

July 30, 2001

TO: LTD Board of Directors

FROM: Diane Hellekson, Finance Manager

SUBJECT: Preliminary June Financial Report

Attached for your review is the preliminary financial report for the fiscal year that ended on June 30, 2001. As many Board members are aware, LTD is required by statute to make a financial report available to its Board on or before July 31 for the previous fiscal year. As has been previously reported, the intent of this statute appears to ensure that boards get at least one financial report per year. It is impossible for even the smallest of properties to provide audited or even final results in the time allowed. Therefore, LTD has met the letter of the law by providing preliminary results and will follow up with audited reports when the independent audit work has been completed.

Remaining transactions and adjustments include depreciation of assets, year-end accruals for vacation and sick leave, year-end revenue accruals, and various expense adjustments. These transactions will not materially impact the income statements.

While the information, when final, will be covered with the Board in detail, some preliminary observations are offered at this time:

General Fund Revenue

- As has been noted throughout FY 2000-01, **passenger fare revenue** has been below expectations. Since ridership has grown in the same period, it is apparent that more passengers are using prepaid fare instruments. Research has determined that approximately 70 percent of LTD's fixed-route passengers use passes or tokens, more than twice what is typical in most transit districts. The health of the group pass program supports this conclusion. **Group pass revenue** grew more than 14 percent in the last fiscal year.
- **Payroll tax revenue** appears to be below budget for the year, a result that was not anticipated. An investigation is underway to determine why LTD received no distributions from the Oregon Department of Revenue during the month of June. It is probable that distribution timing had an impact on the negative variance. However, it is also possible that the weaker local economy is affecting payroll tax payments. In the new fiscal year, the Hynix plant closure will have a material, negative effect on this important resource. It will also affect group pass revenue. The extent of this effect will depend on whether the plant is reopened and employees rehired. LTD's local revenue also was negatively affected by the Komag plant closure in recent months. More information will be provided to the Board at the next regular meeting.

- **Interest income**, which was budgeted low as a contingency to offset tax revenue should the economic slowdown be worse than anticipated, served the purpose. Total revenue was \$420,000 over budget for the fiscal year.

General Fund Expense

- As previously noted, year-end accruals for personnel services expenses have not yet been posted. However, savings in **administration wages** are expected to fully mitigate a slight negative variance in **Amalgamated Transit Union employee wages** due to the implementation of new contract provisions.
- High diesel **fuel prices** resulted in a negative budget variance of more than \$100,000 in the Fleet Services department. Positive variances in other department budgets more than compensated for the Fleet overage. The FY 2001-02 budget for fuel was substantially increased to more realistically reflect fuel market conditions.
- In order to meet projected operating requirements for the next three years, the remaining **transfer to capital** balance was not moved to the Capital Fund at year-end, as has traditionally been the case. The amount \$4,254,817 was transferred from General Fund reserves to Capital Fund reserves at the beginning of FY 2000-01, and an additional \$1,319,241 was transferred to meet federal grant-matching requirements and to fund current-year capital projects.

Should anyone have questions about this material before the final information is formally presented to the Board, please do not hesitate to ask. My direct telephone number at LTD is 682-6151.

DH/crt

Attachments

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, June 20, 2001

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 15, 2001, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, June 20, 2001, at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Hillary Wylie, President
Rob Bennett, Vice President
Gerry Gaydos
Dave Kleger, Treasurer
Robert Melnick
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Virginia Lauritsen, Board Secretary
Pat Hocken

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Hillary Wylie called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT/ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA: No comments, announcements, or additions to the agenda were made.

WORK SESSION – Presentation of Los Angeles, California, Metro Rapid: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano said that Los Angeles had implemented a two-line Metro Rapid system as a bus signal priority demonstration program. Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn, Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner, and Mr. Viggiano recently had visited the Metro Rapid in Los Angeles. Mr. Viggiano thought that program would provide some valuable background information to the Board on the impact of BRT-type enhancements to bus service. The operating environments of Los Angeles and Eugene were substantially different, but the results of the Los Angeles project provided useful information as LTD moved forward with its BRT project.

