



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

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on Thursday, August 2, 2007.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
SERVICE PLANNING AND MARKETING COMMITTEE  
Tuesday, August 7, 2007  
12:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.**

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

*Public testimony will not be heard at this meeting.*

**AGENDA**

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL  
Evans \_\_\_\_\_ Eyster \_\_\_\_\_ Dubick \_\_\_\_\_
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- IV. 2008 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW
- V. FLORENCE SERVICE EXPANSION
- VI. SPRINGFIELD SERVICE REDESIGN
- VII. *BUSPLUS!*
- VIII. OLYMPIC TRIALS SERVICE NEEDS
- IX. UPDATES:
  - River Road Station Purchase
  - RideSource Call Center
- X. ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS
  - Five-Year Transportation Development Plan
  - Park & Ride Plan
- XI. ADJOURNMENT

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** August 7, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** 2008 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW (ARR) EARLY IMPLEMENTATION ITEMS

**PREPARED BY:** Will Mueller, Service Planning Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Inform Service Planning and Marketing Board Committee members of future early action needed

**BACKGROUND:** With the expected opening of the RiverBend hospital next summer, LTD intends to implement certain Annual Route Review (ARR) service changes with summer bid 2008 instead of the customary fall bid implementation date. Thus, we will need the LTD Board to approve certain items from the 2008 ARR service change package earlier than usual before the adoption of the budget. These changes will include, at the very minimum, routing, timing, and possible service frequency changes on the *12 Gateway* route.

**ATTACHMENT:** None



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

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on Monday, May 7.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
SERVICE PLANNING AND MARKETING COMMITTEE  
May 9, 2007 – 3:30 p.m. to 5 p.m.**

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

**AGENDA**

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL  
Dubick \_\_\_\_\_ Evans \_\_\_\_\_ Eyster \_\_\_\_\_
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
- IV. OLYMPIC TRIALS SERVICE PACKAGE
- V. PARK & RIDE PLANNING
- VI. STUDENT TRANSIT PASS PROGRAM
- VII. UPDATES:
  - EmX Stop Spacing
  - Busplus!
  - Casino/Bus Service
- VIII. ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS
  - 2008 Service Package: Route 12 Frequency
  - Five-Year Transportation Development Plan
  - Purchased Service
  - Busplus!
- VIX. ADJOURNMENT

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:**

**ITEM TITLE:**

**PREPARED BY:**

**ACTION REQUESTED:**

**BACKGROUND:**

**ATTACHMENT:**

## MINUTES

### Lane Transit District Board of Directors Service Planning & Marketing Committee

Pursuant to notice given to The Register-Guard for publication on May 7, 2007, a meeting of the Lane Transit District Service Planning and Marketing Committee was held at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 9, 2007, in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Eugene, Oregon.

**PRESENT:** Mike Eyster, Lane Transit District Board Member, Chair  
Michael Dubick, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Greg Evans, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Andy Vobora, Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing  
Will Mueller, Service Planning Manager  
Angie Sifuentez, Marketing Representative  
Connie Bloom Williams, Commuter Solutions Program Manager  
Lisa VanWinkle, School Transportation Project Assistant  
Ken Augustson, Transit Planner  
Ruth Linoz, Transit Planner  
Cosette Rees, Marketing Representative  
Heather Lindsay, Service Planning Associate

#### **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Mr. Eyster called the meeting to order and called the roll.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes from the March 6, 2007, meeting of the Board of Directors Service Planning and Marketing Committee meeting were approved as presented.

**OLYMPIC TRIALS BUS SERVICE PACKAGE:** Tom Jordan and Barbara Kousky from the local organizing committee joined the Board committee for a discussion about the Olympic Trials Bus Service Package. Andy Vobora discussed the background materials presented in the meeting packet that described some of the issues involved in making a decision about the deviating from the pricing guidelines in LTD's Special Service Policy. Materials included an outline of the Annual Route Review, LTD's Special Service Policy, and the District's Fully Allocated Cost Plan.

Mr. Jordan thanked the committee for including them in the transportation planning process. He stated that the transportation component for the trials was coming along very well, and the organizing committee appreciated Mr. Mueller and Ms. Sifuentez attending the meetings and presenting the LTD component, which would provide a major portion of the shuttle system. He added that the goal of the organizing committee was that LTD would provide shuttle service between the area hotels and Hayward Field, as well as from Eugene Airport to various hotels. Mr. Mueller and Ms. Sifuentez came up with a budget reflecting what the needs would be. After talking with the steering committee of the Olympic Trials Committee (OTC), the organizing committee members would like to attend the June Board meeting to ask the LTD Board about the proposed service agreement. He added that there may be issues around consistency with other event providers, but the Olympic trials were an unusual circumstance, so there may be room to deviate from the policy. Mr. Vobora stated that he felt it would be necessary for the Board to be in a solid position to answer questions from other event organizers who question the deviation made for the OTC. As an example, Mr. Vobora told the group that the District uses the total of the direct variable costs used for the Annual Route Review (ARR) package. When small adjustments were made to service, there is no increase to the overhead of the District. This process also was used for pricing service sold the community, like Route 75x service for Sacred Heart, which also could be looked at as another way to evaluate this request.

Mr. Dubick asked if the District would contract the service for the Olympic Trials. Mr. Vobora stated that it would be contracted out and it would be very similar to service provided for the University of Oregon football shuttles or other events. He added that staff anticipate LTD drivers and buses would be used; he added that it did not appear that it would be necessary to contract out for additional buses and drivers. Mr. Vobora told the group that there was no written contract at this time, but that was the intent.

Mr. Dubick asked if it were possible that some of the service provided would be level one and some would be level two, as outlined in the Fully Allocated Cost Plan. Mr. Vobora stated that the levels outlined in the document were more a way to evaluate the level of intensity in dispensing resources and oversight of the service; he added that the only special event service that fell into the Level 2 category is UO football because there were so many coordinators needed to implement the event. Ms. Sifuentez stated that the difference between this service and UO football was the many volunteers that would be available at different sites to help customers with bus information, which keeps costs down.

Mr. Eyster asked if the Board had ever considered not trying to recover all costs because it was such a large event for the community. Mr. Vobora stated that the District often donated a certain amount of service to first-time events, which was done to some extent with the Eugene Marathon this year. There was some precedent. He added that the community had responded, and the city, county, CVALCO, and others were providing resources to help because the Olympic Trials was such a huge community event. Businesses would add staff, which also would benefit LTD in an increase in payroll taxes.

Mr. Eyster stated that it was obvious that this was a very important community event. Mr. Vobora asked if the committee felt that they could deviate and take back a recommendation to the full Board. Mr. Eyster stated that his inclination was to try to be as accommodating as possible, but he wasn't sure what those numbers were.

Mr. Dubick asked if there was a proposal that would outline some of the numbers for the committee. Mr. Vobora stated that staff had discussed going down to direct costs for the service, which were the operator costs and the vehicle operating costs. Mr. Vobora stated that he felt this amount was reasonable, and it was about 50 percent of the level one rate (an approximate difference in cost of \$60,000). Mr. Vobora reminded the group that expenses were disbursed over two fiscal years; he added that Mr. Eyster and Mr. Dubick both serve on the Budget Committee and knew how much was available in contingency funds to absorb this type of request.

Mr. Dubick stated that he thought there was the potential to recover some of the costs through the payroll tax by the fact that the entire business community was stepping up to be able to serve all of the visitors. He stated that he felt that under the circumstances, and because of the unique elements of the event, he would support looking at a reduced rate for the service. He added that the Board would have to be able to address concerns about how they arrived at the decision and concerns about treating people differently. He stated that there was potential to recover some of the costs, which was one way to justify it.

Mr. Eyster stated that he was comfortable about making an exception for this request because it seemed so different and unique.

Mr. Jordan stated that there would be 1,000 media from all over the world, as well as 45,000 people from outside the area which was tremendous advertisement for LTD to showcase LTD's EmX service on Franklin Blvd.

Mr. Eyster told Mr. Jordan and Ms. Kousky that the committee would make a recommendation to the full Board at their June meeting to deviate from the pricing guidelines outlined in the Special Service Policy.

Ms. Linoz asked if the District was at risk of competing with local providers as outlined by the federal charter guidelines. Mr. Vobora stated that the guidelines were being revised. There was a debate going on, and a couple of transit districts have been found in violation of the guidelines, and if a contact was signed, would it take precedent over the new guidelines? Mr. Vobora stated that the timing would be important and LTD would have to wait and see. He added that the District also could write to the administrator and request exceptions for different service requests.

Ms. Sifuentez mentioned that Mr. Jordan and Ms. Kousky were aware of the unknowns about the federal charter regulations. She added that the Olympic Trials event requires accessible vehicles that were not available from private carriers. This fact also may support the District providing the service. It also could be that another private provider could say they would provide the service and then subcontract with LTD.

The group agreed it could be a challenge.

**PARK & RIDE PLANNING – EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Mr. Schwetz stated that staff can prepared to ask the Board to go into Executive Session about this topic. He explained that there actually were two pieces to the agenda. One was described in the meeting packet that dealt with seeking direction around purchasing the River Road Station Park & Ride site. Stefano Viggiano added that the purpose of going into Executive Session would be to talk about price issues and confidential discussions that have occurred with Lane County staff.

As outlined by ORS 192.660(2)(i), the Board Service Planning and Marketing Committee entered Executive Session for the purpose of discussing Park & Ride planning.

Mr. Dubick moved that the committee make a recommendation to the full Board to pursue negotiations for the purchase of the River Road Station Park & Ride site from Lane County. Mr. Evans seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

**RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:** The Committee returned to open session at approximately 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Schwetz told the group that the second item for discussion around Park & Ride planning was to have a broader conversation about the long-term strategy; he distributed a draft document that outlined the EmX scenario and a map of the region. The map showed existing Park & Rides today, and Mr. Schwetz stated that there was a definite need for a Park & Ride strategy for the entire system. He added that with the roll-out of the EmX system, the Park & Rides take on even greater importance. As the West Eugene Extension was discussed, staff envisioned a significant Park & Ride at its westerly terminus (probably in the Willow Creek area, west of Bertelsen) to capture the significant commute travel between Veneta and Eugene. Mr. Schwetz stated that this was an area where there was tremendous value in the Park & Ride site, and the Thurston site was another Park & Ride site that could be in jeopardy because of the State of Oregon's plans for a full interchange at that location. It would be necessary for the District to explore the future potential for this site, as well as looking at other properties in the surrounding area. Mr. Schwetz stated that staff hoped to have a discussion with the Committee at this meeting to reach a more detailed strategy that ties in with the District's plans for the overall EmX system, and the details around a purchase strategy and what that would involve.

Mr. Viggiano added that there were a lot of Park & Rides on the map distributed to the committee, but most of them were very small and mostly available through agreements with local churches. The District's major Park & Ride sites were River Road Station, Thurston Station, Springfield Station, and Seneca Station. The rest of the Park & Rides were very small.

Mr. Dubick asked how many of the Park & Ride sites reach capacity by 8 a.m. Staff responded that Springfield Station, Walnut Station, and Amazon Station all reach capacity by 8 a.m.

Mr. Eyster stated that he agreed it was necessary for the Board of Directors to develop a strategy through agreement or acquisition to secure space.

Ms. Bloom told the Committee that in the last two years, two local churches have contacted LTD to give a 30-day notice to remove LTD Park & Rides.

Mr. Dubick asked why the churches wanted the Park & Ride sites removed. Ms. Bloom responded that the reasons can vary, from wanting the space for other uses to changes in leadership.

Mr. Eyster asked if the committee needed to make a recommendation to the full Board.

Mr. Schwetz responded by asking for direction from the committee to pursue this strategy.

