



LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, January 07, 2020
5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

LTD Board Room
3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene
(Off Glenwood Blvd. in Glenwood)

AGENDA

Time	ITEM	Page
5:30 p.m.	I. CALL TO ORDER	
5:31 p.m.	II. ROLL CALL <input type="checkbox"/> Amy Cubbage (Chair) <input type="checkbox"/> Leah Rausch (Vice Chair) <input type="checkbox"/> Julia Hernandez <input type="checkbox"/> Frannie Brindle <input type="checkbox"/> Rob Zako <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant <input type="checkbox"/> Mike Eyster <input type="checkbox"/> Emily Secord <input type="checkbox"/> Sam Miller <input type="checkbox"/> Greg Evans <input type="checkbox"/> Joe Berney (Commissioner) <input type="checkbox"/> Matt Keeler (Proxy for Lindsey Hayward) <input type="checkbox"/> Carl Yeh <input type="checkbox"/> Sheri Moore <input type="checkbox"/> Gerry Gaydos	
5:32 p.m.	III. PRELIMINARY REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR	
5:35 p.m.	IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA <i>This agenda item provides a formal opportunity for the Chair to announce additions to the agenda, and for Committee members to make announcements.</i>	
5:40 p.m.	V. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ <i>Public Comment Note</i> This part of the agenda is reserved for members of the public to address the committee on any issue. The person speaking is requested to sign-in on the audience participation form. When your name is called, please step up to the podium and state your name, city of residence, and who you are representing for the audio record. If you are unable to utilize the podium, you may address the committee from your seat. ◆ <i>Community member testimony is limited to three (3) minutes.</i> 	
5:45 p.m.	VI. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES Action Needed: Approval <i>Approve minutes from the November 5, 2019, meeting</i>	3
	VII. ITEMS FOR BOARD RECOMMENDATION - NONE	
	VIII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING	
5:50 p.m.	A. DECEMBER BOARD RETREAT OUTCOMES: <i>No Materials Provided</i> [Aurora Jackson] Action Needed: None. Information Only Staff will provide a verbal update regarding the outcomes of the Board's December retreat.	

<u>Time</u>	<u>ITEM</u>	<u>Page</u>
6:00 p.m.	B. TRANSIT TOMORROW DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK: <i>Materials Included</i> [Tom Schwetz] Action Needed: Discussion Committee members will hold discussion regarding the trade-offs involved in Transit Tomorrow decision-making.	9
	IX. WRITTEN REPORTS AND UPDATES - <i>NONE</i>	
7:25 p.m.	X. NEXT/FUTURE MEETING AGENDAS <i>The Chair will ask for updates to be added to the working agenda and which month they should be placed.</i>	12
7:30 p.m.	XI. ADJOURNMENT	

The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. To request a reasonable accommodation or interpreter, including alternative formats of printed materials, please contact LTD's Administration office no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting at 541-682-5555 (voice) or 7-1-1 (TTY through Oregon Relay).

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

Tuesday, November 5, 2019

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 30, 2019, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Strategic Planning Committee of the Lane Transit District held a meeting on Tuesday, November 5, 2019, beginning at 5:30 p.m., at the LTD Board Room, 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: Amy Cabbage, Chair
Frannie Brindle
Greg Evans
Mike Eyster
Gerry Gaydos
Matt Keeler for Lindsay Hayward
Sheri Moore
Leah Rausch
Emily Secord
Carl Yeh (via teleconference)
Rob Zako
Aurora Jackson, LTD General Manager
Camille Gandolfi, Clerk of the Board

Absent: Joe Berney
Julia Hernandez, Vice Chair
Sam Miller

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL — Ms. Cabbage convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and called the roll.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR — Ms. Cabbage welcomed those present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA — Ms. Cabbage stated that Ms. Hernandez has resigned as a committee member and election of a new vice chair would be added to the agenda. She also noted that following the staff presentation of a Transit Tomorrow update the committee would form smaller groups to discuss the information and develop recommendations for the LTD Board of Directors.

ELECTION OF VICE CHAIR — Ms. Cabbage called for nominations for vice president.

