

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, March 17, 1993

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 11, 1993, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the regular monthly meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, March 17, 1993, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Jack Billings
Janet Calvert
Tammy Fitch, Vice President
Patricia Hocken
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary
Keith Parks, President, presiding
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Peter Brandt, Treasurer

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Parks introduced the March Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Judy Rose. Ms. Rose was hired as a part-time bus operator in December 1991 and promoted to full-time in November 1992. In February 1993, she received an award for exceptional attendance, and in March received her first commendation for one year's correct schedule operation (CSO). She was nominated by a customer who said that Ms. Rose is a good driver and shows concern for her riders, always greeting them with a smile and helping as much as she can. When asked what makes Ms. Rose a good employee, Transportation Administrator Bob Hunt said that Judy takes great pride in her work and maintains high standards of job performance, and her focus is always on her customers.

Mr. Parks presented Ms. Rose with her certificate and check, and thanked her for her excellent service.

CONSENT CALENDAR: The Consent Calendar for the meeting included approval of the minutes of the February 17, 1993, work session and the February 17, 1993, regular Board meeting, and selection of the District's financial audit firm. Mr. Billings moved approval of the Consent Calendar. Ms. Fitch seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

MOTION
VOTE

FIRST READING--LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT ORDINANCE NO. 36, AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING REGULATIONS FOR USE OF DISTRICT FACILITIES AND PROVIDING REMEDIES FOR VIOLATIONS THEREOF: Mr. Loobey stated that copies of the ordinance

were available for any member of the audience who wished one. She explained that District Counsel Randall Bryson had corresponded with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) since Ed Spinney raised concerns about the ordinance on the ACLU's behalf at the February Board meeting. A section on fare evasion had been added to the ordinance, to deal with circumstances in which someone is continuously not paying for service, is using counterfeit fare instruments, or is misusing any of the District's fare instruments.

MOTION It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that the reading of Ordinance
VOTE No. 36 be held by title only. Ms. Loobey read the title: "Lane Transit District Ordinance No. 36, An ordinance establishing regulations for use of District facilities and providing remedies for violations thereof."

Ms. Loobey said that the administrative rules that would be drawn up by staff to implement the Ordinance would be brought to the Board for review. Ms. Fitch asked if she was correct in believing that it was not LTD's policy to keep someone from riding the bus for a one-time occurrence with a lost transfer or similar problem. Andy Vobora, Customer Service Administrator, said that was correct, and that bus operators were given the flexibility to use good judgment in those instances. Also, he said, youth would never be excluded from a trip on the bus. Ms. Loobey added that if there were continuing problems with a youngster or group of youngsters, there would be conversations with his or her parents, the school, etc.

Mr. Billings referred to Section 1.02(3) Repulsive Odors, and said he did not know how successfully the District would demonstrate that someone had a grossly repulsive odor. He also noted that there was no subsection (5) in that section; the Ordinance jumped from (4) to (6). Mr. Bryson said that correcting the numbering was not a substantial change and could be done without requiring an additional reading of the ordinance. Tri-Met did not have a "repulsive odors" exclusion, but did exclude people for repulsive odor based upon its disorderly conduct section, creating a physically offensive condition. Mr. Bryson said that seemed more vague to him than a specific provision against repulsive odors. However, he said LTD could do this the same way Tri-Met does, if the Board preferred. Mr. Montgomery asked what would happen if a bus rider considered a heavy amount of perfume on another rider a repulsive odor, and who would decide whether that was a repulsive odor or not. Mr. Bryson said that ordinarily a supervisor would be called to talk to the person or a care giver and make a determination. It would be a last resort to exclude the person from the bus. He added that repulsive odor was aimed more at the kind of odor that might make a person throw up, and it would be rare for perfume to have that kind of reaction.

Ms. Calvert asked how the District would have jurisdiction over other people's property in park and ride lots. Mr. Bryson said that LTD had limited agreements with those people. Staff had wanted park and ride lots left in the definition of District property in the ordinance for some purposes. He thought it would be difficult to apply all of the ordinance to all park and ride locations, but it was a question of trying to include this in the definition just for certain sections of the ordinance. He said the question would be if the District enforced sections of the ordinance at park and ride lots and the property owner told the District to stop enforcing those sections on that property. Mr. Pangborn said that the District had a contract with the property owners, and in most cases, the property owners wanted LTD's assurance that LTD would maintain some sort of behavior standards for bus riders. Ms. Hocken used the example

of skateboarding being prohibited behavior, but thought that people might not care about someone skateboarding at a church parking lot where the District had a park and ride. Mr. Bryson said that the only problem might occur if bus riders were doing the skateboarding, which could mean that the District would have attracted them to the lot.

