

**Salem Area Mass Transit District
Board of Directors**

Planning Retreat

Saturday, February 6, 2016
West Salem Roth's – Oregon Conference Room
1130 Wallace Road NW, Salem, Oregon 97304

CORRECTED MINUTES

PRESENT:	President Robert Krebs; Directors John Hammill, Colleen Busch, Marcia Kelley, Jerry Board Thompson, and Kathy Lincoln	ABSENT:	Director Steve Evans
Staff	Allan Pollock, General Manager; David Trimble, Chief Operating Officer; Paula Dixon, Director of Administration; and Linda Galeazzi, Executive Assistant		
Guests	Dale Penn II, CFM Strategic Communications		

1. **WELCOME / OPENING COMMENTS:** President Robert Krebs 9:00 AM

2. **SKT STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW -**

- **Strategic Plan** – pages 1-18 of the agenda
- **Board Goals Statement** – page 19

Mr. Pollock hit on key points in the narrative of the Strategic Plan created in Fiscal Year 2012 that described Salem-Keizer Transit's direction over the next twenty years.

The Board discussed several goals that were met in the first five years of the Strategic Plan and areas to look at for improvement:

- Making a decision two years prior to strengthen the core service in Phase One of the *Moving Forward* project (Comments: Hammill);
- Service coverage was not increased in the South Salem area but a yearlong pilot project was launched in the West Salem area to provide service coverage with the *West Salem Connector* (Comments: Kelley, Pollock);
- Seniors and people with disabilities now have two more options of travel with the *RED Line Shopper Shuttle* and *Dial-A-Ride* service. It is hard to determine at this time if it is more cost effective but the cost per revenue hour is more efficient, and they will need to manage passengers per revenue hour. (Comments: Lincoln, Pollock)
- CherryLift has been in existence since the mid-1990s and is the most expensive service provided. The predictability of a CherryLift ride from pick up to delivery; in the coming ten years of operations, it may be possible through changes in technology, to schedule a trip with real-time technology. (Comments: Busch, Kelley, Hammill, Pollock)

Discussion on the Election and the Strategic Plan (Comments: Hammill, Kelley)

- The ballot measure got destroyed in the November election.
- We did not execute on the Strategic Plan, or the Plan did not focus on winning an election, and we need to deal with that.
- The Strategic Plan's Goal #1 states they want to focus on delivery of service that takes

people where they want to go in a timely fashion but it left the opportunity for failure in that most of the customers or primary ridership is transit-dependent. They need Saturday service in the core areas and on twelve other routes.

- Saturday ridership used to be about half of weekday ridership. You cannot take service from weekdays to add to Saturday without considering the additional cost.

Is it worth reducing week day service from a policy perspective? It is worth capturing concerns. (Comments: Kelley, Lincoln, Hammill, Thompson, Busch, Pollock)

- Saturday service along newer routes
- Let people know the concerns; let them know about the fixed route and paratransit requirements and costs
- It is difficult to communicate
- The election did not have anything to do with the Strategic Plan. We were outspent.
- We did not have our support base ahead of time.
- Empty buses are not the issue; it is empty cars
- A paper from the Governor's transportation visioning meeting made a statement about empty buses
- There is nothing in the Strategic Plan (SP) that –
 - Defines an acceptable level of service; it does not offer service connections to grocery stores. Collector routes should provide service to necessary resources like grocery stores, medical facilities, etc.
 - Talks about efforts to reach a threshold level of transit to reach a good and viable alternative to customer satisfaction
- The SP is more like a big map or work plan with priorities
- We will have to figure out how to pay for this or it goes on the shelf
- Have short term goals and objectives to accomplish
- In the execution of the SP, it permits us to make serious mistakes; it is not guiding us appropriately
- Thirty-three percent are transit dependent
- It is more than that now; We need to do a true ridership survey and put that in the budget
- Much of what is being discussed could be put in the Board's plans for Phase Two of the Moving Forward project
- I am a great believer in ridership versus coverage but have been hammered by people who are transit-dependent who need service

The Strategic Plan needs to be updated. President Krebs will form a subcommittee with himself, and Directors Hammill and Lincoln.

Dale Penn II arrived at the meeting at 9:52 a.m.

- When updating the SP, we need to be precise; funding what the District pays for.
 - The Board will need to decide what they want the budget document to mean.
- We need to write the SP to include a supplement long range; 20 years out regional plan to develop one seat rides.
- Western Oregon may want to partner with CARTS. We need to do some follow-up; Dale Penn and Mr. Pollock are working with Representative Evans on that.
- Fuel costs are going down for those who ride CARTS. It is having an impact on CARTS ridership.

