



**C-TRAN BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
MEETING MINUTES**

**February 9, 2010**

The C-TRAN Board of Directors meeting was held Tuesday, February 9, 2010 at the C-TRAN Administrative Facility, 2425 NE 65th Avenue, Vancouver, Washington.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Marc Boldt called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Boldt led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

PRESENT: Marc Boldt, Linda Dietzman, Bill Ganley, Jeanne Harris, Jim Irish, Tom Mielke, Jeanne Stewart, Steve Stuart

ABSENT: Tim Leavitt

**CHANGES TO AND APPROVAL OF THE BOARD AGENDA**

JEANNE STEWART MOTIONED, BILL GANLEY SECONDED, AND MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE AGENDA.

**BOARD RESOLUTIONS**

1. PRESENTATION TO RETIRING C-TRAN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT JOYCE HIATT, BOARD RESOLUTION #10-002
2. PRESENTATION TO RETIRED FIXED ROUTE COACH OPERATOR TERRY CONLEY, BOARD RESOLUTION #10-003
3. PRESENTATION TO RETIRED FIXED ROUTE COACH OPERATOR GOLDA DOVE, BOARD RESOLUTION #10-004
4. RECOGNITION OF C-TRAN'S 2009 EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR, BOARD RESOLUTION #10-005

JEANNE STEWART MOTIONED, JIM IRISH SECONDED, AND MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE BOARD RESOLUTIONS BR-10-002, BR-10-003, BR-10-004, AND BR-10-005.

Chair Marc Boldt made a presentation to those present, including Joyce Hiatt, Terry Conley, and Golda Dove.

### CONSENT AGENDA

1. APPROVAL OF BOARD JANUARY 12, 2010 MINUTES.
2. TRANSMITTAL OF CLAIM VOUCHERS NUMBERED 083744 THROUGH 083990 PLUS PAYROLL FOR JANUARY, IN THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$3,088,184.03
3. CONTRACT AWARD – RESURFACE SHOP FLOOR, STAFF REPORT #10-005

The existing shop flooring has been in place and in constant, around-the-clock use since the building of C-TRAN's AOM facility in 1982. The floor is located in a working maintenance area. It has been exposed, over the course of nearly thirty years, to a variety of industrial and commercial cleaners and compounds; as well as a variety of petroleum-based products. The floor is worn, difficult to clean and maintain, and at times, has posed a safety hazard for workers.

STEVE STUART MOTIONED, JEANNE HARRIS SECONDED, AND MOTION CARRIED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

### CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

1. K. TAYLOR CURRY, PO Box 61616, Vancouver, WA 98666-1616, letter dated January 22, 2010, regarding fares.

### CITIZEN COMMENTS TO THE BOARD

1. JIM KARLOCK, 3311 NE 35<sup>th</sup>, Portland, OR 97212 addressed the Board regarding light rail transit and submitted an article entitled "U.N. panel's Glacier Warning is Criticized as Exaggerated", and a DVD of Randal O'Toole's presentation on light rail January 22, 2010, attached to these minutes as Exhibit A (DVD is available for review in the office of the Clerk of the Board).
2. STEPHANIE A. McKEVIFF, 6610 NW Whitney Rd., #158, Vancouver WA 98665 addressed the Board regarding recent changes to the #25 Fruit Valley route. The changes are creating a hardship for those who live on the route, including residents of the trailer park, many of whom are elderly or disabled. Ms. McKeiff submitted a petition and letters of support to restore service for Fruit Valley (available in the office of the Clerk of the Board for review, marked as Exhibit B).

Executive Director/CEO Jeff Hamm said staff is monitoring the recent service changes and will make a recommendation if service hours become available to reinvest.

### LIGHTER SIDE INTERLUDE

1. Goats on the Bus!  
Staff showed the KATU report on the incident.

## STAFF REPORTS

### 1. 2010 C-TRAN VANPOOL FARES, STAFF REPORT #10-006

Director of Development & Public Affairs Scott Patterson and Senior Planner Brad Windler gave the staff report, as outlined in the PowerPoint presentation attached to these minutes as Exhibit C.

