

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
ADJOURNED BOARD MEETING

March 12, 1985

7:30 p.m.

Municipal Courtroom #1,
Eugene City Hall

A G E N D A

- I. CALL TO ORDER

- II. ROLL CALL
 - Eberly_____ Nichols_____ Parducci_____ Pusateri_____
 - Brandt_____ Calvert_____

- III. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT

- IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

- V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH

- VI. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING
 - A. Approval of Minutes
 - B. Capital Improvements Program
 - C. Fiscal Year 1985-86 Goals
 - D. Loan Resolution

- VII. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING
 - A. Current Activities
 - 1. Review of Design for Willamette Street Opening
 - 2. Widening of Sixth and Seventh Avenues
 - 3. Clarification of Transit Goal

4. Negotiation Process
 5. Winter 1985 Route Segment Analysis Results
 6. Petitions for Service to Marcola and Additional Service to McKenzie Bridge
 7. One-day Seminar--Building Better Boards
 8. Note from Employee of the Year
 9. Ride on an 800 Series Bus
- B. Monthly Financial Reporting

VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

- A. Ordinance #27, District Contract Review Board
- B. Marketing Presentation

IX. ADJOURNMENT

AGENDA NOTES

Page No.

V. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Time will be set aside at the beginning of the meeting to present the March Employee of the Month with his check and certificate.

VII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING

A. Approval of Minutes: The minutes of the February 19, 1985 regular meeting and the February 26, 1985 adjourned work session will be included in the April Board packet.

B. Capital Improvements Program:

Issue Presented: Should the Board approve an update to the District's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for Fiscal Year 1985-86? 7

Staff Recommendation: That the Board approve the Capital Improvements Program for Fiscal Year 1985-86.

Results of Recommendation: Staff will include the CIP in the Fiscal Year 1985-86 budget.

C. Fiscal Year 1985-86 Goals: 15

Issue Presented: Should the Board adopt a set of goals for Fiscal Year 1985-86?

Background: Each year, preceding the budget process, staff develops and submits to the Board for their review a set of proposed goals for the upcoming fiscal year. Included in this packet is a set of five proposed goals for the District. They are similar to last year and are fairly broad in scope. If adopted, they will guide staff in the development of the Fiscal Year 1985-86 budget.

Staff Recommendation: That the Board approve the set of proposed goals for Fiscal Year 1985-86.

Results of Recommendation Action: Staff will use the adopted goals as guidelines in developing the Fiscal Year 1985-86 budget.

D. Loan Resolution:

17

Issue Presented: Should the Board adopt the enclosed resolution pledging payroll tax revenues to repay a \$50,000 loan?

Background: In January, the Board approved borrowing \$50,000 to qualify for the sale of tax benefits in connection with bus acquisition. The bank requires a further resolution pledging payroll tax receipts for repayment of the loan.

Staff Recommendation: That the Board adopt the resolution pledging payroll tax receipts for the loan repayment.

VI. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

A. Current Activities

1. Review of Design for Willamette Street Opening: Representatives of the City of Eugene will be present at the Board meeting to discuss the preliminary design for the opening of Willamette Street between 10th and 11th. This design has been presented to the Downtown Development Commission. LTD's Planning Administrator, Stefano Viggiano, sat on the committee and will be present at the meeting to discuss LTD's reaction to the design.
2. Widening of Sixth and Seventh Avenues: Enclosed is a memo responding to the Board request to have this item placed on the agenda. 19
3. Clarification of Transit Goal: Included in the Board packet is a memo from staff which responds to the concerns raised at the last Board meeting about the transit goal. Staff will be present to answer questions about this issue from the Board. 20
4. Negotiation Process: There will be a staff presentation on the upcoming negotiation process.
5. Winter 1985 Route Segment Analysis Results: Included in the Board packet is a memo from staff giving the results of the Winter Route Segment Analysis (RSA). Staff will be present to answer any questions from the Board. 23

6. Petitions for Service to Marcola and Additional Service to McKenzie Bridge: The District has received petitions for additional service to McKenzie Bridge and for service to Marcola. A staff memo included in the Board packet outlines the procedure that will be used to consider these service requests. 28

7. One-Day Seminar--Building Better Boards: Quoting from an ICC newsletter about an upcoming seminar entitled "Building Better Boards":

"LCC has been selected to participate in a demonstration project designed to strengthen the skills of volunteer boards. A member of our staff recently completed the training program in San Francisco, and, by spring, LCC will be offering this training to nonprofit boards in the community. The national project is coordinated by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with the basic premise that individuals who serve on boards in a community make decisions that affect the entire community. The emphasis will be on improving effectiveness and productivity."

If any of the LTD Board members are interested in receiving more information about the upcoming training, please contact Jo Sullivan in Administration.