Mr. Viggiano said that the Metro Rapid lines operating in Los Angeles utilized some of the proposed BRT features, including simple route layout, frequent service, headway-based schedules, less frequent stops, and bus signal priority. Even though the system used bus signal priority, the buses did not use an exclusive lane, so any traffic ahead of the bus benefited from the signal priority as well.

The Metro Rapid featured 40-seat, low-floor buses with a special exterior image. The three station designs featured overhead protection without blocking sidewalks or interfering with adjacent properties and a real-time, “next bus” display.

Mr. Bennett asked if the "next bus" displays were expensive. Mr. Viggiano said that they were not too expensive, but an automatic vehicle locator (AVL) system had to be in place, and depending on the type of system used, that part of it was expensive. Los Angeles used hard-wiring along the route to locate buses as opposed to a satellite locating system.

Mr. Pangborn said that the bus stops along the Metro Rapid were spaced one mile apart to speed up the bus movement. Ms. Wylie asked if park and ride lots were located along or at either end of the routes. Mr. Pangborn said that the area in which the routes operated was too dense for a park and ride lot. Another unique feature of the Metro Rapid was that local service was maintained along the Metro Rapid corridor. Mr. Pangborn said that stop lights were spaced farther apart, every three to four blocks, and the blocks were longer than in Eugene.

Mr. Viggiano said that the signal priority system in use by Metro Rapid did not use queue jumpers to allow buses to get to the front of traffic. Their goal for Phase 2 of the Metro Rapid was for exclusive bus lanes. Mr. Bennett asked how Los Angeles planned to acquire the exclusive bus lanes, and if there was a time frame to complete future phases. Mr. Viggiano said that those issues had not been resolved. Los Angeles originally had a plan for an extensive rail system, but it was deemed too expensive. BRT, in combination with continued rail expansion, was what Los Angeles was touting as the future of transit in that area.

Mr. Viggiano said that the Wilshire-Whittier Rapid corridor, which operated between Santa Monica and East Los Angeles, was 26 miles long with 30 stations. The original plan was to operate 58 weekday peak buses with 3-minute peak and 10-minute off-peak and weekend service. The ridership had increased 33 percent, and, currently, 71 weekday peak buses provided 2.5-minute peak frequency.

The Ventura Rapid corridor operated from Warner Center to Universal City. It was 16 miles long with 15 stations. The original plan was to operate 16 weekday peak buses with 10-minute peak and 12-minute off-peak and weekend service. The ridership along that corridor had increased 26 percent, and, currently, 22 weekday peak buses were in operation, and the 10-minute peak frequency was maintained.

The Metro Rapid program has been successful, and all program objectives have been met. Passenger travel times on the Wilshire corridor had been reduced by 29 percent and by 23 percent on the Ventura corridor. One of the objectives was to attract new riders, and surveys had shown that one-third of the ridership increase was new riders, one-third was current riders riding more often, and one-third was current riders who had changed routes to use the Metro Rapid.

Mr. Viggiano added that Los Angeles was interested in the same type bus that LTD was seeking for BRT, as well as in the left-side door option that would be utilized with median stations. Mr. Bennett asked about the issues Los Angeles faced with regard to acquiring exclusive lanes. Mr. Viggiano said that the issues primarily were loss of parking and access to businesses. Operating buses in the median would have restricted cross traffic and left turns. Los Angeles currently was looking at just removing parking during the peak hours.

Mr. Pangborn said that staff had wanted the Board to see this presentation, because it depicted how just a piece of BRT could have very successful results. It also showed that

exclusive right-of-way (ROW) was a key piece of making BRT a total success. Mr. Viggiano added that Los Angeles realized that exclusive ROW would be needed to further enhance the system, and was working toward that in the next phase of the project.