In May 2009, C-TRAN began operating a vanpool program based upon the Washington State Vanpool model. This model provides low cost vanpooling by utilizing Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Vanpool Investment Program funding to procure vans. The local transit agencies then become the operator of the vanpool service. There are 2,600 vanpools in service statewide and WSDOT is setting a goal of 6,600 vanpools statewide in a long-range plan being prepared by WSDOT. WSDOT grant funds allowed C-TRAN to procure 30 vans in early 2009 at no cost to C-TRAN. This program started with six vans in service and grew to nine vans by December 31, 2009.

Vanpool staff has worked in conjunction with Portland METRO's Drive Less, Save More staff and the City of Vancouver Commute Trip Reduction staff to market to several dozen employers. While the program has not grown as hoped, we are facing significant headwinds due to the economy and the loss of jobs. Statewide, vanpool programs have seen a decline in the number of vehicles in service. Almost every agency has vans available for service.

C-TRAN staff has conducted significant outreach for this fare increase. All of the existing vanpools were notified in November that a fare increase would happen in 2010. They were again notified 2 weeks in advance of the public hearing. At that time, the primary contact in each van received an email showing the proposed fares, given an explanation for the increase, and given an explanation of how the fare increase public outreach process works. C-TRAN has held a public hearing to receive comments.

The proposed 2010 Vanpool fare structure focuses on updating the previous fare structure in order to match actual costs incurred. Changes to the three components of the fare structure are proposed as follows:

- A. **Cost per Mile:** Due to higher than anticipated fuel prices, staff proposes to increase the price per gallon assumption from a retail pump price of \$2.58 to \$3.18 (20 percent). The new cost per mile equals \$0.18 for the 7-passenger vans and equals \$0.21 for the 12-passenger vans. Vanpool groups can elect to pay for their own fuel, but may only change this option when C-TRAN changes fares.
- B. **Cost per Unit:** Insurance and GPS wireless costs have been taken out of this element and moved into element #3, adding to the calculation for fixed costs. This leaves the capital (replacement vehicle) cost in this category at a rate of \$52 per month for the 7-passenger vans and \$71 per month for the 12-passenger vans. No changes are being proposed for the capital cost at this time.

C. **Fixed Costs:** This element now covers expenses for administration, maintenance, marketing, insurance, and GPS wireless services. Under the previous fare structure, the fixed operating costs equaled approximately \$369 per month for the 7-passenger van and approximately \$463 per month for the 12-passenger van. Due to budget constraints brought on by the current economic downturn, staff is proposing to increase these rates in order to cover the cost of the program, while also mitigating the cost per passenger. As such, staff proposes a \$20 (5 percent) increase to the 7-passenger van rate, for a total of approximately \$389 per month and a \$45 (10 percent) increase to the 12-passenger van rate, for a total of approximately \$508 per month. This represents an increase to the cost per passenger of approximately \$3.33 per month for the 7-passenger van passengers and approximately \$4.50 per month for 12-passenger van passengers (assuming full capacity).

Board Member Steve Stuart asked if the RTC Survey results could be used to enhance marketing efforts. Senior Planner Windler advised the data from survey would be analyzed to see if there are marketing opportunities.

Board Member Tom Mielke asked if there were options that would ease the vanpool participant's feelings of obligation. Senior Planner Windler stated the obligation to operate a vanpool is on a month-to-month basis and the first month is free to the vanpool participants because of CMAQ grant funds.

Board Member Jeanne Stewart asked what reasons people are giving for not wanting to commit to a vanpool. Senior Planner Windler said they are worried about not having their personal vehicle, even though a ride home is guaranteed.

Board Member Linda Dietzman asked if the participants have the option of purchasing their own fuel and Senior Planner Windler responded yes.

Director Patterson stated staff does have some concerns we may lose one or two vanpools because of the fare increase, however, staff will closely track the program over the next few months to see if further grant-funded incentives may be necessary. Senior Planner Windler added that when a vanpool loses a rider, it affects the costs to the remaining vanpool members.

Board Member Jeanne Harris asked if the vanpools receive any financial assistance from their employers. Senior Planner Windler responded Boeing subsidizes \$32 per month per employee, and WSDOT and State Farm provide incentives. Staff is current working on a new employer brochure that will detail credits available to the employees.

Chair Boldt asked staff to share the brochures with the Board when they are available.

