

(This packet was printed on recycled paper)

Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 31, 1996.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING/
BOARD STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT**

November 2 and 3, 1996

**VALLEY RIVER INN
1000 Valley River Way, Eugene**

No public testimony will be heard at this meeting.

Saturday, November 2, 1996

- 9:00 a.m. - 9:10 a.m. *Overview of Retreat (Phyllis)*
- *Introduction*
 - *Objectives*
 - *Agenda*
- 9:10 a.m. - 9:20 a.m. *Overview of Strategic Plan (Phyllis)*
- *Background*
 - *Purpose, Objectives, and Desired Features of LTD's Strategic Plan*
 - *Planning Process*
 - *Board's Role*
 - *Susan B. Phillip's Role*
- 9:20 a.m. - 10:45 a.m. *Definition of LTD's Mission (Susan)*
- *Characteristics of Good Mission Statements*
 - *Board Members' Views of LTD's Purpose*
 - *Mission-related Questions Facing LTD*
 - *Proposed Mission Statement*
 - *Discussion and Critique*
 - *Adoption or Direction for Change*

10:45 a.m. - 11:00 a.m. *Break*

11:00 a.m. - 11:40 a.m. *Reach Agreement on Strategy Implications of the Mission Statement (e.g., TDM, Geographic Coverage, etc.)*

11:40 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. *Brief Review of Existing Draft Values Statement*

12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m. *Lunch in meeting room*

1:00 p.m. - 1:45 p.m. *Review LTD's Situation and Implications (Stef, Ed B.)*

1:45 p.m. - 2:00 p.m. *Review of LTD's Financial Performance (Diane)*

2:00 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. *Evaluation of LTD's Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOTs) (Susan)*

- *Board Perceptions*
- *Staff Perceptions*
- *Comparisons and Implications*

2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. *Break*

3:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. *Continue SWOTs*

3:30 p.m. - 4:20 p.m. *Review of LTD's Keys to Success in the Next 1-5+ Years (Phyllis)*

4:20 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. *Summary (Susan)*

4:30 p.m. *Conclude for the day*

Sunday, November 3, 1996

9:00 a.m. - 9:10 a.m. *Welcome and Overview of the Day (Phyllis)*

9:10 a.m. - 9:30 a.m. *Brief Review of LTD's Keys to Success (Phyllis)*

9:30 a.m. - 10:15 a.m. *Review of Vision Statements and Proposed Strategic Actions*

- *Overview (Mark)*
- *Vision I (Ed B.)*
- *Vision II (Stef)*
- *Vision III (Mark)*
- *Vision IV (Phyllis)*

10:15 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. *Break*

10:30 a.m. - 11:15 a.m. *Continue Review of Strategic Actions*

- *Adoption or Direction for Change*

11:15 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. *Review Key Results Expected (Susan)*

- *Staff Assignments*

12:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m. *Lunch*

1:00 p.m. - 2:15 p.m. *Continue Review of Key Results*

- *Adoption or Direction for Change*

2:15 p.m. - 2:45 p.m. *Review of Financial Projections (Diane)*

2:45 p.m. - 3:00 p.m. *Break*

3:00 p.m. - 3:30 p.m. *Next Steps in Strategic Plan Development (Susan)*

- *Board Involvement*
- *Use of Plan*

3:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m. *Summary and Debrief (Phyllis)*

3:45 p.m. *Conclude Retreat*

LTD BOARD RETREAT

November 2-3, 1996

Draft Retreat Objectives

1. To review LTD's enhanced strategic planning process, including:
 - Reasons
 - Goals
 - Methods
2. To examine and determine the answers to key questions related to LTD's mission, including:
 - What is LTD's core business?
 - What does LTD do? For whom? Why?
 - What is unique about LTD?
 - What is LTD's distinctive competence?
3. To review strategic questions facing LTD and determine whether and how the new mission statement addresses those questions. Examples are:
 - How involved should LTD be in supporting TDM and which approaches should be used?
 - What should be the LTD service area?
 - Other?
4. To analyze LTD's performance and strategic situation for the purpose of achieving additional objectives regarding BRT and other activities
5. To review proposed updates to LTD visions and strategic actions based on the latest analysis and determine their appropriateness for achieving the vision
6. To obtain Board direction for the organization in those areas where there are strategic questions (e.g., mission, strategic actions, results expected, policies)
7. To decide or resolve tactical questions that require immediate direction from the Board:
 - Determine the priority for accomplishing the various elements of BRT (i.e., rights-of-way)
 - Other?
8. To agree on desired Board structure and operating procedures:
 - Committees
 - Meetings (e.g., frequency, agendas, staff support, process leadership)
 - Public access to Board
 - Other?

DRAFT OF LTD STRATEGIC PLAN

Board Retreat
November 2-3, 1996

Table of Contents

1. Purpose, Objectives, and Desired Features of LTD's Strategic Plan
2. Mission Statement
3. Values
4. LTD's Situation (Trends, Customer Views, Citizen Views)
5. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOTs)
6. Financial Performance
7. Keys to LTD's Success in the Next 1-5+Years
8. Vision Statements and Strategic Actions for the Next 1-5+ Years
9. Key Results Expected
10. Financial Projections
11. Appendices
 - Susan Phillips' Vita
 - LTD's Visions and Strategic Actions
 - BRT
 - Acronyms
 - Definition of Terms

Purpose of LTD's Strategic Plan

LTD's Strategic Plan will determine the organization's direction and will focus organizational efforts to achieve the District's mission. The plan responds to the needs of the community. It sets a vision for the future that, when combined with financial and operational plans, becomes the roadmap for achieving LTD's long-term objective of enhancing the community's quality of life.

Objectives of LTD's Strategic Plan

- A. To establish LTD's mission and goals
- B. To serve as a blueprint for the future based on community needs, describing the desired future state, and indicating strategic actions to accomplish the goals
- C. To obtain buy-in from the community, Board, and staff on LTD's direction by providing a unified, overarching statement of the organization's goals and priorities
- D. To provide a template that assists LTD staff and the Board in making decisions
- E. To provide a tool for the staff and the Board to use in soliciting community support for LTD's plans
- F. To establish clear measures and targets for evaluating organizational progress toward achieving long-term goals

Desired Features

- 1. Flexible and easy to update
- 2. Easy to understand for staff, Board, and the public
 - Clear
 - Concise
 - Absence of jargon
- 3. Consistent with other community plans
- 4. Answers the critical strategic questions facing the District

Mission Statements

What a Mission Statement Should Explain

1. Purpose
 - What do we do? For whom? Why?
 - What is our primary purpose?
 - What is our reason for existing?
2. Distinctiveness
 - What is unique about us?
 - What is our distinctive competence?
 - What will enable us to succeed in an increasingly competitive market?

Criteria for a Good Mission Statement

1. Describes purpose and uniqueness
2. Simple and easy to remember but not a motto, slogan, or “window dressing”
3. Not goals or objectives
4. Something that can be pursued even if not fully attained
5. Specific enough to tell if it is being pursued
6. Relevant and realistic
7. Something that can be changed

LTD Mission: Questions & Implications

1. Should LTD support activities or programs other than transit (TDM, land-use decisions, etc.)?
2. Should LTD be more competitive with the automobile by providing a more attractive alternative to the automobile?
3. Leadership role?
4. Geographic service area?
 - Eugene/Springfield and surrounding areas (yes)
 - The rural communities of Lane County (maybe)
5. Role in transportation planning?
6. Influencing development decisions of our community that will impact transportation (e.g., Hyundai, prison, etc.)?
7. What is LTD's role in policy making in addressing community needs (e.g., livability, pollution, congestion)?
8. To what degree should LTD maintain current bus service for traditional customers (e.g., too young, too old, too poor, disabled, special event participants)?
9. Serve riders who have transportation choices (e.g., BRT to compete with automobile by providing shorter travel time for people who do not currently use the bus)?
10. Accountability to taxpayers (nonvoting investors)?
11. By being competitive with the automobile, enable public to avoid building more roads (since money is not there)?
12. Efficiency?
13. Provide a better solution to the community's transportation needs (e.g., more efficient, less expensive) than alternatives like roads?
14. Educational role so public understands implications of public (alternative) transportation vs. private (auto)?
15. Equitable, nondiscriminating (even distribution of service throughout the community)?
16. Excellent service?
17. Public transportation?
18. More balanced transportation system?