Mr. Eyster stated that he had talked to Mr. Viggiano in months past about the Springfield Station overcrowding. He stated that when this was considered, along with the River Road Station issue and the church issue, it seemed to culminate in the need to develop a bigger picture in terms of Park & Rides.

Mr. Evans stated that he did not want the District to look at the issue in a vacuum. In the past, he stated that establishing the District's Park & Rides had not been coordinated with city or county planning staff. He suggested having a broader conversation with city planners in Eugene and Springfield and county planners so that LTD could look at a comprehensive strategy that looked at private/public partnerships where LTD could purchase and develop the property, or have private development work with LTD to develop the property so that LTD could extend its resources without casting more fiscal burden on the itself.

Mr. Schwetz stated that Mr. Evans had described a process he had envisioned that involved all of the regional partners, including ODOT, Lane County, Eugene, Springfield, and Coburg, looking at more than the EmX termini, but also other station opportunities where Park & Rides could be considered.

Ms. Linoz stated that, as LTD was looked to to provide transportation for the community, the District's biggest challenge was competing to find locations that were available weekdays and weekends on key dates so that LTD could provide the shuttle service that benefited the community. She stated that LTD often was at a loss to find a place, and when the new arena opens for community venues, it would magnify the problem even more.

Mr. Schwetz proposed to the Committee that staff would come back to the group with a more detailed scope for their review, and he would be prepared to give an update to the full Board at their regular May Board meeting.

Ms. Bloom told the committee that the District now was leasing 22 additional parking spaces for the Springfield Park & Ride site. The added spaces were leased from Booth-Kelly and would be available on June 1.

Mr. Schwetz stated that the committee had gotten the sense of how dynamic and costly the Park & Rides sites were from the discussion about the River Road Station Park & Ride site; he told committee members that when staff comes back to the committee with a scope, it probably would not be wise to get site-specific with the locations.

Mr. Dubick stated that if LTD's transportation services were to be part of the overall transportation plan for the community, it could not rely on whether or not a leasor was willing to lease, and it would be important to look at ways to get everyone on board that the sites would need to be permanent.



Mr. Vobora commented that the District had been looking for large parking lots to accommodate events; there weren't any, and it would be true in the urban area, as well. He added that anything with the size needed for a Park & Ride lot also would be extremely expensive, and he suggested considering sites available just outside the areas currently served by LTD. Service adjustments would be needed, and it would be necessary to anticipate where development would be going.

**STUDENT TRANSIT PASS PROGRAM:** Mr. Vobora reported that the item came back to this group because there have been some changes to the program and there had been interest in the past from some Board members to keep the program going and to find ways to modify it in order to tap into the youth market. Mr. Vobora stated that he wanted to update the committee on the communication process underway. There had been communication to all of the schools and to elected officials and partners. Some entities were signing contracts with the District to do group passes and discussions were continuing with the school districts. He added that the intent of the discussion today was to get further direction of where the Board would like staff to focus their efforts. Mr. Vobora stated that the District could play a role in the Chalk Board Project, but it was a project focused with the schools. Mr. Vobora continued by saying that Mr. Evans had mentioned looking at other entities for partnership opportunities. He stated that the school districts and the city had indicated they were not interested; the county may be interested, but they, too, may have limited funding and have chosen to not fund some programs that were initiated as early as last year for the homeless. Mr. Vobora stated that he did not know what kind of success the District would have, but he felt that staff should talk with city staff to see if there was some creative funding.

Mr. Dubick stated that in years past, the District had sold passes at the schools at a reduced price. Mr. Vobora stated that the passes had not been sold at a reduced price, but a wholesale discount was offered and the schools could choose to reduce the price to the students. In later years, the districts did not offer the discount to the students.

Mr. Dubick asked if the school districts were interested in providing this service again. Mr. Vobora stated that he had contacted all 4J high school principals and had received no responses. Mr. Dubick stated that he felt that selling some passes could cushion the loss of ridership that the District was likely to see. Mr. Vobora stated that the Summer Youth Pass would help folks transition through the first month of school, and the District could look at a separate student pass category that was different from others, and the passes were deeply discounted. He added that this was an opportunity to study the effects of having the program and then not having the program, and he felt that it could be very useful to look at the impact of the loss of the program and use the data for long-term planning. He told the group that everyone agreed that they want a youth program, but no one wanted to pay for it. The District would have to get creative in coming up with resources.

Mr. Dubick stated that there may be a fine line between creating a desire to have students have free bus passes and alienating them once the program was removed. Mr. Vobora stated that his concern was for low income families with several children who have to purchase three, four, or five monthly passes for their children.

Mr. Evans suggested looking into the possibility using advertising revenues taken in to be used for the student pass program funding, as well as negotiating with outside businesses who want to advertise on the buses (the wraparounds, shelters, etc.), and considering if these revenues could be designated specifically for providing the student passes. Mr. Vobora commented that the last time the advertising contract was put out to bid when it was renewed, only one bidder responded (Lamar). He felt that the revenues received by the District for the services provided by Lamar were very good. The District receives about \$300,000 (40 percent of the revenues received by Lamar for the advertising), and was selling out advertising space on the vehicles. Mr. Vobora stated that currently the advertising revenue received went into the general fund. Funds could be moved around to fund the student passes, but funds still would be lost. He stated that it was important to find a new revenue source for the program. One option to increase advertising revenues could be to again look at advertising in bus shelters.

Mr. Evans reiterated that thinking outside the box may be necessary in order to come up with funds to support this student program, and advertising revenues may be an area that could be focused on.

Mr. Dubick asked if the District ever considered selling family passes, especially for the low income. Mr. Vobora responded that they had not been considered. He added that the District had avoided looking at the low-income category because many of LTD's riders fall into this category. There were some examples of family passes used by other transit properties, and he stated that he would research it and get back to the committee. The discussion had come up more and more through the years; with gas prices and higher ridership, the District could evaluate that and see logistically how it could work for LTD. Mr. Vobora told the group that Ms. Van Winkle had suggesting contacting Oregon legislators to gain their support for funding. (The District also was asking for funding for senior programs.) He suggested contacting the legislators after the session ended to see if they had any ideas for funding at the state level.

Mr. Eyster asked about the repercussions of offering a discounted student pass price and the affect on group pass participants. Mr. Vobora responded that the reduced rate of the student pass still was more than twice the rate of the group pass participants. Mr. Eyster stated that, if that was the case, then at a minimum the District should look at trying to come up with a special student rate. He added that he would like to see something in place for this fall, since it would be a hard transition for folks. Mr. Vobora stated that he would come back to the committee with information about what the District anticipates in costs.

Mr. Viggiano told the committee that, before LCC and UO had student passes, the District made available to K-12 students a student pass that was discounted to take into account school holidays and closures. The pass was valid for three months but offered students a larger discount.

Mr. Dubick stated that he would like to see the District offer some option that would help students and families.

Mr. Vobora told the group that the District got away from selling quarterly passes because of the problem of people losing their pass. Another option was a hybrid that would leave the cash fare and monthly pass prices the same, a special pass could be available that offered a really deeper discount. The downside was that low-income customers would need to invest in the pass up front, and the savings would be recouped over time.

Ms. VanWinkle stated that whatever it was that the District structured, the intent was to try to attract the riders of choice. She stated that people using LTD before were thrilled with the free pass, and it could be assumed that those folks would continue to ride LTD as before. The riders of choice who tried LTD because it was free would likely drive them now because the pass no longer was free. These were the students that the District would like to attract. She suggested looking at a monthly pass cost that would attract this group to change from being non-riders to riders.

Mr. Vobora stated that this was the justification of how the summer youth pass had been priced in the past. The District looked at how many passes needed to be sold in order to come out revenue neutral, and this helped to determine the cost of the discounted pass.

Mr. Dubick stated that, in 4J, there were many kids traveling across the city. He would like to see more of them traveling across the city on the bus; he added that he would like to see people out of their cars and the District should have something out there that would entice them into riding the bus to school. Mr. Dubick stated that in the last several years, he had seen a reduction in the number of carpools at the school where he teaches.

Mr. Evans suggested looking into a type of scan card that two or three retailers subsidized; the card would offer store discounts that would get the kids into the retail stores to spend, and some of the program investment would be returned to the merchants through the purchases of the kids.

Mr. Mueller stated that his main concern was the low income families whose children who do not have the option of their parents taking them across town to school functions or activities. If they did not have a bus pass that was affordable, they would not get to go.

Mr. Vobora stated that staff would come back to the committee with options for this fall. He added that it may be worth looking at corporate sponsorships. Mr. Evans stated that most all students go to Valley River Center or Gateway Mall for school supplies and clothing. If a type of scan card were used with each purchase, merchants could determine whether or not to continue supporting the student pass program.

Staff will come back to the committee with ideas.

## **UPDATES**

**EmX STOP SPACING:** Mr. Vobora told the group that EmX stop spacing had come up from customers. He distributed a handout that showed former bus stops of Route *11 Thurston* along the Franklin Corridor and where the EmX stops currently were located. Overall, the stops were very close to the bus stops served prior to EmX.

Mr. Eyster commented that it seemed that it may be a matter of educating the public that, if you want a faster bus, it had to stop less often. Mr. Vobora agreed and stated that the comments had come from a small group of people who were directly affected.

Mr. Eyster asked about how many stops were made at Lexington Station. Mr. Mueller stated that it had the second lowest ridership in the system.

**WHEELCHAIR UNLOADING:** Mr. Vobora told the group that Mr. Evans had a question at the last meeting about wheelchair overload issues, and added that Ms. Lindsay had gathered data about it. The District's percentage of ridership by customers in mobility devices was higher than any of LTD's peer groups (.75 percent of ridership, compared with Salem at .04 percent and Reno at .41 percent). It clearly was an issue that other properties were not experiencing like LTD, and if they were, they were treating it the same way. (If the wait was not over one-half hour, the customer waited for the next bus. If it was longer, another bus would be dispatched.)

**BUSPLUS!** Mr. Vobora reported that staff were working on a few ideas around different corridors; staff would come back to the Board with more information about this project and where the District was headed.

**CASINO/BUS SERVICE:** Mr. Vobora reported that staff met with Three Rivers Casino staff; they are in the process of opening their permanent facility in November. They would be doubling their workforce from approximately 250 to 500 employees. It is anticipated that many employees would live in Eugene and Springfield and would commute over, and casino staff were trying to decide how to provide transportation in the most economical way for employees. District staff met with casino personnel to discuss shift schedules and the dynamic of the service. The service would provide some challenges for LTD, but there was a good discussion about other alternatives that might help them in the early stages, such as carpooling and vanpooling. Mr. Vobora stated that the planning was in the information-gathering stage. Commissioner Bill Fleenor was having an open house listening session of Thursday, May 31, to talk about bus service to West Lane County. LTD staff also would meet with the mayor and city manager of Florence to talk about the process and boundary expansion, what happened in the past, and to answer questions they may have. There was momentum building around service for West Lane County.

Mr. Eyster asked what kind of demand could be anticipated from customers. Mr. Vobora stated that a bus was provided by the casino now that ran three days a week and it was well used. He added that he felt that Florence would benefit greatly from LTD service, just in terms of people from the valley going over to shop and enjoy the coast for the day. Some of the analysis needed was to look

at schedules, and from the Florence standpoint, is there the payroll tax base to keep the District revenue neutral if service was extended to West Lane County. The Board's position in the past had been that if Florence did not want bus service, the District would not push it. Another question that could come up was if the city of Florence said no to bus service but the casino wanted service. It could be that the District would contract with the casino, similar to the contracted service with Sacred Heart for Route 75x Sacred Heart. It would be an open-door public service, but it would be outside LTD's service boundaries, which would mean that other issues would need resolution.