Mr. Eyster nominated Leah Rausch for vice president. There were no other nominations and Ms. Rausch was elected vice chair by acclamation.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION — Ms. Cabbage invited comments from the audience.

Steve Altman, Eugene, spoke to the proposed elimination of routes #28, #24 and #73. He said he lived in the vicinity of 43rd Avenue and Fox Hollow. He did not drive and depended on transit daily to access his job, shopping, medical appointments and for many other purposes. He said many in his neighborhood were transit dependent and it was difficult to get to 30th Avenue. He

said there were also many school children and University students in the neighborhood. He provided comments online and urged LTD to reconsider elimination of those routes.

Russell Jones, Eugene, spoke to his perception of the opaqueness of the Transit Tomorrow process. He said that he rode the bus and many fellow riders had not heard about the process and felt there had been no community input. He said he faulted LTD for lack of public communication in the process. He said the online materials appeared to be an all or nothing choice and he was uncertain if decisions had been made yet. He said the SPC was the interface between the LTD Board and the community and he had not seen any communications regarding the Transit Tomorrow process. He stated he was very disappointed as he would no longer have a bus when the project was implemented.

Lucy Bambrey, Eugene, stated she had moved from Denver, Colorado last year and was impressed by the LTD transit system. She lived in southeast Eugene and her household included two girls who would be attending South Eugene High School within two years. She said the #28 bus stopped close to her home and provided safe and convenient transportation for all family members. She urged LTD not to eliminate the #28 as many people in the neighborhood depended on it.

ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

MOTION **Approval of Meeting Minutes** — Mr. Eyster moved to approve the October 1, 2019, minutes as submitted, Mr. Gaydos provided the second.

VOTE The motion was approved as follows:
YES: Cabbage, Brindle, Evans, Eyster, Gaydos, Keeler, Moore, Rausch, Secord, Yeh, Zako (11)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: Zako (1)
EXCUSED: Berney, Hernandez, Miller (3)

ITEMS FOR BOARD RECOMMENDATION

There were no items.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

Transit Tomorrow Update — Ms. Jackson stated that Transit Tomorrow was a comprehensive analysis of LTD's system in order to determine how to deploy its fleet in order to best serve the community while addressing the tradeoffs between ridership and coverage. The proposed network was focused on increasing ridership and frequency. The current system had 15 minute or better service on 17 percent of the network; 50 percent of the proposed network would have 15 minute or better service and include expanded evening and weekend service. She described the process to date, which included data collection, a Choices Report, community engagement, a Scenarios Report and additional community engagement. Following public input the LTD Board provided direction to move forward with development of a proposed network focused on ridership and frequency and include implementation strategies. This would be the first public presentation of that proposal.

Assistant General Manager Service Delivery Mark Johnson reviewed the proposed network on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis, identifying those areas that would lose service, new and

merged routes, frequency of proposed service, current ridership and riders impacted by the elimination of a stop who were within and outside of a quarter mile of the stop.

Ms. Secord said she felt there could be better explanation of why changes that would impact people's routes and stops were being considered and the benefits of making those changes. She said charts should show the productivity of routes and the effort to connect most riders to stops within a quarter mile. Mr. Johnson said the Board's direction was to explore a service model that had 80-85 percent productivity and 15-20 percent coverage. It was a difficult decision and the proposed ridership network would result in some people having to walk further to a bus stop, if that was the direction the Board continued to pursue.

Ms. Jackson explained the deployment of 40-foot and 60-foot buses on different routes. She said the intent was to maximize routes and achieve high levels of productivity, which would impact some riders. She stressed that the proposed network was in response to Board direction and reflected a first step in the planning and design process, not the final step, and could be refined as a result of the public engagement process.

Ms. Moore suggested providing a chart of routes where frequency would increase in order to demonstrate the impact of increased frequency. Ms. Jackson said the charts could also show the number of people who would gain transit access under the proposed network.

Development Planning Associate Andrew Martin said based on data about 87,500 more people, or 35 percent of those living in Eugene and Springfield, would gain access to 15 minute service, although he acknowledged that some people would lose access. He said communities of concern received more of the benefits of the proposed network than the community at large. He said 15 minute service was more convenient for riders.

