

(This packet was printed on recycled paper.)



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, December 17, 2007.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
SERVICE PLANNING AND MARKETING COMMITTEE**  
Wednesday, December 19, 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<br>Evans _____ Eyster _____ Dubick _____  |    |
| III.  | APPROVAL OF MINUTES   | 1  |
| IV.   | OLYMPIC TRIALS SERVICE PACKAGE AND PRICING  | 7  |
| V.    | ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW – PHASE TWO   | 13 |
| VI.   | SERVICE POLICY AND PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS   | 20 |
| VII.  | COMMITTEE NAME CHANGE CONSIDERATION   |    |
| VIII. | ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETING <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ FIVE-YEAR PLAN</li><li>▪ PARK &amp; RIDE PLAN</li><li>▪ BUSPLUS</li><li>▪ RIDESOURCE CALL CENTER</li></ul> |    |
| IX.   | ADJOURNMENT   |    |

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** December 19, 2007
- ITEM TITLE:** ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW - PHASE TWO
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Discussion of proposed changes and direction regarding funding of system fixes
- BACKGROUND:**
- The 2008 Annual Route Review (ARR) was divided into two phases in order to accommodate the opening of the new Sacred Heart Medical Center at RiverBend. On November 12, 2007, the Board of Directors reviewed the recommended changes to Route 12 Gateway, and on December 19, 2007, the Board will be asked to approve these recommendations.
- Phase Two of the Annual Route Review focuses on a review of substandard productivity along rural routes. Route 93 Veneta and Route 95 Junction City have specific segments that are unproductive and costly to the District. Attached you will find specific information regarding the number of boarding activities along the segments of the routes that staff are reviewing. You also will see a cost per trip for these segments compared to the remainder of the route. In each of the cases, the routing has been in place since the mid-1970's, and therefore has a small number of customers who are accustomed to having the bus available for occasional trips. For a small number of customers, the routing does provide a regular link for commuting purposes.
- In the Veneta analysis, staff are viewing this potential change as an opportunity to free up service dollars that could be used to enhance service to the main population base located in the city of Veneta. Preliminary analysis shows that up to three additional weekday trips and one Saturday trip could be funded by this change. Staff believe such a change would serve a greater number of customers by providing more trips, as well as a better distribution of trip departures and arrivals.
- In the Junction City analysis, the potential change would provide an increased level of service to the growing industrial base along Prairie Road and Highway 99. It also would free up funding that could be used for an additional weekday trip and a mid-day Saturday trip.

A recent survey of Golden Temple employees shows a growing interest in commuting by bus, and Golden Temple management has expressed some interest in a group bus pass program. Golden Temple is located on Prairie Road. A more attractive service along Highway 99 also may appeal to the large population of workers commuting to and from Country Coach.

Extensive outreach is being conducted for both Route 93 Veneta and Route 95 Junction City, including providing information to current customers, a direct mailing to residents of Veneta and Junction City, open house events in Veneta and Junction City, meetings with city officials, and discussions with chamber of commerce staff and boards. As service proposals are firmed up, a follow-up mailing will go out to Veneta and Junction City residents to provide additional information, and to invite customers to attend the Annual Route Review public hearings in February and March 2008.

In addition to the analysis of Route 93 Veneta and Route 95 Junction City, a small routing change will be recommended for Route 96 Coburg. Staff also are gathering data to evaluate the need for system fixes.

There undoubtedly will be system fixes that are necessary due to traffic congestion and the high ridership that the District is experiencing. The ability to fund any additional service, including system fixes, is not currently in the long-range financial plan. This raises interesting and potentially challenging questions, such as:

- Is the Board interested in changing the allocation of service hours by moving additional hours to the “productivity” category?
- If a peak-hour trip becomes dysfunctional, should staff leave it as is or cut other service to fund a fix?
- What is the message to LTD customers and bus operators if the choice is not to make fixes?
- What does the system look like if staff carve service from the fringes instead of redesigning service?
- Does LTD have buses available to make changes in peak-hour service?
- Discussions continue about connector service and the *BusPlus* concept, but with no allocation of service dollars, can LTD deliver on the expectations it is setting?
- How are growth areas to be addressed, such as the Natron housing development in east Springfield?
- If LTD is successful in securing elderly and disabled funding through the State legislature in 2009, should staff attempt to hold onto the system until relief comes, or does a redesign to meet future ridership expectations make sense regardless of the elderly and disabled funding?

Staff continue to discuss these and other questions and would like the committee's thoughts and input.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Route 93 Veneta informational flyer  
Route 95 Junction City informational flyer

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Staff will continue to work with the Service Advisory Committee (SAC) and will prepare a presentation for the full Board to review at the January 2008 Board meeting.

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

None

**NAME OF MEETING: SERVICE PLANNING & MARKETING COMMITTEE**

**DATE OF MEETING: December 19, 2007**

**TO: Kelly Perron**

**RECORDED BY: Lind Henry**

=====

**ROUTING INFORMATION**

01/29/08 llh 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 & Marketing Committee was held at 12 noon on Wednesday, December 19, 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, Senior Service Planner  
Andy Vobora, Service Planning and Marketing Manager  
Ken Auguston, Service Planner  
Ruth Linoz, Service Planner  
Heather Lindsay, Service Planner  
Angie Sifuentez, Marketing  
Cosette Reeves, Marketing  
Tom Schwetz, Planning and Development Director  
Terry Parker, Accessible Services Manager  
Stephano Viggiano, Assistant General Manager  
Mark Pangborn, General Manager

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

#### **ROLL CALL**

Mr. Eyster noted the presence of Board Members Evans, Eyster and Dubick.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Dubick, seconded by Mr. Evans, moved to approve the minutes of the August 7, 2007, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **OLYMPIC TRIALS SERVICE PACKAGE AND PRICING**

Mr. Vobora offered the staff report.

In October 2006 member of the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) for the Olympic Trials 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. Using 2006-07 cost figures, it was determined that the cost for operating an event shuttle service would range between a Level One cost per service hour of \$91 and a Level Two cost per service hour of \$117.

