right through the holidays, only stopping service on Christmas day. It was a busy season with no hitches. LTD did run service one hour later on New Year's Eve, taking home quite a few "First Night" participants.

**Pricing Plan  
2002-2003 to 2007-2008**

Year	Consumer Price Index		Average Fare		Adult Cash Price		Adult Token Price		Adult Pass Price	
	Yearly Increase	Cumulative Increase	Actual Price	Percent Change	Actual Price	Percent Change	Actual Price	Percent Change	Actual Price	Percent Change
1981-82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0.50	0.00	\$0.40	0.00	\$18.00	0.00
1982-83	-0.62%	-0.62%	0.00	0.00	\$0.55	10.00%	\$0.45	12.50%	\$20.00	11.11%
1983-84	2.97%	2.34%	0.00	0.00	\$0.55	10.00%	\$0.50	25.00%	\$20.00	11.11%
1984-85	3.59%	5.93%	0.00	0.00	\$0.55	10.00%	\$0.50	25.00%	\$20.00	11.11%
1985-86	3.53%	9.47%	\$0.40	0.00	\$0.60	20.00%	\$0.50	25.00%	\$20.00	11.11%
1986-87	0.32%	9.78%	\$0.40	0.00	\$0.60	20.00%	\$0.50	25.00%	\$20.00	11.11%
1987-88	2.52%	12.30%	\$0.40	0.00	\$0.65	30.00%	\$0.50	25.00%	\$20.00	11.11%
1988-89	3.69%	15.99%	\$0.39	0.00	\$0.65	30.00%	\$0.55	37.50%	\$20.00	11.11%
1989-90	3.61%	19.60%	\$0.41	3.53%	\$0.65	30.00%	\$0.55	37.50%	\$21.00	16.67%
1990-91	4.58%	24.18%	\$0.43	7.97%	\$0.65	30.00%	\$0.55	37.50%	\$21.00	16.67%
1991-92	6.26%	30.44%	\$0.46	16.19%	\$0.75	50.00%	\$0.55	37.50%	\$21.00	16.67%
1992-93	4.58%	35.02%	\$0.47	19.41%	\$0.75	50.00%	\$0.65	62.50%	\$22.00	22.22%
1993-94	3.42%	38.44%	\$0.50	25.47%	\$0.75	50.00%	\$0.65	62.50%	\$23.00	27.78%
1994-95	2.88%	41.32%	\$0.52	31.26%	\$0.80	60.00%	\$0.65	62.50%	\$23.00	27.78%
1995-96	3.24%	44.56%	\$0.54	36.17%	\$0.80	60.00%	\$0.65	62.50%	\$24.00	33.33%
1996-97	3.09%	47.65%	\$0.59	47.60%	\$0.80	60.00%	\$0.65	62.50%	\$26.00	44.44%
1997-98	1.72%	49.37%	\$0.63	58.02%	\$1.00	100.00%	\$0.65	62.50%	\$26.00	44.44%
1998-99	1.89%	51.26%	\$0.61	53.99%	\$1.00	100.00%	\$0.75	87.50%	\$26.00	44.44%
1999-2000	2.40%	53.66%	\$0.66	66.38%	\$1.00	100.00%	\$0.75	87.50%	\$28.00	55.56%
2000-01	3.50%	57.16%	0.63	58.81%	\$1.00	100.00%	\$0.85	112.50%	\$28.00	55.56%
2001-02	2.60%	59.76%	0.63	58.81%	\$1.25	150.00%	\$0.85	112.50%	\$28.00	55.56%
<b>Total % Change</b>										
<b>Since 1981-82 ---&gt;</b>		<b>59.8%</b>	<b>58.8%</b>		<b>150.0%</b>		<b>112.5%</b>		<b>55.6%</b>	
2002-03	3.00%	62.76%	0.65	64.21%	\$1.25	150.00%	\$1.00	150.00%	\$35.00	94.44%
2003-04	3.00%	65.76%	0.67	69.80%	\$1.35	170.00%	\$1.00	150.00%	\$35.00	94.44%
2004-05	3.00%	68.76%	0.70	75.57%	\$1.35	170.00%	\$1.10	175.00%	\$35.00	94.44%
2005-06	3.00%	71.76%	0.72	81.54%	\$1.35	170.00%	\$1.10	175.00%	\$38.00	111.11%
2006-07	3.00%	74.76%	0.74	87.71%	\$1.50	200.00%	\$1.10	175.00%	\$38.00	111.11%
2007-08	3.00%	77.76%	0.77	94.09%	\$1.50	200.00%	\$1.35	237.50%	\$38.00	111.11%

RideSource Fare History:

	Sept. 1999	Sept. 2000	July 2001	FY 02-03 Proposed
RideSource (cash)	\$1.50 one-way	\$1.75 one-way	\$2.00 one-way	\$2.50 one-way
RideSource Ticket Books	10 tickets @\$14	10 tickets @\$15	10 tickets @\$15	10 tickets @\$20
RideSource Escort	\$1.50 one-way	\$1.75 one-way	\$2.00 one-way	\$2.50 one-way
RideSource Shopper	\$1.75 round-trip	\$2.00 round-trip	\$2.00 round-trip	\$2.00 round-trip

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 16, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORTS

**PREPARED BY:** Ken Hamm, General Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None

**BACKGROUND:** In response to a request by the Board for regular reporting on the District's performance in several areas, monthly performance reports are included in the Board agenda packets. The December 2001 Performance Reports are attached.

Staff will be available at the January 16 meeting to answer any questions the Board may have about this information.

**ATTACHMENTS:** December 2001 Performance Reports

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** January 14, 2002

**ITEM TITLE:** SPRINGFIELD STATION UPDATE

**PREPARED BY:** Charlie Simmons, Springfield Station Project Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None. Information only.

**BACKGROUND:** In December 2001, the LTD Board of Directors approved the Design Review Committee for the new Springfield Station. WBGS also was given notice to proceed with developing the Master Plan.

The project schedule has been reviewed thoroughly and revised by LTD staff in coordination with WBGS, which results in a new date for completion (spring of 2004). LTD staff have scheduled the first Design Review Committee meeting for January 22, 2002. A two-day design charette also has been scheduled for the end of January. Discussions have continued regarding the land acquisition for the Springfield Station, along with the rights-of-entry agreements.

WBGS and staff will present the charette materials to the Springfield Station Committees by mid-February 2002.

**ATTACHMENT:** None.

**PROPOSED MOTION:** None



January 16, 2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors  
FROM: Mark Johnson, Transit Operations Manager  
RE: Attached Publication

Attached is the *Pipeline* magazine published by the Wackenhut Corporation. On pages 17 and 18 of the publication is an article on the LTD security program. The article focuses on the guest service aspect of the program, particularly with regard to people with disabilities. This is an important contract for Wackenhut because we utilize our officers in a much broader manner than their other contracts. We allow them to problem-solve to determine how we can continue to provide service to disruptive people, especially those with disabilities.

We are proud of our security officers and the job that Rick Bailor has done in training and coaching them. They understand the mission of LTD and are dedicated partners in helping to achieve our goals.

It is a pat on the back for our officers and our program to get national recognition in this publication.

Mark Johnson  
Transit Operations Manager

MJ:js

attachment

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2002\01\Regular Mtg\wackenhut ltr handout .doc