Ed Spinney, representing the ACLU, said that the ACLU normally would be commenting on a specific section of an ordinance based on a client's complaint, but in this instance, the acceptability of an entire ordinance was being discussed. He said that some of the issues he raised in his first letter were addressed adequately in the amended ordinance. However, some problems remained. He thought there were constitutional problems with the vagueness aspect of the repulsive odors statement, because it left too much discretion with the person authorized to enforce the ordinance. People with offensive odors included transit customers without access to adequate sanitary facilities, which might lead to offensive body odors. There also could be a situation where a person had been drinking and the alcohol caused a bad odor, but LTD could be in the position of discouraging people who have had too much to drink from making a good decision to ride the bus, rather than driving their cars.

Mr. Spinney commented on the constitutional implications of Section 4(k), concerning canvassing or distributing anything in the District station. Special constitutional protection was afforded to public sidewalks and parks, and the District stations included parts of public sidewalks, where people generally were free to express ideas or distribute campaign literature, or just generally assemble for the common good. He said that a couple of years ago, someone had been told he could not distribute campaign literature at the Lane County Fairgrounds. That ended up in litigation, with the Fairgrounds being told that the person had to be allowed to distribute campaign literature there, because it was constitutionally required.

In regard to physically offensive conditions, in Section 1.02(6)(d), Mr. Spinney said that there was already some Oregon appellate law on what "physically offensive condition" means. If the contention was that "repulsive odor" was a physically offensive condition, it could be left in this section as Tri-Met had done, and the courts could determine if a bad odor is a physically offensive condition.

Another section on which Mr. Spinney commented was the restriction of the use of the District station, so that if a someone were there too long and not waiting for a bus, that person could be asked to leave. He said that sometime free speech issues creep into issues where they don't seem to belong, and that this was the kind of case where, somewhere down the road, someone will be asked to leave a District station because he/she is there trying to express a viewpoint, talking with someone, giving a speech, or assembling with others, and this kind of language can be used to exclude them. Another aspect, he said, was that generally the courts have felt that public property is held in trust by the government for use by the people, and unless the use that it is being put to conflicts with what the government decided it was to be used for, there is difficulty restricting that activity. For instance, if someone set up a band at the federal courthouse and distracted the normal business of the courthouse, that activity would not have to be allowed. However, if a homeless person wanted to sit in the District station to stay warm and dry for awhile and was not bothering anyone, there did not seem to be any reason that the person should not be allowed to do so.

Mr. Spinney said that the constitutional issues were complex, and may have to be dealt with on a case-by-case basis when someone is excluded from the bus and wants to challenge the ordinance.

Mr. Billings said he was interested in the issue of canvassing or collecting money, in Section 1.02(4)(k). He said that Mr. Bryson had cited some cases which concluded that in circumstances of captive audience, there may be some differences in what the governmental body can do to protect that group. He asked Mr. Spinney if he thought Mr. Bryson had misinterpreted these cases, or if he thought that maybe this was not a captive audience. Mr. Spinney said that one of the problems in making a constitutional evaluation was that there were two constitutions to make the determination under, and that generally the Oregon courts were much stricter in interpreting the Oregon constitution than the U.S. Supreme Court. He agreed that Mr. Bryson's statements reflected federal law, but he wasn't sure that the Oregon courts necessarily would follow that. However, he did not know of any cases where an Oregon court had dealt with a captive audience type of situation.