Mr. Evans observed that service west of North Terry Street would be eliminated and there were many residents in the area who depended on transit and were already concerned about lack of frequency. He asked how cutting off service to that neighborhood aligned with increasing the frequency of service. Ms. Jackson said the #41 route was a good route with 1,656 boardings and the proposal would only affect 107 of those riders, of whom 85 would still have transit access within one-quarter mile.

Ms. Jackson summarized the next steps in the process, noting that a robust public engagement process was planned for the proposed network, draft implementation plan and draft service policy. The LTD Board was scheduled to adopt a final version of the network at its February 2020 meeting. She said implementation would occur over a year and a half, beginning in September 2020.

Mr. Eyster commented that the rationale for the proposed changes was the community input that had already occurred during earlier public engagement activities and that input demonstrated a strong preference for increased frequency and ridership rather than coverage.

Ms. Cabbage asked the committee to form smaller groups and develop feedback on the following:

- What questions or concerns did committee members have related to:
 - Public engagement
 - Implementation

Public engagement

- Some major players were not included in outreach such as the University of Oregon and Lane Community College
- Assure that the audience is being met where they are with relevant information to address their concerns
- Conduct neighborhood focus groups in areas where there were populations depending on transit for access to services
- Survey riders and bus operators and let operators gather feedback from customers
- Presentation was very confusing and people would not be able to respond to something they could not understand - more work was required to explain the proposal and why it was being considered
- Presentation was about buses and routes and not about people - it should speak to the public as human beings, not numbers
- Lead off presentations with the benefits and reasons for changes
- Language related to percentages of ridership and coverage was alienating to the public
- Stress gains at the neighborhood level
- The less technical the presentation of the proposed network to the public the better - it would be presented to lay people
- Explain what the District was trying to accomplish based on input from the community

Implementation

- January 2020 was too early in the process for a public hearing - consider slowing down the implementation schedule
- There were questions about the quality of the quarter-mile access as that could mean walking in areas with no sidewalks, lack of lighting, along busy roads, up and down hills
- Could vehicles smaller than 40- and 60-foot buses be used for some routes
- Could some routes that were productive remain unchanged
- The public was not concerned with the size or type vehicle being deployed, only whether a bus would pick them up
- The goal of a 45-minute trip was not discussed in the presentation
- Elimination of some routes could result in longer, less convenient trips for those who were not losing easy access to service
- Be clear about what was being proposed, when a final plan would be presented and how and when the public could influence the design
- The longer the implementation took the more painful it would be
- Continue to stress the benefits of the proposed network in all communications
- With the holiday period beginning shortly, holding a public hearing in January 2020 and adopting a final plan in February 2020 seemed too fast

Ms. Jackson said the project's timeline was aggressive in order to meet a fall 2020 implementation deadline and the proposed network plan had just been completed, but consisted primarily of data, without the human story. She said if the committee recommended a later implementation date it would provide an opportunity to engage with the community and get the human story and perhaps revise the final draft.

Mr. Eyster said he felt the committee had recommended that implementation proceed quickly once it began, but there did not seem to be opposition to delaying implementation. Mr. Johnson said service changes required about a seven month timeline, which is why Board approval had to occur in February 2020 if implementation was to begin in the fall. He indicated staff was not opposed to a later start for implementation.

Ms. Moore said it would be helpful to have a map of a route that indicated the locations of eliminated and proposed stops so people could see how they would be impacted or benefitted. Mr. Martin said additional information and maps were on the LTD website related to Transit Tomorrow.

Mr. Zako commented that Transit Tomorrow was an effort to serve the community better and it was important to get it right and delay implementation. He said the presentation was not ready for the public and suggested that it be updated consistent with committee feedback and tested before the committee at its next meeting.

Mr. Evans said people wanted to know how the new network would improve their bus riding experiences and there were other factors that affected those experiences beyond frequency that should be explored.

Ms. Brindle said options for reaching people without access to the network should also be discussed.

Director of Planning and Development Tom Schwetz said MovingAhead was examining a suite of multi-modal transportation solutions to address mobility needs.

Mr. Zako remarked that having simultaneous discussions of MovingAhead and Transit Tomorrow was very confusing. He suggested that LTD finish Transit Tomorrow before continuing with MovingAhead.