Draft Mission Statement

Lane Transit District's mission is:

- To provide innovative, quality public transportation services that offer a competitive alternative to the automobile for all residents of and visitors to the Eugene/Springfield metropolitan area
- To provide progressive leadership in finding effective and efficient solutions to the community's transportation needs and integrate transportation and land use planning to enhance the area's quality of life
- To be clearly accountable for effective use of the community's resources

Current LTD Mission Statement

Lane Transit District is committed to customer and community satisfaction through service excellence.

Draft Value Statements

LTD Values Its Customers

- Its commitment to safety; on-time performance; courteous, customer-driven service; and high-quality workmanship
- Its commitment to getting the job done

LTD Values the Stewardship of Its Resources

- Its ability to prepare for the future
- Its contribution to the community's economic prosperity
- Its obligation to conform to federal, state, and local statutory and regulatory provisions and protocols
- Its image in the community
- Its ethical standards
- Maintaining its financial integrity
- The excellence of its administrative work products
- Its efficiency and effectiveness

LTD Values the Dignity and Diversity of Its Employees

- The value of shared decision making and problem resolution
- Its commitment to open communication with its employees, the public, the Board of Directors, and the media
- The investment in its employees' ability to perform at a high level
- Its obligation of a high standard of operator performance for customer care

LTD Values Its Contribution to the Community's Quality of Life

- Its commitment to mobility, air quality, and reduced traffic congestion
- Its commitment to value-added facilities and service improvements
- Its ability to be an effective member of the community
- Its partnership with local, regional, and national organizations
- Its contribution to the community's transportation infrastructure

Trends in the Environment

Population and Employment

- The region's population is expected to grow 42 percent to approximately 290,000 people by the year 2010.
- Average household size has been decreasing and is expected to be at 2.2 persons per household by the year 2010.
- Employment in the metro area has been increasing at a faster rate than both national employment and the rate of the area's population growth.

Implications of population and employment trends:

- There will be an increased demand on LTD's service and increased pressure on the area's transportation infrastructure.

Land Use

- Jobs are becoming increasingly dispersed throughout the region.
- New residential developments have tended to be lower density and separated from commercial activities.
- The area's urban growth boundary is expected to force an increase in overall residential densities over the next 20 years.

Implications of land use trends:

- Dispersed employment sites and trip patterns are more difficult to serve with conventional transit; though expected increases in residential densities will make transit more viable.

Travel

- The number of vehicles per capita has been increasing steadily, to the point that there are now more vehicles than people in Lane County.
- Vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) have been increasing at a rate four times population growth.
- Work trips comprise a decreasing percentage of total trips.
- Trips have become increasingly dispersed throughout the region.
- Traffic congestion in the metro area has been increasing and is projected to continue to increase.

- LTD ridership has doubled since 1983, while transit ridership nationally has been flat.
- LTD service has increased an average of 3 percent per year over the last ten years.

Implications of travel trends:

- There will be increased pressure on the area's transportation system and on LTD to help solve worsening congestion problems.
- Congestion also degrades bus travel time, increasing LTD's costs to maintain existing service levels.

Economic and Financial

- Gas prices, with adjustments for inflation, are lower today than 30 years ago.
- Most employees park for free (86 percent nationwide).
- LTD's allocation of FTA Section 9 funding (formula funds) has decreased during the last decade.
- State funding for Special Transportation (cigarette tax revenue) has been decreasing while demand for the service has been increasing.
- The growth in payroll tax revenue has been strong of late, but also fluctuates with economic upturns and downturns.
- Investment in transportation facilities has not kept pace with demand, and the gap is expected to widen in the future.
- Legislative attempts aimed at increasing funding for transportation have not been successful in recent sessions.

Implications of economic and financial trends:

- Transportation system degradation will occur.
- Shortfalls in funding for transportation infrastructure will result in the need for optimal efficiency of transportation expenditures within the region.
- There is a need to consider alternatives to costly increased road capacity.

Customer Profile

LTD serves a diverse customer base within the Eugene/Springfield area. Major market segments include the University of Oregon, Lane Community College, Sacred Heart Hospital, area high schools, other employment centers, and downtown Eugene employees. Customers are students, senior citizens, employees, persons with disabilities, children, and shoppers.

Basic demographics:

- Almost 40 percent are 21 years old or younger
- Fifty-five percent are female
- Almost 50 percent identify themselves as students
- Fifty-seven percent have household incomes less than \$15,000 a year
- Almost 14 percent have household incomes over \$40,000 a year (this income group has almost doubled in size from 7.5 percent from 1990)
- Thirty-seven percent of weekday riders were "choice" riders (i.e., they reported having a car available for that trip)

Why do they use LTD?

- No other transportation
- Low cost
- Concern for the environment
- Lack of parking

For what purpose do current customers use the bus?

- "Work" and "school" are the predominant reasons for taking the bus on weekdays
- "Shopping" and "social" trip purposes predominate on weekends

What service improvements do current customers want?

- More service on weekends
- Later service
- Lower prices
- Service to new areas

Implications of customer profile:

- There are opportunities to further tap the employee market
- The many young people (especially high school and college age) who are using LTD services provide an opportunity to form life-long transit habits

Source: 1994 Origin & Destination Study

Community Views of LTD

The community wants LTD to take a leadership role in finding solutions to transportation problems arising from the growth of the community. More specifically, a community survey reveals that residents want LTD to:

- Focus on transportation objectives geared toward increased use of public transportation and high-occupancy vehicles
- Educate the public about the benefits of creating a less automobile-oriented society
- Address important quality-of-life issues, including reducing congestion, improving air quality, and creating an environment in which use of alternative modes of transportation is a viable option

The community believes that LTD is doing a good job of providing service on many important factors:

- Mechanical dependability of the bus
- Courteous and helpful drivers
- Personal safety on the bus
- On-time performance
- Clarity of *Rider's Digest* and timetable information
- Access to a bus stop near where residents live

Community residents believe LTD should focus resources on improving service on the following important factors:

- Frequency of service
- Safety at the transit stations and bus stops
- Speed of travel by bus
- Comfort and cleanliness of transit stations
- The number of connections/transfers required to get to destinations

Implications of community survey:

- The community is looking to LTD to help address current and future transportation problems.
- The community desires improved speed and convenience from LTD, which implies the need for a BRT-type system.

Source: 1994 Market Area Study

Strengths/Weaknesses (Primarily Internal)

RELATED ISSUES	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Reorganization	Reorganization is working and has strengthened LTD's ability to meet future challenges.	The benefits of the reorganization have not been fully realized. Outstanding issues focus on workload, proper allocation of resources, decision-making processes, and carrying the message of the reorganization to the rest of the organization.
Labor Relations	LTD has an increased emphasis on, and opportunities for, improved employee/labor relations.	LTD's labor relations are characterized by a lack of partnership, an inflexible labor contract, and distrust and resentment.
Work Force/ Employee Relations	<p>Work Force</p> <p>LTD does a good job recruiting and retaining talented employees.</p> <p>LTD has a dedicated, experienced, and customer-focused work force.</p>	<p>Employee Relations</p> <p>Employee relations are generally fragile and in disarray, compounded by the lack of a strategic Human Resources plan, a lack of teamwork, and the perspective that compensation and value are not consistently assessed.</p>
Financial Health/ Funding	LTD is in a strong financial position.	Federal funding is inadequate and inflexible to meet growing expectations to provide services, including the need for human resources and fleet replacement and expansion.
Service	LTD provides quality service that is efficiently operated.	LTD has the opportunity to improve employee safety, the perception of efficiency in service planning and provision, and overall service quality.