8. Note from Employee of the Year: Enclosed in the Board packet is a copy of a card received from Paul Stuart, who was chosen LTD 1984 Employee of the Year. 29

9. Ride on an 800 Series Bus: There will be an 800 series bus available for Board members to ride on at the conclusion of tonight's meeting.

- B. Monthly Financial Reporting: Due to the early date of the March Board meeting, a financial report for February 1985 will not be available; that report will be included in the April Board packet.

IX. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT A FUTURE MEETING

- A. Ordinance No. 27, District Contract Review Board: The state has now adopted a public purchasing law. After review by staff, those rules will be presented to the Budget Subcommittee for discussion and preparation of policies and procedures for the District's Public Contract Review Board. An ordinance adopting the rules of the Review Board will need to be adopted after reading at two consecutive meetings of the Board.
- B. Marketing Presentation: A presentation on summer promotions by the Marketing division is scheduled for the April Board meeting.

X. ADJOURNMENT



March 12, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: ACCOUNTANT
RE: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is presented for your review and approval. This is the second year in which a formal CIP has been developed and presented to the Board for approval. This document is a planning as well as a budget document. The first year--Fiscal Year 1985-86--of the CIP, along with grant funded capital carryovers from the current year, will be incorporated into our Fiscal Year 1985-86 budget.

The CIP contains detailed requirements for the next two to three years, along with projected needs in various general categories such as maintenance equipment replacement and passenger boarding improvements. Revenue vehicle replacement and fleet expansion has been projected based upon a 15-year vehicle life and the fleet projections programmed in the Facility Needs Study. Beyond several years, the CIP is merely a projection of the level of capital expenditures the District can expect to make rather than a commitment for any particular project or acquisition. Funding of the capital reserve in light of these needs allows us to accumulate a local share toward future projects. It also helps us to qualify for discretionary funding, such as UMTA Section 3, by indicating our commitment to prudent capital planning.

The most significant project included in the CIP is the acquisition or construction of a new maintenance and administrative facility. Should the Board decide to proceed with this project after the second phase of the Facility Needs Study is complete, the District would proceed this summer with grant applications to fund site acquisition and development, preliminary engineering, and architectural fees. Grant applications for construction of the facility would follow in Fiscal Year 1986-87.

UMTA Section 9 monies are allocated to the District on a formula basis and cover 80 percent of the cost for approved projects; however, our allocation for the next two years will not cover the costs of a new facility.

In order to apply for Section 3 funding, UMTA has indicated that we must demonstrate a commitment to use our Section 9 funding first. Therefore, our proposed CIP was developed under the following assumptions:

1. First priority for Section 9 funding will be the proposed maintenance and administration facility.
2. Improvements to current facilities will be made only when absolutely necessary.
3. Office furniture and equipment purchases will be made only when they cannot be deferred.
4. Computer expenditures will be minimal in light of completion of an expansion phase this fiscal year.

Total proposed expenditures for Fiscal Year 1985-86 are \$2,787,950, of which \$2,000,000 represents part of the new facility as discussed above, and \$600,000 for five suburban coaches to replace the 400's. The \$600,000 would be spent only if anticipated Section 18 money is allocated to the District by the State Public Transit Division.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

District staff recommend that the Board approve the CIP which will be incorporated into the budget and presented to the Budget Committee in April.

Karen R. Rivenburg

Karen R. Rivenburg
Accountant

KRR:sbe

DRAFT-MARCH 5, 1985

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT/REPLACEMENT PROGRAM
FUTURE VALUES ASSUME A 5% ANNUAL INFLATION RATE

	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	TOTAL

COMPUTER SOFTWARE	-----												

NETWORK SOFTWARE													0
DBASE III-NETWORK VERSION	2,100												2,100
GRAPHIC DESIGN	800												800
NEW PCHS & UPGRADES	3,000	8,000											11,000
POINT 4 SOFTWARE													0
SOFTWARE MODIFICATION	1,500	2,000											3,500
OTHER COMPUTER SOFTWARE			5,000	5,250	5,513	5,788	6,078	6,381	6,700	7,036	36,936	38,783	123,465

SUBTOTAL-COMPUTER SOFTWARE	7,400	10,000	5,000	5,250	5,513	5,788	6,078	6,381	6,700	7,036	36,936	38,783	140,865

OFFICE FURNITURE & EQUIPMENT	-----												

FILING CABINETS	300												300
FILING CABINETS	300	300											600
TYPEWRITER STAND-2	400												400
COMPUTER TABLE	250												250
COMPUTER TABLE	250												250
2 FRONT DESK CHAIRS	600												
COMPUTER CHAIRS	900												900
PRINTOUT RACKS	400												400
ADMIN CONF ROOM ERASER BOARD	450												450
BOOKSHELVES		350											350
HIGH SPEED PHOTO COPIER			28,000										28,000
COIN ROLL CRIMPER			300										300
COMPUTERIZED COIN COUNTER			11,000										11,000
POSTAGE MACHINE			4,000										4,000
DOLLAR BILL COUNTER					500								500
OTHER OFFICE ITEMS	3,000		10,000	10,500	11,025	11,576	12,155	12,763	13,401	14,071	73,873	77,566	249,930