In June 2007 the Board Service Planning and Marketing Committee and the Board Finance committee discussed the concept of deviating from the policy rates and using a pricing figure

that would cover LTD's hard costs, including driver wages, fuel and operation of the buses, as well as some supervisor costs. It did not cover all of LTD's overhead. This rate of \$61 per hour increased to \$65 per hour in the updated cost plan. The full Board reviewed this discussion and chose to use the Level 1 pricing outlined in the Special Service Policy.

The LOC asked staff if the price could be revisited. Since the discussion of pricing began with the Board Service Planning and marketing Committee, staff felt it was appropriate that the LOC request for a pricing change go back to the committee.

Staff supported deviating from the policy rates for this event and recommended using the updated direct variable rate of \$65 per service hour.

Mr. Eyster entertained questions from committee members.

Mr. Dubick expressed concern about the impact this decision could have on other groups that contracted with LTD and what precedent this would set for expectations of those groups in the future.

Responding to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Vobora said the Country Fair currently paid the Level 1 rate, as did most other events, other than University of Oregon football (UO) events, due to the size of the football events.

Mr. Evans stated he wanted to revisit the issue. He opined the scope of this project was broader than the local community in terms of the market being served. The community investment could result in having similar events of similar scope over the next five years which would need to be considered on a case by a case basis. This had the potential for building Eugene/Springfield as a track capital. Although \$41,000 may be a short term issue, in the long run, this would be an investment in the LTD's payroll tax base. Supporting the staff recommendation would provide benefits bigger than "giving away" \$41,000.

Mr. Dubick was concerned that the recommendation would negatively set the Board up for future negotiations with other groups. He large amounts of money spent in the community did not necessarily compute to increased revenue for LTD. It was irresponsible to not at least consider the financial impact of not recovering at least some of the administrative costs.

Mr. Eyster said he was comfortable with the \$65 rate, and it was clear to him that this action would not be precedent setting.

Mr. Evans, seconded by Mr. Eyster, moved to recommend that the Service Planning and Marketing Committee recommend approval to the full LTD Board. The motion passed unanimously, 3:0.

## **2008 ANNUAL ROUTE REVIEW—PHASE TWO**

Mr. Mueller provided the staff report reviewing the route changes. He noted Route 96 Coburg was a minor change which encountered minor opposition and saved time, allowing the ability to address connection, transfer and timing issues.

Phase Two of the Annual Route Reviewed focused on the review of substandard productivity along rural routes. Route 93 Veneta and Route 95 Junction City had specific segments that were unproductive and costly to the District. A small number of customers were accustomed to having the bus available for occasional trips, and for a small number of customers the

routing did provide a regular link for commuting purposes. Outreach efforts were made to talk with riders from these rural routes. Mr. Vobora reviewed the information contained in the Route 93 Veneta and Route 95 Junction City informational flyers included in the Agenda Item Summary (AIS).

Mr. Eyster opined these were the most drastic cuts during his tenure on the Board. He asked if the Board had ever considered giving a two-year notice to residents.

Mr. Mueller said in the past a major change had been proposed for a neighborhood north of Barger Drive, for which a year notification was given. After one year, no change was noted. Several other service reductions were noted.

Mr. Evans said he had heard from Lane Community College (LCC) students that there was a need to increase service between the campus and Veneta during certain critical times of the day.

Mr. Vobora said no surveys had been done with the students, but said the proposed package would improve service to all riders to and from the population center. He noted ridership in the Veneta/Alvadore area was pretty sparse.

Ms. Linoz said RideSource requirements would be triggered if more service was introduced to Veneta.

Mr. Vobora said as ridership increased there would be increased pressures for system “fixes” which staff was working on. The long range financial planning did not include the one percent service fixes.

Responding to a question from Mr. Evans, Mr. Vobora said two trippers had been running this fall to address school overloads which would be included in the next bid process. Two additional trippers had not been added because vehicles were not available.

Mr. Mueller stated in previous years, .4 or .5 percent had been set aside in a contingency fund to support trippers in the fall. There was zero percent for “fixes” in 2008. Additionally, because the busses were filled, people were having to wait 5:00 p.m., and having to wait 30 minutes for another bus. Community expectations were that LTD did not make riders wait more than 30 minutes for a bus.

Responding to a question from Mr. Evans, Mr. Mueller there were not “dead” zones or times throughout the system. During the need for service reductions in the early 2000’s, some routes were cut to one run per hour, particularly between 9:30 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. Subsequently, some of the route service had been reinstated to 30 minute service. There was very little fat in the system, with the standard for an urban weekday route now 34-35 rides per hour, whereas it used to be in the low 20’s.

Mr. Vobora said the next bus buy would take place in 2010, and staff was always looking at low productivity routes.

Mr. Evans asserted the public would soon be asking how the EmX service would augment the existing route service to provide more flexibility in the system. He noted during a recent meeting with the Eugene City Council, the Council noted a reduction of services in some areas to accommodate EmX.



Mr. Vobora replied this was a difficult conversation and there was a need to emphasize that the EmX model was more efficient and would succeed in the long run.

Mr. Dubick emphasized the need for productivity criteria to support consistent decisions.

### **SERVICE POLICY AND PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS**

Mr. Mueller provided the staff report. He facilitated a discussion and directed committee members to the AIS in the meeting packet. The impacts of the sale of Westmoreland student housing and the opening of the Sacred Heart campus in Springfield were discussed. Mr. Evans noted all class offerings at LCC were down, and opined a decreased ridership would follow.

Responding to a question from Mr. Eyster, Mr. Mueller said perhaps additional language, such as Standards urban, rural and school routes as well as other variables should be added to the Productivity Standards and revisited periodically.

Mr. Evans what challenges related to comfort and safety, particularly for wheelchair service. He noted some of the newer model wheelchairs may not be adaptable to current bus configurations.

Mr. Mueller had head anecdotal information regarding the larger chairs and the amount of time required to load and unload them, but he was not aware that chairs were not able to be accommodated. He said staff was monitoring the number of passengers in chairs who were being passed by because the bus could not accommodate them because the wheelchair bays were full. Based upon counts by the drivers, approximately 20 people per week were being passed by.

Mr. Vobora stated because the busses were running so full, community expectations may not always be able to be met. Bus stop spacing was one issue that was under consideration.

Mr. Mueller asked if the committee intended to have a zero percent service change level for 2008, was existing service cut in order to establish a contingency fund for tripper service next fall? He added there maybe some savings from the proposed changes to the rural routes, albeit a small amount. Making the rural service viable continued to be a consideration.