Mr. Melnick asked if the study of Metro Rapid had caused staff to think further or differently about LTD's BRT plan. Mr. Viggiano said that Metro Rapid showed the results of what LTD could have achieved if it used just those BRT attributes that Los Angeles had used. The Metro Rapid experience also showed that it was important to take the steps now to get exclusive ROW, which would help down the road.

Mr. Gaydos asked if Los Angeles had used an extensive public involvement process. Mr. Viggiano said that Metro Rapid was planned with little public involvement, as the first phase would have little impact along the corridors. Mr. Gaydos was said that he was concerned about not meeting the expectation of the public.

Mr. Viggiano added that the Metro Rapid had resulted from a very strong partnership with the Los Angeles transit authority and the City of Los Angeles, and phase one of the project had very strong political support. Because regular, local service continued to operate along the same corridors, Los Angeles had not yet realized any savings with the Metro Rapid system, but the system had been well received.

BREEZE UPDATE: Service Planning Manager Andy Vobora said that the written update could be found beginning on page 151 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He discussed how and why the name "Breeze Around Town" had been selected. He presented an illustration of the painted bus with the logo, and a mock-up of the *Breeze* bus stops that would be placed along the route. He reported that the hybrid-electric buses that had been ordered for the shuttle would begin arriving in late July or early August. One of the buses would be on display at the Lane County Fair.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that her report could be found on page 168 of the Board meeting agenda packet. She highlighted some of the information contained in her written report. She added that since the writing of her report, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation had released its list of earmarks, and LTD had not been named. It was hoped that LTD would be named a recipient in the Senate appropriations process.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT: Mr. Hamm said that his written report was located on page 130 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He added that staff had been paying close attention to the local discussions about the expansion of Sacred Heart Hospital. He had discussed with Sacred Heart staff the importance of transit consideration in the location of the hospital. Mr. Hamm reported also that the City of Eugene would maintain the office and community service officer at the Eugene Station and had planned to add an officer to the mid-town area.

Mr. Bennett asked about LTD's involvement in the possible reopening of West Broadway Street. Mr. Vobora said that LTD had provided comments about the desired accommodations for transit services. Actual design work would not begin until the results of the election in September were known, and LTD would be involved at that time.

MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – MAY 2001 FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson referred to the financial report located on page 140 of the Board meeting agenda packet and highlighted some of the information contained in the report.

FAMILIES IN GOOD COMPANY RECOGNITION AND AWARD: Human Resources Manager Dave Dickman referred to page 131 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He said that LTD had been named one of ten companies from around the state to demonstrate dedication to families and community. He presented a plaque to the Board of Directors.

BOARD ACTIVITY CALENDARS – SCHEDULE FALL STRATEGIC PLANNING WORK SESSION: Executive Assistant Jo Sullivan said that the calendars could be found on page 132 of the Board meeting agenda packet. After calendars were checked, the fall strategic planning work session was scheduled for November 16 and 17, 2001.

Ms. Wylie suggested canceling the July 2001 regular Board meeting due to lack of business. Other Board members agreed, and the July 2001 regular Board meeting was canceled. The August 2001 Board meeting would be held as scheduled.

Ms. Wylie noted that the LTD Bus Roadeo and annual employee picnic would be held in July, and she encouraged Board members to attend each of these events.

Mr. Kleger suggested that the November regular Board meeting, scheduled for November 21, 2001, be moved to Wednesday, November 14, as the 21st was the day before the Thanksgiving holiday. Other Board members agreed, and the date of November 14 was tentatively selected.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH – JULY 2001: Bus Operator Marcia Maffei was selected as the July 2001 Employee of the Month. Ms. Maffei was hired on August 3, 1987, and had earned awards for seven years of safe driving, good attendance, and Correct Schedule Operation. Ms. Maffei was a member of LTD's Take Care Committee and the Accessible Issues Committee. She was nominated by a guest who said that Ms. Maffei always had a wonderful smile and tried to make accommodations for all of her passengers. The guest added that Ms. Maffei was very patient and worked well with varying groups of guests and with those who have special needs.

Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson introduced Ms. Maffei to the Board and said that Ms. Maffei was a pleasure to work with, and that she worked hard to make LTD a better place. As a member of the Take Care Committee, Ms. Maffei would be representing LTD at a Wellness Conference in Seaside, Oregon.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Ms. Maffei and presented her with an Employee of the Month lapel pin, a plaque, a letter of commendation, and a monetary award. Ms. Maffei thanked the Board.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No one in the audience wished to address the Board.

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Bennett called attention to the draft minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting. He said that on page 32, where the Board discussed the Budget Committee process, the recorder had not captured correctly what he had tried to

communicate, and he asked that the minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting be changed to better reflect his intent.

Because the Board held discussions throughout the year regarding budgetary issues, he felt that he was very informed, and he had been prepared for and had looked forward to a discussion of the issues with other Budget Committee members. His concern was not about a lack of information or understanding as a Board member. In hindsight, because some of the budget policy and strategy was changing, it might have helped him to have been presented a worse-case scenario on issues such as BRT, capital funding, or payroll tax revenues for further discussion. Other than that, however, he felt that he as a Board member was kept very much up to date and that the financial work done at LTD was very strong.

The minutes of the May 16, 2001, Board meeting would be revised to better reflect Mr. Bennett's intent and would be presented for Board approval at the next Board meeting.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Kleger then moved adoption of the following resolution:, "LTD Resolution No. 2001-020: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for June 20, 2001, with the exception of the minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting, is approved as presented." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote, with Bennett, Melnick, Gaydos, Kleger, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. The June 20, 2001, Consent Calendar, as revised, consisted of the minutes of the May 14, 2001, special joint meeting with the Springfield City Council; a resolution amending consolidated application ranking sheet for Special Transportation proposals to the State of Oregon; Special Transportation Fund Advisory Committee Membership recommendations; and a resolution reaffirming the District Boundaries for FY 2001-02. The approval of the minutes of the May 16, 2001, regular Board meeting would be postponed until the next regular Board meeting.

ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2001-2002 BUDGET: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson pointed out that there was a typographical error in the proposed motion found on page 45 of the Board meeting agenda packet. The total budget appropriation was listed as \$81,303,240,922, but should have been listed at \$81,303,240. Ms. Hellekson provided a brief review of the proposed budget. She noted that there were two changes, resulting in an increase of \$1.8 million to the proposed budget that had occurred since the Budget Committee review. The shuttle vehicles that were ordered earlier in Fiscal Year 2000-01 would not be received until after July 1, 2001, which would require the appropriation in the current year to roll over into FY 2001-02. Also, the financial systems conversion project expected to be completed by July 1 actually would begin on that date, requiring \$200,000 of current-year capital appropriations to roll forward. The changes were within Oregon budget law and did not require additional action on the part of the Budget Committee. The total approved budget appropriation presented for adoption was \$81,303,204.

Mr. Melnick asked about the \$3.5 million reserves in the General Fund. Ms. Hellekson said that the reserves had been growing, and previous Board policy allowed for 25 to 40 percent of the operating budget to be held in reserves. The new policy, implemented in FY 2000-01, set a minimum of \$3 million in total reserves, but could fluctuate some, and would cover self insurance, payroll for a period, and an operating contingency.

The Board also decided that given LTD's very aggressive capital agenda, reserves should be built in the fund where they would be most needed. Staff were attempting to simultaneously build reserves in both the Capital and General Funds. Mr. Melnick said that he thought the reserve policy was appropriate, and it made sense to tie the reserves to certain events.

Public Hearing: No one in the audience wished to address the Board.

Board Deliberation: Mr. Kleger said that staff again had presented a reasonable budget that addressed the needs of the community within the available resources. He thanked staff for their hard work in producing the budget on time and presenting it clearly.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved approval of the following resolution: "Lane Transit District Resolution No. 2001-023 adopting the LTD Fiscal Year 2001-2002 budget and appropriating \$81,303,240 as represented in the Resolution." Mr. Gaydos seconded the motion.