Ms. Williams added that there also was the impact on some Medicaid/medical trips of getting people from Florence over to the valley for medical care. She stated that there was a daily service now for very limited medical trips; Friends of Eugene provide van service for cancer and dialysis patients. Porter Stage Lines also comes from south coast and comes through Florence and travels to Eastern Oregon.

**UO STUDENT SURVEY:** Mr. Vobora reported that the UO student survey had been completed. A final version would be provided to the Board. Participation was good (22 percent or 3,800 responses), and the survey indicated that the service was well used and considered a good value.

*Q:\Reference\Board Packet FINAL\2007\05\SP&M Comm\BoardSPAM5-9-07meetingminutes.doc*

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** August 7, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** *BUSPLUS!* – SELECTION OF THE FIRST CORRIDOR

**PREPARED BY:** Tom Schwetz, Director of Planning and Development

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Discussion and direction

**BACKGROUND:** To enable the District to introduce transit corridor improvements in a more timely manner, LTD is embarking on a program called *Busplus!* This program encompasses the incremental improvement of transit corridors with the goal of improving the performance of transit service and reducing transit operating cost.

In early 2006 the LTD Board instructed staff to investigate the linking of the River Road and Lane Community College routes into a single continuous *Busplus!* route. On their own these two routes are well utilized and would benefit from transit improvements along their respective corridors. Further investigation of combining the routes yielded a number of inefficiencies resulting from schedule incompatibility, LCC class times, long round-trip times, limited stop elimination, and few traffic signal benefits.

Staff have reviewed the remaining major corridors in the community and recommend the consideration of a “flag”-shaped route linking the Eugene Station via Coburg Road to the proposed EmX Pioneer Parkway route at the Gateway Station. The route was originally selected by the City of Eugene Council as the second EmX line; however, many of the property owners along the corridor objected to the impacts that EmX may have had on access and private property.

**ATTACHMENT:** *Busplus!* - Development of the First Corridor

## **Busplus! – Development of the First Corridor**

### **Background:**

While Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) has been identified in the Regional Transportation Plan as the preferred transit strategy for the Eugene/Springfield area, the implementation of EmX with its full complement of improvements is a very complex and long-term process. Funding limitations, combined with an extensive environmental review process, limit construction of a full EmX corridor to, at most, one corridor every six years. In order to realize the benefits of the various EmX elements more quickly, LTD is pursuing an incremental development of the EmX system for some corridors. The proposed service, which we have called *Busplus!* (previously referred to as Progressive Corridor Enhancement [PCE]), would allow faster implementation of transit corridor improvements. *Busplus!* investments have been included in the most recent update of the Regional Transportation Plan. The goal of *Busplus!* is to improve the performance (travel time, reliability) of the transit service and reduce transit operating cost. Over time, additional EmX elements will be added to the *Busplus!* corridors with some routes possessing the complement of EmX elements.

In early 2006 the LTD Board instructed staff to investigate the introduction of *Busplus!* on a route combining River Road and Lane Community College. These two routes would provide for a single continuous route between the Santa Clara neighborhood and Lane Community College. Both of these routes are experiencing high ridership and would benefit, at a system level, from being linked together. While staff had concerns regarding the compatibility of the schedules of these routes, it was felt that the two areas could be served with the minimum amount of additional service. The reduction of underutilized stops and the introduction of transit signal priority were also seen as measures that would compensate for the additional service by reducing existing travel time delays.

### **Results of Investigation:**

LTD staff developed schedules for the combined route; however, there were substantial inefficiencies caused by the combining of the routes. These inefficiencies can be attributed to the following reasons:

- Service span incompatible: Service to LCC is only provided to approximately 7:00 p.m. in the evening and there is no weekend service; whereas Route #51 Santa Clara is in service until 11:00 p.m. on weekdays and Saturdays, and until 8:00 p.m. on Sundays. The extended service to LCC on weekends and evenings would be underutilized. The route could be “cut short” at Eugene Station during the evening and weekends, but this would likely be confusing to passengers.
- Meeting LCC class times. In order to meet LCC class times, it meant that the River Road service would arrive at the Eugene Station outside of the major “pulses”, requiring an extended passenger transfer time.
- Extensive round trip times. In order to maximize the efficiency of the service, a regular bus may undertake several different routes in a shift. The long round-trip time of the River Road/LCC route reduces some of the efficiency in the

scheduling, and causes run-cutting difficulties (dividing up the service into approximately eight-hour pieces)

- Limited stop reductions: Most of the stops on River Road are accompanied by pull-outs and, in some cases, shelters. Abandoning these stops is a possibility; however it would be unlikely that replacement pull-outs will be developed near-by.

Additionally, further examination by the City of Eugene as to the effectiveness of traffic signal priority along the corridor indicates that the benefits are going to be small as most of the traffic signals on River Road are actuated and cause minimal delay to the through traffic. Where the greatest delays are experienced (Beltline and River Road), there was little the City of Eugene could do to improve the situation.

### **Busplus! on Coburg Road:**

In search of a successful candidate corridor for the *Busplus!* concept, staff reviewed all of the major corridors in the Eugene/Springfield area.

Current service levels along each of the major corridors in the community are illustrated in the following table.

<b>Corridor</b>	<b>Routes Currently Using Corridor</b>	<b>Frequency In buses per hour (Peak)</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Willamette Street	24 Donald	2	
	25 Amazon	2	
West 11 <sup>th</sup> /13 <sup>th</sup>	30 Bertelsen	2	
	41 Barger/West 11 <sup>th</sup>	2	Eastbound Only
	43 West 11 <sup>th</sup> /Barger	2	Westbound Only
Amazon Parkway	82 LCC/Pearl	6	
	92 Lowell/LCC	1	Limited Service
	22 Crest Drive	1	Limited Service
Highway 99	41 Barger/West 11 <sup>th</sup>	2	Northbound Only
	43 West 11 <sup>th</sup> /Barger	2	Southbound Only
	95 Junction City	1	Limited Service
River Road	51 Santa Clara	2	
	52 Irving	2	
	55 River Road	2	
	Connector		Neighborhood Circulator
Main Street	11 Thurston	4	
Centennial/ MLK	13 Centennial	2	
Coburg Road	60 Cal Young	2	Limited Service,
	64 Sheldon Plaza	2	Southbound Only
	66 VRC/Coburg Road	2	Southbound Only
	67 Coburg Road/VRC	2	Northbound Only

As a starting point to the evaluation, the criteria used to select the initial *Busplus!* corridor were reviewed. These criteria are listed below:

- High, established ridership
- Ability to form a single cross-city/through route
- Logical connections along through route
- Ability to consolidate existing routes into a single corridor service
- Complimentary service frequency between the two ends of the route
- Ease of implementation of Level 2 transit priority measures
- Opportunity to have a significant impact on travel time with Level 2 improvements

Evaluating each corridor it became evident that the Coburg Road best meets these criteria. It is envisioned that existing LTD services on Coburg Road would be realigned to provide a connection to the proposed Pioneer Parkway EmX line at Gateway Station. The proposed *Busplus!* route forms a “flag-like” configuration, extending from Downtown Eugene through the Crescent/Chad area and then to Gateway Street and returning along Harlow Road.

As a major corridor in the northeastern sector of Eugene, this corridor has up to six buses per hour during certain times of the day. This corridor was initially selected by the City of Eugene as the second BRT corridor, primarily because of the opportunity to connect with the Pioneer Parkway EmX corridor.

Existing station amenities will be upgraded to provide a safe and comfortable environment for passengers as well as provide an easily identifiable point of access to the *Busplus!* line. Exclusive right-of-way would not be part of the project.

### **Schedule:**

LTD’s goal is to have the Coburg Road *Busplus!* service in place before the opening of the Pioneer Parkway EmX service. Improvements to the corridor could begin as early as Spring 2008.

### **Funding:**

A total of \$3 million for development has been authorized as part of the federal transportation bill (TEA-LU). LTD is providing a 20 percent match to these funds.

### **Recommendation:**

Based on this review, staff recommends further investigation of Coburg Road as the initial *Busplus!* corridor.



## SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 9, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** EXECUTIVE (NON-PUBLIC) SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(2)(e)

**PREPARED BY:** Jo Sullivan, Clerk of the Board

**ACTION REQUESTED:** That the Board Service Planning & Marketing Committee meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

**PROPOSED MOTION:** I move that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2007\05\SP&M Comm\EXECSUM-e.doc

# Draft

## Lane Transit District Bus Service to Florence Frequently Asked Questions

### What is the decision process for expanding LTD services?

State law provides for an initiative process to place a ballot measure before the people who live in the entire Lane Transit District boundary; however, this method has not been used in an attempt to expand the boundary. State law also allows the LTD Board to unilaterally decide to change boundaries through its annual ordinance process; however, the LTD Board has never exercised this authority. The LTD Board has taken the position that the elected officials, representing a city or area within the county, would be required to request a service provision to their community and that LTD would not unilaterally change the boundaries. In the cases of Creswell and Cottage Grove, it was the City Council that made a request. In Florence, it would be the City Council, however, the Florence situation introduces a new twist. Because so much of the route operates along the State highway, and in area overseen by the County, the process will need to involve residents, business owners, and other interested parties.

### What is the timeline?

There is no set timeline for beginning service to Florence because the Florence City Council has not requested service. Additionally, added service to Florence is not currently in LTD's Five-Year Transportation Development Plan. Funding for service changes outlined in the development plan is assumed in the District's Long-Range Financial Plan. Because dedicated funding would come along with a decision to expand the service boundary, it is possible for this service to be added to the development plan.

LTD traditionally implements new service in September each year, which would point us toward September 2008 as the earliest date for the start of service to Florence.

### How does LTD set its boundaries?

District boundaries are set through an ordinance process and are affirmed annually by the LTD Board. State law allows the boundary to be the county boundary, to be placed along census tracts, or to be set a specific distance from the bus route. LTD uses a distance-based approach along rural service corridors and then works with the local elected officials to determine what makes sense within the urban area. In the most recent boundary expansion, Creswell and Cottage Grove joined the District. In these cases, the boundary was set tightly along Interstate 5 because customers cannot access the bus along the freeway. Within the two cities, the boundary follows the urban growth boundary. Along rural highways, LTD sets the boundary 2.5 miles from the bus route. The reasoning behind this distance is that it is a reasonable distance to travel to access the bus and that the bus is accessible along the entire highway.

To view LTD's current boundary please visit: <http://www.ltd.org/pdf/smbd.pdf>

Formatted: Bottom: 0.88"

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 0.5", Space Before: 6 pt

Formatted: Space After: 3 pt

Deleted: L

Deleted: ,

Deleted: .

Deleted: starting

Deleted:

Deleted:

Formatted: Space After: 3 pt

Deleted: .

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Deleted: /

Formatted: Font: Italic

# Draft

## Who pays LTD taxes?

Payroll and self-employment taxes, which provide revenue for mass transit, are collected and administered by the [Oregon Department of Revenue](#) (DOR). The Oregon Department of Revenue staff can be reached at (503) 378-4988.

Effective January 1, 2007, the rate increased to .0062 percent (\$6.20 per \$1,000) of the wages paid by an employer and the net earnings from self-employment for services performed within the Lane Transit District boundary. Employers should apply the new rate with their reporting related to wages for the first quarter of 2007. Self-employed individuals should use the new rate when first reporting earnings for 2007.

The 2003 Oregon Legislature provided Lane Transit District with the authority to increase the rate over 10 years to help pay for transit service throughout the region. The rate increases annually until the maximum of .007 percent (\$7.00 per \$1,000 of wages) is reached in 2014.