- We could have a weekly column in the Statesman Journal; like a public forum. I would be happy to head that up – Director Lincoln
- The budget document is another way to reach people and transit supporters
- You can use Twitter and Facebook, etc. It is one of the main ways to communicate.
- If we need to expand, we need a blog
- Multi-channels to get the word out! On February 29th, the District will have a new Director of Communications

3. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS

- **Performance Metrics** – page 19 of the agenda

Mr. Pollock explained that there were three levels of the performance report for management, the board and the community. As part of the update to the Strategic Plan, he wants to ask the community, what is important for them to know, to measure community acceptance. He asked that the Board review the performance metrics and let him know what is missing.

(Comments: Hammill, Thompson, Krebs, Kelley, Busch, Lincoln, Pollock)

- There are two communities – the riders and the taxpayers
- What are they complaining about – the TripLink Call Center, parents with strollers in ADA spaces on the buses. Changed signs – has it been effective, has it been dealt with. It is the law; it is a policy issue.
- The issue of the “empty bus” – Video
- When we update the SP, incorporate community measures

4. MOVING FORWARD PHASE II FUNDING – WHAT’S NEXT

10:12 AM

- a) **Governor’s Visioning Transportation Panel** – pages 21-25 of the agenda
- b) **OTA / OTF** – page 26–28
- c) **HB 4078 Salem Chamber Transit Bill** – pages 29-33
- d) **President Krebs’ Funding Proposal** – page 34

Dale Penn led the discussion about funding.

(Comments: Krebs, Kelley, Busch, Lincoln, Hammill, Pollock)

- a) The key preliminary findings from the Governor’s Transportation Vision Panel (on pages 24-25 of the agenda) included state and local transit investments, and increasing the flexibility of K-12 student transportation services across the state. A final report will be delivered to Governor Kate Brown by spring 2016 to serve as a tool to shore up and prioritize investments in the state’s transportation system over the next several years.
- b) As a result of a November government affairs strategic planning meeting, members of the Oregon Transit Association (OTA) authorized the creation of OTA subcommittees charged with developing a transit-specific revenue package proposal for consideration by the 2017 Oregon Legislative Assembly; and developing communications materials, coalition allies and grassroots capacity to support OTF advocacy efforts concerning a 2017 transportation investment package that would include transit.
- c) The Salem Area Chamber’s Transit Bill LC163 is “dead.” The big hurdle for this bill was how to fund the Transit Expansion Fund estimated at \$20 to \$40 million. Representative John Davis from Wilsonville spoke against the Chamber’s bill asking why the state should support the Chamber’s bill for a transit fund when the Chamber was not willing to support public transit in its own community. The main goal will be to continue the conversation about a transportation package for next year. Mr. Pollock attended the

hearing, as did Director Busch. Mr. Pollock did a good job answering the questions he was asked. **Mr. Penn will send the Board a link to the hearing.**

- d) Income tax package ready for the 2017 legislative session that funds transit throughout the state, is distributed by county at two levels - for local transit and intercity services. The funding source is needed to get federal dollars. Components of this tax may need to be approved by voters statewide; would need to get legal advice. It may require an adjustment to the tax for TriMet and Lane Transit District. Salem-Keizer Transit is willing to carry the flag for this potential statewide program and would also benefit.
- e) There is a hearing in the Senate on SJR 201 about doing different things with property tax and the real market value of owner-occupied property. There has been consensus that something needs to be done. Police, fire and other essential services including transit are all impacted by this. The League of Oregon Cities is bringing up the issue. Director Kelley recommended that they get involved with some of those discussions.

5. SKT ROLE WITH SALEM AREA AND KEIZER CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE 11:25 PM

Board members discussed their future roles with the chambers of commerce and next steps for discussions regarding funding opportunities.

(Comments: Lincoln, Hammill, Kelley, Krebs, Pollock, Penn)

- Board members discussed whether or not to continue the District's membership with the chambers of commerce of both Salem and Keizer after they aggressively opposed Ballot Measure 24-388 in the November 2015 election. The Chamber publicly stated that they felt transit was important to the community but they did not agree on the funding source. As an alternative, they intended to help the District find funding sources necessary to provide the services (for Phase II of the Moving Forward project).
- If there are no funds for Phase II, the Board will need to decide what service is important to the riders. Board members will not go out for another ballot measure in the near future.
- If the Board were to go out for a ballot measure in the November 2018 election, they would begin now to educate and gather local support. There is also the potential of a state solution in the works which they can support that may provide necessary funding.
- It is important to continue to educate the community and the Chamber about the District's services, how these services are funded and how the District is a strong steward of the people's tax dollars; encourage their understanding.
- When reaching out to thank the Chamber for their efforts with the LC163 Measure, discuss the possibility of other funding options, invite Chamber members to sit on the Budget Committee or a task force.

Mr. Pollock will set up meetings with President Krebs, Director Thompson, and the Keizer and Salem Area Chamber leaderships.

6. FUTURE ROLE OF THE CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) 12:37 PM

- **CAC Bylaws** – page 35-38

Board members discussed the cessation and the future role of the CAC.