UNRELATED ISSUES	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Board Strength	LTD has a visionary Board that is involved and committed to the goals of the District.	
Supervision		First-line supervision needs to be improved to support decision-making at the appropriate level.
Image in Community	LTD has developed a good reputation with the business community, service partners, and customers.	
Staffing/Human Resources		LTD lacks a Human Resources plan to carry out the strategic plan and may lack the resources necessary to plan and implement it.
Innovation and Change	LTD supports innovation, change, and more risk taking.	
Training & Communication		Some LTD employees feel uninformed about key issues and may not be adequately trained to meet the needs of positions and teams on which they serve.
Long-Range Planning	LTD has achieved an increased commitment to and involvement in local and regional planning efforts.	
Quality Facilities & Equipment	LTD has modern and well-maintained equipment and facilities.	

Opportunities/Threats (Primarily External)

RELATED ISSUES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
<p>Political</p>	<p>Board can provide leadership in achieving goals.</p> <p>LTD is positioned to become a community leader in transit and transportation-related issues. LTD should actively seek a leadership role in these issues.</p> <p>LTD should optimize its contacts at the federal level in support of transit.</p> <p>LTD should optimize contacts with those at the state level in support of transit.</p>	<p>A. Anti-tax Has the potential to disrupt/degrade/destroy public service.</p> <p>B. Self-Employed Most complaints are coming from low-income, self-employed people.</p> <p>C. Elected Board An elected Board is believed to be detrimental to LTD's long-term interests.</p> <p>D. Political Support/Climate Political leadership for transit is lacking at the local, state, and federal level. LTD's political support is spotty.</p>
<p>Labor Relations</p>	<p>LTD should seek improvements in the labor contract through smarter negotiations and new advantages offered by the collective bargaining law.</p> <p>LTD should seize the opportunity to improve the labor-management environment offered by the combination of a better attitude of employees and a professed desire by ATU to change methodologies.</p>	<p>Efforts to change climate by national labor leaders is viewed with skepticism.</p>

RELATED ISSUES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
Trends	<p>The local economy and population are growing, providing revenues and potential customers for the system.</p> <p>New technology can address some concerns (noise, pollution) that some people have about transit.</p> <p>People <u>want</u> to support transit and other alternative modes (even if their actions don't always follow).</p>	<p>Despite local economic health and the high per capita ridership, LTD still carries only 3 percent of all the trips in the area.</p>
Service/ Operations	<p>LTD should expand service and programs to tap new markets.</p> <p>LTD should work closely with area employers to increase use of alternative modes.</p> <p>LTD should move forward with BRT, given initial favorable reaction.</p>	<p>A. Safety/Security Nonriders often cite security concerns as reasons for not riding.</p> <p>B. Service Issues LTD is often not competitive with the automobile except in costs.</p>
Facilities	<p>LTD should use new community facilities, both our own and others that may be built, to increase ridership.</p>	<p>Physical Plant/Facilities Service demands may exceed resources.</p>

UNRELATED ISSUES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
Planning	<p>LTD should increase involvement in land use planning to create a more transit-friendly environment.</p> <p>LTD should use TransPlan and other local planning efforts to further LTD's initiatives.</p>	
Finance		<p>Federal Funding/Capital Funding Capital funding resources are limited and have an uncertain future.</p>
Image	<p>LTD operates in a local community in which people are environmentally and socially conscious.</p> <p>LTD operates in a relatively transit-friendly, supportive community.</p>	

Financial Trends Summary 1987 - 1996

- Total revenue grew 103 percent during the ten-year period. Total expense increased 93.4 percent.
- Revenue from passenger fares and other operating revenue increased from 15.4 percent of the total in FY 1987 to 17.2 percent in 1996. This increase in the growth of earned income as a percent of total income is the result of the growth of advertising sales. Farebox revenue has grown with service and ridership increases but has consistently contributed about 20 percent of operating expenses.
- Revenue from grants (all sources) fell from 22.9 percent of the total in 1987 to 12.4 percent in 1996.
- Tax revenue increased from 49.2 percent of total revenue to 65.2 percent. The addition of a self-employment tax in FY 1996 contributed 3.4 percent of total revenue. Payroll tax revenue has more than doubled during the last ten years. Tax receipts cover about 80 percent of operating expenses, and will become an important source of capital funds as grant resources decline.
- Since 1990, Special Transportation services expenses have required General Fund subsidies. In FY 1996, expenses exceeded revenues by \$477,156.
- Careful budgeting, expenditure controls, and a strong commitment to financial planning have resulted in the creation of operating reserves over a five-year period that reached the fully-funded level in FY 1996. The Board of Directors sets targeted reserve levels at 25-40 percent of operating expenses.
- During the past ten years, LTD has managed its financial resources well to meet short- and intermediate-term requirements and to fund large capital projects. The District maintains a Long-Range Financial Plan that is reviewed semiannually to ensure that resources will be available to meet goals and objectives five, ten, and twenty years into the future.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
COMPARATIVE COMBINED STATEMENTS OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES (BUDGETARY BASIS)
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1987 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1996

	<u>1987</u>	...	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>10 YR CHG</u>
REVENUE BY SOURCE:								
Passenger fares	\$ 1,481,631		\$ 2,248,548	\$ 2,359,936	\$ 2,462,081	\$ 2,781,909	\$ 3,038,437	105.1%
Other operating revenue	53,310		165,422	232,548	266,046	248,739	458,813	760.7%
Employer payroll taxes	5,146,688		7,447,224	8,895,338	9,457,363	10,769,903	11,709,671	127.5%
Self-employment taxes							695,104	
Federal operating asst.	909,600		1,012,516	956,867	1,013,529	897,248	143,905	-84.2%
Federal inventory grant	-		-	56,007	173,865	138,523	-	
State payroll assessment	594,425		719,794	756,667	787,860	816,598	853,045	43.5%
State operating grant	-		-	-	6,875	2,494	-	
Special transportation	271,395		523,752	549,260	537,152	375,995	404,840	49.2%
Interest	166,624		234,655	255,279	276,197	446,122	647,778	288.8%
Capital funding	1,352,121		245,422	413,733	4,975,946	482,154	2,384,268	76.3%
Other grant	25,282		36,677	-	14,000	293,152	-	-100.0%
Totals	<u>10,001,076</u>	...	<u>12,634,010</u>	<u>14,475,635</u>	<u>19,970,914</u>	<u>17,252,837</u>	<u>20,335,861</u>	103.3%
GENERAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTION:								
Personal services	\$ 5,568,692		\$ 7,774,899	\$ 8,476,375	\$ 9,119,374	\$ 10,018,639	\$ 10,765,709	93.3%
Materials and services	1,442,070		2,120,385	2,240,970	2,456,700	2,846,866	2,888,704	100.3%
Special transportation	271,395		726,612	802,087	861,498	766,433	881,996	225.0%
Insurance	370,668		560,119	474,373	510,029	624,781	645,912	74.3%
Other	277,191		-	-	-	-	-	-100.0%
Capital expenditures	1,429,254		371,790	521,254	6,133,712	642,757	2,915,121	104.0%
Totals	<u>9,359,270</u>	...	<u>11,553,805</u>	<u>12,515,059</u>	<u>19,081,313</u>	<u>14,899,476</u>	<u>18,097,442</u>	93.4%
Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenditures	<u>\$ 641,806</u>	...	<u>\$ 1,080,205</u>	<u>\$ 1,960,576</u>	<u>\$ 889,601</u>	<u>\$ 2,353,361</u>	<u>\$ 2,238,419</u>	248.8%

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
COMPARATIVE COMBINED STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 1987, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1996**