SUBTOTAL-FURNITURE & EQUIPMENT	6,850	650	53,300	10,500	11,525	11,576	12,155	12,763	13,401	14,071	73,873	77,566	297,630

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT/REPLACEMENT PROGRAM
 FUTURE VALUES ASSUME A 5% ANNUAL INFLATION RATE

	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	TOTAL

COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	-----												

NETWORK HARDWARE													0
TAPE BACKUP UNIT-HARD DISK PC'S	2,100												2,100
EXPANSION 10MB DRIVE	1,000												1,000
COLOR PRINTER & STAND	2,500												2,500
NETWORK SERVER			11,000										11,000
UPGRADES	2,000												2,000
POINT 4 HARDWARE													0
TELEVIDEO TERMINALS-REPL	1,300												1,300
DOT MATRIX PRINTER-REPL-MAINT			900										900
FUTURE COMPUTER ITEMS			20,000	21,000	22,050	23,153	24,310	25,526	26,802	28,142	147,746	155,133	493,861
													0

SUBTOTAL-COMPUTER EQUIPMENT	8,900	0	31,900	21,000	22,050	23,153	24,310	25,526	26,802	28,142	147,746	155,133	514,661

MAINTENANCE	-----												

REPLACEMENT ITEMS													0
BUS WASHER BRUSHES	5,000			10,000									15,000
STEAM CLEANER	6,200												6,200
EXHAUST HOSES	2,000												2,000
5-TON HOIST			3,000										
TRANSMISSION JACK FOR 730 TRANS	1,000												1,000
OTHER REPLACEMENT ITEMS			10,000	10,500	11,025	11,576	12,155	12,763	13,401	14,071	73,873	77,566	246,930

SUBTOTAL-MAINTENANCE	14,200	0	13,000	20,500	11,025	11,576	12,155	12,763	13,401	14,071	73,873	77,566	271,130

DRAFT-MARCH 5, 1985

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT/REPLACEMENT PROGRAM
FUTURE VALUES ASSUME A 5% ANNUAL INFLATION RATE

	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	TOTAL

PASSENGER BOARDING IMPROVEMENTS													

MAJOR BUS STOPS													0
VALLEY RIVER CENTER			150,000										150,000
WEST EUGENE STATION			30,000										30,000
SPRINGFIELD AT 58TH			30,000										30,000
JUNCTION CITY STATION			15,000										15,000
VENETA STATION			15,000										15,000
IMPROVEMENTS @ EUGENE STATION													0
MISC IMPROVE-BIKE RACKS, ETC.		1,500											1,500
BETTER SHELTER IDENTIFICATION	1,000												1,000
UNSPECIFIED			10,000	10,000	10,000								30,000
BUS STOP IMPROVEMENTS													0
PADS, SHELTERS, CANS, BIKE RACKS	50,000	50,000	75,000	75,000	75,000								325,000
INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS-													0
TURNOUTS, PAVING, CURBCUTS, ETC			50,000	50,000	50,000								150,000
BUS STOP INFORMATION DISPLAYS			100,000										100,000
BUS STOP INFORMATION DISPLAYS	2,000												2,000
COMPUTERIZED PASSENGER INFO			50,000										50,000
WHEEL SIGNS	2,000		3,000										5,000
PORTABLE INFORMATION DISPLAYS	5,000												5,000
OTHER					150,000	157,500	165,375	173,644	182,326	191,442	1,005,072	1,055,325	3,080,684

SUBTOTAL-PASS BOARDING IMPROVEMENTS	60,000	51,500	528,000	135,000	285,000	157,500	165,375	173,644	182,326	191,442	1,005,072	1,055,325	3,990,184

FACILITIES													

FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS & MAINT	10,000			10,000	10,500	11,025	11,576	12,155	12,763	13,401	70,355	73,873	235,648
MAINTENANCE & ADMIN FACILITY	2,000,000	6,000,000											8,000,000
STORAGE SHED/PARTS BINS	4,000												4,000
MAINT HOT WATER SYSTEM	500												500
MAINT LOUNGE CEILING	1,600												1,600

SUTOTAL-FACILITIES	2,016,100	6,000,000	0	10,000	10,500	11,025	11,576	12,155	12,763	13,401	70,355	73,873	8,241,748

DRAFT-MARCH 5, 1985

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT/REPLACEMENT PROGRAM
 FUTURE VALUES ASSUME A 5% ANNUAL INFLATION RATE