Board Member Jim Irish clarified that if staff's proposed increase is not approved, C-TRAN will have to subsidize more of the cost to operate the Vanpool program.

LINDA DIETZMAN MOTIONED, STEVE STUART SECONDED, AND MOTION CARRIED WITH STEVE STUART, LINDA DIETZMAN, MARC BOLDT, JEANNE STEWART, AND JEANNE HARRIS VOTING AYE TO APPROVE THE STAFF PROPOSED INCREASE FOR FUEL (NO INCREASE TO ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS) EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 2010.

*Staff was directed to ensure current vanpool customers are aware that if they opt to purchase their own fuel, there is no increase to the cost to operate their vanpool.*

### PRESENTATIONS

1. C-TRAN/TRIMET FARE RECIPROCITY-CONCEPT FOR A NEW APPROACH AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISCUSSION ONLY #10-01

Controller Diane O'Regan submitted additional information regarding fare reciprocity, attached to these minutes as Exhibit D.

C-TRAN and TriMet honor each other's fares for regional travel. A customer with a valid All Zone or Express C-TRAN transfer or pass can board TriMet and ride at no additional cost; a customer with a valid TriMet transfer or pass can board C-TRAN and ride at no additional cost. A fare reciprocity agreement in 1976 started this collaborative effort, which, continues today.

Many more C-TRAN customers cross into Oregon and ride TriMet than TriMet customers ride C-TRAN. As a result, C-TRAN owes TriMet money each year according to the terms of the reciprocity agreement. Due to C-TRAN's financial situation the last several years, we negotiated a fixed price settlement at \$152,773 per year. However, ridership has grown and at approximately one million C-TRAN customer trips per year on TriMet, the \$0.15 per trip is not equitable. Accordingly, TriMet has informed C-TRAN that the negotiated settlement can no longer continue. C-TRAN and TriMet staffs have subsequently begun work developing possible modifications to the reciprocity agreement that would result in more equitable revenue sharing and acceptable regional fare prices.

Without fare reciprocity, any cash-paying customer transferring between C-TRAN and TriMet would have to pay a cash fare twice--once when boarding C-TRAN and once when transferring to TriMet, or would have to purchase two monthly bus passes, a C-TRAN pass and a TriMet pass. Both agencies would receive 100 percent of their fare, but ridership would drop significantly because the customer would be paying double what is normally charged to ride transit. Ridership losses could be so steep that both agencies would lose revenue. TriMet passes and transfers used in the C-TRAN system account for 525,000 annual trips (about 9 percent of ridership) which may be lost without fare reciprocity.

**Current Fare Reciprocity Agreement between C-TRAN and TriMet:**

C-TRAN assumes most trips are roundtrips. Customer boards, pays All-Zone fare and receives a transfer valid on other system. TriMet/C-TRAN receives fare for the outward leg of the trip; the other agency will receive the fare for the return leg of the trip. Each agency receives half the round trip fare. TriMet 2-Zone fares are not accepted.

Customer buys either a C-TRAN or TriMet All-Zone pass and rides on both systems. C-TRAN and TriMet survey annually to determine the fares lost from trips on TriMet made with C-TRAN pass and trips on C-TRAN made with a TriMet pass. In theory the agency that lost money is reimbursed by the other agency; however the last several years have indicated that C-TRAN owes TriMet significantly more than what the agency can afford with our current fare structure.

Controller O'Regan advised staff recommends creation of a Regional Pass, priced high enough so that only pass customers who travel between the two systems would purchase it. Regional Pass price would be the same whether purchased in Portland or Vancouver. Agencies would then split Regional Pass revenue 50% - 50%. Regional cash fares/transfers would be accepted on both systems.

Board Member Jeanne Stewart asked what would happen if someone qualifies as low income on the C-TRAN system but wants to ride in the TriMet system. Controller O'Regan responded they would need either to purchase a Regional Pass or pay cash for the part of the trip outside of C-TRAN's service boundary. TriMet does not have a low-income fare category.

Board Member Jeanne Stewart said she is concerned TriMet is using data that cannot be verified, and does not support the assumption that there are one million C-TRAN customer trips per year on the TriMet system. Board Member Stewart asked how much C-TRAN pays TriMet annually.