	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>10-YR CHG</u>
REVENUE BY SOURCE:											
Passenger fares	\$ 1,481,631	\$1,563,550	\$1,776,538	\$1,850,145	\$2,101,785	\$ 2,248,548	\$ 2,359,936	\$ 2,462,081	\$ 2,781,909	\$ 3,038,437	105.1%
Other operating revenue	53,310	68,331	79,787	213,525	129,510	165,422	232,548	266,046	248,739	458,813	760.7%
Employer payroll taxes	5,146,688	5,433,886	5,932,303	6,602,535	6,910,234	7,447,224	8,895,338	9,457,363	10,769,903	11,709,671	127.5%
Self-employment taxes										695,104	
Federal operating asst.	909,600	893,448	1,073,037	1,075,160	1,159,926	1,012,516	956,867	1,013,529	897,248	143,905	-84.2%
Federal inventory grant	-					-	56,007	173,865	138,523	-	
State payroll assessment	594,425	513,356	605,266	616,608	690,513	719,794	756,667	787,860	816,598	853,045	43.5%
State operating grant	-				5,000	-	-	6,875	2,494	-	
Special transportation	271,395	295,586	255,893	387,181	323,729	523,752	549,260	537,152	375,995	404,840	49.2%
Interest	166,624	257,972	356,394	387,455	343,039	234,655	255,279	276,197	446,122	647,778	288.8%
Capital funding	1,352,121	1,414,745	6,699,999	1,301,359	3,011,606	245,422	413,733	4,975,946	482,154	2,384,268	76.3%
Other grant	25,282	31,761	9,422	35,699	187,825	36,677	-	14,000	293,152	-	-100.0%
Totals	10,001,076	10,472,635	16,788,639	12,469,667	14,863,167	12,634,010	14,475,635	19,970,914	17,252,837	20,335,861	103.3%
GENERAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTION:											
Personal services	\$ 5,568,692	\$ 5,818,458	\$ 6,343,390	\$ 6,817,507	\$ 7,232,203	\$ 7,774,899	\$ 8,476,375	\$ 9,119,374	\$ 10,018,639	\$ 10,765,709	93.3%
Materials and services	1,442,070	1,715,391	1,723,821	1,836,556	2,086,081	2,120,385	2,240,970	2,456,700	2,846,866	2,888,704	100.3%
Special transportation	271,395	295,586	255,893	494,281	435,113	726,612	802,087	861,498	766,433	881,996	225.0%
Insurance	370,668	399,020	506,947	351,611	385,359	560,119	474,373	510,029	624,781	645,912	74.3%
Other	277,191						-	-	-	-	-100.0%
Capital expenditures	1,429,254	1,723,093	7,823,415	2,927,307	5,446,240	371,790	521,254	6,133,712	642,757	2,915,121	104.0%
Totals	9,359,270	9,951,548	16,653,466	12,427,262	15,584,996	11,553,805	12,515,059	19,081,313	14,899,476	18,097,442	93.4%
Excess (deficiency) of revenue over expenditures	\$ 641,806	\$ 521,087	\$ 135,173	\$ 42,405	\$ (721,829)	\$ 1,080,205	\$ 1,960,576	\$ 889,601	\$ 2,353,361	\$ 2,238,419	248.8%

Keys to LTD's Success in the Next 1-5+ Years

1. To provide the means for and promote the use of alternative forms of transportation (e.g., BRT, TDM, bus service) in order to maintain a high quality of life by reducing the use of the automobile and the related problems of congestion, air pollution, urban sprawl, and public investment in roads and bridges
2. To maintain the health of our core operating business to meet the needs of the current riders while positioning LTD to meet the future transportation needs of the community
3. To meet increased service demands caused by population growth
4. To secure adequate funding to meet LTD's strategic plan goals
5. To earn ever-increasing community understanding of and support for LTD's mission, accomplishments, and plans
6. To maintain stability, continuity, and apolitical nature of LTD's governance
7. To ensure the adoption of TransPlan in order to enable the accomplishment of LTD's goals
8. To improve management's working relationship with ATU and LTD employees
9. To provide leadership and form key partnerships with public and private organizations to address transportation issues

LTD's Visions and Strategic Actions

In order to promote a high quality of life for our community...

Vision I

LTD is a leader in ~~shaping~~ **the development of** local and regional transportation **plans**, strategies **and funding**, through strengthened partnerships, alliances, and community support.

Vision II

LTD provides innovative, quality service that commands an increasing share of the transportation market.

Vision III

LTD's decisions, priorities, and actions are driven by strategic planning and sound fiscal and operational management.

Vision IV

~~LTD encourages innovation and flexibility in anticipating and responding to the community's needs and opportunities.~~ [Note: Incorporated into the Strategic Actions for Vision II and III.]

Vision V

LTD supports a work environment that attracts talented employees who share LTD's vision and are committed to its success.

Vision I

LTD is a leader in ~~shaping~~ **the development of** local and regional transportation **plans, strategies, and funding** through strengthened partnerships, alliances, and community support.

Strategic Actions

1. **Promote the adoption and implementation of a TransPlan that supports LTD's strategic plans.**
2. ~~Develop a plan of action that identifies our~~ **network of** key natural partners and allies (i.e., ~~Cities of Springfield and Eugene, Lane County, School Districts, Chambers of Commerce, Planning Commissions, and agencies of the State of Oregon.~~ **to assist in achieving LTD's goals.**
3. ~~Establish a formal process for regularly making transit and other alternative transportation issues part of our partners' agendas. Staff will be aggressively involved in creating these partnerships~~ **accomplishing this.** The Board also will be involved in this process. ~~regularly and formally.~~
4. ~~Identify, through our~~ priority setting, local and regional transportation projects and partnerships to which LTD may contribute resources.
5. ~~Through our~~ research and knowledge, be the substantive leader and resource in regional and local transportation issues.
6. **Maintain and enhance the Board's leadership role in developing and achieving the District's strategic plan.**
7. **Develop and implement public education programs to create understanding of and support for the value of LTD in maintaining and enhancing the region's quality of life.**
8. **Actively promote the authorization of state and federal funding for public transportation, including reauthorization of ISTEA at fully-authorized funding levels.**
9. **Support the development of the Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI) and the Oregon Transportation Financing Plan (OTFP) and persuade the 1997 Legislature to approve the OTFP in order to secure:**
 - a. **In 1997, LTD's share of \$35-45 million in statewide funding for elderly and handicapped transit services;**

- b. *In 1999, one half of the local share for capital expenditures and increased local taxing authority; and***

- c. *Improvements in the state's transportation infrastructure.***

Vision II

LTD provides innovative, quality service that commands an increasing share of the transportation market.

Strategic Actions

1. **Maintain high levels of rider satisfaction with the quality of LTD services.**
2. **Systematically explore, evaluate, and incorporate relevant technological innovations and new approaches and opportunities to increase market share (e.g., express service, reduced bus travel times, bus amenities).**

~~Investigate ways to increase the frequency of service on major transportation corridors, as well as options for express service on these routes.~~

~~Explore premium service opportunities in an effort to create substantial shifts in utilization patterns. This service expansion might include bus amenities, point-to-point service, van/small bus pools, shuttle systems, etc.~~

~~Explore other service opportunities to increase ridership, such as special service to community events and service to surrounding communities.~~

3. **Obtain funding for and implement a pilot BRT corridor with a yet-to-be-determined percentage of exclusive rights-of-way in order to:**
 - a. **Reduce travel time**
 - b. **Increase market appeal**
 - c. **Reduce VMTs**

~~Establish a transit-priority system for buses. While this is a long-term project, it is also an immediate priority because of the Ferry Street Bridge project. The comprehensive plan would include a bus-priority expressway with the potential to convert to rail.~~

4. ~~Actively encourage~~ Promote group passes **programs and other TDM strategies** as a way to increase ridership **and decrease VMTs**. Most immediately, target LCC and downtown employees.
5. **Increase the public's confidence in the safety and security of LTD's services and facilities.**

~~Improve passenger, employee, and facility security and safety.~~

6. **Implement attractive, well-designed, high-quality facilities that will be viewed as community assets (e.g., Eugene Station, Springfield Transfer Station, Park and Ride facilities).**

~~Expand Park and Ride and other passenger boarding facilities to increase ridership and improve operating efficiency.~~

7. Actively gather information from our citizens, customers, and other sources to learn about the public's transportation related needs **and views of LTD and LTD's plans.**
[Note: This item was moved from Vision IV.]