Ms. Secord urged the committee to develop recommendations on Transit Tomorrow for the Board.

Ms. Cabbage summarized the committee's discussion and recommendations for very robust public communications strategies for Transit Tomorrow and delaying implementation of Transit Tomorrow.

Mr. Evans said the project should conduct a deeper level of analysis of the different segments of the community: choice riders, those who were transit dependent and non-riders.

Ms. Moore encouraged the communication strategies and presentations to focus on what was being gained with the new network, not what was being lost.

Mr. Gaydos said he concurred that the implementation process should be slowed down, quality public input obtained and a clear direction established.

Mr. Keeler said he agreed with Ms. Moore on emphasizing the benefits that would be gained and ridership increases realized with the new network.

Mr. Zako said he hoped to see the committee continue its discussion when staff felt prepared, either in December 2019 or January 2020, and public engagement activities should be delayed until the committee felt the materials were ready for presentation to the public.

Ms. Cabbage summarized that the committee wanted to preview public outreach materials before they were presented to the community and did not feel that fall 2020 implementation was realistic. She suggested forming an ad hoc committee to meet with staff and discuss the communication and outreach strategies the SPC had suggested prior to the committee's December meeting.

Ms. Jackson said meetings were planned with community partners in order to collect the human element to add to the presentation and share it with the SPC. She would also inform the Board that the SPC was recommending more time be allocated to refining the message to the community and improving communication strategies.

Mr. Zako suggested delaying any planned open houses until the Transit Tomorrow story was refined.

Ms. Jackson said her understanding was that the SPC's recommendation was to delay the implementation of Transit Tomorrow to allow for more public engagement to get it right rather than implementing it quickly. It also recommended that future presentations provide more clarity about gains as a result of the proposed network and that a more refined presentation be provided to the SPC before taking it out for public comment. Further, the SPC wanted to engage staff on communication strategies. She suggested that could occur during the SPC's scheduled agenda setting meeting and any interested committee member could participate.

Ms. Cabbage said the committee was also recommending that while the beginning of implementation should be delayed, once it began it should proceed quickly.

Ms. Moore expressed appreciation for staff efforts to date and stressed the importance of hearing from those who were just becoming aware of the Transit Tomorrow process.

In response to a question from Mr. Zako, it was stated that the SPC could support the Board by providing other perspectives on Transit Tomorrow as it had just done with its recommendations. It was very important for the community to be well informed about what LTD was trying to do and why it would benefit the community.

Ms. Secord asked that a member of the committee other than herself or Mr. Yeh reported to the Board on the SPC's deliberations and recommendations.

Ms. Cabbage determined there was consensus on Ms. Jackson's summary of the SPC's recommendation and agreed to present them to the Board at its November meeting. A written summary would also be provided to the Board.

Strategic Planning Committee Work Plan Development — This item was postponed to a future meeting.

WRITTEN REPORTS AND UPDATES — Mr. Gaydos asked for updates on the bike share and EmGo programs.

NEXT/FUTURE MEETING AGENDAS — The next agenda setting meeting was scheduled for November 13, 2019, at 1:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT — Ms. Cabbage adjourned the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

DATE OF MEETING:	January 7, 2020
ITEM TITLE:	TRANSIT TOMORROW DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK
PRESENTER:	Tom Schwetz
DIRECTOR:	Aurora Jackson
ACTION REQUESTED:	Information and Discussion

PURPOSE: Committee members will discuss how the range of community values might inform the Board in considering the trade-offs involved in its decision-making on Transit Tomorrow.

HISTORY: At the December 2017 Board of Director's meeting, the Board approved an award of contract to Jarrett Walker and Associates (JWA) to perform a comprehensive operational analysis (COA) that entailed a detailed study of LTD's transit service, including an assessment of existing strengths, areas for improvements, and options to better serve the community it serves. In an outreach program to engage the community in the decision-making process of the COA, LTD branded the project "Transit Tomorrow." Through Transit Tomorrow, LTD is evaluating the entire transit network in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area.

The COA was developed in two phases and included two public outreach efforts as highlighted below.