LTD BOARD MEETING
 03/12/85 Page 12

	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	TOTAL

SYSTEM DESIGN													

RIDERSHIP MODEL STUDY	2,000												2,000
OTHER LONG RANGE PLANNING			50,000	52,500	55,125	57,881	60,775	63,814	67,005	70,355	369,364	387,832	1,234,651

SUBTOTAL-SYSTEM DESIGN	2,000	0	50,000	52,500	55,125	57,881	60,775	63,814	67,005	70,355	369,364	387,832	1,236,651

VEHICLES & ACCESSORIES													

REPLACE 400 BUSES-2 SUBURBAN & 7 STANDARD-BUY 5-SEC 18	600,000												600,000
REPLACE 20 500 BUSES - 15 YEAR LIFE CURRENT PRICE '85 \$150,000							4,221,301						4,221,301
REPLACE 18 700 BUSES - 15 YEAR LIFE										4,398,015			4,398,015
REPLACE 31 800 BUSES - 15 YEAR LIFE												9,667,016	9,667,016

INCREASE FLEET SIZE													
STANDARD BUS-10 EACH TIME				1,914,422				2,326,992		3,118,392	3,979,947		11,339,753
ARTICULATED BUS		2,250,000											2,250,000
DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE		300,000											300,000
MINI-VANS		66,150		72,930		80,406		88,647		205,485	394,166		907,784

SUBTOTAL-VEHICLES & ACCESSORIES	600,000	0	2,616,150	0	1,987,353	0	4,301,707	0	2,415,640	0	7,721,893	14,041,128	33,683,870

DRAFT-MARCH 5, 1985

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT/REPLACEMENT PROGRAM
 FUTURE VALUES ASSUME A 5% ANNUAL INFLATION RATE

	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	TOTAL

BUS RELATED EQUIPMENT													

AUTO PASS CNTRS, MICROPROCESSOR, SIGNPOSTS, DATA RETRIEVAL UNIT, CPU	50,000												50,000
FAREBOXES THAT ACCEPT PAPER \$			233,000										233,000
HAND HELD RADIO	1,500												1,500
MOBILE RADIOS-4 SPARE	6,000												6,000

TOTAL BUS RELATED EQUIPMENT	57,500	0	233,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	290,500

SERVICE VEHICLES													

SUPERVISORS' VANS	15,000	15,750	16,538	17,364	18,233	19,144	20,101	21,107	22,162	23,270	122,167	128,275	439,111
MAINTENANCE TRUCK						16,592					21,176	27,026	64,794

TOTAL SERVICE VEHICLES	15,000	15,750	16,538	17,364	18,233	35,736	20,101	21,107	22,162	23,270	143,343	155,301	503,905

GRAND TOTAL	2,787,950	6,077,900	3,546,888	272,114	2,406,323	314,236	4,614,233	328,152	2,760,199	361,788	9,642,454	16,062,509	49,171,145
=====													

DRAFT-MARCH 5, 1985

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT/REPLACEMENT PROGRAM
FUTURE VALUES ASSUME A 5% ANNUAL INFLATION RATE

	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94	94-95	1995-2000	2000-2005	TOTAL
GRAND TOTAL	2,787,950	6,077,900	3,546,888	272,114	2,406,323	314,236	4,614,233	328,152	2,760,199	361,788	9,642,454	16,062,509	49,171,145

FEDERAL SHARE

SECTION 3-75%	687,005	3,604,467	1,588,312										
SECTION 9-80%	1,017,555	1,017,555	1,119,311										
SECTION 18-80%	480,000	0	0										
FAU-88%	0	0	26,400										

TOTAL FEDERAL SHARE 2,184,560 4,622,022 2,734,023

LOCAL SHARE 603,390 1,455,878 812,865

FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE

SECTION 9 1,017,555 1,017,555 1,119,311

FOOTNOTES-NOT INCLUDED IN ABOVE

MOVE STATION FOR MALL DEVELOPMENT	300,000
SHELTER IN SPECIAL SECTION	25,000
	325,000



March 12, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Phyllis Loobey
RE: Recommended 1985-86 Goals and Objectives

1. RIDERSHIP

Increase ridership by six percent over 1984-85 levels with no decrease in productivity.

2. REVENUE

The District shall increase passenger revenues during FY 1985-86 to improve farebox-to-operating cost ratio.

- Pursue legislative actions designed to broaden the base of resources.
- Implement Fare Policy.
- Develop Marketing programs/promotions which contribute to increased ridership.

3. EFFICIENCY

The District shall continue to seek improvements in internal operating efficiency.

- Continue to improve employee relations and internal communications in order to improve staff efficiency, morale, job satisfaction and productivity.
- Continue with computerization efforts.
- Develop and implement an employee fitness/health program.
- Develop employee incentive programs.
- Continue support for staff training.