Mr. Melnick said that this had been his first LTD budget process. He thought that the budget reflected current operations, future thinking and growth, yet with cautious elements that he thought were appropriate. Mr. Gaydos said that it was good that the Board approved the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR), which he hoped would show a dramatic impact. One of the concerns that he heard in the community was with regard to the payroll tax. He thought the public needed to hear more about the benefits of the transit system and BRT. The budget did a good job of communicating those benefits to those who understood it, but not to the community as a whole.

VOTE

There was no further discussion, and a vote was taken by voice on the motion, which carried by unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

APPROVAL OF REMAINING MPC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TRANSPLAN:

Capital Grants Administrator Lisa Gardner said that all jurisdictions were taking action, and the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Board would be taking action on the federal plan. Mr. Bennett asked if Eugene and Springfield had agreed to disagree on some of the issues. Mr. Viggiano said that was true on some issues, but the two cities were in agreement on most issues.

MOTION

Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "Lane Transit District Resolution No. 2001-024: Resolved that the Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby approves policy changes for TransPlan, as proposed by the Metropolitan Policy Committee and included in the May 10, 2001, LCOG TransPlan materials." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Kleger commented that there were many times when he doubted that this time would come, but he was happy to get to this point after seven years, with the only disagreement coming around fairly small issues. The financing of transportation in our community was not in conformance with the philosophy in TransPlan, not because jurisdictions did not want it to be that way, but because of regulations. The community was told by state and federal authorities to write the plan, but was not getting control of the money to carry out the plan.

There was no further discussion. A vote was taken, and the motion carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

BRT PHASE 1 APPROVAL: Mr. Viggiano said that all partner agencies had approved the BRT Phase 1 package. Staff were now asking the Board to approve the Phase 1 project as a whole. The Board previously had approved individual segments. The approval also would authorize the general manager to take action to execute contracts on behalf of LTD. The Environmental Assessment (EA) had not yet been approved. The EA currently was out for a 30-day comment period. Staff expected to have final approval by August 1, and further action was contingent upon that approval. At a later meeting, the Board would be asked to pass a resolution to go forward with required land purchases. This approval would allow LTD to hire a design contractor.

Mr. Kleger wondered if it would be possible for the Board to approve a resolution regarding acquisition of the property by telephone polling rather than having to get the members together, if that were the only business item to come up in August. Ms. Sullivan said that a meeting by conference call could be called, and at least one Board member would need to be present and the others would be polled by telephone.

Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-025: It is resolved that the LTD Board approves the BRT Phase 1 Project, as described in the attached description, with the project to proceed once final environmental approval is received from the Federal Transit Administration. The general manager is authorized to execute all necessary contracts to implement the BRT Phase 1 Project." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

MOTION

VOTE

SPRINGFIELD STATION SITE SELECTION: Mr. Viggiano said that he had nothing to add to the written report found on page 104 of the Board meeting agenda packet. Mr. Kleger asked if the Springfield City Council had any further questions or concerns. Mr. Viggiano replied that there had been none, and the Council had unanimously approved the site.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Gaydos moved that the Board adopt LTD Resolution No. 2001-026, a Resolution declaring the public necessity to acquire property for the construction of the Springfield Transit Station. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

MOTION

VOTE

DEBT POLICY: Ms. Hellekson said that the Board Finance Committee and LTD's attorney had reviewed the proposed debt policy and were very comfortable with the wording to more than adequately protect all parties, and it committed LTD to a very strong fiduciary position. The Board Finance Committee had met and reviewed the policy and were comfortable with it.