Controller O'Regan responded in 2009 and the previous three years, C-TRAN negotiated a payment to TriMet of \$153,000.

Board Member Ganley stated the TriMet system is a large system and provides riders with many more travel options, and suggested consideration of an "Express Pass Plus" that would allow additional rides beyond the current Express Pass, in the TriMet system.

Board Member Steve Stuart said he is comfortable giving staff direction to take the Regional Fare concept out to the public for feedback.

Board Member Jim Irish asked if this would need annual review. Controller O'Regan said the regional fare agreement would need to be reviewed annually because TriMet does an annual fare review. Board Member Irish expressed concern with having to renegotiate reciprocity each year.

Board Member Jeanne Stewart said she is concerned the basis of the proposal is the assumption of one million rides by C-TRAN customers in the TriMet system, and how the proposed fees are scaled.

Board Member Jeanne Harris said TriMet is a larger system and many of Clark County's citizens need to use that larger system. Board Member Harris said she supports taking the proposal to the public for input.

4. COLUMBIA RIVER CROSSING (CRC) PROJECT STATUS/UPDATES

Board Member Steve Stuart said the L4 group is comprised of four elected officials who were appointed to the Project Sponsors Council (PSC) by the Governors of Washington and Oregon. Permission has been given to begin distribution of the Draft FEIS to review agencies.

Board Member Jeanne Stewart asked if the RTC has given Steve Stuart and Tim Leavitt the authority to release DRAFT Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and if so, why is RTC not the agency releasing the document. Board Member Steve Stuart responded all of the agencies seated on the PSC are required to sign the document. Federal agencies that have jurisdiction and/or will need to issue permits, must also sign off on the document.

Board Member Ganley said his concern is recent changes may bring more opposition to the project and there may be changes to the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Board Member Steve Stuart said the approved LPA includes 135 caveats, many of which are contradictory to each other. The project will become more complex as we move farther in to the details.

Board Member Irish said on-going debate could result in the Federal Governmental not funding as much of the project as anticipated, and local government being held responsible for additional project costs.

Board Member Jeanne Harris asked what needs to happen to stabilize the project. Board Member Steve Stuart said the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has timelines and milestones associated with the project, including having the FEIS signed by the end of 2010.

Executive Director/CEO Jeff Hamm said he has advised CRC staff that the C-TRAN Board of Directors will need a minimum of two Board meetings to review the Draft FEIS.

COMMUNICATIONS

From The Chair

2. C-TRAN Representation on the Project Sponsors Council

Board Member Tom Mielke nominated Board Member Jeanne Stewart as C-TRAN's representative on the Project Sponsors Council.

Board Member Jeanne Stewart accepted the nomination.

JIM IRISH MOTIONED, TOM MIELKE SECONDED, AND MOTION CARRIED TO CLOSE THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECT JEANNE STEWART AS C-TRAN'S REPRESENTATIVE ON THE PROJECT SPONSORS COUNCIL.

*Board Member Steve Stuart left the meeting at 7:25 p.m.*

**PRESENTATIONS (Continued)**

2. **ADA TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION STATUS REPORT**

Director of Operations Lynn Halsey presented the report, as outlined in the agenda packet information.

3. **STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

Director of Development & Public Affairs Scott Patterson gave the update.

**Vehicle License Fee:**

Board Member Bill Ganley stated he would not support any legislation that would affect citizens, such as the proposed vehicle license fee. Board Member Jeanne Stewart asked if the vehicle license fee legislation includes a sunset clause. Director Patterson said the proposed legislation provides an option for a transit agency to impose a fee but is not mandatory. An agency many not chose to use the option, but we do not want to take that option away from other agencies. *Consensus of the Board was to remain neutral on the legislation.*

**Labor Representation on Boards:**

Board Member Jeanne Harris said she supports this legislation. Board Member Jeanne Stewart said she would advocate for active communication with unions that represent employees in all forms of government and is neutral on the proposed legislation. Board Member Bill Ganley advised having a non-voting member on a board is difficult and he does not see the benefit. Board Member Linda Dietzman said she has mixed emotions, but is leaning towards opposing the legislation. Board Member Jim Irish said he opposes the proposed legislation. *Staff was directed to continue to track this legislation.*

**COMMUNICATIONS (Continued)**

**From The Chair**

1. Election of 2010 Vice-Chair

LINDA DIETZMAN NOMINATED JEANNE HARRIS, MARC BOLDT SECONDED THE NOMINATION, AND THE MOTION TO ELECT JEANNE HARRIS AS THE 2010 VICE-CHAIR CARRIED.