### **Link to payroll tax information from DOR:**

<http://egov.oregon.gov/DOR/BUS/transit-excise.shtml>

### **Link to self-employment tax info from DOR:**

<http://egov.oregon.gov/DOR/BUS/IC-102-406.shtml>

## How is the tax rate set?

A funding ordinance establishing a payroll tax on employers within the LTD service district was implemented in 1971. An ordinance establishing a comparable self-employment tax was established in 1994. LTD also receives "in-lieu-of" payroll tax subsidies from the State of Oregon, based on state employment within the service district. In 1985, the state legislature created a Special Transportation Fund through a tax on tobacco products. This funding provides transportation services to the elderly and persons with disabilities in Lane County. LTD also continues to receive some funding from the federal government for assistance with fleet and facilities, though the amount of federal support for transit has declined substantially in the last decade.

## What is the tax rate?

The following chart shows that LTD has not always charged the maximum tax rate. In 1969, the Oregon legislature created the District and approved the use of a payroll tax. The District has adjusted the rate based upon revenues and the demand for increased service. In 2003, the state legislature raised the tax rate cap from .006 to .007 (\$6 per \$1,000 of payroll to \$7 per \$1,000 of payroll). This increase must be phased in over a 10-year period ending in 2014. The LTD Board chose not to implement this tax upon authorization by the legislature. The current plan calls for the incremental increase to occur beginning in January 2007.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Deleted:

Deleted: ¶

¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.09", Space Before: 12 pt

Formatted: Left

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ,

Deleted: /

Formatted: Font: Italic

# Draft

1973	0.0047
July 1974	0.0055
January 1979	0.005
January 1980	0.006

October 1983	0.005
July 1987	0.0049
January 1992	0.0056
October 1994	0.006
January 2007	0.0062

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Left

## What is the estimated tax revenue from the Florence area?

Information regarding tax payments is confidential and difficult to obtain even in aggregated form due to the nature of payroll that would be subject to this tax. In order to make an estimate of potential payroll tax receipts, LTD works with a state economist who evaluates payroll information provided to the State Employment Department. This information tends to lag slightly due to reporting cycles; therefore, the latest information will show data from 2005. The information includes data from the entire 97439 zip code area, which is broader than the taxing district boundaries would be.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Deleted: ,

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Data for 2005 for the 97439 zip code shows \$108,774,090.00 in total payroll. This number is reduced by \$20,359,169.00 in payroll for local schools, state, federal, and tribal wages that are not taxed. The taxable wages of \$88,414,921.00 is multiplied by the current LTD tax rate of .0062 to arrive at an estimated tax receipts figure of \$548,200.00.

Formatted: Space After: 6 pt

## Why doesn't LTD just charge higher fares to those who ride the bus?

Passenger fares are an important revenue source for LTD, and in an average year, provide roughly 17 to 22 percent of the total revenues available to fund LTD services. Compared to the bus fares in similar-sized cities, LTD's fares are above average.

Deleted: .

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.44"

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0.5", Space Before: 0 pt

Deleted: ¶

Each year, LTD makes appropriate upward adjustments in its fares in a manner that is consistent with the annual inflation in transportation costs, with a goal of optimizing total passenger revenues while minimizing associated ridership losses. There becomes a point, however, where customers with limited income are priced out and can no longer use the service or must use it on a much more limited basis. The LTD Board policy on fares attempts to balance the needs of the customer and the District in a way that maximizes ridership and revenues.

Formatted: Space After: 6 pt

## How many trips would operate and how is the schedule determined?

Schedules are determined based upon projected ridership and the specific ridership needs being targeted. Currently, LTD rural routes operate between four and ten trips on weekdays. Weekend service is not provided to all areas, and the number of trips is minimal. Routes 91 through 98 are LTD rural routes and may be viewed at: <http://www.ltd.org/ridingltd/routesschedules.html>

Deleted: ¶

¶

¶

¶

Deleted: /

Formatted: Font: Italic

# Draft

A number for ridership needs have been expressed to LTD. These include:

- ◆ Recreation and tourism trips to and from Florence
- ◆ Employment trips to and from Florence
- ◆ Accessing services in Eugene-Springfield

Deleted: Florence

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.54", Space After: 6 pt

Where will the route go in Florence?

Deleted: ¶

Route analysis has not been conducted at this time. A centrally located Park & Ride lot would be desirable to many riders and a circulation route through town makes access convenient to other riders who wish to access the service. These determinations are made following analysis conducted by LTD service planning staff; and discussions with residents, businesses, and city staff.

Deleted: p

Deleted: and

Deleted: r

Deleted: ,

Will the Rhody Express be affected by LTD service operating to Florence?

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: in

No. Local oversight of the Rhody Express would continue. Federal and state grants and a local contribution from the City of Florence currently pay for the Rhody Express. LTD would need to continue to be successful in applying for grants and getting support from the Oregon Public Transit Division and the City of Florence to operate the Rhody Express.

Deleted: This service is currently termed, "out of district" and would become "in district" if Florence were to join the LTD service area. This same change occurred for South Lane Wheels in Cottage Grove in 2000.

Deleted: As an "in-district" provider, the state funding opportunities may expand and funding would come through LTD to the Rhody Express. ¶

What would be the expected ridership on a Florence route?

Ridership is difficult to anticipate; however, LTD has rural route performance standards that are used to measure route productivity. The current standard is 30 boardings per round trip. Within the urban area, the standard is based on the number of boardings per service hour, but this standard does not work well for rural routes extending long distances.

Deleted: as

Deleted: '

Deleted: that travel

Deleted: /

Formatted: Font: Italic

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** August 7, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** FLORENCE SERVICE EXPANSION

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Board direction on process and timeline

**BACKGROUND:** In 1974 a number of rural Lane County communities joined the Lane Transit District service area. Several chose not to join the District, and they included: Oakridge, Creswell, Cottage Grove, and Florence. Since that time, both Creswell and Cottage Grove have joined the District. Oakridge discussed joining and held community votes to gauge community support. Each vote failed and Oakridge remains out of the District. Florence has never requested to join the District.

District boundaries may be changed through three processes. First, an initiative process outlined in O.R.S. 267 allows an area within the county to be voted in to or out of the District. The entire District population would vote on such measures. Second, the LTD Board may unilaterally change the boundary through an ordinance process. Third, an area may request to be included in the District boundary, and the LTD Board may change the boundary, through an ordinance process, to include the new area. LTD Boards have stated that boundary changes will be handled through a collaborative process involving the local community. If community members want LTD service, they will need to work with their elected representatives and forward a request to the LTD Board.

In 1999, Creswell joined the District. This was preceded by the Creswell City Council making a request to join the District. In 2000, Cottage Grove joined the District. The Cottage Grove City Council made a request to join the District following an advisory vote of Cottage Grove residents who showed support for joining.

While there has been some level of community discussion regarding expanding the boundary to include Florence, no formal request for service expansion has come from the Florence City Council. The recent discussion of expansion has been spurred by groups with different interests. First, Three Rivers Casino has an interest in bringing employees to work at their expanded facilities that will be

opening soon. Second, Lane County Commissioner Bill Fleenor has expressed interest in seeing public transportation expanded to west Lane County. Third, the Florence Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) has discussed LTD service to Florence. The Florence TAC oversees the Rhody Express public bus service within the Florence area.

To date staff and LTD Board members have met with Commissioner Fleenor or his staff at two public meetings where the expansion of service was discussed. Meetings with the Florence City Manager and the casino general manager have also occurred. These meetings provided opportunities for residents, business owners, and staff to learn about the expansion process.

The next step is to complete a “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQ) document. This document will provide a common set of information from which interested parties may learn about the process. A key piece of information in the FAQ is background on current service in Florence (Rhody Express), an overview of services from Florence to the valley, and a review of other service models such as the Diamond Express. The Diamond Express provides weekday service between Oakridge and Eugene-Springfield and is funded through state intercity grant funds. The service is currently operated by Special Mobility Services.

Concurrent with completion of the Florence FAQ, staff will be discussing operational issues and fleet constraints that may have an impact on the District’s ability to expand service.

Staff is interested in hearing Board concerns, suggestions for additional information in the FAQ, data needs that will help the Board assess this issue, and general comments on boundary expansion versus other operational needs facing the District in coming years.

**ATTACHMENT:**

Draft Florence Frequently Asked Questions Document.

Q:\Reference\Board Packet FINAL\2007\08\SP&M Comm\florence svc expansion.doc



## Student Transit Pass Program ends after June 30, 2007

The current Student Transit Pass Program (STPP) is allowing students in grades 6-12 to ride LTD free using the Smart Ways to School pink sticker through June 30, 2007. **This program, which has been a research project, has completed its work and will not continue after the current school year.**

For the coming 2007-08 year, LTD has offered a Group Pass Program that public school districts and private schools can purchase to provide students with LTD passes, similar to the very successful Group Pass Program purchased by many area businesses and organizations. The cost is \$3.68 per student per month for all students enrolled at participating schools during September 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

While a good value, the program represents a cost that public school districts and private schools have not previously incurred. Bethel, Eugene 4J, and Springfield school districts have declined to purchase the program, citing the need to fund other educational priorities. Several private schools have indicated their interest in purchasing a Group Pass Program for their students.

For this summer, LTD is offering students a three-month pass covering July, August, and September for \$19.95. The summer Youth Pass gives students an unlimited opportunity to ride through the summer and first month of the new school year.

For 2007-08 school year, students attending schools that do not provide a Group Pass Program may purchase an LTD Monthly Youth Pass for \$19.00 or \$51.50 for a three-month pass, or buy tokens or pay cash to ride LTD.

LTD and Commuter Solutions appreciated the opportunity to provide students with a free-ride experience as part of the STPP.



We will continue to seek low-cost ways to serve youth riders. Meanwhile, LTD and the program partners hope the positive experience students and parents enjoyed will encourage them to use LTD as one of their travel options.

The STPP was made possible by replacing the approximately \$600,000 in annual LTD student fare with research funds provided through a partnership involving Oregon Department of Energy, Commuter Solutions' Smart Ways to School Program, LTD, Lane Council of Governments, and Pacific Continental Bank. The project began three years ago serving 5,000 high school students, and expanded during the past two years to its present size serving about 27,000 students.

The project successfully completed its research goal by demonstrating that a free-pass program significantly increases transit use by students, particularly for transportation to and from school. More than 6,000 LTD boardings per school day were attributed to students in the program. Students, parents, school staff, and community leaders appreciated the value of the program in encouraging students to try LTD and use it more often for their school transportation and other travel.



# Lane Transit District

---

## Fully Allocated Cost Plan

---

From audited expenses for the fiscal year  
ending June 30, 2006

# Fully Allocated Cost Plan

## Fully allocated cost plan methodology

The 2005-2006 cost plan was prepared using a model consistent with previous years. This model follows the guidelines for public transit providers in the *Fully Allocated Cost Analysis*, published by the United States Department of Transportation. The principle underlying fully allocated costing analysis is that the total cost incurred in producing a single product or in delivering a specific service should be attributed to that product or to that service. The fully allocated cost of a specific product or service includes both:

- 1) The direct costs of the labor, capital, and material resources used exclusively in the delivery of the service, and
- 2) A portion of the shared costs of the administrative labor, capital, and material resources used in the production of the range of services.

## Components of a Fully Allocated Cost Estimate

The costs associated with the delivery of transit service include the following:

- Fixed Costs, which are constant over very large increments of service and, therefore, do not vary with small changes in the level of transit service. Examples of fixed costs include most administrative labor cost, facility-related capital costs, and materials and supplies costs other than those costs incurred directly to support revenue service.
- Variable Costs, which normally vary with the level of transit service provided. Variable costs include driver wages and vehicle fuel costs, which vary directly with level of service.

A fully allocated costing analysis recognizes that both fixed and variable resources contribute to the delivery of transit service. A fully allocated cost estimate, therefore, represents a complete accounting of all the labor, capital, and material resources used in the delivery of transit service.

- All costs are based on audited expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2006. The cost per hour calculated for fiscal year 2005-2006 will be used for fiscal year 2006-2007. The computed cost per hour is used to establish the total cost per route for the previous year.