Mr. Bryson said that whether or not an offensive odor was a physically offensive condition had not been litigated by the Oregon courts. He did not think it mattered whether this matter went to the courts for resolution under the physically offensive condition statute or under the offensive odor statute. He thought that leaving it in Section 1.02(3) apprised people better of what they cannot do, but either way, the District could accomplish what it wanted to accomplish. He said that the District was balancing, on one hand, possibly protecting what may be a constitutional right, smelling bad, against the discomfort of other riders. With respect to canvassing, he said he had added a section to contact the General Manager before canvassing, and the General Manager would grant permission if conditions were met on time, place, and manner of canvassing. He thought the District did not necessarily want to open up the transit district to political rallies at any time, because of the possibility that those would block traffic and create hazardous conditions. He suggested that the regulations could be adjusted from time to time to accommodate people, possibly allowing a table set up with a certain number of people in a particular location where it could be seen yet not interfere with the crowd. He thought that the administrative regulations could allow a certain amount of that and still accomplish the District's goals of ensuring that the station is safe and comfortable for bus riders. He said the same was true with letting people gather in a shelter; letting a person sit in a shelter for a while doesn't cause a problem, but if a large number of people take over the shelter so bus riders can't use it, that is a problem.

Ms. Calvert asked if the prohibition against being in the District station longer than an hour would keep anyone from the station who might have missed a bus or otherwise had a long wait for a bus, such as for a rural route. CSC Administrator Andy Vobora said this would be used to address the situations where people were hanging out downtown for eight or ten hours a day, and staff could approach them and find out what bus they were waiting for and let them know they had to be on the next bus to that location. There often were people who waited for the rural buses, and that did not cause problems.

Ms. Loobey said it would be incredibly difficult to try to codify every nuance of human behavior, but staff knew there were certain problem areas that caused concern and a sense of insecurity for many bus riders, and those were the cases staff were trying to deal with in the

ordinance. She said that after the ordinance was adopted, the administrative rules would be prepared and implemented, and there would be no "gestapo" implementation. The same kind of judgment that was being used at the meeting would be used. Staff would work with care givers and families, and the administrative rules would evolve with experience with the ordinance. The ordinance was prepared because staff did need some assistance in order to respond to particular situations, and it had been recommended by law enforcement that the District codify those situations.

Mr. Billings thanked Mr. Spinney for his remarks, because it was helpful to hear the perspective of other than the management point of view. He acknowledged that the District had not made all the changes recommended by Mr. Spinney, but the Board had listened to his suggestions and some changes had been made, and he thought it had been very helpful.

Mr. Parks said that the second reading of Ordinance No. 36 would occur at the April Board meeting.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Parks asked for testimony from the audience on items other than those scheduled for discussion that evening. There was none.

FISCAL YEAR 1993-94 SERVICE CHANGES: Planning Administrator Stefano Viggiano stated that at the February Board meeting, staff had presented some ideas for service changes. In response to public comment at the meeting, more research was done, and some changes in priorities were made. Also, some items were scaled back to meet budget requirements. He then discussed the three items which had changed since February. First, the addition of a 60-minute route to serve VRC, Goodpasture Island Road, and Delta to the Stapp and Lakeridge residential areas generated some public testimony at the February meeting. As a result, the staff recommendation changed so that the route would turn onto Stapp, pull into Lakeridge, and turn around there. Ms. Hocken asked if the gates were always open at Lakeridge. A resident said they closed around 7:00 or 8:00 p.m. Mr. Viggiano said the route would operate until about 5:30 p.m.

The second change was the Willamette Street route. A gentleman had requested that this route serve 52nd Avenue and Solar Heights. Staff had not yet resolved the issue of an adequate turn-around, but there were three options for the route: it could turn around at 46th or maybe 48th and Willamette; it could turn around in the parking lot for the Ridgeline Trail (but the District would have to pay to pave the lot); or it could turn around on Solar Heights. Staff had heard that someone was circulating a petition to have the bus turn around on Solar Heights. Staff still needed to make sure the street wouldn't be blocked at any time, but their other concern was that the steep streets meant that the buses would be fairly loud, and they were not sure how residents would react to the noise level. He thought that the petition might give staff a better idea about residents' interest in bus service in that area. Mr. Viggiano said that staff would like to serve this area if a solution could be found.

Third, the proposal to expand the #2 UO route previously had been shown as a connection from the Jefferson area to the University of Oregon. Discussions with the Planning Advisory Committee had resulted in an alternative which did not provide the Jefferson connection but did take people from the 24th Avenue area to the University, and would provide

some relief for the Fox Hollow route. This route would address some operational problems as well as providing some added connections. It probably would be attractive to Amazon Housing students who want to go to the east side of campus, or from downtown to Amazon Housing in the afternoon.