Ms. Hellekson asked the Board to consider an important aspect of the policy. Debt financing was a new arena for LTD, but a necessary one for bus acquisitions. There were some timing issues to be considered. Assuming the policy was approved, staff would act

quickly to consider options for financing. If a decision was made to lease buses, staff would do nothing for a year, but if a bank loan or bonds were used for financing, the rates currently were at a very favorable level, and staff would want to move quickly. A major national bank was willing to lend LTD up to \$9,999,000 (anything over \$10 million would have arbitrage implications) on good faith and would not keep the titles to the buses. General obligation bonds would require a vote. If the Board was comfortable with the policy, Ms. Hellekson asked if the members also would be comfortable delegating to the general manager the authority to act if the business case was strong to do so before the Board met again.

Mr. Gaydos said that he supported the policy, and he was comfortable with giving the general manager the authority to act on LTD's behalf. LTD had a strong sense of stewardship. He supported delegating authority to two staff members, the general manager and finance manager, and he suggested that a mechanism be in place for regular reporting back to the Board in the interim between Board meetings. He did not think it was necessary to call a full meeting.

Mr. Melnick said that he supported the policy. LTD had been fairly conservative and cautious about debt financing. He also recognized that 60 days in a market was way too long to wait for approval from the Board. He understood the need for approval of delegations. Mr. Kleger said that he supported the policy and delegating authority.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger then moved approval of LTD Resolution No. 2001-027, adopting a debt policy for Lane Transit District. Mr. Melnick seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett asked about the local match ratio. Ms. Hellekson said that if LTD were successful in the federal New Starts grant program, then it would enter into a full-funding grant agreement, where funding would be granted at up to a maximum of 50 percent. Federal funds did not grow along with any growth in costs.

Ms. Hellekson added that bus purchases would use no federal funds up front, but LTD would use federal funds to retire the debt.

VOTE

There being no further discussion, the Board voted on the motion, which carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

MOTION

Mr. Kleger then moved that the Board delegate to the general manager and finance manager the authority to act on the Debt Policy to take advantage of desirable opportunities and that they inform the Board within 90 days when taking such actions. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously by voice vote, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

LOW-FLOOR BUS, ARTICULATED BUS, AND HYBRID-ELECTRIC BUS PURCHASE:
Fleet Services Manager Ron Berkshire said that background information could be found on page 120 of the Board meeting agenda packet. Staff were seeking direction from the Board to procure 5 articulated buses, 18 low-floor buses, and 6 hybrid-electric buses to be used as fleet replacement.

Mr. Bennett asked if Gillig was the only manufacturer. Mr. Berkshire said that there were other manufacturers, but LTD had an existing contract with Gillig. Also, it was

important to receive a product that LTD was familiar with. Mr. Berkshire did not think that any other manufacturers had a better product.

Mr. Berkshire noted that staff would prefer to move ahead with hybrid-electric buses; however, the heavy-duty, hybrid-electric buses were not yet available. It was expected that they would be available by the year 2004.

Mr. Bennett said that he appreciated the comments about Gillig, and asked if Gillig was also the manufacturer of the articulated buses. Mr. Berkshire said that Gillig did not build articulated buses, but LTD would prefer to tag onto an existing contract with another agency, if the specifications met LTD's needs.

Mr. Bennett said that he was concerned about not looking at other manufacturers for the 18 low-floor buses and not getting appropriate competitive pricing. Mr. Berkshire said that staff would be comparing Gillig's proposed price with prices from other manufacturers. Mr. Hamm added that several years ago, the Board approved a multi-year purchase agreement with Gillig. There was one purchase left before that agreement expired. The majority of the fleet was Gillig buses, and because of the purchasing agreement, LTD could forego the competitive process and get its order into the manufacturing line right away rather than waiting for the competitive bidding process. Staff would compare prices to ensure that Gillig's price was consistent with the market.

Mr. Berkshire reiterated that the Board's action would direct staff to proceed with the procurement process. Staff would then begin the analysis work of preparing to purchase the buses, which would include the cost comparisons. The Board would take action at a later date to give staff the authorization to sign contracts for the purchases.