## Fully allocated cost by formula

The fully allocated cost by formula model utilizes three allocation variables. Transportation-related costs are allocated to vehicle hours since these costs are a function of the number of vehicle hours operated. Vehicle maintenance and fuel costs are allocated to vehicle miles, since the number of miles operated reflects the exposure of vehicles to wear and the rate of fuel consumption. Administrative and capital costs are allocated to peak vehicles because they are largely a function of the size of the transit system. The following table shows the fully allocated cost by formula for fiscal year 2005-2006 along with a five-year projection:

	FY 2005-2006	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<b>Vehicle Hours</b>						
Operator cost per platform hour (variable)	40.48	42.51	44.64	46.87	49.21	51.67
Direct Operator supervision cost per platform hour	3.62	3.80	3.99	4.19	4.40	4.62
<b>Total direct vehicle operating cost per platform hour</b>	<b>44.10</b>	<b>46.31</b>	<b>48.63</b>	<b>51.06</b>	<b>53.61</b>	<b>56.29</b>
<b>Vehicle Miles</b>						
Variable cost per vehicle mile	1.36	1.43	1.50	1.58	1.66	1.74
Fixed cost per vehicle mile	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.18
<b>Total cost per vehicle mile</b>	<b>1.50</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>1.65</b>	<b>1.74</b>	<b>1.83</b>	<b>1.92</b>
<b>Peak Service</b>						
Cost per vehicle in peak service	148,952.72	156,400.35	164,220.37	172,431.39	181,052.96	190,105.61
Marketing cost per vehicle in peak service	9,949.35	10,446.81	10,969.15	11,517.61	12,093.49	12,698.16
<b>Total cost per vehicle in peak service</b>	<b>158,902.06</b>	<b>166,847.16</b>	<b>175,189.52</b>	<b>183,949.00</b>	<b>193,146.45</b>	<b>202,803.77</b>

## Fully allocated costs by platform hours

The following table shows the fully allocated cost by platform hour for fiscal year 2005-2006 along with a five-year projection:

	FY 2005-2006	FY 2006-2007	FY 2007-2008	FY 2008-2009	FY 2009-2010	FY 2010-2011
<b>Direct Variable Costs</b>						
Operator cost per platform hour	40.48	42.51	44.64	46.87	49.21	51.67
Vehicle operating cost per platform hour	17.98	18.88	19.82	20.81	21.85	22.94
<b>Subtotal direct variable</b>	<b>58.46</b>	<b>61.39</b>	<b>64.46</b>	<b>67.68</b>	<b>71.06</b>	<b>74.61</b>
<b>Direct Fixed Cost</b>						
Operations supervision per platform hour	3.62	3.80	3.99	4.19	4.40	4.62
Fleet maintenance service costs per platform hour	1.76	1.84	1.93	2.03	2.13	2.24
Other costs per platform hour	21.05	22.10	23.21	24.37	25.59	26.87
<b>Subtotal direct fixed cost per platform hour</b>	<b>26.42</b>	<b>27.74</b>	<b>29.13</b>	<b>30.59</b>	<b>32.12</b>	<b>33.73</b>
<b>Indirect Fixed Cost</b>						
General administration per platform hour	22.13	23.23	24.39	25.61	26.89	28.23
Marketing, planning, and CSC cost per platform hour	2.88	3.03	3.18	3.34	3.51	3.69
<b>Subtotal indirect fixed costs per platform hour</b>	<b>25.01</b>	<b>26.26</b>	<b>27.57</b>	<b>28.95</b>	<b>30.40</b>	<b>31.92</b>
<b>Fully allocated cost per platform hour</b>	<b>109.90</b>	<b>115.39</b>	<b>121.16</b>	<b>127.22</b>	<b>133.58</b>	<b>140.26</b>

Direct variable expenses have a strong correlation with service changes. These expenses include the cost of direct labor such as operator wages, fuel, parts, mechanics, and cleaners. The fiscal year 2005-2006 cost per platform hour is \$58.46.

Direct fixed costs are closely associated with service but do not increase by small incremental service changes. These costs tend to stay flat until conditions warrant their increase. These expenses include direct supervision of operators, labor for the parts department, transportation administration, and depreciation of buses and shelters.

Indirect fixed costs include the general administration costs of the District. These are considered shared costs and include the general management, planning, finance, information services, personnel, facilities, some depreciation, and safety and risk.

The cost allocation model uses the trial balance worksheet as a basis for the expenses. Please consult the cost allocation model for the detail on how the expenses were classified by category.

### Special Events Rates

The Special Event rates and a direct variable cost rate are listed in the table below. The rates are effective for the 2007 calendar year. The rates for future years are estimates only and should be used only as a guideline. When providing a quote for a future year, please remember to caution the customer that this is an estimate only. The reliability of the number decreases the farther out the quote for service is for. Ask the customer to check back for a more accurate rate as the date of the event draws near. The rates are calculated using the actual operating expenses of the District. The rate estimate for fiscal year 2006-2007 assumes a 5 percent increase over the actual expenses for fiscal year 2005-2006. The rate estimate for future years are based on an annual increase of 5 percent. The change in actual expenses over the last 10 years has ranged from a decrease of 1 percent to an increase of 11 percent.

	CY 2007	CY 2008	CY 2009	CY 2010	CY 2011
Level Two Special Service (Fully Allocated) Rate	115.00	121.00	127.00	134.00	140.00
Level One Special Service (Direct Costs) Rate	89.00	94.00	98.00	103.00	108.00
Direct Variable Cost Rate	61.00	64.00	68.00	71.00	75.00



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

**PLACED BY FAX**

**TO:** MICHELLE BICKELL, LEGAL PUBLICATIONS  
THE REGISTER-GUARD; FAX NO. 687-6677

ONE PAGE

**FROM:** EILEEN MUGGLEWORTZ, ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

**LTD PO #A-06403**

**PLEASE PUBLIC THE FOLLOWING LEGAL PUBLICATION ON FRIDAY, MAY 4, 2007**

**NOTICE OF BOARD COMMITTEE MEETING**

The Service Planning and Marketing Committee of Lane Transit District will meet for discussion about Park & Ride planning, the Olympic Trials service package, the Student Transit Pass Program, and updates on EmX, Busplus!, and the casino/bus service. The meeting will be held at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 9, in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene (in Glenwood). Public comment will not be heard at this meeting. 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, call 682-6100 (800-735-2900 TTY-Oregon Relay).

###

GREGORY EVANS  
5147 TREVON STREET  
EUGENE, OR 97402

MICHAEL EYSTER  
UNIVERSITY HOUSING  
1220 UNIVERSITY OF  
OREGON  
EUGENE, OR 97403-1220

MICHAEL DUBICK  
500 E. 43RD  
EUGENE, OR 97405

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 1

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 2

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 3

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 4

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 5

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 6

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 7

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 8

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 9

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 10

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 11

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 12

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 13

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 14

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 15

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 16

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 17

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 18

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 19

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 20

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 21

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 22

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 23

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
05/09/07 Page 24

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** August 7, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** OLYMPIC TRIALS SERVICE PACKAGE

**PREPARED BY:** Will Mueller, Service Planning Manager

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Give direction on level of service to be provided on July 4, 2008

**BACKGROUND:** LTD is in the process of designing a service package for shuttle service serving the athletes, media, and spectators for the 2008 Olympic Trials. As part of this package, which is now estimated at approximately 1,140 hours of service, staff have included almost 100 hours of service supplementation for the EmX route to provide 10-minute service during the evenings and weekends when it would be best utilized.

LTD would like the Board to consider directing staff to run a Saturday level of service for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July holiday, 2008, which would customarily run Sunday-level service, to better meet the needs of the community and the Olympic Trials attendees during this event. Saturday service requires approximately 213 more hours of pay than Sunday. It should be noted that pay for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July holiday would be at the overtime rate, as per the ATU contract, resulting in an increase of approximately 320 pay hours.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 9, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** **Olympic Trials Bus Service Package**

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Discuss and provide direction to staff and event organizers.

**BACKGROUND:** In October 2006 members of the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) met with the LTD Board of Directors to discuss their work with private and public partners in an effort to make the 2007 Olympic Trials the best ever. Their vision includes major upgrades to facilities that will serve our community for many years to come. It also includes creating an experience for both participants and spectators that is something unique in the world of track and field.

In securing the bid to host this event, an important factor was the experience of LTD in the event shuttle arena. A service package has been developed to transport athletes, coaches, and media, as well as the general public, to and from Hayward Field. Approximately 1,200 hours of service currently are scheduled as part of the service package. Using 2007-2008 cost figures, the cost for operating this service, according to the Special Service Policy, would range between a Level One cost per service hour of \$93.59 and a Level Two cost per service hour of \$121.16.

Staff will be joined by Tom Jordan and Barbara Kousky to discuss the importance of this service and to hear how comfortable the Board may be in deviating from the pricing guidelines outlined in the Special Service Policy.

**ATTACHMENT:** LTD Special Service Policy  
Fully Allocated Cost Plan



## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** August 7, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** RIDE*SOURCE* CALL CENTER UPDATE

**PREPARED BY:** Rand Stamm, Human Services Transportation Specialist

**ACTION REQUESTED:** None. Information Only.

**BACKGROUND:** In September 2005, the LTD Board directed staff to research contracting with the Oregon Department of Medical Assistance Programs (DMAP) to establish a call center and transportation brokerage in Lane County for Medicaid transportation that could be folded in with Ride*Source* services. Contracts with Oregon Department of Transportation's Public Transit Division and with the Department of Human Services were signed in October 2006.

In order to utilize the established name and brand for Ride*Source*, as a well recognized identity in Lane County positively associated with human services transportation, staff have chosen the name **Ride*Source* Call Center** for the brokerage.

Since then, staff have hired a specialist to oversee Call Center development, and awarded a contract to Special Mobility Services, Inc., as the contractor to not only assist with development, but also to act as the direct service operator of the Call Center.

New and existing community (and statewide) partnerships with stakeholders are continuing to be established, including a valuable association with the Lane Individual Practice Association (LIPA), which is "a community-based, physician-owned organization dedicated to the administration of quality healthcare to all Oregon Health Plan patients in Lane County, Oregon...."

LTD anticipates that the Ride*Source* Call Center will be fully operational by April 1, 2008, and Medicaid clients are being integrated into the call center incrementally by area. On July 9, 2007, the first area to be integrated into call center operations was LCOG Senior & Disabled Services Medicaid clients in and around Oakridge. These 50 or so clients were notified that they had a new number to call to schedule their rides, but their transportation and eligibility criteria would not change. The next area, Florence, will come on line on November 1, 2007, followed by South Lane, and finally, the metro Eugene/Springfield area on April 1, 2008.

Finding and creating the right information technology tools is critical to the success of the brokerage plan. This has proven to be a challenge for staff. Currently, the only brokerage software available is Medicaid-based, and does not accommodate other types of rides, such as Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and mental health, etc., that are billed separately. It always has been LTD's desire to meld the Medicaid rides into the mix of rides currently being provided by RideSource.

A grant proposal to fund software development and other parts of the RideSource Call Center that would integrate ADA paratransit services was submitted during the Public Transit Division's Discretionary Grant process. LTD was successful in having this IT grant project reviewed under the Innovations category, and the Public Transit Advisory Committee has asked LTD to revisit its application, provide a more in-depth and detailed application--including a step-by-step description of the project, budget, and cost breakdown; and a detailed scope of the final project results. Staff have begun drafting this revised proposal and have met with staff from the Salem and Portland brokerages to discuss their needs for brokerage management and scheduling technologies. LTD and Special Mobility Services staff have developed an interim plan that utilizes upgraded software currently in use at RideSource and integrates new scheduling software that should prove to meet the needs of the call center until the final software can be fully developed. A new part-time staff person is being hired in LTD's Information Technology department and will be dedicated to the further development of the call center software package.