4. SERVICE

As funds become available, the District shall implement new service designed to meet District productivity standards and which can be sustained in future years.

- Evaluate, and possibly modify, low productivity service.
- Modest service increases should be pursued.
- Restructure service where needed to improve efficiency.

5. PUBLIC SUPPORT

The District shall maintain, and seek to expand, support from the community at large.

- Strengthen ties with, and enhance support from, local public agencies.
- Continue participation in business and community groups, committees and associations.
- Generate support and favorable policies from local Cities, the State of Oregon and Federal agencies.
- Enhance support for public transportation and the District from the public at large.
- Improve customer information system.
- Improve employee/patron interaction.

Phyllis
Phyllis Loobey
General Manager

MP:sbe



Lane Transit District

P.O. Box 2710 Eugene, Oregon 97402 Telephone: (503) 687-5581

March 12, 1985

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: ACCOUNTANT
RE: BORROWING RESOLUTION

In January the Board of Directors adopted a resolution authorizing the District to borrow up to \$50,000 to meet safe harbor leasing requirements. The District has come to an agreement with First Interstate to borrow the funds at 7 1/8 percent to be repaid on June 28, 1985. Documentation required by the bank to transact the loan includes a pledge to repay the amount out of our next quarter payroll tax receipts. A resolution to pledge these funds follows for your approval.

Karen R. Rivenburg

Karen R. Rivenburg
Accountant

KRB/ms

RESOLUTION

The Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District hereby resolves as follows:

The Lane Transit District (the "District") has agreed to borrow from First Interstate Bank (the "Bank") the sum of \$50,000 to finance a portion of the District's local share of its bus acquisition program for the purpose of the sale of certain surplus tax benefits on those buses. The borrowing will occur subject to the terms and conditions, including the rate of interest, set forth in the bank's offer letter, dated March 5, 1985. To ensure the full and timely repayment of the District's borrowing, the Board of Directors hereby pledges, from its first receipt of payroll taxes, the sum of \$50,000, plus interest accrued thereon from March 13 to June 28, 1985. The sum hereby pledged may be invested temporarily prior to June 28, 1985, but may be used for no other purpose than to repay the District's borrowing in full when due.

Secretary

Date



March 12, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: General Manager
RE: Street Widening Project--6th & 7th

The Board has asked that the staff determine the impact of the proposed widening upon transit operations. Internal review indicates no significant, direct impact upon current LTD service. The District's long-range service plan does include the use of 6th and 7th Avenues for express routes coming in from the western service sectors and the continuous use of 5th and 8th Avenues for neighborhood service.

The widening of 6th and 7th will not give transit an advantage over any other mode. To the extent that traffic flow would be improved, then future express service would be improved in the same relative degree as other modes.

From the standpoint of making progress toward the T-2000 modal split goals, the widening project would not make a contribution to this end.

If the project is a political "good" in the sense of contributing to the economic growth opportunities in this metropolitan community, then, in the long-term, the District would benefit from such realized growth.

Phyllis
Phyllis Loobey
General Manager

PL/em



March 12, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Planning Administrator
RE: Reconsideration of the Transit Goal

At the February Board meeting, Jim Hale and Harold Chapman presented information on the transit goal and the repercussions it has on projected traffic volumes. They requested that the LTD Board urge the City Councils and the Lane County Board of Commissioners to reconsider the transit goal. The following is a staff analysis of this request. Much of the information that follows was contained in a memorandum that was included in the February Board packet.

Background

As part of the update of the long range transportation plan, several assumptions that are used as input into the traffic model were reviewed, among these the transit goal. In October of last year, elected officials from the three local jurisdictions adopted a goal that transit will carry eight percent of all metropolitan area trips by the year 2000. This goal was a downward revision of the previous goal of 14 percent transit trips.

The eight percent goal would call for the District to carry approximately 28,000,000 person trips in the year 2000. This contrasts with the 3,500,000 person trips that we are estimating for Fiscal Year 1984-85. The fleet projections made by Economic Consultants of Oregon (ECO) for the Facilities Study included a 20-year ridership projection. The ECO report estimated that annual ridership in the year 2000 is likely to be between 6,000,000 and 7,100,000 person trips. Much of the concerns mentioned by Mr. Hale and Mr. Chapman centered around the discrepancy between the TransPlan goal and the ECO projections. They feel that the transit goal should be revised in light of the ECO findings.

It should be noted that many other assumptions beside transit usage go into the traffic model. Among the more important are use of other alternative modes (bicycling, walking, and carpooling), changes in the trip-making rate, and changes in population. Each of these assumptions are controversial, and most have a much greater effect on traffic volumes than the transit goal.