Mr. Melnick asked about the impacts of buying articulated buses on LTD's maintenance and bus storage facilities. Mr. Berkshire said that LTD would need an immediate expenditure of a six-point hoist. Staff were analyzing what would be needed in the shop with the addition of the articulated buses and the BRT vehicles.

Mr. Kleger said that LTD had acquired some used articulated buses to be used for sport shuttles, which would give LTD some experience. He asked if manufacturers were moving forward on the size of the hybrid-electric buses. Mr. Berkshire said that the hybrid-electric technology had yet to be proven. AVS was the only manufacturer that was aggressive in the market place. AVS had developed 30- and 35-foot hybrid-electric buses, and was now developing a 40-foot bus. LTD wanted to get some experience with the shuttle buses before deciding to move forward with the more heavy-duty buses.

Mr. Hamm said that from a technology standpoint, staff would prefer to wait until the hybrid, heavy-duty bus was tried in the marketplace to see what the other manufacturers might do. Even though staff were seeking Board approval to begin the process to purchase six 30-foot hybrid-electric buses, staff would put off the purchase in order to gain experience with the hybrid-electric technology.

Mr. Kleger asked if the motion should be revised to include 6 heavy-duty hybrid buses, just so staff would not be limited to 30-footers if the market changed.

Mr. Bennett asked if a figure for the sale of the replaced buses was reflected in the budget. Ms. Hellekson said that those buses were not worth much, about \$2,000 each, by the time LTD retired them. Mr. Bennett also asked if LTD planned to offer external advertising on the 22-foot hybrid-electric buses. Mr. Hamm said that no exterior advertising was being planned on the new shuttle buses. The advertising contract specified the number of buses available for advertising space.

Mr. Melnick added that students at the UO were designing a prototype for non-usable buses for cleaning them out and redesigning them for homeless housing. He commended Mr. Berkshire and Mr. Pangborn for their assistance to the students. The students also were talking to people in the community to determine the need. If the project moved forward, it would be a great win-win situation for both LTD and the UO for public service. Mr. Berkshire added that the students had visited LTD to measure the buses, then came back at the end of the term to show their ideas. There were many interesting concepts.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution, "LTD Resolution No. 2001-028: It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board directs staff to begin the procurement process for five articulated buses, six heavy-duty hybrid-electric buses, and eighteen low-floor buses to replace buses that have exceeded their life expectancy, and to return to the Board for authority to purchase the buses." Mr. Melnick second the motion, which carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEE PERSONNEL POLICY HANDBOOK: Mr. Dickman said that the Board had received individual copies of the proposed handbook, and the background information could be found on page 123 of the Board meeting agenda packet. He reviewed the major changes that had a fiscal impact, including the addition of one holiday, including holiday hours as "time worked" in the calculation for overtime, and increasing the amount of annual educational assistance available to employees from \$200 per year to \$500 per year for approved programs.

MOTION Mr. Gaydos moved the following resolution: "LTD Resolution No. 2001-029: The Lane Transit District Board of Directors hereby ratifies and adopts the revised *Administrative Employee Personnel Policy Handbook*, as presented, and further authorizes the general manager to make future amendments and implement these amended policies as may be needed as a result of law, efficiency, or minor correction." Mr. Melnick seconded the motion.

Mr. Gaydos noted that the Board Human Resources Committee had changed the motion to reflect that the Board should not have to deal with those amendments that were required by law. The HR Committee believed the handbook created a sense of fairness and was part of what made LTD a good family place.

Mr. Kleger said that he personally had been involved in the writing of employee handbooks, and he had not seen as clean a job of writing as this handbook. He thanked staff for their hard work on this document

VOTE There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the motion, which carried unanimously, with Bennett, Gaydos, Kleger, Melnick, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: a) **Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):** The MPC did not meet in June.

b) **BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee:** Mr. Hamm said that the committee members had discussed the role of the steering committee and the membership of the committee. There was general discussion about adding an additional citizen member from each of the two cities or potentially from the county. There was enthusiasm to retain the current membership. The committee members discussed the focus of the committee, and the members stated their desire to have oversight of BRT considerations both in Eugene and in Springfield, much like a regional oversight committee.