From the Executive Director/CEO

- Executive Director/CEO Hamm gave a brief overview of staff's 2010 work plan and advised periodic updates on the plan will be provided to the Board.
- Columbia River Crossing Project Co-Director Don Wagner will be making a presentation on the Tolling Study at the Board's March 9, 2010 meeting.
- C-TRAN's Annual Report will be distributed as a stuffer in local papers in the next two weeks.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

Prepared By: Debbie Jermann

## The New York Times

This copy is for your personal, noncommercial use only. You can order presentation-ready copies for distribution to your colleagues, clients or customers here or use the "Reprints" tool that appears next to any article. Visit [www.nytreprints.com](http://www.nytreprints.com) for samples and additional information. Order a reprint of this article now.

PRINTER-FRIENDLY FORMAT  
SPONSORED BY



January 19, 2010

### U.N. Panel's Glacier Warning Is Criticized as Exaggerated

By ELISABETH ROSENTHAL

A much-publicized estimate from a United Nations panel about the rapid melting of Himalayan glaciers from climate change is coming under fire as a gross exaggeration.

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change said in 2007 — the same year it shared the Nobel Peace Prize with former Vice President Al Gore — that it was “very likely” that Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035 if current warming trends continued.

That date has been much quoted and a cause for enormous consternation, since hundreds of millions of people in Asia rely on ice and snow melt from these glaciers for their water supply.

The panel, the United Nations’ scientific advisory body on climate change, ranks its conclusions using a probability scale in which “very likely” means there is greater than 90 percent chance that an event will occur.

But it now appears that the estimate about Himalayan glacial melt was based on a decade-old interview of one climate scientist in a science magazine, The New Scientist, and that hard scientific evidence to support that figure is lacking. The scientist, Dr. Syed Hasnain, a glacier specialist with the government of the Indian state of Sikkim and currently a fellow at the TERI research institute in Delhi, said in an e-mail message that he was “misquoted” about the 2035 estimate in The New Scientist article. He has more recently said that his research suggests that only small glaciers could disappear entirely.

The panel, which relies on contributions from hundreds of scientists, is considering whether to amend the estimate or remove it.

“The I.P.C.C. considers this a very serious issue and we’re working very hard to set the record straight as soon as we can,” said Christopher Field, co-chairman of the panel’s section that was responsible for the report, which deals with impacts, adaptation and vulnerability.

He noted that the potentially erroneous figure in question had appeared only in the panel’s full report of more than 1,000 pages and had been omitted in later summary documents that the panel produced to guide policy. The summaries said only that the Himalayan glaciers “could decay at very rapid rates” if warming continued. Such documents are produced after panel members review a full-length report, although if a figure in the report is deemed to be in error, it is supposed to be removed.

Still, the revelation is the latest in a string of events that climate change skeptics have seized on to support their contention that fears about warming are unfounded, or at least overblown. Late last year, hackers obtained private e-mail messages from leading researchers at the University of East Anglia in England suggesting they were altering the presentation of some data in a way that emphasized the human influence on climate change.

Exhibit: A

Meeting Date: 2/9/10

Received By: D. Gismann

14

2/3/2010 1:53 AM

The flawed estimate raises more questions about the panel's vetting procedures than it does about the melting of Himalayan glaciers, which most scientists believe is a major problem. But the panel's reports are the basis for global policy and their conclusions are widely heeded.

"The Himalayan glaciers will not disappear by 2035 — that is an overstatement," said Dr. Bodo Bookhagen, an assistant professor at the University of California at Santa Barbara who studies the effect of climate change at high altitudes. "That number somehow got incorporated into the I.P.C.C. report, and that probably shouldn't have happened."

Still, he added: "It is very clear that there is glacier retreat and that it has devastating impact."

There is mounting proof that accelerating glacial melt is occurring, although the specifics are poorly defined, in part because these glaciers are remote and poorly studied.