Vision III

LTD's decisions, priorities, and actions are driven by strategic planning and sound fiscal and operational management.

Strategic Actions

1. Determine what performance measures and benchmarks are used to evaluate the organization's fiscal and operational performance. Develop benchmark measures that are aligned with our vision.
2. Examine our fare policy, using available data and research. Include effects of group pass rates and individual fares. The Board will balance goals of ridership with fare-to-budget base data to determine LTD's fare policy. New proposals that reduce fare-to-total revenue would be considered if they meet other productivity measures or acquire customers who would otherwise be driving cars.
3. Develop and agree on a method of analysis and tools to guide ~~us~~ **the Board and staff** as ~~we~~ **they** evaluate new service proposals and investments.
4. Continue to ~~improve~~ **enhance** operating **and service** efficiencies and effectiveness through ~~ongoing~~ improvements in ~~operating~~ procedures **and decision-making in order to increase flexibility in responding to emerging needs.** [Note: This item now includes an item from prior Vision IV.]
5. Assess current federal, state, and local funding sources and determine impact on long-range financial plan. ~~Discuss financing alternatives with Board.~~
6. **Develop critical evaluation methods to assess organizational needs and the means by which those needs can be met.**

Vision IV

~~LTD encourages innovation and flexibility in anticipating and responding to the community's needs and opportunities.~~

Strategic Actions

- ~~1. Actively gather information from our citizens, our customers, and other sources to learn about the public's transportation-related needs. [Note: This item was moved to Vision II.]~~

- ~~2. Identify ways to streamline our decision-making process in order to create flexibility in responding to emerging needs. [Note: This item was moved to Vision III.]~~

~~Vision V~~ Vision IV

LTD supports a work environment that attracts talented employees who share LTD's vision and are committed to its success.

Strategic Actions

1. ***Complete and implement a new proactive Employee Relations Plan in order to build partnership, trust, and improved communications among all employees.***
2. Use the knowledge and experience of ~~our~~ **LTD's** employees more fully. Empower work groups and individuals with the authority, responsibility, and accountability to respond to new situations, as well as to maintain consistent **excellent** levels of service.
3. Recognize, encourage, and reward creativity, customer service, innovation, and exceptional performance, ***which contribute to LTD's success.***
4. Develop a training plan for all classifications ***to continually upgrade skills in order to respond to new technology and changing conditions.***
5. ~~Assess and implement, if feasible, technological innovations that respond to the community's needs and expectations. Encourage and acknowledge employee contributions.~~ [Note: This item was incorporated into the Strategic Actions for Vision II.]

Key Results Expected

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS	
			1994	1998	2002
Service Effectiveness: To maintain service reliability and riders' satisfaction	Rider ratings of service	Percent of riders rating LTD service good or excellent in market survey (O&D)	85%	85%	85%
	Percentage of on-time trips	Percentage of bus trips leaving established timepoints exactly on-time to 4 minutes late	To be collected	To be determined (TBD)	
	Schedule downtime	Ratio of schedule downtime to total service hours	To be collected	To be determined (TBD)	
	Annual ridership	Annual person trips	5,650,000	+5% → 6%	
				Year?	Year-Year?

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS				
			1995-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	
Service Effectiveness (cont.)	Special event ridership	1. Average percentage of event attendees who traveled by bus for events attended by 5,000 or more people and served by LTD ¹	Modal split 8.9%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
		2. Total special event ridership percentage of special event days served by bus	To be collected	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	

¹ Events included in calculations: U of O football, U of O men's basketball, Oregon Country Fair, Asian Celebration, Lane County Fair, and Fiesta Latina. (Eugene Celebration and Filbert Festival not included)

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS					
			1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
Service Efficiency: Maintain and improve our efficiency	LTD ranking in comparison with other transit districts regarding resources and results	1. UNCC study percentile ranking among all U.S. transit systems	17.5%	Top 20%					
		2. UNCC study ranking among transit peer group	#4 Top 25%	Top 25%	Top 25%	Top 25%	Top 25%	Top 25%	
	Ridership productivity	Trips per service hour	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	
			23.1	23.5	24.0	24.5	25.0	25.0	
	Operating cost for each vehicle mile	1. Operating cost per vehicle revenue <u>mile</u> adjusted for inflation (UNCC)	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
			\$3.61	3.60	3.60	3.60	3.60	3.60	
	Overhead cost	Overhead as a percentage of operating cost	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	
			\$50.50	\$50.50	\$50.50	\$50.50	\$50.50	\$50.50	
	Overhead cost	Overhead as a percentage of operating cost	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	
			25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	25%	

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS				
			1994	1998		2002		
Market Share of Alternative vs. Conventional Transportation: Increase percentage of trips taken in the community using alternative transportation modes	Market share	Rides per capita:						
		--Bus	23	26.5	31			
		--Vanpool	No data	Create Measure	TBD			
		--Carpool	No data	Create Measure	TBD			
		--Bicycle	No data	Create Measure	TBD			
	Improve competitiveness of bus vs. car	Ratio of travel time on bus vs. automobile on set of representative trips	1996-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	
			To be collected	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	
	Increase in the number of "choice" riders who ride the bus	1. Percentage of trips taken by riders who are "choice" riders, i.e., riders who could drive instead of using a bus, those who had a car or could have had a car to use instead of a bus. 2. Gross number of trips taken by choice riders	1994	1998	2002			
			37%	39%	41%			
			1.8 MM	2.4 MM	3.2 MM			

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS	
Quality of Life: Contribute to our community's high livability in spite of current trends, which are increasing reliance on the automobile	Air quality	EPA rating level for our community based on number of violations	1996	1997-2001	
			Attainment	Attainment	
	Traffic congestion	Percent of miles that are congested at level D or worse in major corridors	1996	2015	
			2.6%	5.2%	
	Mobility	1. Hours of service per capita	1996	1998	2002
			1.2	1.24	1.3
		2. Percentage of households within a quarter mile of the bus stop	1994	1998	2002
			85%	85%	85%

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS	
Quality of Life (cont.)		3. ADA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trips per service hour (paratransit) • Cost per trip (RideSource) (all rides adjusted for inflation) • Ridership per capita (RideSource) • Lift rides per capita (fixed route) 	1996	1998	2002
			3.2	3.3	3.4
			\$8.11	\$8.00	\$8.00
			.44	.44	.44
			.27	.29	.31
	Degree of integration of land use and transportation decisions	To be developed (e.g., percent of employment located within a quarter mile of major bus corridors or downtown center, acreage added to Urban Growth Boundary, residential density per acre)	1997	1998-2002	
			Develop measure and collect baseline	TBD	

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS		
Community Satisfaction: To maintain and improve community satisfaction with and support for LTD	Community opinion	Percentage of community rating LTD at good to excellent (in market-area survey)	1994-95	1997-98	2000-01	2003-04
			79%	80%	80%	80%
	Performance on an independent external standard regarding stewardship of resources	1. Audit of financial results 2. Certificate of achievement in reporting excellence	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98
			"Unqualified" result None	"Unqualified" result Certificate received	"Unqualified" result Certificate received	"Unqualified" result Certificate received
	Voter support	1. Favorable voting results on ballot measures affecting LTD 2. Absence of hostile ballot measures	1994-95	1996-2005		
			Not applicable Not applicable	100% 100%		

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS			TARGETS		
			1995-96	1997-98	1999-2005			
Community Satisfaction (cont.)	Opinions of elected officials	Percentage of elected officials rating LTD at good to excellent (in face-to-face independent interviews)	No data	Develop measure and collect baseline	TBD			
	Community awareness and support for LTD's contribution to the community's quality of life	Percent of community members who indicate awareness of and support for LTD's contribution to quality of life	No data	Develop measure and collect baseline	TBD			

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS		TARGETS			
			6 yr Avg 88-94	1995	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-2000
Safety: To maintain an excellent level of public and employee safety	Injuries to employees	1. Number of injuries per 100 employees per year (percent of employees in parentheses) ²	13.3 (5.7%)	12.5 (4.5%)	12.2 (4.3%)	12.0 (4.1%)	11.5 (3.8%)	11.0 (3.6%)
			2 yr Avg	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-2000
	Injuries to employees	2. Annual cost of employee days lost due to injuries (in hours) ³ Hours lost time	5,357	6,313	6,025	5,500	5,300	5,100
								-4.8%
	Injuries to citizens or public property	1. Number of preventable ⁴ accidents per 100,000 miles ⁵	5 yr Avg 90-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-2000
			.95	1.34	1.30	1.32	1.34	1.38

² Average on calendar year 1990-95 - 2.1% decrease. Employees increase over 6 years was 41 (6.8 employees per year).