PIVOT Architecture of Eugene was selected to provide a modification of the RideSource facility that would incorporate call center space. The design work is expected to be completed by mid-October.

Other activities associated with the development of the call center have included the development of a "Frequently Asked Questions" document to be distributed to area providers, development of the transportation provider list that will include all taxi service providers in Eugene/Springfield, and a draft transportation provider contract.

**ATTACHMENT:** None.

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** August 7, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** STATUS OF RIVER ROAD STATION PURCHASE

**PREPARED BY:** Tom Schwetz, Planning and Development Director

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Information Only

**BACKGROUND:** The River Road Station is LTD's best utilized Park & Ride location. Situated at the intersection of River Road and Beltline Road, the station provides easy access to LTD services for residents from the northwestern part of the community.

At the time this station was developed, the parcel of land was a remnant of the construction of Beltline Road. In 1980 LTD constructed a transit station platform and a Park & Ride lot for approximately 120 vehicles, and has continued to lease the property from Lane County. To date, LTD has paid a nominal rent for use of the property; Lane County now wishes to charge a market-value rent for the use of the property.

At its May 16, 2007, meeting, the LTD Board directed staff to pursue the purchase of this site. On June 27 LTD staff and Board members Gerry Gaydos, Greg Evans, and Michael Dubick participated in an Executive Session discussion of this issue with the Lane County Board of Commissioners. As a result of that meeting, LTD staff are working with Lane County staff to assess options that include both a purchase of the full parcel by LTD; and Lane County subdividing the parcel into a commercially viable piece, which they would retain, and then selling the remainder to LTD. A meeting is scheduled for Friday, August 3 to review Lane County's subdivision proposal.

At the August 7 SP&M meeting, staff will provide an update on the option of subdividing the parcel and other details associated with the process.

**ATTACHMENT:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** May 9, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** River Road Station Site Purchase

**PREPARED BY:** Tom Schwetz, Director of Planning and Development

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Provide input regarding the desirability of purchasing the current River Road Station site from Lane County.

**BACKGROUND:** The River Road Station is LTD's best utilized Park & Ride location. Located at the intersection of River Road and Beltline Road, the station provides easy access to LTD services for residents from the northwestern part of the community.

At the time this station was developed, the parcel of land was a remnant of the construction of Beltline Road. In 1980 LTD constructed a transit station platform and a Park & Ride lot for approximately 120 vehicles, and has continued to lease the property from Lane County. To date, LTD has paid a nominal rent for use of the property; Lane County now wishes to charge a market-value rent for the use of the property.

At this meeting, staff will discuss LTD's options, including possible purchase of the River Road Station property.

**ATTACHMENTS:** River Road Station Site Purchase by Lane Transit District

# River Road Station Site Purchase by Lane Transit District

## Background

Since 1980 Lane Transit District (LTD) has used the southeast corner of the River Road and Beltline intersection as a transit station serving the River Road/Santa Clara region. The station includes a Park & Ride lot with approximately 120 spaces. The site functions as a transfer and boarding location for four bus routes, and it is used as a meeting place for carpool and vanpool users. Direct transit connections are provided to PeaceHealth, the University of Oregon, downtown Eugene, and other regional destinations. On a typical weekday the Park & Ride lot is used by approximately 75 cars. It also is used for special event service, such as UO football shuttles.



*LTD proposes to purchase the River Road Station site from Lane County.*

LTD has leased the station site from Lane County for \$100 a year for almost 30 years. This year's lease expires on September 29, 2007. County staff have indicated that they will not renew the lease for this nominal amount, but will seek an amount closer to market value. An appraisal done by the county has placed the value of the property at \$2.9 million, which suggests a lease rate of about \$200,000 per year.

## Station Options

An ongoing lease in this cost range would represent a significant operational cost for LTD, and it is not a cost-effective option. The option of purchasing a site is much more attractive, both from a cost standpoint and as a stable public investment. LTD has considered site options other than the River Road Station, but has concluded that the current station is the preferred site for the following reasons:

- The current site is vital to LTD's operation. The River Road Station provides good access from River Road and Santa Clara neighborhoods north and south of Beltline, as well as for residents who use Beltline Road to access the Park & Ride lot.
- A public investment already has been made on this site as a Park & Ride and transfer station. Any other site would have considerable development costs in addition to acquisition costs.
- There are no other vacant or underdeveloped sites within a reasonable distance from the current site that offer direct, signalized access to River Road and that are of sufficient size to accommodate a large Park & Ride lot.

If this site is not available to LTD, it is possible that no suitable alternative location would be developed. Beltline between River Road and I-5 now copes with some of the most severe congestion in the metropolitan area, and will continue to cope with it into the future. The River Road Station represents a significant public investment in regional mobility. Loss of the station would eliminate an essential transportation option for residents of the area. The loss of the station also would run counter to LTD's long-range plan to have Park & Ride stations located on all major arterials.

# *Special Service Policy*

---

## **Service to Community Events**

### **Definition**

Public transit service that is organized by LTD or an event organizer to address transportation needs arising from an event, with a sufficient number of participants to cause negative impacts on the community's transportation network or on the neighborhood adjacent to the event site.

### **Access**

Access to the community event transit service must be open to all persons.

### **Restrictions**

1. Operating service for community events should not have a negative impact on regular service. There should not be a reduction in scheduled regular service levels. There also should not be a significant degradation in service capacity or scheduled timing of regular service.
2. Consideration will be given to the availability of buses and the type of bus appropriate for the event.
3. Consideration will be given to the availability of staff.
4. Consideration will be given to the availability of bus operators.
  - a. Service expected to use ten (10) or more bus operators must be scheduled in advance and accounted for in the bus operator vacation bid.
  - b. Service planning and marketing staff shall produce a service analysis for proposed special events not accounted for in the bus operator vacation bid. Transit Operations and Fleet Services must agree to the proposed service package before the District contracts with the event organizer.

### **Fees**

The District will charge fees based upon the level of LTD resources required to plan and implement the shuttle service. Level one event pricing will be based upon the sum of direct variable and direct fixed operating costs as outlined in the District's Fully-allocated Cost Plan. Level two event pricing will be based upon the sum of all direct and indirect operating costs, measured at a rate per schedule hour of service (rounded up to the nearest whole dollar), as outlined in the District's Fully-allocated Cost Plan. Events that are not clearly identified as level one or level two will be priced through an in-depth review of all associated costs.

Level one events are charged the District's direct cost rate and require the following:

1. A minimal level of planning is required. Some events require a higher level of planning the first year, but remain relatively unchanged in future years and therefore require fewer planning resources.
2. Operations oversight is conducted by the on-duty field supervisor and a minimal number of transportation coordinators.
3. LTD marketing resources are not used to provide paid media promotion.
4. Vehicle needs are minimal.

Level two events are charged the District's fully-allocated cost rate and require the following:

1. Extensive planning is required to develop and maintain the service package each year. This may include LTD's involvement in securing Park & Ride locations for the event.
2. Operations oversight is extensive and may involve contracting for outside resources.
3. LTD marketing staff develops and implements marketing plan components in order to promote the event shuttles.
4. Vehicle needs are significant and may require that contingency vehicles be used in service.

The event organizer will determine the fare charged.

## **Service Provided Through Charter Agreements**

### **Definition**

Transit service that is organized to meet a transportation need of a private party or organization.

### **Access**

The contracting party or organization will determine access to chartered service.

### **Restrictions**

Charter service will be directed to local private providers to determine the availability and willingness of these providers to provide the desired service. The District will consider contracting, through subcontracting agreements with private providers, when service on fixed routes is not compromised and when bus operators are available.

The only exception will be for organizations that are exempted in FTA 49 CFR Part 604, which allows the District to contract directly with a government entity that is a qualified social service agency, or a private, non-profit organization serving seniors or people with disabilities.

### **Fees**

The District will charge fees equaling the sum of all direct variable and fixed operating costs, as well as indirect fixed costs (measured at a rate per schedule hour of service), rounded up to the nearest whole dollar, as outlined in the District's Fully-allocated Cost Plan.

The event organizer will determine the fare charged.

## **Maintenance of the Charter and Community Events Service Policy**

The Marketing and Communications Department is responsible for maintaining this policy and recommending changes to the policy as necessary.





**NAME OF MEETING:**           **Service Planning & Marketing Committee**

**DATE OF MEETING:**       **August 7, 2007**

**TO:**                               **Kelly Perron**

**RECORDED BY:**           **Kimberly Young**

-----  
**ROUTING INFORMATION**

9/1 ky Draft to staff  
(Date and initials)

=====

## **MINUTES**

### **Lane Transit District Service Planning & Marketing Committee**

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on August 4, 2007, a meeting of the Lane Transit District Service Planning and Marketing Committee was held at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, August 7, 2007, in the LTD Conference Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

**PRESENT:** Mike Eyster, Lane Transit District Board Member, Chair  
Michael Dubick, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Greg Evans, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Will Mueller, Service Planning Manager  
Andy Vobora, Marketing and Public Relations Manager  
Graham Carey, BRT Project Engineer  
Cosette Rees, Marketing Representative  
Ruth Linoz, Service Planner  
Heather Lindsay, Service Planning Associate  
Angie Sifuentez, Marketing Representative

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Eyster called the meeting of the Lane Transit District Service Planning and Marketing Committee to order.

#### **ROLL CALL**

Mr. Eyster called the roll. Mr. Eyster, Mr. Evans, and Mr. Dubick were present.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Dubick moved, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve the minutes of the May 9, 2007, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **2008 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW**

Service Planning Manager Will Mueller introduced other staff present for the item, including Heather Lindsey, Ruth Linoz, Graham Carey, Cosette Rees, and Angie Sifuentez.

Mr. Mueller reviewed route changes associated with the Sacred Heart Medical Center at RiverBend campus that were proposed for implementation for the summer bid 2008 rather than the customary fall bid implementation due to the impact of the changes, primarily around Route 12. He asked that those changes be approved at a January 2008 Board meeting rather than in March 2008. He did not anticipate public hearings because service would increase, but information would be shared through other means, such as *Bus Talk*.

Responding to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Vobora indicated that staff would schedule a full Board overview in November 2007. Mr. Vobora commented about not scheduling public hearings; he started that he did not think people would object to the increase in service, but noted that there could be comments about the small routing change off Beltline. He added

that public hearings could occur where there were more radical changes to other routes or targeted outreach could be done.

Mr. Evans asked if LTD service hours would be changed to accommodate hospital shift changes. Mr. Mueller stated that this was not anticipated at this time. Mr. Vobora noted that the community had begun to request bus service for later and earlier work shifts.

Mr. Pangborn clarified that the changes on Route 12 were interim changes that would be in place until the implementation of Pioneer Parkway EMX service.

Mr. Vobora told the group that staff would bring preliminary information about Route 12 service to the Board in January or February 2008 for their review.

### **FLORENCE SERVICE EXPANSION**

Mr. Vobora called attention to the background memorandum about Florence service expansion. He stated that the issue of service to Florence had come up several times in the past; this year, the expansion of the casino and its workers' transportation needs raised the subject again. The casino had several workers living in the valley who had challenging shift requirements. A lack of affordable housing also was affecting Florence residents, who had moved out of town to find other housing options and needed transportation to Florence. The new West Lane County Commissioner Bill Fleenor also was interested in expanded LTD service to Florence. In addition, the Florence transportation advisory committee, which oversees special transportation needs in Florence, also had expressed interest.

Mr. Vobora called attention to a list of frequently asked questions (FAQ) and information about services now available in Florence. He told the group that the document would be redrafted and input from the committee was welcomed. He added that the document would be used as a foundational information piece that would be available when community meetings occurred.