Mr. Dubick noted construction of a State of Oregon hospital and prison in Junction City would impact the routing.

Mr. Evans asked what the agency was doing capture unrealized payroll revenues. Mr. Pangborn said staff would review the issue after the first of the year for implementation in 2008. He added another consideration was employees who worked for subcontractors that were located outside of the district.

Mr. Eyster suggested whenever route cuts were made, the funding should go into the general funding pool to be used where it would be most beneficial, and the Board needed to look at the system as a whole system.

### **COMMITTEE NAME CHANGE CONSIDERATION**

There was consensus by committee members with the staff proposal that the committee's name be changed to Board Service Committee.

### **ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETING**

Mr. Vobora noted the following items for future committee meetings:

- Five-Year Plan
- Park & Ride Plan
- *BUSPLUS*
- *RideSource* Call Center

Mr. Vobora said ridership on the Jefferson segment of Route 33 was low, and may be moved to Polk Street.

Responding to a question from Mr. Evans, Mr. Viggiano a lot line adjustment with Lane County was needed for the River Road Park and Ride, which should be completed by the end of January 2008.

Ms. Linoz said staff was reviewing Springfield service when Pioneer Parkway opened. Mr. Vobora added it presented challenges in a zero percent budget change.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Eyster adjourned the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

# Fall 2007 Route Productivity

Weekday

Route Productivity for Fall '07      substandard productivity level (67% of average)      **substandard for 2007?**

**Urban**      *Significant portion of service is on arterial street with high density land use and high ridership generators such as large businesses, retail & schools.*

00	Breeze	41.8	34.3
11	Thurston	59.3	34.3
12	Gateway	60.1	34.3
13	Centennial	51.3	34.3
24	Donald	55.4	34.3
25	Amazon	30.9	34.3
28	Hilyard	40.6	34.3
30	Bertelsen	53.4	34.3
40	Echo Hollow	57.3	34.3
41	Barger / W 11th	56.4	34.3
43	W 11th / Barger	50.7	34.3
51	Santa Clara	56.0	34.3
52	Irving	52.6	34.3
64	Sheldon Plz / R-G	35.6	34.3
66	VRC / Coburg Rd.	51.7	34.3
67	Coburg Rd. / VRC	44.6	34.3
73	UO / Willamette	42.4	34.3
79	UO / Gateway	52.8	34.3
81	LCC / Harris	52.7	34.3
85	LCC / Springfield	47.3	34.3

**Urban Avg.      51.2**

**Yes**

**EmX**

101	Green Line	<b>116.4</b>	n/a
-----	------------	--------------	-----

**Connector**      *Significant portion of the route is in neighborhoods or in low ridership areas.*

01	Campbell Center	28.6	20.4
18	Mohawk / Fairview	28.4	20.4
19	Fairview / Mohawk	24.9	20.4
27	Fairmount	26.3	20.4
33	Jefferson	45.8	20.4
55	River Rd Connector	32.0	20.4
60	Cal Young	19.5	20.4

**Connector Avg.      30.5**

**Yes**

**Rural**      *Limited service in the smaller cities outside the urban growth boundary (UGB).*

*(Standard for rural routes is 30 boardings per round trip.)*

Round-trip Boardings

91	McKenzie Bridge	42.8	30.0
92	Lowell / LCC	28.4	30.0
93	Veneta	31.0	30.0
95	Junction City	37.3	30.0
95x	Junction City Exprs	23.2	30.0
96	Coburg	21.6	30.0
98	Cottage Grove	46.2	30.0

**Rural Avg.      34.7**

**Yes**

**Yes**

**Yes**

**Contracted**      Although open to public, contracted by company (eg. Symantec, PeaceHealth) to meet geographic coverage & timing needs.

07x	Syantec	22.3	n/a
75x	Sacred Heart	68.5	n/a

**Express**      Limited trip, limited stop service that operates on arterials or freeways. Beginning +/- or end of trips are major ridership generators or park & rides.

03x	River Road Sta	41.3	27.4
08x	Thurston Sta	24.3	27.4
32	West 1st Avenue	62.0	27.4
96x	Coburg Express	50.3	27.4

**Yes**

## Fall 2007 Route Productivity

*Weekday*

		Route Productivity for Fall '07	substandard productivity level (67% of average)	substandard for 2007?
<b>Express Avg.</b>		<b>40.9</b>		
 <b>College</b>				
<b>Commuter</b>	High capacity, frequent service geared to class times.			
76	UO / Westmoreland	44.4	53.0	<b>Yes</b>
78	UO / Oak Patch	49.7	53.0	<b>Yes</b>
82	LCC / Pearl	72.7	53.0	
79x	UO / Kinsrow	155.6	53.0	
<b>College Commuter Avg.</b>		<b>79.1</b>		
 <b>K-12</b>				
<b>Commuter</b>	Limited neighborhood service geared to class times.			
422	SEHS/Crest Drive	24.3	39.6	<b>Yes</b>
426	SEHS / Brae Burn	50.9	39.6	
430	Eugene Station	128.0	39.6	
435	CHS / City View	85.0	39.6	
451	NEHS / Spr Creek	65.7	39.6	
453	Eugene Station	30.0	39.6	<b>Yes</b>
<b>K-12 Commuter Avg.</b>		<b>59.1</b>		