- May 2018: the *Choices Report* was published
- June through August, 2018: Community Engagement, Phase 1
- January 2019: *Scenarios Report* was published
- January through February 2019: Community Engagement, Phase 2

On March 5, LTD's Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) spent their full meeting developing a recommendation for the Board's action on allocation of resources between provision of coverage and frequent fixed-route service for the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area. Representatives from SPC conveyed their recommendation to the Board at the March 20 regular meeting.

At the March 20, 2019, Board Meeting, the LTD Board of Director's adopted a resolution directing staff to develop a fixed-route service scenario for the Eugene/Springfield metropolitan area that focuses 80-85 percent of the metro area resources on High Ridership with up to 5 percent of metro resources being focused on non-fixed route mobility options. Based on the Board's direction, a multi-jurisdictional technical advisory group composed of agency partners and LTD staff met for a two-day "Core Design Retreat" on March 21 and 22 to develop the Draft Preferred Scenario for the fixed-route transit network in Eugene/Springfield. Following the retreat, a report was drafted summarizing key features of the draft network, along with measurements of outcomes which was provided to the Board in May 2019.

The LTD Board of Director's held a work session on July 17, 2019, in which the findings of the project to date, the proposed network, and analysis prepared by JWA were presented.

At its August 6, 2019, SPC meeting, committee members were briefed on the proposed network and the draft implementation process. The committee held small group discussions to discuss:

- Benefits and concerns associated with the proposed network and proposed implementation process.
- Areas of focus for strategizing implementation based on the identified benefits and concerns.

SPC members expressed support for the proposed network overall and recommended that implementation include a thoughtful process and communication strategy that promotes the positive aspects of the proposed changes. SPC members discussed the merits of rolling out the network changes all at once as compared to a phased approach over two years with primary changes occurring in the first year. While both approaches were acceptable to SPC members, most advocated for the changes to be implemented as quickly as could reasonably be achieved with the guidance that the changes and timing of changes be clearly articulated to stakeholders.

At the August 21 Board meeting, staff provided the following recommendation:

- Based on the above stated considerations, staff recommends that the proposed network be advanced for additional study and implementation planning.
- Additionally, staff recommends that the pace of implementation should occur as quickly as reasonable but be primarily informed by the detailed service and operational analysis that will occur as part of the implementation planning step. Reasonableness may mean that some phasing of the roll out would occur.
 - For example, construction of the Santa Clara Transit Station is anticipated to be complete in December 2020; therefore, staff recommends that the timing of changes that rely on this new station being operationally aligned with the construction schedule.

At that same meeting, through Resolution 2019-08-21-050, the Board directed staff to advance the proposed network for further study and implementation planning.

At its October 1, 2019 meeting, SPC members discussed a variety of strategic issues related to transit and how those issues intersect the MovingAhead and Transit Tomorrow projects and related Board decision-making. The committee broke into two small group discussions to answer two questions:

1. What are the desired outcomes of the project decisions? (Example – for Transit Tomorrow, the desired outcome is to make transit more useful for more people).
2. What questions should the board be considering as these projects progress? (Example – for MovingAhead - how can LTD use the outcomes of the greenhouse gas inventory to assess the outcomes of MovingAhead investments?)

Attachment 1 provides a summary of the committee's October discussion as it related to Transit Tomorrow. SPC can draw on this work in its discussion.

At their November 20, 2019, meeting after significant discussion, the Board directed staff to extend the scheduled outreach and decision timeframe to allow staff to 1) conduct robust outreach, and 2) to bring back to the Board a system alternative that provides some mitigation for areas that would lose service under the current proposed transit network.

Since the Board's meeting in November, staff have been developing strategies that would provide some level of service to areas identified for service reductions proposed under the 82/18% Ridership/Coverage system. With additional time, staff is developing a new communications plan to accomplish the following goals:

- Have a conversation with the community about why LTD has undertaken this project,
- Engage the broad and diverse community on emerging alternatives, and
- Present meaningful feedback to the Board for consideration in a decision of an adopted transit network.

CONSIDERATIONS: The committee's discussion will have two parts: the first is a discussion (small group) to identify specific values and measures that would fall under a broad triple bottom line framework of equity, efficiency, and environment.