Ms. Wylie added that the committee members wanted to continue to meet and continue to represent all the jurisdictions.

Mr. Viggiano reminded the Board that the BRT Steering Committee was an advisory committee to the LTD Board, and the Board appointed the committee members. The Steering Committee would meet again in early September.

c) **Statewide Livability Forum:** No meeting had been held in June.

d) **Board Finance Committee:** Ms. Hellekson said that the committee had debriefed the budget process and discussed the Debt Policy and the New Start Program timeline. Mr. Bennett asked if staff believed the New Start Program was a probability for LTD. Ms. Hellekson said that staff were learning all they could about the potential of the program and how it might apply to the BRT project.

e) **Board Human Resources Committee:** Mr. Gaydos said that the committee met in early June, and the bulk of the discussion was about the update of the Personnel Policy Handbook. The Committee had a good discussion and appreciated Mr. Kleger's thorough review of the handbook.

f) **West-Eugene Parkway (WEP):** Mr. Gaydos attended a meeting sponsored by ODOT and the City of Eugene. Bill Glosser, a past member of the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) facilitated the meeting. ODOT, the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA), and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) were well represented, as were the Cities and County. The goal of the meeting was to look at the WEP situation and attempt to find solutions. The first day consisted of a series of presentations to bring participants to a common ground. The second day consisted of discussion among the participants, and Mr. Gaydos was impressed by how many people stressed the importance of LTD to the community in addressing congestion issues.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) suggested the alternative to build a continuation of Beltline that hooked directly into 6th & 7th Avenues. The City of Eugene was favoring improvements for West 11th Avenue, and LTD was mentioned often. The thoroughfare concept was brought up, where West 11th Avenue would remain in the middle, and two side streets would be built to carry the local traffic.

g) **LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan Trustees:** Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn said that LTD had two pension trust plans – The LTD Salaried Employees

Retirement Plan and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU)/LTD Pension Plan. The Trustees for the ATU/LTD plan included Mr. Hamm, Ms. Wylie, and two representatives from the ATU. The salaried plan Trustees were Ms. Wylie, Mr. Hamm, and Mr. Pangborn. The Trustees for the salaried plan met on May 31, 2001. Mr. Pangborn provided a description of the two pension plans.

LTD had not, in the history of the LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan, sought new professional advisors until recently. Requests for Quotes (RFQ) were issued for a trust investment firm, trust attorney, trust actuarial, trust auditor, and trust administrator. The Trustees reviewed the RFQs that were received. There had been no competition for the investment firm, Columbia Trust. The Trustees selected Grove, Mueller, & Swank as the trust auditor. Milliman & Robertson was retained as the trust actuarial, and had proposed that LTD become the plan's own administrator. With the appropriate software, LTD could administer the trust, but that process had not yet been analyzed, so, no change in trust administrator was being made at this time. Two quotes were received for trust actuarial, and the Trustees had selected Milliman USA, based both on cost and service. Milliman USA was a leading actuarial firm for public plans in the Northwest. Four legal firms had submitted quotes for legal services, and two local firms would be interviewed.

2001-2002 PACIFIC PROGRAM: Mr. Pangborn said that the Pacific Program would hold its fall session on October 6 through 13, 2001, in Welches, Oregon. The Pacific Program was a week-long, intensive management training course that had been designed by Jeff Luke and focused on public sector management. It was an excellent program, and if Board members were interested in additional information, Mr. Pangborn could provide additional material.

2001 LTD BUS ROADEO AND EMPLOYEE PICNIC: Ms. Wylie reminded the Board that the LTD Bus Roadeo would be held on Sunday, July 22, and the LTD Employee Picnic would be held on Sunday, July 30. She encouraged Board members to participate in the Bus Roadeo and to attend the picnic.

ADJOURNMENT: There were no further discussions, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:38 p.m.

Board Secretary