# Fall 2007 Route Productivity

Saturday

		Route Productivity for Fall '07	substandard productivity level (67% of average)	substandard for 2007?
<b>Urban</b>	<i>Significant portion of service is on arterial street with high density land use and high ridership generators such as large businesses, retail &amp; schools.</i>			
11	Thurston	54.3	31.5	
12	Gateway	65.8	31.5	
13	Centennial	35.8	31.5	
24	Donald	42.6	31.5	
25	Amazon	42.9	31.5	
28	Hilyard	18.5	31.5	Yes
30	Bertelsen	42.0	31.5	
40	Echo Hollow	47.6	31.5	
41	Barger / W 11th	43.1	31.5	
43	W 11th / Barger	38.9	31.5	
51	Santa Clara	45.1	31.5	
52	Irving	41.8	31.5	
66	VRC / Coburg Rd.	61.8	31.5	
67	Coburg Rd. / VRC	60.3	31.5	
73	UO / Willamette	31.4	31.5	Yes
81	LCC / Harris	23.3	31.5	Yes
	<b>Urban Avg.</b>	<b>47.0</b>		
<b>EmX</b>				
101	Green Line	<b>128.8</b>	n/a	
<b>Connector</b>	<i>Significant portion of the route is in neighborhoods or in low ridership areas.</i>			
01	Campbell Center	21.8	14.3	
18	Mohawk / Fairview	22.9	14.3	
19	Fairview / Mohawk	19.0	14.3	
27	Fairmount	13.9	14.3	Yes
33	Jefferson	29.6	14.3	
55	River Rd Connector	21.0	14.3	
	<b>Connector Avg.</b>	<b>21.3</b>		
<b>Rural</b>	<i>Limited service in the smaller cities outside the urban growth boundary (UGB). (Standard for rural routes is 30 boardings per round trip.)</i>			
		Round-trip Boardings		
91	McKenzie Bridge	44.5	30.0	
93	Veneta	28.5	30.0	Yes
95	Junction City	22.5	30.0	Yes
98	Cottage Grove	47.7	30.0	
	<b>Rural Avg.</b>	<b>37.1</b>		

# Fall 2007 Route Productivity

**Sunday**

		Route Productivity for Fall '07	substandard productivity level (67% of average)	substandard for 2007?
<b>Urban</b>	<i>Significant portion of service is on arterial street with high density land use and high ridership generators such as large businesses, retail &amp; schools.</i>			
11	Thurston	42.1	30.2	
12	Gateway	60.4	30.2	
13	Centennial	45.1	30.2	
24	Donald	34.5	30.2	
25	Amazon	39.6	30.2	
30	Bertelsen	38.2	30.2	
40	Echo Hollow	48.3	30.2	
41	Barger / W 11th	36.9	30.2	
43	W 11th / Barger	36.4	30.2	
51	Santa Clara	48.3	30.2	
52	Irving	39.7	30.2	
66	VRC / Coburg Rd.	71.6	30.2	
67	Coburg Rd. / VRC	59.5	30.2	
73	UO / Willamette	32.5	30.2	
	<b>Urban Avg.</b>	<b>45.1</b>		
<b>EmX</b>				
101	Green Line	<b>99.1</b>	n/a	
<b>Connector</b>	<i>Significant portion of the route is in neighborhoods or in low ridership areas.</i>			
01	Campbell Center	15.6	13.8	
18	Mohawk / Fairview	22.4	13.8	
	<b>Connector Avg.</b>	<b>20.6</b>		
<b>Rural</b>	<i>Limited service in the smaller cities outside the urban growth boundary (UGB).</i>			
	<i>(Standard for rural routes is 30 boardings per round trip.)</i>			
		Round-trip Boardings		
91	McKenzie Bridge	30.0	30	
98	Cottage Grove	41.0	30	
	<b>Rural Avg.</b>	<b>35.5</b>		

# Lane Transit District

---

## Fully Allocated Cost Plan

---

From audited expenses for the fiscal year  
ending June 30, 2007

# Fully Allocated Cost Plan

## Fully allocated cost plan methodology

The 2006-2007 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, 2007. The cost per hour calculated for fiscal year 2006-2007 will be used for calendar year 2008. 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 2006-2007 along with a five-year projection:

	<u>FY 2006-2007</u>	<u>FY 2007-2008</u>	<u>FY 2008-2009</u>	<u>FY 2009-2010</u>	<u>FY 2010-2011</u>	<u>FY 2011-2012</u>
<b>Vehicle Hours</b>						
Operator cost per platform hour (variable)	43.28	45.44	47.71	50.10	52.61	55.24
Direct Operator supervision cost per platform hour	4.05	4.25	4.46	4.68	4.91	5.16
<u>Total direct vehicle operating cost per platform hour</u>	<u>47.32</u>	<u>49.69</u>	<u>52.17</u>	<u>54.78</u>	<u>57.52</u>	<u>60.40</u>
<b>Vehicle Miles</b>						
Variable cost per vehicle mile	1.40	1.47	1.54	1.62	1.70	1.79
Fixed cost per vehicle mile	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.18	0.19
<u>Total cost per vehicle mile</u>	<u>1.54</u>	<u>1.62</u>	<u>1.70</u>	<u>1.79</u>	<u>1.88</u>	<u>1.98</u>
<b>Peak Service</b>						
Cost per vehicle in peak service	140,008.95	147,009.39	154,359.86	162,077.85	170,181.74	178,690.83
Marketing cost per vehicle in peak service	12,218.83	12,829.77	13,471.26	14,144.82	14,852.06	15,594.66
<u>Total cost per vehicle in peak service</u>	<u>152,227.78</u>	<u>159,839.16</u>	<u>167,831.12</u>	<u>176,222.67</u>	<u>185,033.80</u>	<u>194,285.49</u>

## Fully allocated costs by platform hours

The following table shows the fully allocated cost by platform hour for fiscal year 2006-2007 along with a five-year projection:

	<u>FY 2006-2007</u>	<u>FY 2007-2008</u>	<u>FY 2008-2009</u>	<u>FY 2009-2010</u>	<u>FY 2010-2011</u>	<u>FY 2011-2012</u>
<b>Direct Variable Costs</b>						
Operator cost per platform hour	43.28	45.44	47.71	50.10	52.61	55.24
Vehicle operating cost per platform hour	18.73	19.66	20.64	21.67	22.75	23.89
<u>Subtotal direct variable</u>	<u>62.01</u>	<u>65.10</u>	<u>68.35</u>	<u>71.77</u>	<u>75.36</u>	<u>79.13</u>
<b>Direct Fixed Cost</b>						
Operations supervision per platform hour	4.05	4.25	4.46	4.68	4.91	5.16
Fleet maintenance service costs per platform hour	1.87	1.96	2.06	2.16	2.27	2.38
Other costs per platform hour	18.83	19.77	20.76	21.80	22.89	24.03
<u>Subtotal direct fixed cost per platform hour</u>	<u>24.75</u>	<u>25.98</u>	<u>27.28</u>	<u>28.64</u>	<u>30.07</u>	<u>31.57</u>
<b>Indirect Fixed Cost</b>						
General administration per platform hour	21.12	22.18	23.29	24.45	25.67	26.95
Marketing, planning, and CSC cost per platform hour	3.49	3.66	3.84	4.03	4.23	4.44
<u>Subtotal indirect fixed costs per platform hour</u>	<u>24.61</u>	<u>25.84</u>	<u>27.13</u>	<u>28.48</u>	<u>29.90</u>	<u>31.39</u>
<u>Fully allocated cost per platform hour</u>	<u>111.36</u>	<u>116.92</u>	<u>122.76</u>	<u>128.89</u>	<u>135.33</u>	<u>142.09</u>

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 2006-2007 cost per platform hour is \$62.01.