The second part of the committee's discussion would apply its values work to the trade-off balancing LTD's resources between increasing frequency and maintaining coverage. This work is intended to ultimately feed into a values-based discussion by the Board and could be used by SPC to make its recommendation to the Board following the public engagement in April-May 2020.

NEXT STEPS: The committee's work is intended to ultimately feed into a values-based deliberation by the Board in making its decisions related to Transit Tomorrow implementation.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

- 1) SPC Anticipated Outcomes and Strategic Questions for Transit Tomorrow

Attachment 1: SPC Anticipated Outcomes and Strategic Questions for Transit Tomorrow:

Outcomes:

- Reduce transit door-to-door travel time and increase access to the number of jobs and services within a given period of time
- Increase ridership
- Reduce the community's carbon footprint
- Improve the customer experience for people riding the bus through better service, better access for those with disabilities, riders with pets, ease of fare payment
- Decrease/control cost of living expenses, specifically transportation
- Establish a transit system that facilitates compact development to support climate goals and livability and travel time
- Full buses
- Communications with the public to promote ridership with increased ridership as the primary focus
- Budgetary impact - assure there is a value added and net gain to the community; understand the financial tradeoff and making sure it is a net positive
- Find opportunities to influence additional housing development
- Create a confident consumer decision that results in a cohesive experience through frequent service and efficient connections

Questions:

- Community must understand and support Transit Tomorrow - communication and outreach are critical
- LTD being a leader in communicating and educating the public about the desired outcomes and why the plan is a draft, while soliciting some modifications without going back to the beginning of the process
- Should there be additional public engagement and public education before the LTD Board makes a decisions and how can that be done?
- How can the public be effectively educated about the coming changes once a decision is made and Transit Tomorrow is implemented in the fall of 2020?
- Once a new system is implemented, how will it be monitored in terms of benefits and negative impacts on people in the community?
- What are people doing once they no longer have service?
- After a period of monitoring, determine how well the experiment worked, did it benefit the community, should it continue?
- Can there be more ridership than is possible with existing resources?
- How can transit advance the community's and LTD's climate change goals?
- What is the implementation schedule, cost efficiency of implementation, how is implementation being done and why was that approach selected - communicate that information effectively to the community?
- What is the Board's policy regarding erosion of the target ridership percentage?
- Is the goal mass transit for the greater good or meeting individual needs and how to build a net gain story, knowing there would be very compelling testimony?
- What areas of opportunities can be acknowledged in advance regarding coverage losses and ridership targets?
- What course corrections might be needed now versus over time?
- What values should be Board keep in mind related to acceptable levels of ridership/coverage drift that might occur?
- What are the financial tradeoffs, both when implementing and maintaining the plan?
- What does success look like?
- Heart versus policy – how to balance?



Strategic Planning Committee Annual Working Agenda

Topic	Notes	Presenter	Agenda Time
January 7, 2020 Materials Deadline: December 20			Time (minutes)
Introductory Items			15
Items for action:			
Approval of Minutes			5
Items for Board Recommendation			
Items for Information/Discussion:			
Retreat Outcomes		Aurora Jackson	10
TT Implementation Update - breakouts		Tom Schwetz	90
Written Reports:			
		TOTAL TIME	120
February 5, 2020 Materials Deadline: January 17			Time (minutes)
Introductory Items			15
Items for Action:			
Approval of Minutes			5
Items for Board Recommendation			
LTD's Strategic Business Plan Discussion		Tom Schwetz	60
Moving Ahead Update		Tom Schwetz	40
Items for Information/Discussion:			
Written Reports:			
		TOTAL TIME	120
March 5 2020 Materials Deadline: February 21			Time (minutes)
Introductory Items			15
Items for Action:			
Approval of Minutes			5
Items for Board Recommendation			
Items for Information/Discussion:			
Written Reports:			
		TOTAL TIME	20