Mr. Vobora noted that the availability of buses and LTD's ability to support the service were issues for future discussion.

Mr. Evans asked if LTD staff have discussed the subject with the city councils of Florence and Mapleton. Mr. Vobora stated that the community of Mapleton was not incorporated and would be represented by Commissioner Fleenor. Mr. Vobora told the group that he had met with the new Florence city manager but not with the Florence city council. He added that the Florence city council probably would want its special transportation advisory committee to forward a recommendation, but the committee had not yet embarked on the research necessary to make such a recommendation.

Responding to a question from Mr. Evans, Mr. Vobora stated that he believed that LTD had what was needed regarding supporting such long-term service, given its service history to Creswell and Cottage Grove. Mr. Evans thought there were security issues, as well, given the lack of Lane County Sheriff deputies.

Mr. Dubick supported continuing to look at the issue, although he felt the District was a long way from a decision. He added that he thought Florence had a lot of community processing to do before it could go forward, and in the meantime, the District should be prepared to address the request if it were made. Mr. Vobora concurred. Mr. Dubick commented that he thought the FAQ sheet looked good.

Mr. Eyster asked if LTD had any precedent for a different rate structure. Mr. Vobora explained the District's three-zone structure, where rates increased as the distances traveled increased. Andy stated that the administrative burden overwhelmed the benefit. The Diamond Express to Oakridge was another model; the service was partially grant funded, had a premium \$5 fare, and was very well used. He added that he felt the District would explore this and other options.

Mr. Dubick asked about the potential of securing funding from the casino. Mr. Vobora stated that the casino would be interested, but the outstanding question was whether LTD could meet the need. As a sovereign nation, the casino would not pay payroll taxes, but Mr. Vobora felt that they would be willing to pay in-lieu of taxes as a demonstration of its partnership with the community. Mr. Dubick thought that a demonstration of how the system would work would go a long way toward convincing the community of the need. Mr. Vobora agreed that the Cottage Grove pilot project had helped address the concerns in that community. Mr. Pangborn recalled that the District contracted for service with Cottage Grove for one year, which paid the District's direct costs for the pilot period; the District then held an election to expand services. Mr. Vobora added that the cost of a service similar to Cottage Grove's was \$600,000 to \$800,000 per year, and while the casino might be willing to fund a pilot project, he was unsure if they would be willing to fund such a service package. Mr. Vobora agreed that the District would want to explore a pilot project and the likely partners. Florence indicated a lack of funding to contribute, but the State could be a source of funding.

#### **SPRINGFIELD SERVICE REDESIGN**

Mr. Vobora provided an overview of the proposed Springfield service redesign process. He stated that he anticipated a robust public involvement process, and he noted that if there were changes, they would be implemented when EMX service began. He added that there still were unanswered questions. (Were resources available to support expanded service hours or maintain existing service levels? Would Springfield restrict the streets on which routes could operate? Would Springfield support relocation of bus stops along new routes? What information would help the Board decide if existing routes should be eliminated to add new routes?)

Mr. Evans asked what factors would affect Springfield if LTD wanted to move a route. Mr. Vobora stated that engineering concerns and a desire to preserve existing streets were major factors for Springfield. He added that close coordination with Springfield staff would be essential in order to avoid raising expectations about service areas. In response to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Vobora stated that LTD felt it legally could send equipment down any street, but Springfield authorized all bus stops because of their location in the right-of-way. Mr. Pangborn emphasized the importance of coordination and cooperation with Springfield given its authority over the right-of-way. Mr. Vobora stated that LTD also must seek concurrence for bus stops from adjacent property owners, which often can be a challenge in new service areas.

Mr. Pangborn stated that the process would require even greater coordination and cooperation between Springfield and LTD, which he felt was a good thing.

Mr. Evans asked if express service on designated routes would mitigate the issue of bus stops. Mr. Vobora stated that it would; however, buses still would have a physical impact on the streets. Mr. Dubick pointed out that major collectors were built to a different standard than local streets to accommodate greater vehicle weights. Mr. Mueller stated that

sometimes the District had to use neighborhood streets to accommodate service needs. Mr. Evans asked if a different vehicle, such as the *Breeze* buses, would alleviate the concerns regarding the impact on streets. Mr. Mueller stated that, although the vehicle was lighter, the load per axle was about the same. Mr. Vobora added that the District had talked about using small neighborhood buses, but to do so raised issues about fleet diversity and whether it was better to have a standardized coach.

Responding to a question from Mr. Eyster about timing, Mr. Vobora told the group that the communication and outreach process would occur in coordination with the Pioneer Parkway and Gateway Station work early in 2008 in order to accommodate the opening of EMX in 2010. Mr. Pangborn added that a joint Board and City Council meeting was scheduled in October when further discussion about the outreach activity could occur.

Mr. Evans asked if the scheduled roadway improvements would impact LTD's planning. Mr. Schwetz stated that most of the projects in the TIP were for roads that LTD already ran on.

Responding to a question from Mr. Dubick, Mr. Vobora stated that precedent existed for the two agencies to go to the State, citing the improvements on Glenwood as an example.

Mr. Pangborn told the group that the 2009 legislature would be focused on transportation and he anticipated the region would work as a group to increase local transportation funding.

Responding to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Vobora stated that he would schedule a briefing before the Board.

Mr. Vobora referred to the fourth question he had posed, and reiterated that it was an issue that the District would have to deal with as service redesigns were considered. Mr. Eyster stated that he thought the District might want input from the City since there was a common interest in serving Springfield citizens.

## **BUSPLUS**

Mr. Carey recalled the Board's approval of the progressive corridor enhancement program, which now was being called "*BusPlus*." He told the group that *BusPlus* was intended to improve service along corridors that otherwise would not see any other improvements. He added that the Board had directed staff to examine River Road and Lane Community College routes as the first *BusPlus* corridor. Subsequent examination indicated that it was likely that the two routes would not work together because the span of service on the two routes was quite different and because of class scheduling at Lane Community College. It also created a very long route, making it difficult for the run cuts to be efficient. Staff have reexamined the routes and the original criteria used to select the first corridor, and Coburg Road came out as the top choice. He stated that the Eugene City Council had asked LTD to investigate Coburg Road as the second EMX route, but objections from property owners had stopped it.

Mr. Carey stated that Coburg Road presented many advantages since it would have been similar to the EMX route, forming a flagship route to connect to the EMX route at the Gateway Station and back to Eugene. He added that staff wanted to place some resources into the examination of that route; he noted that staff also would like to make transit improvements to River Road, such as signal prioritization.

Mr. Eyster asked if bus stops would be eliminated for *BusPlus*. Mr. Carey responded that they would be removed. Staff would look for opportunities for queue jumping, stop consolidation, etc., but Mr. Carey cautioned that there was not much opportunity given the lack of real estate available.

Mr. Evans asked how quickly buses could move through the Coburg Road area at peak hours. Mr. Carey stated that travel times would not be reduced much, although the improvements would help. Mr. Evans asked what incentives would be for riders. Mr. Carey responded that clarity of services and ease of use, increased service frequencies, more clearly defined stops, and access to service were some examples. Mr. Evans asked if new Park & Ride facilities might be built. Mr. Carey stated that it was likely, and added that staff currently were exploring new sites for Park & Ride facilities.

Mr. Vobora stated that he felt there would be physical improvements that would speed up the buses, and the packaging of routes could help determine headways. He added that he anticipated tradeoffs would have to be made. He stated that he believed it would not be until 2009 or 2010 until the physical changes could be made; it would depend on resources.

Mr. Eyster stated that he was reluctant to spend money if the changes were not obvious to the rider. Mr. Mueller stated that some of the gains would be in real time, while others would be both for time gains and the psychological “boost” that queue jumpers provided to riders.

Mr. Evans stated that the service envisioned made sense for a user such as his mother, who might want to Christmas shop at the different malls, for example, if the service had sufficiently frequent stops.

#### **OLYMPIC TRIALS SERVICE NEEDS**

Mr. Mueller noted staff’s discussion of running Saturday-level service on July 4, 2008, which would require 213 more staff hours. He stated that, after further discussion, staff were considering increasing headways on the EMX route. He noted the demand that would be generated by activities in conjunction with the holiday and the Olympic Trials, as well as the fact that bus operators would be asked to work more hours for the Oregon Country Fair the following week. He described the bus services anticipated in conjunction with the Olympic Trials and stated that staff were still discussing whether LTD could handle Saturday-level service on July 4. He invited the committee to contact him with their input.

Responding to a question from Mr. Evans, Mr. Muller stated that the issue would not affect the District’s agreement for service hours with the Olympic Trials organizers. He stated that the situation was somewhat fluid, as the demand for service and available routes was worked out. Mr. Vobora clarified that the decision related to Saturday-level of service was strictly an LTD decision related to LTD’s services.

Responding to a question from Mr. Dubick, Mr. Pangborn indicated that information would be included in the next budget as specific expenditures.

Committee members briefly discussed the many activities that would occur on the July 4, 2008, weekend that would be supported by LTD.

Mr. Eyster asked if Mr. Evans and Mr. Dubick wanted to revisit the Board’s decision on the rates to be charged to the Olympic Trials organizers, and he asked why the committee’s recommendation had not been adopted. Mr. Dubick believed the Board adopted a

compromise for those concerned with the cost aspect and those concerned with supporting community events. He added that, in light of the additional costs involved, and in hindsight, he thought it was a good choice. He stated that he was not uncomfortable with it and he was not eager to revisit the decision. Mr. Evans agreed.

## **UPDATES**

- River Road Station Purchase

Mr. Schwetz distributed copies of an aerial photograph of the site in question and referenced the memorandum included in the meeting packet. He stated that the District was in the process of doing its due diligence in response to a proposal made by Lane County for the purchase of the property prior to the expiration of the lease in October. He stated that the site partition proposed by Lane County could take from five to eight months, and the District did not feel an obligation to pay those costs; however, it would be part of the negotiations process. He stated that, with some adjustments, the proposal could work. After the due diligence process, staff would meet with the Board of Directors.

Mr. Dubick asked if the partition proposal affected LTD's access to the site. Mr. Schwetz stated that it did not. He also told the group that LTD would retain its frontage along River Road. Responding to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Carey stated that there were 145 parking spaces on the site now, and if the property was partitioned, LTD would lose about 45 spaces. Responding to a question from Mr. Dubick, Mr. Pangborn clarified that the McDonald's parcel was included in the configuration, and Lane County had suggested that LTD could buy the parcel and sell it to McDonald's. Mr. Evans asked about purchasing the entire site, allowing Lane County to develop it, and splitting the revenues. Mr. Pangborn stated that he thought it would be overly complicated, given that Lane County was trying to generate revenue now.

Responding to a question from Mr. Dubick, Mr. Schwetz stated that Lane County believed the total property value was \$2.4 million. The cost for the LTD parcel would be \$1.75 million. Mr. Schwetz noted that Lane County was requesting \$12,000 per month for the property.

Mr. Eyster recommended that the full Board be briefed about the above item. Mr. Pangborn indicated that a briefing would be held in September.

- RideSource Call Center

Mr. Pangborn told the group that a memorandum was in the meeting packet about the RideSource Call Center.

## **ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**

- Five-Year Transportation Development Plan
- Park & Ride Plan

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Eyster adjourned the meeting at 1:31 p.m.