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 2008 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 calendar year 2008 assumes a 5 percent increase over the actual expenses for fiscal year 2006-2007. 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 2008	CY 2009	CY 2010	CY 2011	CY 2012
Level Two Special Service (Fully Allocated) Rate	117.00	123.00	129.00	135.00	142.00
Level One Special Service (Direct Costs) Rate	91.00	96.00	100.00	105.00	111.00
Direct Variable Cost Rate	65.00	68.00	72.00	75.00	79.00



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-08118**

**PLEASE PUBLISH THE FOLLOWING LEGAL PUBLICATION ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2007.**

**NOTICE OF BOARD COMMITTEE MEETING**

The Service Planning and Marketing Committee of Lane Transit District will meet to discuss the Olympic Trials Service Package and Pricing, the Annual Route Review (ARR) Phase Two, and the Service Policy and Productivity Standards. The meeting will be held at 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, December 19, 2007, 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).

###

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

- DATE OF MEETING:** December 19, 2007
- ITEM TITLE:** OLYMPIC TRIALS SHUTTLE PRICING
- PREPARED BY:** Andy Vobora, Director of Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Recommend the use of the direct variable cost for pricing the Olympic Trials shuttle service
- 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, as well as 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, media, and the general public to and from Hayward Field. Approximately 1,600 hours of service currently are scheduled as part of the service package. Using 2006-07 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 \$91 and a Level Two cost per service hour of \$117.
- In June 2007 the Board Service Planning and Marketing Committee and the Board Finance Committee discussed the concept of deviating from the policy rates and using a pricing figure that would cover LTD's "hard" costs. This rate, \$61 per service hour, has increased to \$65 per hour in the updated cost plan. The full Board reviewed this discussion and chose to use the Level 1 pricing outlined in the Special Service Policy.
- The cost of putting together an event of this magnitude is enormous, and it is becoming more real as opening day is less than 200 days away. The Local Organizing Committee asked staff if the price could be revisited. Since the discussion of pricing began with the Board Service Planning & Marketing Committee, staff feel it is appropriate that the Local Organizing Committee request for a pricing change comes back to this committee.

Staff support deviating from the policy rates for this event and recommend using the updated direct variable cost rate of \$65 per service hour. This rate covers the "hard" costs discussed previously by the Board.

**ATTACHMENTS:** 2006-07 Fully Allocated Cost Plan

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Request action from the full Board at the December 19, 2007, meeting

**PROPOSED MOTION:** The Board Service Planning & Marketing Committee recommends that the LTD Board of Directors approve the application of the 2008 direct variable cost rate of \$65 per service hour for shuttle services provided for the 2008 Olympic Trials.

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 1

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 2

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 3

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 4

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 5

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 6

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 7

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 8

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 9

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 10

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 11

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 12

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 13

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 14

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 15

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 16

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 17

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 18

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 19

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 20

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 21

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 22

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 23

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 24

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 25

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 26

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 27

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 28

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 29

LTD Board Service  
Planning & Marketing Committee  
12/19/07 Page 30

## AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

**DATE OF MEETING:** December 19, 2007

**ITEM TITLE:** SERVICE POLICY AND PRODUCTIVITY STANDARDS

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

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Discussion of productivity standards and direction from Board on strategies for making service decisions

**BACKGROUND:** Increased ridership is placing more and more pressure on the system, resulting in tight schedules and missed transfers. Staff would like to discuss certain aspects of LTD's current Service Policy that may require modification in light of this current environment.

Staff will review certain productivity standards from the *Service Standards* policy to determine how adjustments may be made to better meet District goals. Parts of this discussion will include looking at the current productivity of routes in the Fall 2007 bid, how productivity relates to various LTD service standards, and the prospects for adjustment in the 2008 Annual Route Review (ARR). Attached are LTD's Service Policy and documents showing Fall 2007 route productivity on weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays.

The following **Productivity Standards** will be examined:

*"A route will be considered substandard if it has a ridership productivity of less than 67 percent of the average of other routes within the category, computed separately for weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays."*

*"A rural route will be considered substandard if it carries less than an average of 30 boardings per round trip."*

In the *weekday urban* route category, only one route (Route 25 Amazon) is listed as substandard for 2007. Route 25 misses the 34.3 standard with its 30.9 route productivity. Staff do not believe that a route averaging over 30 boardings per hour should be considered substandard. When the service policy was established a number of years ago, the standard was much lower (in the low 20's). Route 25 already has reduced frequency (once per hour between 9:10 a.m. and 2:10 p.m.), and staff believe that further reductions in the route are not warranted, even though it does not meet the standard.

In the *weekday connector* route category, Route 60 Cal Young (19.5) is the only route that does not meet the 20.4 standard. This route only provides five trips per day. It may not be viable to eliminate individual trips, which only leaves the option of eliminating the entire route, and eliminating the route has consequences. Staff are examining the productivity of the segment of the route that serves Valley River to see if it warrants elimination.

On weekdays Route 92 Lowell/LCC (28.4), Route 95x Junction City Express (23.2), and Route 96 Coburg (21.6) do not meet the **rural** route standard of 30 boardings per round trip. Route 92 just misses the standard; staff probably will let it remain unchanged for now. Route 95x will be reconfigured as part of the 2008 Annual Route Review. Route 96 does not meet the standard, but its short round-trip running time puts it at a distinct disadvantage when compared to other routes in its category. This route ranks second in the rural route category in the number of boardings per hour. Route 96 provides a lifeline level of service; therefore, staff believe it either should run in its entirety or be cut.