(Comments: Krebs, Hammill, Busch, Lincoln, Kelley, Thompson, Pollock):

- The first members were a mix of transit riders and all of the meeting time was spent educating the members with no end point. A new approach was taken with constituents from the business community, but they were not going back to their agencies and

sharing the information they received at the meetings. The goal was to be of value to the members and of value to the Board to make decisions; to create opportunities for town halls, etc. That did not happen.

- It was so much trouble to keep the membership. The first group was transit-dependent who did not have a constituency to go back to. The second group never engaged.
- There was nothing for the CAC to do – study something, go to a neighborhood association meeting – they just wanted to learn. They cannot give a good response unless they know what they are doing. Does the American Public Transportation Association or the Transit Research Board offer guidance?
- Focus groups may be the way to go to bounce back ideas from a wider group to the community.
- The Keizer Fire District Board convenes a CAC when they have an issue to discuss; targeted groups with influence in particular areas of need.
- We could get opinions on-line like ODOT has done or OPB.
- We did the phone poll for the ballot measure.
- We may get better participation now; like the Book Bins participation.
- The regional transportation workshops put on by Jarrett Walker & Association's were good presentations with stakeholders.

Staff will put together a proposal for a restructured Citizens Advisory Committee.

7. SALEM RIVER CROSSING DISCUSSION *CORRECTED* 12:52 PM

- **Salem River Crossing Alternative Modes Study** – pages 39-130

Mr. Pollock reviewed the Board's involvement with the Salem River Crossing (SRC) Oversight Team and the Alternative Modes Study completed with strategies to help reduce congestion. When the transit district raised questions about funding to fulfill the strategies, those options were taken out.

Director Lincoln stated that the EIS is not out yet and in her opinion, the SRC is not going to improve congestion. She asked that the Board revisit their prior decision made on April 24, 2014 to adopt Resolution No. 2014-03 that states in part that ...

“as a matter of record, support for the Salem Alternative as the preferred alternative to be included in the Salem River Crossing Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and ... in order to avoid additional costs and design conflicts, bus stop locations and construction shall be coordinated with Salem-Keizer Transit. In addition, other public transportation supportive amenities, such as park and ride lots, transit centers, bus queue jump lanes, and transit signal priority will be considered as part of the design of the project.”

Building the new highway will encourage more driving; there is nothing in the design project for the transit district. The study was supposed to reduce congestion by eight percent. The cost of the bridge will be **\$500 million**. It does not include maintenance for the mile-long bridge that will end up costing approximately \$45 million per year. It will suck a lot of money out of the community. Salem-Keizer Transit only needs \$5 million for Saturday and Sunday service. When the final study comes out, the Board needs to rethink the impact on transit and on the community.

(Comments: Krebs, Kelley, Hammill, Thompson, Pollock):

- Other bridges have 80,000 vehicle trips per day.

- There may be no federal dollars to build the bridge and there are not enough local dollars. The state said there would be no funding. We should wait to see what kind of funding they come up with.
- Why would the Chamber support the bridge and not transit? It is an infrastructure project – lots of construction.
- Lane Transit District is talking about funding from Small Starts that they are getting for their projects.
- The project team is already working on Marine Drive. There has to be some investment or a funding footprint on their end to keep the project open in order to get the EIS funded.

Mr. Pollock proposed that a subcommittee be established to focus on a District plan and respond to the Salem River Crossing EIS.

8. BUS ADVERTISING TO FUND DISCOUNT STUDENT BUS PASSES CONCEPT

- **Director Kelley's Proposal** – page 131

Director Kelley briefed the Board on the initial meeting she and Director Thompson had with Krina Lee from the Salem-Keizer Education Foundation (SKEF) to discuss the concept of bus advertising as a way to fund discounted youth bus passes for students for transportation to after school or extracurricular activities. It was important to Director Kelley that the revenue from the bus advertising sales be used for the kids, and this partnership would be a way to promote local good will.

Mr. Pollock advised that bus advertising will require a contract that will go through the request for proposal (RFP) process because it is a revenue stream. The District has received inquiries from several firms in the last few months that have an interest in doing bus advertising. The SKEF, a 501(c)(3) organization, would have to submit a proposal and go through the RFP process if they have an interest in the bus advertising sales as well as the youth bus pass distribution. Even if the bid went out to another firm, the revenue from the bus advertising sales could still be used to offset the costs for this program.

Comments (Hammill, Thompson, Lincoln, Krebs, Kelley, Pollock):

- Board members discussed what things might be included in an RFP; how to go about it and whether to form a committee.
- Director Kelley plans to meet with Ms. Lee again on February 8th at 3:00 p.m.

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS/COMMENTS

- Board members briefly discussed that Scott Bassett, a citizen member on the Budget Committee has made suggestions for changes to the District's budget document and what it is the committee as a whole wants the budget document to say. The information he is asking for is important but it may need to be in a year-end report.

Director Lincoln suggested that the District contact Mr. Bassett to discuss his suggestions.

10. MEETING ADJOURNED (This planning session was voice recorded.)

2:13 PM

Respectfully Submitted:
Linda Galeazzi
Executive Assistant