At an international conference last year on Asia's glaciers, held at the University of California, San Diego, Yao Tandong, a Chinese glaciologist who specializes in the Tibetan Plateau, said, "Studies indicate that by 2030 another 30 percent will disappear; by 2050, 40 percent; and by the end of the century 70 percent." He added: "Actually we don't know much about process and impacts of the disappearance. That's why we need an international effort."

Copyright 2010 The New York Times Company.

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Terms of Service](#) | [Search](#) | [Corrections](#) | [RSS](#) | [First Look](#) | [Help](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Work for Us](#) | [Site Map](#)

15

Exhibit A, 2/9/10 2/3/2010 1:53 AM



# Vanpool Program Review & Fare Proposal

Exhibit:

C

Meeting Date:

2/9/10

Received By:

D. Genmann





# Program Update

- **May 2009: 6 Vans in service  
(inherited from prior program)**
- **December 2009: 9 Vans in service**
- **Growth: 1-Intra Clark County Van  
2 Clark-Cowlitz County Vans**



## **Program Update** *continued...*

- **All “Growth” vans service CTR work sites**
- **Recruited several riders for existing vans**
- **Statewide, vanpool declined by about 150 vans**



# Marketing Efforts

- **Employer hosted events: Boeing, Providence Health, Vigor Industrial, Daimler.**
- **Clark County Employee Transportation Coordinators (CTR)**



# **Marketing Efforts** *continued...*

- **Economic conditions:**
  - **Job Loss**
  - **2008 Fuel Price spikes**
  - **Potential groups hesitant**



# Future Marketing Efforts

- **Employer Brochure**
- **Incentives**
- **Work Site Events**
- **Oregon Mailing**
- **Employer-Specific Programs**

# 2009 VS. 2010 FARE COMPARISON

Round Trip Miles	2009	2010	Total Increase in \$	% Increase	Increase per Rider
<b>Mini-Van</b>					
40	\$544.47	\$589.20	\$44.73	8%	\$7.46
60	\$606.23	\$663.33	\$57.10	9%	\$9.52
80	\$668.00	\$737.46	\$69.46	10%	\$11.58
<b>Full Size Van</b>					
40	\$683.51	\$758.52	\$75.01	11%	\$7.50
60	\$758.51	\$848.53	\$90.02	12%	\$9
80	\$833.51	\$938.53	\$105.02	13%	\$10.50

## C-TRAN/TriMet Fare Reciprocity

### C-TRAN All Zone traveler example

One way : 4<sup>th</sup> Plain → transfer to MAX/Delta Park → transfer to MAX/Beaverton = 3 rides

Round Trip: MAX/Beaverton → transfer to MAX/Delta Park → transfer to 4<sup>th</sup> Plain = 3 rides

Total = 6 rides on that day, but what if they are traveling for work 20 days a month then = 120 rides per month

- Customer Perspective – 120 rides per month @ \$30 per month = Good Value
- TriMet Perspective – 80 rides were within TriMet @ about \$1 per ride = \$80 from C-TRAN
- C-TRAN Perspective – \$30 revenue less \$80 owed to TriMet = \$50 deficit

### Regional travel ridership

Floor	Ceiling
1,500,000 annual rides	3,000,000 annual rides
C-TRAN 500,000	C-TRAN 500,000
TriMet 1,000,000	TriMet 2,500,000

### Impacts 27% of our monthly pass buyers = 1,670 customers per month

- Senior/Disabled/Youth Fare = 1,300 customers per month
- Adult Fare = 150 customers per month
- Low Income Fare = 220 customers per month

### Options for Monthly Pass Buyers (Customer Perspective)

- Buy regional monthly pass at an increased rate
  - Senior/Disabled/Youth Fare – Breakeven is 37 cash rides per month
  - Adult Fare – Breakeven is 42 cash rides per month
  - Low Income Fare – Breakeven is 42 cash rides per month
- Buy C-Zone monthly pass, pay cash when transferring to TriMet
  - Senior/Disabled/Youth Fare – Best value when riding fewer than 6 round trips into TriMet's system
  - Adult Fare – Best value when riding fewer than 10 round trips into TriMet's system
  - Low Income Fare – Best value when riding fewer than 15 round trips into TriMet's system

Exhibit:

Meeting Date:

Received By:

23

2/9/10

D. G. Hermann