Weekday **contracted** routes includes Route 7x International Way. While the District does not have a standard for contracted routes (because they are paid for by their sponsors), LTD does share the cost of Route 7x with both Symantec and Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines (RCCL). Given its low boardings-per-hour average (22.3), staff are looking at eliminating its lowest productivity trips as part of the 2008 Annual Route Review.

Of the District's weekday **express** routes, Route 8x Thurston Station (24.3 versus the 27.4 standard) does not meet the standard for the category. Route 8x only runs four trips per day, and one of the morning trips and both of the afternoon trips do not meet the standard. Cutting any of the trips on the route does not seem to be a viable option. Deleting the route has been proposed in the past, but customer testimony convinced the Board to keep it intact.

In the **college commuter** route category, Route 76 UO/Westmoreland (44.4) and Route 78 UO/Oak Patch (49.7) do not meet the 53.0 standard for this route category. However, staff do not believe that these routes are substandard when the robust productivity numbers are considered. It should be noted that, with productivity of over 155 boardings per hour, Route 79x skews this category.

In the **K-12 commuter** category, Route 422 SEHS/Crest Drive (24.3) and the Route 453 Eugene Station (30.0) do not meet the 39.6 standard. Route 422 only operates two trips per day and eliminating the service would not result in a significant savings, although it would make one more vehicle available for afternoon peak service. Route 453 only operates once per day and provides backup to the regular routes (Route 51 and Route 52) between the hours of 3:30 p.m.-4:00 p.m.



In the **urban** category on Saturdays, Route 28 Hilyard (18.5), Route 73 UO/Willamette (31.4), and Route 81 LCC/Harris (23.3) do not meet the 31.5 standard. Route 28 and Route 81 will be reviewed for possible reductions in service on Saturday. Route 73 just misses the mark by one-tenth of a percent and likely will be left alone.

In the **collector** route category on Saturdays, only Route 27 Fairmount (13.9) is below the 14.3 standard. It probably will be left unchanged for now.

In the **rural** route category on Saturdays, both Route 93 Veneta (28.5) and Route 95 Junction City (22.5) miss the standard, although Route 93 is very close. Both routes are undergoing redesign work in the 2008 Annual Route Review. The question should be asked if rural routes should have the same 30 boardings per round trip standard on Saturdays that they have on weekdays. It may be worth considering a *25 boardings per route trip* standard on Saturdays instead.

All LTD routes are meeting their productivity standards on Sundays.

Staff have the following observations/questions about the following sections of the Service Policy:

### **Productivity Standards**

*A route will be considered substandard if it has a ridership productivity of less than 67 percent of the average of other routes within the category, computed separately for weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays.*

- Does this standard still work considering the robust average now experienced on certain categories of routes; e.g. urban, college commuter, etc.? Perhaps additional language should be added to this standard to establish another minimum (perhaps 25 boardings per hour) that would become operative for those categories of routes with very high overall averages. Otherwise weekday routes with good ridership (Routes 25, 76, and 78) are labeled as substandard when they actually have decent performance.

### **Comfort and Safety Standards**

*Additional service may be added if:*

- *Customer loads consistently exceed 1.5 times the seated capacity of the vehicle.*
- *Customers are consistently not accommodated on a trip due to full customer loads and the next scheduled trip is more than 30 minutes away.*
  - Currently there are many trips that would qualify for added service using the above criteria of “1.5 times the seated capacity of the vehicle.” Should this wording be revised? It may not need changed since the operative word is ‘may.’

- Is the Board comfortable with the standard that states that leaving customers behind is okay as long as there is a bus coming in 30 minutes? What is the response if the next bus is an hour away? Is other service cut to address this need?

**Standards for Tripper Service**

*The following criteria are to be used in determining whether to offer tripper service:*

- *Trips cannot be adequately provided by existing service, or there is not enough capacity within the existing service.*
- *There are no budgetary or fleet constraints that would preclude the addition of the tripper.*
- If the plan is to have a zero percent service change level for the 2008 ARR, is existing service cut in order to establish a contingency fund for tripper service next fall?

**General Questions**

- Without enough buses to expand the peak fleet, staff cannot address fixes in peak-hour service. Does the Board support outfitting contingency buses with radios and APC equipment to meet bus needs over the next three years?

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Service Policy document  
Fall 2007 Route Productivity document

**RESULTS OF RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Staff will continue to work with the Service Advisory Committee and will prepare a presentation of 2008 Annual Route Review changes for the full Board to review at the January 2008 Board meeting.

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

None

# *Service Policy*

---

## **Objective**

To provide standards for the implementation and evaluation of bus service.

## **Application**

This policy applies to all bus service offered by Lane Transit District, including regular fixed-route service, tripper service, and special events service.

## **Policy**

The policy segment is divided into the following sections:

- A. Definition of Terms
- B. Service Standards:
  - 1. Standards for Productivity
  - 2. Standards for Guest Convenience
  - 3. Standards for Guest Comfort and Safety
  - 4. Standards for Service Reliability
- C. Service Evaluation Procedures
- D. Substandard Service
- E. Implementation/Evaluation of New Service
- F. Service Decision-Making Process
- G. Standards for Tripper Service
- H. Maintenance of Policy

### **A. Definition of Terms**

**Bid:** Bids are held at least three times per year, as defined in the labor agreement with ATU 757, and provide an opportunity to implement service changes. Contract employees select work shifts at this time.

**Block:** See "Schedule."

**Boardings:** A boarding, or unlinked trip, occurs every time a guest boards a bus. Thus, a trip requiring a transfer would count as two boardings.

**Community Events:** Community events are defined both as one-time events (concerts at Autzen Stadium) and annual or repeating events (the Oregon Country Fair and University of Oregon football games).

**Correct Schedule Operation (CSO):** Correct schedule operation is when a bus leaves a timepoint no earlier than the scheduled time and not more than four minutes late.

**Coverage:** Coverage is defined as the percentage of households that are within one-quarter mile of a bus stop.

**Deadhead:** Deadhead refers to bus travel that is not in revenue service, such as travel time to the garage after the bus has completed scheduled service.

**Directional Routes:** Directional routes typically are offered during peak times and are oriented toward commuter travel. Productivity results for directional routes will include a factor for unproductive deadhead time necessary to position these routes for revenue service.