³ Average from FY94-95 and FY95-96 (bus operators only).

⁴ Average from FY91-96. Total miles divided by 100,000 for each year. Total miles for each future year equals 96 plus 104,701 avg./yr. over FY91-96. Gradual increase due to worsening traffic condition.

⁵ Not all defensive driving techniques were used.

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS		TARGETS			
			4 yr Avg	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-2000
Safety (cont.)		2. Costs per year of preventable damage claims per 100,000 miles ⁶	\$57,935					
			\$1,581	\$1,668	\$1,601	\$1,634	\$1,668	\$1,735

⁶ Average from 1992-96; 57,935 avg. dollars/year over 4 years; \$1,581 avg. dollars/100,000 miles over 4 years.

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS	
			1995-96	1998	1999-2005
Employee Satisfaction: To increase the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of LTD employees	Voluntary turnover ⁷	Annual separation rate (number of employees who left voluntarily in a given period divided by the average number of employees during the period) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salaried employees • Bargaining unit employees 	1.7% 5.2%	2% Up to 7% ⁸	2% Up to 6%
	Reported job satisfaction	Valid and reliable surveys of employee perceptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire • Organizational Commitment Questionnaire 	No data	Baseline to be collected	TBD

⁷ There are some problems associated with setting "targets" for voluntary turnover levels since low targets might commit LTD to paying artificially-high wages and benefits. Likewise, high targets might signal that employees are not valued. There are many different ways to assess employee satisfaction and commitment to the organization but these measures cannot be put into place immediately. Therefore, it is proposed that LTD monitor turnover and review this indicator at least annually in order to ensure that LTD's employment practices are continuing to attract and retain desirable employees as the competition for good employees continues to increase in Lane County.

⁸ The expected turnover rate for 1998 is higher than for subsequent years due to the potential impact of the Hyundai plant opening.

GOALS	INDICATORS	MEASURES	CURRENT LEVELS	TARGETS				
			1995-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-2000	
Financial Strength: Maintain LTD's excellent level of financial health	Creditworthiness	1. Dun and Bradstreet average annual rating	4A1	4A1	4A1	4A1	4A1	
		2. Dun and Bradstreet opinion	Financial condition strong					
	Liquidity	Current ratio (current assets to current liabilities)	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
	Funding for liabilities	Percentage of liabilities (e.g., pensions) that are funded	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
	Earned income contribution to operating expense	1. Farebox income to operating cost ratio 2. Other earned income as a percentage of operating cost	.23	≥ .20	≥ .20	≥ .20	≥ .20	
3%			3%	4%	4%	5%		



Long-Range Financial Plan

Assumptions for Lane Transit District Budget Model

General

The information provided by the long-range financial plan (LRFP) assists the District in planning growth in service and setting operating and capital reserve contributions. The budget version of the long-range plan is primarily built to assist in setting the current-year budget plan. As such, this version of the plan focuses on prudent planning for the budget year, while maintaining long-term planning for capital bus replacement. Future-year assumptions are slightly more aggressive, with the knowledge that this plan will be assessed at least twice yearly.

A long-term key to District financial planning is to maintain operating expense levels that are lower than current-year revenues over a five-year planning horizon. (In other words, each year new working capital is generated, and current operations do not depend on cash carried forward from prior years.) The planning also includes maintaining prudent operating and capital reserves. In addition, the plan is used to assess the level of LTD's payroll and self-employment tax rate. LTD's statutory tax rate maximum is six tenths of one percent (.006) but has been lowered by the District in the past when revenues have exceeded expectations over a period of time.

Revenues

- Tax rates are maintained at .6 percent.
- The first five years of payroll tax revenue is assumed to grow at the same rate projected by the State of Oregon for wage growth.
- After FY 2001, total annual revenue is assumed to increase by 6 percent per year.

Expenses

- Eugene Station facility cost increases are fully programmed beginning in FY 1999.
- After five years, the base costs, before service increases, are assumed to increase 4.5 percent per year, with the transfer to Special Transportation increasing a 6 percent per year.
- Annual budgets are expected to have a positive variance of .5 percent of revenue, 2 percent on personnel expenses, and 3 percent on materials and services.

- Service increases for the first five years are programmed at a rate that would result in a doubling of service in 20 years. Given the conservative assumptions used, it is doubtful that service could be doubled in 20 years, so the service growth rate for the remaining 15 years has been reduced by .6 percent per year. The service increase assumptions used are 2.75 percent for FY 1997, 5 percent for FY 1998, and 3.7 percent through FY 2001. The rate is 3.1 percent for each year thereafter.
- Service increase costs per bus hour are assumed at the marginal cost rate (\$38.23 in FY 1997) with 4 percent per year increase per service hour for the full 20 years.

Capital

- The small bus purchase in FY 1997 is federally grant funded at 80 percent.
- Subsequent bus purchases are assumed to be 50 percent federally funded.
- The Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project is assumed to be 80 percent federally funded, with 20 percent local match. Two BRT corridors (a pilot corridor that is likely to extend from east or west Springfield to west Eugene, and a second corridor, likely from north to south) are expected to be funded at this level.
- Shelters and other smaller capital purchases are assumed to be 80 percent federally funded through FY 1997, and at the 50 percent level in subsequent years.

Other

- Operating reserves, which include self-insured risk reserves, are maintained between 25 and 40 percent of operating costs. The Board of Directors established this standard, which was attained in FY 1996. (It took five years for the District to attain this goal.)
- Cigarette tax funding for LTD's special transportation program is assumed to be at the FY 1996 level through FY 1997, with a 2 percent per year reduction thereafter. LTD's general fund contribution to special transportation will increase by 25 percent in FY 1997, with 7 to 9 percent annual increases in subsequent years. The special transportation program is federally mandated; cigarette tax revenue declines and/or service increases must be covered by Lane Transit District.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT FIVE-YEAR FINANCIAL OPERATING PLAN FY 1996/97 - FY 2000/01