Mr. Viggiano said that the Five-Year Service Plan was included in the agenda packet for that evening, but Board approval of the Plan included specific approval of only the first-year service change. Years two through five were considered annually as an indication of what future service improvements might include, but would probably change from year to year.

Public Hearing on Proposed FY 93-94 Service Changes: Mr. Parks opened the public hearing on the proposed service changes for FY 93-94. Roger Ferguson, of 3064 Stapp, thanked staff for the telephone call reminding him of the public hearing and Board discussion that evening. He had testified at the February public hearing on service, and said he thought the proposed route to Stapp, which Mr. Viggiano had just described, was a very good route. He asked if it would return to downtown Eugene the same way it traveled outbound. Mr. Viggiano said that it would. Mr. Ferguson said there was a fire lane near Lakeridge where a pedestrian gate probably could be installed, and that residents would welcome a stop there. He thought that the 70 families in the Delta Pines Area and more families in Lakeridge would use this route, and he said that the neighborhood wanted to thank the District for considering their service request.

Closure of Public Hearing: There was no further testimony, and the public hearing was closed.

MOTION **Board Discussion and Decision:** Ms. Calvert moved that the Five-Year Service Plan be approved as presented. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion. Ms. Fitch said she appreciated staff's hard work and their listening to the public comments last month and finding innovative ways to make the bus work for more people. There was no further discussion, and

VOTE the motion carried by unanimous vote.

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES: Ms. Loobey stated that she wished to discuss four Senate Bills with the Board. Two of those bills would be up for hearing in two days. She said that SB 429 was a re-run of the same bill from the 1989-91 session, and called for a prohibition of striking by employees of mass transit districts. The 1989 bill did not go to the Governor; instead, there was a compromise that the transit districts would be subject to the Employee Relations Board, which provides for fact-finding and mediation. Ms. Loobey explained that state law/policy/legislative history was that those employees whose actions in going on strike would present a clear and present danger to the public would be prohibited from striking. She said that opening this issue for other types of organizations or for transit districts would go against this reasoning.

Senate Bill 431 would require that the boards of directors of mass transit districts be elected, not appointed. This bill was requested by the Amalgamated Transit Union, not by the customers, the community, or the taxpayers. Ms. Loobey said she did not believe that this bill had any compelling public interest.

Ms. Loobey said that she had discussed SB 430 with two labor attorneys and negotiators and Tri-Met staff, and they did not understand the bill. SB 430 would require the District to do things it had no authority to do, and would infringe upon a subcontractor's relationship with its employees, and that was against federal labor law. She said that this type of bill had been before the legislature before and did not even get to a hearing, because it contravenes federal law. It was sponsored by a Senate committee at the request of the ATU.

Senate Bill 433 was the ATU's attempt to manage from arm's length the Board's authority to set compensation for its non-bargaining unit employees. It would require that non-bargaining unit employees never be given salary increases larger than the smallest increase given to bargaining unit employees. Ms. Loobey said that the LTD Board Salary Committee had been very sensitive to the way the District compensated its bargaining unit employees, through good faith negotiations, and the non-bargaining unit employees. Compensation increases basically had been the same for the two groups. Ms. Loobey said that this bill would interfere with the Board's authority to set that compensation, and was in violation of ORS 267. She did not know when SB 430 and SB 433 would go before the Senate committee.

MOTION Ms. Fitch moved that the Board give the General Manager the authority to represent the views of the Board in opposing Senate Bills 429, 430, 431, and 433. Mr. Billings seconded,
VOTE and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

Ms. Calvert asked about the proposed battery and tire tax. Ms. Loobey said that bill was "dead," because upon closer examination in a ruling by the Oregon Supreme Court on vehicle emission fees, it was determined that the use of emission fees for transit districts or capital was constitutionally prohibited. Without a constitutional amendment, emission fees could be used only for roads and highways.

Ms. Loobey reminded the Board members that they could make telephone calls to the Senate Labor Committee staff if they liked. Senator Karsten Rasmussen was the new Senator on that committee, and Mr. Billings had called him to provide an introduction for Ms. Loobey to speak with him.