**Duty:** See “Run.”

**Express Service:** Express service significantly reduces travel time for guests compared to regular bus service. Express service typically is offered during peak times and is oriented toward commuter travel. Productivity results for express service will include a factor for unproductive deadhead time necessary to position these routes for revenue service.

**Farebox-to-Operating-Cost Ratio:** The farebox-to-operating-cost ratio measures the percentage of the operating cost paid by guests. It is computed as the total farebox revenue (including sales of passes and tokens) divided by the total operating cost.

**Headway:** Bus headway refers to the amount of time between consecutive buses on a given route. The lower the headway, the more frequent the service.

**Layover Time:** This term identifies time that a bus is not in operation between scheduled revenue service. The typical five-minute pause at the Eugene Station between trips is not considered layover time, but instead is considered part of revenue hours.

**Limited-Stop Service:** Limited-stop service combines fixed-route service and express service to provide neighborhood coverage and reduced travel times. Limited-stop service typically is offered during peak times and is oriented toward commuter travel. Productivity results for limited-stop express service will include a factor for unproductive deadhead time necessary to position these routes for revenue service.

**Line Route:** A line route is defined as a bus route that travels outbound and inbound along the same streets. Line routes differ from loop routes, in that loop routes travel to and from their point of origin using different streets.

**Passenger Trips:** A passenger trip occurs when a guest travels from trip origin to trip destination, regardless of the number of transfers required to complete the trip. Thus, a trip requiring a transfer still only counts as one passenger trip.

**Pay Hours:** Pay hours refers to the number of hours actually paid to the bus operators to provide the service. Overtime is calculated at time and one-half (one hour of overtime is 1.5 hours at regular pay).

**Peak Hour:** The peak-hour period on the system is weekdays between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., and between 2:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. This is the time when the greatest number of buses is in use and the greatest number of guests is carried.

**Platform Hours:** A platform hour is counted for every hour that a bus operator is with a bus, including deadhead and layover time. This does not include report time or turn-in time.

**Preparatory Time:** This term refers to the time allotted each bus operator to check a bus out from the garage.

**Report Time:** The time an employee is scheduled to report for work.

**Revenue Hours:** A revenue hour is each hour that a bus is in revenue service. This is equivalent to platform hours less deadhead time and layover time.

**Ridership Productivity:** Ridership productivity, as used in this document, is defined as the number of boardings per revenue hour of service. Ridership productivity is defined with different units, such as passenger trips per schedule hour, in other applications.

**Road Call:** A road call occurs when a bus is replaced or repaired during revenue service.

**Run:** A run is the work operated by a bus operator, either full-time or part-time, on a given day. Runs can be either straight (with no unpaid breaks in the workday) or splits, composed of two or more pieces of work that may include paid or unpaid breaks between them.

**Run Cut:** The run cut is the collection of runs developed from a set of schedules. Separate run cuts are developed for weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays.

**Run Cut Efficiency:** Run cut efficiency measures how efficiently the schedules are divided into runs. It is computed as the percentage of pay hours that are used to provide platform hours. The formula is pay hours minus platform hours divided by platform hours.

**Rural Route:** A rural route is a route that operates, at least in part, outside the Eugene/Springfield urban growth boundary.

**Schedule Efficiency:** Schedule efficiency measures how efficiently the service is written into schedules. It is computed as the percentage of platform hours that actually are in revenue service. The formula is platform hours minus revenue hours divided by platform hours.

**Schedule Hours:** Schedule hours are simply the amount of time on the schedules.

**Timed-meet:** A timed-meet occurs when separate bus routes converge at one point, generally a transit station, and guests make transfers.

**Transfer:** To transfer means to change from one bus to another.

**Tripper:** A tripper is a short-term bus trip that is designed to meet a particular demand.

**Turn-In Time:** This term applies to the time provided every bus operator when the bus is returned to the garage,

**Urban Route:** An urban route is a route that operates entirely within the Eugene/Springfield urban growth boundary. Lane Community College, although just outside the urban growth boundary, is considered within the urban area for the purposes of route identification.

**Route Deviation:** A route deviation involves deviating from the standard bus route to serve a housing, school, or commercial node.

## **B. Service Standards**

### **Productivity Standards**

A route will be considered substandard if it has a ridership productivity of less than 67 percent of the average of other routes within the category, computed separately for weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays. This standard may apply to productivity during the entire day or to productivity during specific time periods. The following route categories are evaluated:

- ◆ **Urban.** Urban routes are arterial routes that operate from major transit stations.
- ◆ **Express.** Express routes are limited-stop routes that operate in peak direction.
- ◆ **Connector/Shuttle.** Connector/shuttle routes operate within neighborhoods or along designated shuttle routes in the urban core.
- ◆ **Commuter.** Commuter routes are peak-direction routes serving specific school or work locations.
- ◆ **Rural.** Rural routes operate outside the urban growth boundary and provide lifeline service to rural communities within the District.

A segment, or trip, of a route will be considered substandard if it has a ridership productivity of less than 67 percent of the average of all similar segments or trip in the route category. Similar segments are separated between those that are primarily in residential areas and those that are primarily in commercial or industrial areas. This standard applies to the route segment during the entire day or to the segment during a specific time period.

A rural route will be considered substandard if it carries less than an average of 30 boardings per round trip. A specific trip on a rural route will be considered substandard if it carries fewer than 20 boardings.

Route deviations will carry a minimum of 5 boardings per trip and will be scheduled when deviation conditions are met and when schedule time allows.

Route deviations should occur only in order to satisfy one of the following conditions:

1. To serve a major trip generator.
2. To serve an area with a high population of seniors or persons with disabilities.
3. To remedy a significant coverage deficiency.

### **Customer Convenience Standards**

A 60-minute headway is the minimum frequency for all urban routes. This is considered the policy headway.

Headways shorter than the policy headway will be based upon demand for the service. The frequency of a route will not be increased unless the route has a ridership productivity of at least 20 percent above the system average of other routes operating during the same time period, or if the change is necessary to improve transfer connections to other routes, or if improvements in the headway are expected to improve route productivity.

A timed-meet (pulse) system is to be used at the Eugene Station and at other significant regional transit stations.

Route scheduling will take into consideration the following factors:

1. Staggering of routes on major arterials.
2. Minimizing the necessity to transfer.
3. Minimizing transfer time when transfers are necessary.
4. Maintaining consistency and clarity of timetables for guests.
5. Arriving and departing at major destinations in a timely manner (i.e., meeting class schedules at LCC and the UO).