**NAME OF MEETING:** Board Service Planning and Marketing Committee

**DATE OF MEETING:** March 6, 2007

**TO:** Kelly Perron

**RECORDED BY:** Lynn Taylor

**MINUTES FILE NAME:** M:\2007\Lane Transit District\Service Planning & Marketing Committee\spmc070306.doc

=====

**ROUTING INFORMATION**

3/28/07 lt Draft to staff  
(Date and initials)

=====

## **MINUTES**

### **Lane Transit District Service Planning and Marketing Committee**

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 4, 2007, a meeting of the Lane Transit District Service Planning and Marketing Committee was held at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, March 6, 2007, in the LTD Conference Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

**PRESENT:** Mike Eyster, Lane Transit District Board Member, Chair  
Michael Dubick, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Greg Evans, Lane Transit District Board Member  
Will Mueller, Service Planning Manager  
Andy Vobora, Marketing and Public Relations Manager  
Ken Auguston, Service Planner  
Ruth Linoz, Service Planner  
Heather Lindsay, Service Planning Associate

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Mr. Eyster called the meeting to order and called the roll.

#### **II. SELECTION OF COMMITTEE CHAIR**

Mr. Eyster was selected as committee chair by affirmation.

#### **III. LTD SERVICE POLICY**

Mr. Vobora indicated that the meeting would focus on a review of the primary documents related to service and some aspects of service planning.

Mr. Mueller provided an overview of how services were planned. He said the planning process considered factors such as cost effectiveness, operator needs, customer needs, and vehicle availability. He said that operator meal breaks also needed to be factored in. He explained that service was planned in blocks, which was what a bus did in a day and stops were segments of routes. He used a hypothetical example block to illustrate how services were built. He said that one block could have more than one driver and a typical weekday had about 110 blocks, consisting of over 2,000 trips.

In response to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Vobora said that a trip was considered a single departure within a route.

Mr. Dubick asked how meal breaks were handled. Mr. Mueller replied there were two types of meal breaks: layover meal breaks and relief meal breaks. He said that 60 percent of breaks were layovers and 40 percent were relief breaks.

Mr. Mueller said other factors involved in service planning were scheduling school trips to avoid disruption of blocks during holidays and the use of articulated buses on certain routes. He said that blocks were a minimum of two hours; "runs" were what drivers worked and could be composed of many blocks.

Mr. Vobora said that all of the employment rules, such as breaks, were included in the software program that service planners use, along with all of the other factors that had to be considered. Regarding service standards, he said that LTD's floating standard of 67 percent drove the system to greater productivity. He said that routes were compared within each category to determine productivity so that rural routes were not competing with urban routes.

Mr. Mueller distributed a chart comparing the weekday productivity of routes by category in Fall 2005 and Fall 2006. Mr. Vobora noted that the standards for urban routes were higher than for rural routes. He said that EmX currently was considered an urban route but eventually, when more corridors were operational, could be a separate category.

Mr. Vobora commented that 1,000 feet, or two to three city blocks, was typical stop spacing on urban routes. He said that stop spacing on EmX routes was farther apart because it was a different type of service and that needed to be better articulated in view of testimony at the recent public hearing. He said that also would be an issue for *Busplus!*, as the stop spacing would be greater on those routes. He continued with a review of comfort and safety standards and how those related to service planning decisions. He said an emerging issue was the capacity for wheelchairs on buses and the growing demand for that service.

Mr. Mueller reported that in a typical week, about 20 people in wheelchairs had to wait for the next bus. The District was exploring ways to respond to that increasing need.

Mr. Evans suggested that staff see how other districts were handling that issue.

Mr. Vobora said another emerging issue was accessibility in unimproved areas, and the District was moving towards all low-floor vehicles in its fleet and it was much more difficult for a person in a wheelchair to board that type of vehicle in an area without curbs and sidewalks.

Mr. Vobora reviewed the service reliability standards and noted they would be updated with new standards for on-time arrivals and road calls; he added that the District had no difficulty meeting the standards. He said that 18 months was the probationary period for new service. The District implemented service in September, giving the service an opportunity to mature by the second Annual Route Review. He pointed out the criteria used for service decision-making contained in the policy.

Mr. Eyster asked how decisions regarding the possible expansion of Park & Rides would be made. Mr. Vobora replied that staff have been discussing that issue with respect to the lack of parking space at the Springfield Station and the upcoming expiration of the lease on the River Road Station facility. He said the District lacked a long-term strategic plan for this and it was challenging to find property that could support a Park & Ride.

Ms. Linoz noted that two other Park & Ride facilities had been lost in the past year due to expiration of leases.

In response to a question from Mr. Evans, Mr. Vobora said the District owned two Park & Ride facilities and the others were leased.

#### **IV. FIVE YEAR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Mr. Vobora said work on the plan began two years ago and was halted as staff focused on implementation of EmX. He said the concept was a five-year rolling plan where the first year would become the Annual Route Review focus area. He said the plan was a road map for

the future and would help the public understand the District's direction. He said the challenge was how to incorporate new and emerging ideas in the plan.

Mr. Eyster asked if issues such as introducing fares to EmX and adding real time reader boards to EmX stations would be part of the plan. Mr. Vobora agreed those types of programs should be addressed in the plan. He hoped the real time reader boards would be implemented in 2007 and expected that fares would be added when service was extended. He noted that it would be challenging to enforce fares on the EmX service. He referred to the list of activities for FY 2005-06 and said that, with a few exceptions, they had been accomplished. He said a transit signal priority system was still being developed and vehicles had been equipped with emitters; it was a matter of working with the City to implement the system.

Mr. Auguston said that City staff had been focused on signals for the EmX service and now that it was completed could return to signal priority elsewhere in the system.

Mr. Eyster asked if there had been complaints from public drivers on the EmX route. Mr. Mueller said there had been very few complaints. Mr. Vobora said it was still a problem to educate people about the changes in left turns from Franklin Boulevard, particularly with respect to Onyx Street. He said the City was considering improving the signage to help people find the entrance to the University of Oregon. He did not think the signal system itself was causing any concerns.

Mr. Vobora remarked that the student transit pass had been implemented but would be discontinued in Fall 2007. He said that staff was exploring options for funding a similar program in the future.

Mr. Eyster commented that it would be important to carefully manage the message regarding discontinuation of the student pass program. Mr. Vobora said the program was funded as a research and development project, and the funding source was not designed for ongoing programs.

Mr. Evans asked if the District was experiencing problems with operators getting lost on some of the special services such as football shuttles. Ms. Linoz said that the Laidlaw and other drivers received the same materials used by LTD drivers in advance of the event, but they did not seem to get the same caliber briefing as LTD drivers, resulting in a number of problems. She said the contract was with the University of Oregon and LTD facilitated the service; the University was informed about the problems and it did seem to be improving.

There was a general discussion of the District's ongoing ability to meet the University's needs.

Mr. Vobora pointed out that the expected increase in overall level of fixed-route service was one percent, but the actual increase in the Annual Route Review for 2007 was two percent. He said that the growth of service demand would continue to be a concern, particularly the continuing pressure to allocate more resources for accessible services.

Mr. Evans asked how the planned parking facility at RiverBend would affect planning for Route 12 service. Mr. Vobora replied he was not certain, as the District was getting mixed signals regarding that facility, and while it would have some impact on planning, the area around RiverBend was growing so quickly that it would have a greater influence on the demand for service.

Mr. Vobora reviewed the range of events for which special services were requested. He said another long-term consideration was the construction of a state mental hospital facility in Junction City and its impact on rural services.

Ms. Linoz said she was a member of the transportation advisory committee for Junction City and it would be interesting to see how services developed.

Mr. Vobora said the plan would be presented to the committee when it had been updated.

#### **V. ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW SERVICE PACKAGE**

Mr. Vobora reported that the Board would be considering the service package on March 12 and the only revision would be a recommendation to implement the Route 28 and Route 36 changes in the summer bid, consistent with testimony received during the public hearing. He said staff had researched the issues raised at the hearing and responded to those who had testified.

#### **VI. PURCHASED SERVICE (7x, 75x)**

Mr. Vobora explained that group pass organization had the opportunity to buy service, an example being Sacred Heart paying for the full operating cost of Route 75x. He said the question was how to evolve the service as more employers became interested in the arrangement and how to divide the costs equitably among users.

Ms. Linoz noted that Route 3x was a good example of service that began as purchased service, but it had evolved into a route that was used by the public and no longer was funded by an organization.

Mr. Vobora said that as more employers moved to the fringes of the metropolitan area, it would put stress on the system, and the issue was what level of service LTD should provide. At what point would an employer be asked to pay for enhanced service?

#### **VII. EmX UPDATE**

Mr. Vobora reported that ridership was continuing to climb, and last Friday was the highest ridership day at just under 5,000. He said that timing was improving, although it would be necessary to make decisions about trying to maintain a 10-minute frequency. He said it was currently difficult for drivers to take breaks. There were several options for addressing that.

#### **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The committee agreed to meet on a quarterly basis, particularly before the September bid was implemented.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** August 7, 2007
- ITEM TITLE:** SPRINGFIELD SERVICE REDESIGN
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Information only
- BACKGROUND:** The Pioneer Parkway EmX project provides a unique opportunity to evaluate Lane Transit District bus service in Springfield.
- Service to RiverBend, International Way, and Gateway Street will be provided by route 12 until the EmX Green Line is extended to serve this region in 2010. Because route 12 operates along 5<sup>th</sup> Street, staff believe it will be necessary to maintain some level of route 12 service for businesses and residents who will not have easy access to the EmX line. What this service will look like, and how other Springfield routes connect to EmX, will be evaluated over the coming two years. Ultimately, staff will bring a service recommendation before the Board in Spring 2010 as part of the annual route review process.
- Staff are excited to review how Springfield has changed in recent years and how it will change in the years to come. These changes mean new travel patterns for many and opportunities for LTD to design service to better meet these travel needs. Recent news articles have highlighted the quickly developing areas along Marcola Road and in the Jasper-Natron development area south of Main Street.
- A robust public involvement process will be developed and implemented beginning in early 2008. Prior to going to the public, it will be important for staff to have a number of questions answered. Some of these questions include:
1. Are resources available to expand service hours or will changes be needed in order to result in a zero percent service change?
  2. Will the City of Springfield place restrictions as to which streets the routes can operate on?
  3. Will the City of Springfield support relocation of bus stops along new routes?
  4. If staff recommend the elimination of low productivity service in order to redirect funds for adding service to new locations, what information will help the Board make these decisions?
- ATTACHMENT:** None

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** May 9, 2007
- ITEM TITLE:** **Student Transit Pass Program**
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Discuss and provide direction to staff on the next steps regarding the Student Pass Program.
- BACKGROUND:**
- The Board has discussed the Student Transit Pass Program on numerous occasions over the past several months. There is interest from the Board and staff to continue discussing options for funding a sustainable student pass program, which will be the focus of the meeting with the service planning and marketing committee.
- Staff will review the status of current communications with program participants, school districts, and elected officials.
- The committee may remember that the District is offering a three-month summer youth pass as a transition between the expiration of the student transit pass and the beginning of school in September. The \$19.95 purchase price allows students three months of unlimited rides for the cost of \$6.65 per month, or roughly 22¢ per day.
- When fall rolls around, students and/or student families will be required to pick up the cost of purchasing monthly or three-month passes and this will have an affect on student ridership; how big an impact is the question. Discontinuing the student pass program offers LTD and our community the first opportunity to study the affect of ending a large group pass program. This opportunity has not come up in the nearly 20 years of offering group pass programs, and it may provide valuable information about the value of group pass programs. The Board has the authority to modify student pass prices as a way to mitigate the impact on students who will be purchasing bus fares; however, changing the dynamics of youth pass pricing would have an affect on the District's ability to

analyze the change in ridership by students. Some districts offer a student rate that is independent of other rates charged. A special “student” category could be developed with a rate set by the Board. The financial impact to the District could be estimated based on the rate chosen. As explained in the budget meetings, the District is anticipating a loss in fare revenue of approximately \$140,000 this coming fiscal year. Any change to the youth monthly or three-month pass prices will further reduce fare revenue.

Staff would like direction from the committee on funding sources, changes to youth fares, partnering opportunities, and program communications.

**ATTACHMENT:**

Student Pass Program Information Sheet