Staff Analysis

Staff recommends that the Board not recommend a revision of the transit goal. This recommendation is based on the following reasons:

1. There are inherent differences between goals and projections. The TransPlan goal is an indication of the role that the community would like to see transit play in future, whereas the ECO projection is an estimate of future ridership based on historical trends and current policies and practices. The goal is appropriate for a long range planning document such as TransPlan, while the more conservative projection is appropriate for planning a new facility.
2. The ECO projections are based primarily on the historical relationship between transit ridership and employment. The projections do not assume major changes in policies that affect transit usage. The TransPlan goal is approachable only if the community makes a concerted effort to make transit a more attractive alternative. This point was made repeatedly during the discussions on the transit goal that occurred last summer.
3. In reviewing the ECO analysis, staff felt that many assumptions were overly pessimistic of transit's ability to achieve ridership increases and that the projections were therefore conservative. For example, the ECO's analysis concluded that fares seem to have little impact on ridership. However, the District's experience with the free service during the Lane County Fair and the reduced weekend fare would tend to dispute that.
4. The material contained in the ECO report is not, by and large, new. Most of the information on which ECO's projections are based was provided by either LTD or L-COG. The experience of other cities as well as historical ridership data from LTD was included in the T-2000 Evaluation Report. This information was available when the local elected officials opted for the eight percent transit goal.
5. A change in the transit goal at this time would set the update of the transportation plan back at least four to five months.
6. The transportation plan is scheduled to be updated again within the next five years. Transit travel, as well as automobile traffic, population increases, and trip-making rates, will be monitored. Any changes indicated by the trends in these factors can be considered at that time.
7. It is the opinion of L-COG's transportation planners that a lowering of the transit goal would not have an appreciable impact in the identification of traffic overloads. It is their opinion that the

Board of Directors Regular Meeting
Reconsideration of the Transit Goal
March 12, 1985
Page 3

significant overloads would be evident under either assumption. The only change might be in streets that are projected to be slightly below overload status. Those marginal overloads would be a low priority and would likely not be built before the next transportation plan update.

Stefano Viggiano/sve

Stefano Viggiano
Planning Administrator

SV:ms:js



March 12, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Planning
RE: Winter 1985 Route Segment Analysis

The Route Segment Analysis (RSA) is a quarterly tabulation of ridership on all of the District's routes. The winter RSA was conducted on Saturday, February 2; Sunday, February 3; and Wednesday, February 6. Surveyors recorded the ongoing passenger count of each bus before and after every trip. This data is used to determine ridership on each trip of every route. Ridership on individual trips can also be aggregated to determine ridership by route, sector, or time of day.

The RSA is most useful for identifying trends in individual routes or groups of routes. Since it only represents a one-day sample of ridership for weekday, Saturday, and Sunday service, it is less useful for evaluating overall trends in ridership. The ridership totals collected daily by drivers provide the most useful information for making overall comparisons. This information is provided for the Board on a quarterly basis, with the next report due in April.

The following tables compare the productivity of routes in Winter 1985 to Winter 1984. Productivity is calculated by dividing ridership by hours of service and, thus, measures the rides per vehicle hour.

Weekday Service

Tables 1 and 3 show the productivity of the weekday routes. Among the routes showing the greatest increases in productivity are newer routes such as the #32 WEST 11TH, #35 WESTSIDE, #36 UNIVERSITY and #39 PARKWAY. The #32 and #35 serve the Fred Meyer store on West 11th, while the #36 and #39 provide service from west Eugene to the U of O, and transfers to LCC. The productivity of #32 increased by 48.4 percent, while the productivity of #35 increased by 43.6 percent. Routes #36 and #39 increased by 47.5 percent and 28.2 percent respectively. This trend illustrates that routes require at least a year before they "mature" and show their true ridership potential.

Other routes showing substantial increases in productivity include two River Road area routes, the #55 RIVIERA EXPRESS, which increased 97.9 percent, and the #52 IRVING, which shows a gain of 30.3 percent. These increases reflect the patronage of new commercial development along River Road and gains in acceptance of these routes among riders.

Routes that reflect September 1984 service changes show varying productivities. The #24 WILLAMETTE, #66A VRC/CRESCENT, and #66B COBURG/CRESCENT have strong productivities (26.5, 29.5, and 23.6 percent respectively), while the Downtown Shuttle, #60 VRC/CAL YOUNG, #65 VRC/RIVER ROAD, and #61 OAKWAY have relatively lower productivities. This again illustrates that it takes time for new or redesigned routes to reach their full ridership potential.

Another route that was changed in September, the #11 THURSTON, shows a loss of 20.6 percent in productivity. Service on this route was improved to every 15 minutes on weekdays. A decline in productivity is fairly typical when service is added to a route and productivity on this route is expected to increase during the remainder of the year.