Strategic Planning Committee Annual Working Agenda

Topic	Notes	Presenter	Agenda Time
April 2, 2020 Materials Deadline: March 20			Time (minutes)
Introductory Items			15
Items for Action:			
Approval of Minutes			5
Items for Board Recommendation			
Mobility on Demand Update	Cottage Grove and Downtown Eugene	Cosette Rees	60
Items for Information/Discussion:			
Sustainable City Year Report	Fall Term Reports	Jennifer Zankowski	30
Moving Ahead Update		Tom Schwetz	45
Written Reports:			
		TOTAL TIME	155
May 7, 2019 Materials Deadline: April 17			Time (minutes)
Introductory Items			15
Items for Action:			
Approval of Minutes			5
Items for Board Recommendation			
Items for Information/Discussion:			
Written Reports:			
		TOTAL TIME	20
June 4, 2019 Materials Deadline: May 15			Time (minutes)
Introductory Items			15
Items for Action:			
Items for Board Recommendation			
Items for Information/Discussion:			
Written Reports:			



MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 07, 2020

TO: SPC Members

SUBJECT: SPC Meeting Attendance

LTD is looking at ways to improve attendance at its SPC meetings. One option being looked at is potentially adjusting the time that the meeting is being held.

Below are some options for alternate times of day that the meeting could be held (all proposed times are for the same Tuesday that meetings are currently held). We would like your input on which time you think would work best, or any other suggestion you may have.

- 3:00 – 5:00
- 4:00 – 6:00
- 5:00 – 7:00
- 5:30 – 7:30 (current time)
- Other: _____

LTD Strategic Planning Committee

Transit Tomorrow Decision Making Framework Discussion

January 7, 2020

1. Small Group Discussion (30 mins)

Objective: Explicitly link **values** to the outcomes/trade-offs of a high-ridership network. Recommend a set of values and next steps to the LTD Board of Directors to inform a public involvement strategy for Transit Tomorrow.

Questions:

- Why should the community support a high ridership model?
- How should LTD incorporate these reasons and values into a public involvement strategy?

2. Debrief (15 mins)

3. Next Steps (20 mins)

Questions:

- What if any recommendations should SPC make to the LTD Board of Directors?
- How can SPC be most supportive of the Board and staff in Transit Tomorrow moving forward? (Public involvement planning, upcoming board meetings, etc.)
- What does SPC's work plan look like moving forward? Immediate next steps and conversations?
- What information does SPC need from staff/board to inform future conversations?

SPC Recommendation Presented at 11/20/19 LTD Board Meeting:

1. SPC recommends postponing the launch of Transit Tomorrow service changes.
2. SPC recommends that LTD undertake a robust public education and engagement strategy.
 - a. Phase One: Allow plenty of time for public education and engagement aimed at building community support for change.
 - b. Phase Two: Once the LTD Board has approved a specific set of changes, allow sufficient time to educate the community about exactly what they can expect and when and what they will need to do differently.
3. SPC recommends that once Transit Tomorrow service changes begin, the changes take place as quickly as possible in order to avoid a long period of change and confusion.
4. SPC recommends that staff bring a revised Transit Tomorrow presentation and updates related to the public education and engagement strategy to SPC's December meeting, or as soon as they are ready. SPC members are willing to engage with staff outside of SPC meetings to support this effort.

Recommendation: SPC recommends the Board provide staff with a strong, clear directive to continue pursuing a high(er) ridership model. To accomplish this, LTD should engage in an intentional and iterative public involvement process to build community support. This process should:

- 1) Explain the purpose of Transit Tomorrow and present the benefits of a higher ridership model;
- 2) Proactively reaches out to people who stand to gain or lose service from the proposal and key stakeholders to engage them in the process, ideally through a stakeholder forum;
- 3) Provides opportunities to give specific feedback on the proposed network change; and,
- 4) Incorporates this feedback into development of an updated version of the network.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION SIGN-UP SHEET— STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: January 7, 2020

Note: Please note that your verbal testimony is limited to three (3) minutes.

If you wish to present written materials, please furnish at least one copy to the Clerk of the Board/Recording Secretary for the official record.

NAME	CITY OF RESIDENCE	GROUP / REPRESENTING	TOPIC
Linda Duggan	Eugene		Transit tomorrow
John Lepinski	Eugene		Transit tomorrow
Eleanor Lepinski	Eugene		transit tomorrow
Jess Roshak	EUGENE		45 + transit tomorrow
Kathleen O'Bieblyk	Eugene	OR Commission for the Blind	Transit Tomorrow

* This document is a public record subject to disclosure under the Oregon Public Records Law.