	95/96 ACTUAL	96/97 BUDGET	Projections: 97/98	98/99	99/00	00/01
REVENUE						
Operating Revenue:						
Regular Fares	2,449,019	2,669,830	2,936,813	3,230,494	3,553,544	3,908,898
Group Passes	<u>589,418</u>	<u>602,510</u>	<u>626,610</u>	<u>651,675</u>	<u>677,742</u>	<u>704,851</u>
Total Fares	3,038,437	3,272,340	3,563,423	3,882,169	4,231,286	4,613,749
Special Services	64,600	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
Advertising	271,998	315,510	324,976	334,725	344,767	355,110
Other Revenue						
Misc. Operating	122,215	42,250	44,785	47,472	50,320	53,340
Total Operating	3,497,250	3,700,100	4,003,184	4,334,366	4,696,373	5,092,199
Payroll Tax	11,709,671	12,672,110	13,419,764	14,164,561	14,971,941	15,832,828
Self-Employment Tax	695,104	799,400	803,370	807,203	810,865	814,344
State-in-Lieu	<u>853,045</u>	<u>867,580</u>	<u>884,932</u>	<u>902,630</u>	<u>920,683</u>	<u>939,096</u>
Total Taxes	13,257,820	14,339,090	15,108,066	15,874,394	16,703,489	17,586,268
FTA Operating Grant	0	0	0	0	0	0
TDM & Parts Grant	<u>143,905</u>	<u>186,000</u>	<u>186,000</u>	<u>186,000</u>	<u>186,000</u>	<u>186,000</u>
Total Grants	143,905	186,000	186,000	186,000	186,000	186,000
Special Transportation	404,840					
Interest Income	647,778	722,000	629,642	641,560	780,812	889,559
TOTAL REVENUE (Excluding Capital)	17,951,593	18,947,190	19,926,892	21,036,320	22,366,674	23,754,026
EXPENSE SUMMARY						
Personal Services	10,765,709	11,704,690	12,231,401	12,781,814	13,356,996	13,958,061
Materials & Services	2,888,704	3,328,980	3,489,467	3,696,371	3,876,664	4,067,224
Other Programs	0	0	276,193	1,051,757	1,589,804	2,188,297
Risk/Insurance	645,912	621,360	652,428	685,049	719,302	755,267
Special Transportation	881,996	602,000	642,900	702,814	765,411	830,850
TOTAL EXPENSE (Excluding Capital)	15,182,321	16,257,030	17,292,389	18,917,805	20,308,177	21,799,699
Excess (deficiency) (Excluding Capital and Effect of Beginning Balance)	2,769,272	2,690,160	2,634,503	2,118,515	2,058,497	1,954,327

Lane Transit District

Long-Range Capital Plan Summary

FY END	EXPENDITURES				RESOURCES			CAPITAL CASH RESERVES			
	BUSES	BRT	EUG STAT OTHER	TOTAL	GRANT REVENUE	RESERVES USED	TOTAL	BEGINNING BALANCE	ADD	SPEND	ENDING BALANCE
1995				(642,758)	\$482,154	160,603	642,757	\$ 3,422,046	2,037,303	(642,758)	4,816,591
1996			(3,920,860)	(3,920,860)	-	-	-	4,816,591	4,842,210	(3,920,860)	5,737,941
1997	(1,580,000)	-	(10,369,630)	(11,949,630)	9,574,451	2,375,179	11,949,630	5,737,941	12,536,690	(11,949,630)	6,325,001
1998	(8,925,000)	-	(3,110,000)	(12,035,000)	6,777,500	5,257,500	12,035,000	6,325,001	10,051,170	(12,035,000)	4,341,171
1999		(9,700,000)	(610,000)	(10,310,000)	8,157,500	2,152,500	10,310,000	4,341,171	10,660,890	(10,310,000)	4,692,061
2000		-	(610,000)	(610,000)	300,000	310,000	610,000	4,692,061	2,788,390	(610,000)	6,870,451
2001		(1,000,000)	(610,000)	(1,610,000)	800,000	810,000	1,610,000	6,870,451	3,288,390	(1,610,000)	8,548,841
2002		-	(650,000)	(650,000)	300,000	350,000	650,000	8,548,841	2,828,390	(650,000)	10,727,231
2003	(8,868,447)	(10,000,000)	(650,000)	(19,518,447)	12,831,723	6,686,723	19,518,447	10,727,231	15,360,113	(19,518,447)	6,568,898
2004		-	(650,000)	(650,000)	300,000	350,000	650,000	6,568,898	2,364,950	(650,000)	8,283,848
2005		-	(550,000)	(550,000)	250,000	300,000	550,000	8,283,848	2,264,950	(550,000)	9,998,798
2006		-	(650,000)	(650,000)	300,000	350,000	650,000	9,998,798	2,364,950	(650,000)	11,713,748
2007	(2,607,198)	(1,000,000)	(550,000)	(4,157,198)	2,451,099	1,706,099	4,157,198	11,713,748	4,466,049	(4,157,198)	12,022,599
2008		-	(650,000)	(650,000)	300,000	350,000	650,000	12,022,599	2,379,280	(650,000)	13,751,879
2009	(21,178,778)	-	(550,000)	(21,728,778)	10,839,389	10,889,389	21,728,778	13,751,879	12,868,669	(21,728,778)	4,891,770
2010		-	(650,000)	(650,000)	300,000	350,000	650,000	4,891,770	2,356,740	(650,000)	6,598,510
2011		(1,000,000)	(550,000)	(1,550,000)	1,147,500	402,500	1,550,000	6,598,510	3,154,240	(1,550,000)	8,202,750
2012		-	(650,000)	(650,000)	300,000	350,000	650,000	8,202,750	2,337,240	(650,000)	9,889,990
2013		-	(550,000)	(550,000)	250,000	300,000	550,000	9,889,990	2,237,240	(550,000)	11,577,230
2014		-	(650,000)	(650,000)	300,000	350,000	650,000	11,577,230	2,337,240	(650,000)	13,264,470
2015	(17,280,522)	-	(550,000)	(17,830,522)	8,890,261	8,940,261	17,830,522	13,264,470	10,877,501	(17,830,522)	6,311,449
	(60,439,945)	(22,700,000)	(23,809,630)								

Susan B. Phillips

Principal Susan B. Phillips & Associates

Susan B. Phillips is a nationally recognized organizational consultant serving Fortune 500 companies. As principal of Phillips & Associates, a consulting firm based in Eugene, Oregon, she provides consultation, facilitation and training services for organization planning and development. Her areas of expertise include strategic planning, organization design, goal-setting, human resource planning, organization culture and philosophy, employee involvement, management development, union-management cooperation, communications, motivation, quality and productivity improvement, management coaching, performance planning and appraisal, conflict resolution, teambuilding, personnel selection, survey feedback and work design.

Dr. Phillips has extensive experience in working with individuals and groups at all organizational levels from Boards of Directors, senior managers and union leaders to first-line supervisors and employees. She has served client organizations in a wide variety of industries and sectors including oil, airline, auto, steel, wood products, pulp and paper, bio-technology, health care, food processing, insurance, electronics, computer software, textiles, government, education and consumer products. Projects vary in scope from specific interventions such as planning meetings or customized training activities to comprehensive organizational assessment and long-term, planned organization change or redesign.

Prior to forming her own firm, Susan was Vice-President of the American Productivity and Quality Center in Houston, Texas where she was responsible for managing the Center's consulting services related to employee involvement and human resource management. She has been consulting since 1971, often in conjunction with university teaching and research responsibilities. Susan has served on the faculty of the Department of Psychology at the University of Oregon, teaching graduate courses in organizational and industrial psychology. She is the past director of the American Society for Training and Development's National Network on Involvement and Quality.

Susan is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Stanford University where she earned a B.A. in Psychology "With Great Distinction" (top 5%) and Departmental Honors. She earned an M.B.A. from Stanford's Graduate School of Business where she was a Gilbreth Scholar. Susan holds an M.A. and a Ph.D. from the University of Oregon in Clinical Psychology and she completed an Internship in Medical Psychology at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center.

Susan B. Phillips and Associates

Partial List of National and International Clients Served

National and International Organizations

Cap Snap Company
Champion International Corporation
Coopers and Lybrand
Georgia Pacific Corporation
James River Corporation
John LaBatt Foods
Microsoft Corporation
Pacific Western Extruded Plastics Company (PWPipe)
Protein Design Labs, Inc.
S.D. Warren Company
Scott Paper Company
Sony Disc Manufacturing
UDF Computers (Advanced Laboratory Systems)
United States Internal Revenue Service
Weyerhaeuser Company

Northwest Regional Organizations

Benton County, Oregon
Bright Wood Corporation
City of Eugene, Oregon
City of Mercer Island, Washington
Eugene Hospital and Clinic
Eugene Water and Electric Board
Frontier Technology, Inc.
Lane Community College
Lane Council of Governments
Lane County, Oregon
McKenzie-Willamette Hospital
Moss Adams
Northwest Natural Gas Company
Oregon Medical Group
Oregon Research Institute
Peace Harbor Hospital
PeaceHealth
PeaceHealth Oregon Region
Sacred Heart Medical Center
Seattle Community Colleges
St. John's Medical Center
University of Oregon
Williams Bakery (U.S. Bakery)

LTD's Visions and Strategic Actions

In order to promote a high quality of life for our community...