DOWNTOWN RAILROAD PROPOSAL: Mr. Pangborn explained that staff were recommending that the issue of a downtown Eugene train be studied during the TransPlan Update process, to gain a community-wide perspective. Staff believed this recommendation to be consistent with Ray Robinson's request on behalf of the Emerald Empire Railroad. Rather than having the Board endorse a particular plan at a fairly substantial cost, staff recommended that more time and energy be spent studying the idea during the TransPlan Update process. Ms. Calvert stated that, as with any other kind of alternative transportation, it should be clearly stated that the proposed train had to meet the same standards of accessibility and the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as well as being economically feasible. Mr. Pangborn said that those kinds of issues would come back to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) during their discussions of the TransPlan, and agreed that the District and community had no other choice but to meet the federal ADA requirements.

Mr. Pangborn said that no other transit districts would order buses in conjunction with LTD's order this time. Mr. Billings asked if particulate traps would address the problems with PM 10s. Mr. Pangborn said that they would, that they would reduce the emission of particulate matter to below federal standards. Mr. Billings then asked if the District would be dipping into the \$865,000 in Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds programmed for replacement parking for the Eugene Station. Mr. Pangborn said it appeared that the State would be very stringent in meeting the October 1993 deadline for obligating the STP funds, and that there would not be a City decision about a parking structure in time to obligate the funds. LTD would use \$485,000 of these funds this year, for additional buses, and would be able to draw down \$865,000 in 1994 STP funds for parking replacement. If the 1993 STP money is not used for the bus purchase, the District should relinquish it for reprogramming by the MPC.

SECTION 9 GRANT APPLICATION--ECONOMIC STIMULUS FUNDS: Mr. Pangborn said there were no guarantees that the District would receive an additional \$351,309 in Section 9 funds as part of President Clinton's economic stimulus package, but staff had prepared an application in case the funds were available for LTD. If these funds were received, some capital purchases would be moved ahead from future years; they would not be used for new capital purchases; rather it would mean having the ability to buy parts and other capital items ahead of time.

Public Hearing on Section 3 and Section 9 Capital Grant Applications: Mr. Parks opened the public hearing on the District's applications for Section 3 capital funds for 33 new buses, and Section 9 economic stimulus funds for passenger boarding improvements, a maintenance storage building, and support vehicles. There was no testimony from the audience, and the public hearing was closed.

Board Discussion and Decision: Ms. Hocken asked about smaller buses, and the 15-passenger van that could be used in snow service. Mr. Pangborn said that included in the Section 9 grant application were one or two 15-passenger four-wheel-drive vans, as well as other replacement support vehicles.

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved approval of the Section 3 grant application for 33 new buses, in the amount of \$6,176,000 in federal funds and \$1,544,000 in local funds, for a total of \$7,720,000, and that the Board authorize the General Manager to execute all grant documents on behalf of LTD. Mr. Billings seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous vote.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved approval of the Section 9 economic stimulus grant application, in the amount of \$467,309 in federal Section 9 Economic Stimulus funds and \$116,827 in local funds, for a total of \$584,136, and that the Board authorize the General Manager to executive all grant document on behalf of LTD. Mr. Montgomery seconded, and the motion was approved by unanimous vote.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Board Member Reports: **CATS:** Mr. Parks, on behalf of the Board, thanked Ms. Fitch for her participation on the Central Area Transportation Study's Citizen Advisory Committee. The Committee had finished its work with the approval of a draft CATS update.

Ms. Hocken said she was not sure the motion was complete enough. She said there had been a certain amount of confusion in the media about the Board's position on this particular proposal, and she would prefer a motion that made it clear that the Board was not going on record either supporting or opposing this particular proposal, and was, in addition, recommending further study of the whole area of rail services in the metro area in a broader forum. She said that the Board did not have the data, construction costs, etc., to make a decision. She suggested a motion that said that rail in general needed to be studied in depth, and eliminated the word "light."

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved the recommendation on page 62 of the agenda packet, without the word "light," so that the motion read, "I move that the LTD Board recommend to the MPC that rail applications be included in the TransPlan Update as one of the future transportation alternatives." Mr. Billings seconded the motion.