Whenever possible, routing will be direct, using major arterials and neighborhood collector streets to provide the shortest practical travel time between points on a line. When possible, terminal points at both ends of a route should be located at major activity centers to ensure ridership in both directions of operation.

When possible, routes will be structured as two-way line routes. Line routes reduce travel time and are easier for the public to understand. Loops at the end of routes will be used as a turnaround and to provide neighborhood coverage.

The spacing between bus stops in developed areas generally will be approximately two to three city blocks or 1,000 feet. Closer spacing may be implemented in the downtown or other high-density areas. Wider spacing will be considered in less developed areas.

Transit stations will be located in areas with very high numbers of transferring guests or major trip generators. The size of the transit station will be consistent with expected use, operational needs, and the financial capacity of the District.

The District will strive to make all service and associated facilities wheelchair accessible.

### **Comfort and Safety Standards**

The scheduled running time for routes will adequately meet average guest loads and typical traffic congestion, and will include an ample amount of recovery time for each route to compensate for variations in running time and to provide for bus operator restroom breaks.

Additional service may be added if:

- ◆ Customer loads consistently exceed 1.5 times the seated capacity of the vehicle.
- ◆ Customers are consistently not accommodated on a trip due to full customer loads and the next scheduled trip is more than 30 minutes away.

This load standard does not apply to special event service.

If funding is available, bus shelters will be located at bus stops with at least 30 boardings per day, with the priority of installation based on heaviest usage. Bus benches will be located at stops with at least 15 boardings per day. Shelters and benches also may be located at stops that are heavily used by seniors and persons with disabilities, or if there is a significant amount of transfer activity at the stop. Shelters and benches that do not meet the productivity criteria may be installed if the adjacent development subsidizes the cost of the shelter and its installation.

Every bus stop is to have a paved boarding area. This will not be a requirement where curbs and sidewalks do not exist. Streets will not be considered for bus routes unless the street and the associated intersections and traffic controls allow for the safe operation of the bus. LTD's Safety Committee will be consulted whenever a new street is considered for service.

All buses will be cleaned daily, inside and out.

#### **Service Reliability Standards**

Buses will arrive within two minutes of the departure time of connecting buses 95 percent of the time.

Road calls on the system should not occur more frequently than every 10,000 vehicle miles.

The number of missed trips will be less than one-half of one percent of total trips operated.

The average age of the bus fleet will be eight years or less, and no buses older than 20 years will be used in regular route service, unless they have been rehabilitated to acceptable standards.

### **C. Service Evaluation Procedures**

#### **Timing of Changes**

There are at least three bids per year when service changes typically are made. The fall bid coincides with the commencement of classes at area schools. The summer bid coincides with the end of the school year. The winter bid is scheduled at approximately half way between the fall and summer bids.

Major service changes generally will be confined to the fall bid. Minor service changes can be made during the winter and summer bids, and the deletion of school service can occur during the summer bid and during holiday breaks.

An Annual Route Review (ARR) will be conducted every year. Requests for changes or additions to service and other improvements to the system will be considered during the ARR. Approved recommendations from the ARR will be implemented with the fall bid.

A major bus rider survey will be conducted at least every four years. The survey will determine travel behavior, fare payment trends, and guest opinions on service options and guest information.



## **D. Substandard Service**

Substandard service, as defined in Section B, Productivity Standards, will be evaluated as part of the Annual Route Review. The substandard service will be subject to possible elimination or modification. The District may choose to continue to offer service that does not meet productivity standards if the service meets other District objectives.

## **E. Implementation/Evaluation Guidelines for New Service**

New service, as defined in this context, includes the establishment of new routes or the addition of service on existing routes, either through increased frequency or increased span of service. Service hours will be allocated according the following percentages:

1. 75 percent productivity
2. 20 percent coverage
3. 5 percent discretionary

The addition of new service generally will be considered only during the Annual Route Review. Factors to consider in evaluating potential service additions include the following:

1. Financial situation of the District.
2. Expected ridership and ridership productivity, both immediate and long term.
3. Availability of fleet and maintenance capacity.
4. Integration of the service in the District's overall route system.

New service will be operated for a probationary period of at least 18 months without major modification, except in extenuating circumstances. Productivity standards for the performance of new service will be different than the standards for mature service. Following the probationary period, new service will be subject to the same standards as the remainder of the system.

Adequate marketing resources to promote the new service are to be available during the probationary period.

## **F. Service Decision-Making Process**

Recommendations for service changes or the addition of new service will be made by the Development Services Department. The Service Planning and Marketing staff will consult with the Service Advisory Committee and other employees before developing recommendations on significant service changes. Input will be collected from current guests and potential guests through public outreach processes.

The Leadership Council will review and approve all recommendations for significant service changes or additions.

The Leadership Council will determine which service changes are to be presented to the Board of Directors for approval. Any change that affects 25 percent of the service miles on a route, or 25 percent of the trips on a route, or the establishment of a new route, must go to the Board of Directors for approval. A service presentation will be made to the Board of Directors each December or January. This will be followed by public hearings in February

and March. The Board of Directors will approve the ARR service package at the March Board of Directors meeting.

If financial constraints or other problems require that reductions in service that are not substandard be implemented, the elimination of service will be based upon the following factors:

- ◆ The productivity of the service (boardings per revenue hour, cost per boarding).
- ◆ The availability of alternate bus service in the area.
- ◆ Ridership by seniors and persons with disabilities or others with limited transportation alternatives.
- ◆ The cost effectiveness of the service cut.

### **G. Standards for Tripper Service**

The following criteria are to be used in determining whether to offer tripper service:

- ◆ Trips cannot be adequately provided by existing service, or there is not enough capacity within the existing service.
- ◆ There are no budgetary or fleet constraints that would preclude the addition of the tripper.

Trippers will be evaluated weekly and discontinued when no longer needed. If the demand continues, the tripper will be added as regular service and included in the next available run cut.

### **H. Maintenance of the Service Policy**

The Service Planning and Marketing Manager is responsible for maintaining this policy and recommending changes to the policy as necessary.

Board Approval of Revisions: 6/16/99  
Revised: 11/23/04



**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.