Vision I

LTD is a leader in the development of local and regional transportation plans, strategies and funding, through strengthened partnerships, alliances, and community support.

Vision II

LTD provides innovative, quality service that commands an increasing share of the transportation market.

Vision III

LTD's decisions, priorities, and actions are driven by strategic planning and sound fiscal and operational management.

Vision IV

LTD supports a work environment that attracts talented employees who share LTD's vision and are committed to its success.

Vision I

LTD is a leader in the development of local and regional transportation plans, strategies, and funding through strengthened partnerships, alliances, and community support.

Strategic Actions

1. Promote the adoption and implementation of a TransPlan that supports LTD's strategic plans.
2. Develop a network of key partners and allies to assist in achieving LTD's goals.
3. Establish a process for regularly making transit and other alternative transportation issues part of our partners' agendas. Staff will be aggressively involved in accomplishing this. The Board also will be involved in this process.
4. Identify, through priority setting, local and regional transportation projects and partnerships to which LTD may contribute resources.
5. Through research and knowledge, be the substantive leader and resource in regional and local transportation issues.
6. Maintain and enhance the Board's leadership role in developing and achieving the District's strategic plan.
7. Develop and implement public education programs to create understanding of and support for the value of LTD in maintaining and enhancing the region's quality of life.
8. Actively promote the authorization of state and federal funding for public transportation, including reauthorization of ISTEA at fully-authorized funding levels.
9. Support the development of the Oregon Transportation Initiative (OTI) and the Oregon Transportation Financing Plan (OTFP) and persuade the 1997 Legislature to approve the OTFP in order to secure:
 - a. In 1997, LTD's share of \$35-45 million in statewide funding for elderly and handicapped transit services;
 - b. In 1999, one half of the local share for capital expenditures and increased local taxing authority; and
 - c. Improvements in the state's transportation infrastructure.

Vision II

LTD provides innovative, quality service that commands an increasing share of the transportation market.

Strategic Actions

1. Maintain high levels of rider satisfaction with the quality of LTD services.
2. Systematically explore, evaluate, and incorporate relevant technological innovations and new approaches and opportunities to increase market share (e.g., express service, reduced bus travel times, bus amenities).
3. Obtain funding for and implement a pilot BRT corridor with a yet-to-be-determined percentage of exclusive rights-of-way in order to:
 - a. Reduce travel time
 - b. Increase market appeal
 - c. Reduce VMTs
4. Promote group pass programs and other TDM strategies to increase ridership and decrease VMTs.
5. Increase the public's confidence in the safety and security of LTD's services and facilities.
6. Implement attractive, well-designed, high-quality facilities that will be viewed as community assets (e.g., Eugene Station, Springfield Transfer Station, Park and Rides facilities).
7. Actively gather information from citizens, customers, and other sources to learn about the public's transportation needs and views of LTD and LTD's plans.

Vision III

LTD's decisions, priorities, and actions are driven by strategic planning and sound fiscal and operational management.

Strategic Actions

1. Determine what performance measures and benchmarks are used to evaluate the organization's fiscal and operational performance. Develop benchmark measures that are aligned with our vision.
2. Examine our fare policy, using available data and research. Include effects of group pass rates and individual fares. The Board will balance goals of ridership with fare-to-budget base data to determine LTD's fare policy. New proposals that reduce fare-to-total revenue would be considered if they meet other productivity measures or acquire customers who would otherwise be driving cars.
3. Develop and agree on a method of analysis and tools to guide the Board and staff as they evaluate new service proposals and investments.
4. Continue to enhance operating and service efficiencies and effectiveness through improvements in procedures and decision-making in order to increase flexibility in responding to emerging needs.
5. Assess current federal, state, and local funding sources and determine impact on long-range financial plan.
6. Develop critical evaluation methods to assess organizational needs and the means by which those needs can be met.

Vision IV

LTD supports a work environment that attracts talented employees who share LTD's vision and are committed to its success.

Strategic Actions

1. Complete and implement a new proactive Employee Relations Plan in order to build partnership, trust, and improved communications among all employees.
2. Use the knowledge and experience of LTD's employees more fully. Empower work groups and individuals with the authority, responsibility, and accountability to respond to new situations, as well as to maintain excellent levels of service.
3. Recognize, encourage, and reward creativity, customer service, innovation, and exceptional performance, which contribute to LTD's success.
4. Develop a training plan for all classifications to continually upgrade skills in order to respond to new technology and changing conditions.

Acronyms

AARC	American Association of Retired Citizens
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADP	Automated Data Processing
AIC	Accessible Issues Committee
APC	Automated Passenger Counter
ARC	Association for Retarded Citizens
APTA	American Public Transit Association
ASLCC	Associated Students of Lane Community College
ASUO	Associated Students of the University of Oregon
ATU	Amalgamated Transit Union
BBC	Better Bus Committee
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
CATS	Central Area Transportation Study
CIB	Current Information Book
CIP	Capital Improvement Program
CRP	Capital Replacement Program
CSC	Customer Service Center
CSF	Customer Service Form
CSR	Comprehensive Service Redesign
CSO	Correct Schedule Operation
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
DC	Display Case (Team)
DEI	Downtown Eugene Inc.
DOT	Department of Transportation
EDD	Eugene Development Department
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMU	Erb Memorial Union
EOM	Employee of the Month
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERA	Eugene Renewal Agency
ES	Eugene Station
ESCVB	Eugene/Springfield Convention and Visitors Bureau
FAU	Federal Aid Urban
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GDM	General Discussion Meeting
HCC	Housing and Community Conservation
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle (lane)
HR	Human Resources
HUD	Department of Housing & Urban Development

IS	Information Services (Division)
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
LAN	Local Area Network
LCC	Lane Community College
LCDC	Lane Conservation and Development Commission
LCOG	Lane Council of Governments
LES	Lane Education Service District
LRAPA	Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority
LRT	Light Rail Transit
MAPAC	Metropolitan Area Plan Advisory Committee
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Panel (Committee)
MPC	Metropolitan Policy Committee
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MT	Management Team (Committee)
NCC	Northwest Christian College
O & D	Origin and Destination Study
ODOR	Oregon Department of Revenue
ODOT	Oregon Department of Transportation
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
OPS	(Transportation Dispatch Area, not the Operations Department)
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OSHD	Oregon State Highway Division
OTA	Oregon Transit Association
OTC	Oregon Transportation Conference Oregon Transportation Commission
P&D	Planning & Development (Department)
PAC	Planning Advisory Committee
PUC	Public Utility Commission
PUD	Planned Unit Development
RATS	Revenue and Taxation Subcommittee (Eugene Chamber of Commerce)
RIP	Rural Improvement Program
RIS	Regional Information System
SF	Strategic Forum (Committee)
SMSA	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area
SOV	Single-Occupant Vehicle
SP&M	Service Planning & Marketing (Department)
SPSS	Statistical Program for the Social Services
STF	Special Transportation Fund
STIP	Special Transportation Improvement Plan
STP	Surface Transportation Program
TDM	Transit Demand Management
TDP	Transit Development Plan

TIE Transit Information Exchange
TIP Transportation Improvement Program
TOD Transit Oriented Development
TOP Transit Operations Personnel
TPC Transportation Planning Committee
TSM Transportation Systems Management
TPR Transportation Planning Rule
TRB Transportation Research Board
TRIP Transportation Rule Implementation Program

UO University of Oregon
USDOT United States Department of Transportation
UTPS Urban Transportation Planning System

VMTs Vehicle Miles Traveled

WashDOT Washington Department of Transportation
WWW World Wide Web