LCC routes such as the #15A LCC/SPRINGFIELD CITY CENTER, #15 LCC/ASHLANE, and #20 30TH AVENUE SHUTTLE also show relatively low productivity. This drop in ridership is attributable to a 10 percent decline in enrollment at LCC. Other routes which show substantial decreases in productivity are the #27 FAIRMONT, #51 SANTA CLARA, #12 HARLOW, and #10B MOHAWK/YOLANDA. Since there have not been any changes in the service on these routes, it is possible that these decreases simply reflect day-to-day fluctuations in ridership.

Saturday and Sunday Service

Table 2 shows the productivity of the weekend routes. The trends continue to reflect the positive impact on ridership of the 25-cent weekend cash fare. Virtually all routes show productivity increases, and Sunday routes in particular show strong gains over 1984. It is interesting to note that the 25-cent weekend fare was in place when the RSA was conducted in 1984. Thus, ridership continues to increase on weekends even after a year at the lower weekend fare rate.


Dolly Gudder
Planning Technician

DG:sbe

Attachments

TABLE 1

WEEKDAY PRODUCTIVITY BY ROUTE
COMPARISON OF WINTER 1985 TO WINTER 1984

<u>ROUTE</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
#22 LCC EXPRESS	48.9	43.4	+ 12.7%
#31B CITY VIEW/U OF O	39.0	34.4	+ 13.4
#31A BAILEY HILL/U OF O	34.3	34.2	+ 0.3
#21 LCC HARRIS	33.6	33.6	+ 0.0
#29 U OF O	31.9	33.6	- 5.0
#41 BARGER	31.7	31.3	+ 1.3
#30 BERTELSEN	31.2	30.2	+ 3.3
#25 AMAZON	30.6	28.6	+ 7.0
#11 THURSTON	30.0	37.8	- 20.6
#66A VRC/CRESCENT	29.5	0.0	NA
#51 SANTA CLARA	29.0	33.9	- 14.5
#55 RIVIERA EXPRESS	28.3	14.3	+ 97.9
#33 JEFFERSON	28.1	25.5	+ 10.2
#23 FOX HOLLOW	27.9	33.0	- 15.5
#10A MOHAWK/Q ST	26.6	18.1	+ 47.0
#24 WILLAMETTE	26.5	0.0	NA
#27 FAIRMOUNT	26.5	34.4	- 23.0
#36 UNIVERSITY	26.1	17.7	+ 47.5
#40 ROYAL	25.3	23.3	+ 8.6
#44 ECHO HOLLOW	24.7	24.2	+ 2.1
#13 CENTENNIAL	24.0	22.5	+ 6.7
#66B COBURG/CRESCENT	23.6	0.0	NA
#32 WEST 11TH	23.6	15.9	+ 48.4
#39 PARKWAY	22.7	17.7	+ 28.2
#12 HARLOW	22.5	26.8	- 16.0
#35 WESTSIDE	22.4	15.6	+ 43.6
#15A LCC/SPFD CITY CIR	22.2	26.5	- 16.2
#10B MOHAWK/YOLANDA	21.2	22.5	- 5.8
#15 LCC/ASHLANE	20.4	24.7	- 17.4
#50 PARK	20.3	20.1	+ 1.0
#52 IRVING	20.2	15.5	+ 30.3
# 1 DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE	20.0	0.0	NA
#14 FAIRVIEW	17.9	14.6	+ 22.6
#60 VRC/CAL YOUNG	16.3	26.5	- 38.5
#61 OAKWAY	15.5	20.6	- 24.8
#65 VRC/RIVER ROAD	15.1	0.0	NA
#20 30TH AVENUE SHUTTLE	12.6	0.0	NA
TOTALS	27.1	28.5	- 4.9

TABLE 2

SATURDAY AND SUNDAY PRODUCTIVITY BY ROUTE

COMPARISON OF WINTER 1985 TO WINTER 1984

<u>ROUTE</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
<u>SATURDAY</u>			
#60 VRC/CAL YOUNG	50.1	38.5	+ 30.1%
#66A VRC/CRESCENT	46.5	NA	NA
#41 BARGER	43.3	30.1	+ 43.9
#10A MOHAWK/Q ST	37.0	19.6	+ 88.8
#25 AMAZON	35.9	31.4	+ 14.3
#51 SANTA CLARA	35.2	30.5	+ 15.4
#31B CITY VIEW	34.8	23.7	+ 46.8
#30 BERTELSEN	34.4	35.2	- 2.3
#11 THURSTON	33.7	37.5	- 10.1
#23 FOX HOLLOW	33.0	34.8	- 5.2
#27 FAIRMOUNT	32.8	24.2	+ 35.5
#13 CENTENNIAL	29.6	21.5	+ 37.7
#24A WILLAMETTE	27.3	NA	NA
#40 ROYAL	27.1	19.3	+ 40.4
#12 HARLOW	26.6	25.1	+ 6.0
#54 VRC SPECIAL	26.1	8.9	+ 193.3
#44 ECHO HOLLOW	24.9	14.7	+ 69.4
#61 OAKWAY	24.9	14.8	+ 68.2
#33 JEFFERSON	22.2	14.2	+ 56.3
#17 VRC SPECIAL	17.8	14.2	+ 25.4
#50 PARK	17.6	10.4	+ 69.2
# 1 DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE	16.2	NA	NA
#14 FAIRVIEW	13.9	7.3	+ 90.4
SATURDAY TOTALS	31.7	26.8	+ 18.3
<u>SUNDAY</u>			
#65 VRC/RIVER ROAD	39.4	NA	NA
#11 THURSTON	38.3	26.3	+ 45.6
#10A MOHAWK/Q ST	37.5	17.3	+ 116.8
#30 BERTELSEN	31.9	25.1	+ 27.1
#51 SANTA CLARA	30.9	20.2	+ 53.0
#41 BARGER	30.7	20.9	+ 46.9
#60 VRC/CAL YOUNG	27.0	30.0	- 10.0
#66A VRC/CRESCENT	26.9	NA	NA
#25 AMAZON	23.0	20.2	+ 13.9
#23 FOX HOLLOW	21.2	22.2	- 4.5
#40 ROYAL	20.8	13.0	+ 60.0
#12 HARLOW	20.3	15.6	+ 30.1
#13 CENTENNIAL	19.8	18.5	+ 7.0
#31B CITY VIEW	18.6	17.1	+ 8.8
DOWNTOWN SHUTTLE	17.0	NA	NA
#61 OAKWAY	15.5	NA	NA
#14 FAIRVIEW	7.5	7.7	- 2.6
SUNDAY TOTALS	26.1	21.3	+ 22.5

TABLE 3
 PRODUCTIVITY OF URBAN ROUTES BY TIME OF DAY
 COMPARISON OF WINTER 1985 TO WINTER 1984

<u>SERVICE</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>% CHANGE</u>
<u>Weekday</u>			
A.M. PEAK	27.5	29.0	- 5.2%
MID-DAY	27.8	31.2	- 10.9
P.M. PEAK	30.2	30.8	- 1.9
EVENING	18.1	15.3	+ 18.3
TOTAL DAY	27.1	28.5	- 4.9
<u>Saturday</u>			
A.M. PEAK	13.4	12.8	+ 4.7
MID-DAY	35.1	32.5	+ 8.0
P.M. PEAK	40.2	31.6	+ 27.2
EVENING	21.9	16.3	+ 34.4
TOTAL DAY	31.7	26.8	+ 18.3
<u>Sunday</u>			
A.M. PEAK	12.3	10.5	+ 17.1
MID-DAY	26.2	21.9	+ 19.6
P.M. & EVENING	31.1	24.9	+ 24.9
TOTAL DAY	26.1	21.3	+ 22.5



March 12, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Planning Administrator
RE: Petitions for Service to Marcola and Additional Service to McKenzie Bridge

During the last three weeks, the District has received two petitions for additional service.

One petition is from residents on the McKenzie Bridge route requesting an additional mid-morning trip and the extension of the 5:20 p.m. trip to McKenzie Bridge (the trip now goes as far as Blue River). The petition has been signed by 89 persons.

The second petition is from residents in Marcola and requests the re-establishment of bus service to that community. The District discontinued service to Marcola in 1979 as a result of poor ridership. The petition was signed by 59 persons.

The Marcola service request is complicated by the fact that service to that area would require extension of the District's service boundary. Board policy states that when service is requested by residents in an area outside of the District's boundaries, the request must be channeled through the Lane County Commissioners, who then, if approved, forward the request to the District. When such action takes place, the request will be considered by the District.

Service requests are considered as part of the Annual Route Review process. This process will evaluate the potential of the new service to meet productivity standards and compare the expected ridership on the new service to existing service and to other potential additional service. The Annual Route Review is currently underway, with recommendations to be presented to the Budget Committee and the Board in April and May. Recommendations that are approved would be implemented in September 1985.

Stefano Viggiano/sbe

Stefano Viggiano
Planning Administrator

SV:ms:sbe

Thank You!



2-28-85

To: Board of Directors of
Lane Transit Dist.

Although I don't know many
of you, I wish to thank you for
having an employee of the month
award + Employee of the year.

I happen to be one of the
lucky people to have this honor
bestowed upon me.

The greatest honor of all
was being selected as Employee
of the year.

I will never forget that honor.

All Employees of LTD are
employees of the month + year
+ I wish everyone could have
that honor bestowed upon them.
Thanks to everyone again

Sincerely
Carl Stewart