Ms. Fitch asked why Ms. Hocken preferred to remove the word "light." Ms. Hocken replied that light rail usually means that tracks are part of the street system, and she was uncomfortable with that notion. It meant that high voltage lines could not be part of the tracks, and diesel technology or overhead lines would have to be used. Wheelchair access would become more difficult; wheelchairs and bicycles would be crossing streets with tracks in them. She thought that if the city streets were not shared with rail, maybe some of those problems could be avoided. It was her belief that this whole issue needed to be studied. Mr. Billings thought that "rail" was more inclusive and did not exclude light rail. Ms. Hocken said that there were also advantages to light rail, so agreed that it should not be excluded entirely.

VOTE Ms. Fitch called for the question, and the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION Ms. Hocken then moved that the LTD Board take no position on the street car proposal at that time, because of a lack of sufficient data about construction costs and operational issues. Ms. Fitch seconded the motion. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

VOTE

SECTION 3 CAPITAL GRANT APPLICATION: Ms. Loobey stated that the approved Capital Improvements Program (CIP) had programmed 23 to 25 buses, depending on the price. Staff were hoping to increase the purchase to 33 buses, principally because they understood that there might be some stimulus money that would be put into the capital grant process by the Clinton administration. The stimulus money would have a deadline for spending that coincided with the District's next bus purchase. This would be an opportunity to replace more of the older buses than the District otherwise would be able to.

Ms. Fitch asked if some of the buses could be cleaner burning or shorter in length, if the feasibility study showed that a downtown shuttle were appropriate. Mr. Pangborn said that the new buses would be substantially cleaner to meet new federal standards. Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, said the buses would burn 50 percent cleaner, with no visible emissions. Ms. Loobey said the District would not have to have special engines to use low sulfur fuels. Mr. Billings asked about fuel costs. Ms. Loobey said that these new standards were mandated across the county, and the suppliers would have to supply the fuel. The costs to treat the fuel would increase, and staff had anticipated that increase in next year's budget.

MOTION MPC: Mr. Parks said that there had been some discussion regarding whether the LTD Board representatives to the Metropolitan Policy Committee could participate in discussions on issues other than transit-related issues. Ms. Calvert asked if the Board wished the two MPC representatives to continue their participation on the MPC. Ms. Fitch moved that the Board approve the continued participation by LTD's two MPC representatives, Ms. Calvert and Mr. Billings. Mr. Montgomery seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

VOTE

Report on Intergovernmental Visit to Oregon U.S. Congressional Delegation: Ms. Hocken said the trip had been very exciting and worthwhile; that she and Ms. Loobey had gotten to speak with Representatives Kopetski, Furse, and DeFazio; Senators Hatfield and Packwood, and members of the staff of the Oregon delegation. Ms. Hocken also participated in a group that met with Congressman Wyden. She thanked the Board for sending her, and said it had been a wonderful opportunity. She reported how impressive she thought Ms. Loobey was in that situation, and how much Ms. Loobey knew about the issues when talking with the legislative staff; that she had a depth of information and was very effective. Ms. Calvert said she had heard from Ms. Loobey that Ms. Hocken had done a terrific job on the trip.

Ms. Hocken said she had a chance to talk individually with representatives from other jurisdictions, such as the Eugene City Council, the 4J School District, Lane Community College, the City of Springfield, etc., regarding the background of their issues. She thought it would be very helpful when working on projects together. Ms. Loobey and Ms. Hocken also had a chance to meet with City Councilors Nancy Nathanson and Bobby Green regarding issues of mutual concern, such as the proposed downtown shuttle, CATS, etc. Ms. Nathanson and Mr. Green had suggested that the Council officers and representatives from the LTD Board meet to talk about some of those issues.

Ms. Hocken said that Senator Hatfield had been concerned that the money for the Ferry Street Bridge and other projects was not being spent fast enough and might be reallocated, but his staff was not as concerned. Ms. Fitch asked where the District was on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Eugene Station. Mr. Viggiano said that staff were expecting a draft report in May or June. The technical work was proceeding fine, about as expected, but there had been a delay in the process, waiting for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to place a notice in the *Federal Register*. Following the notice, there would be a 30-day scoping period, with a public scoping meeting. If no new issues were raised during this period, the report could be completed. If new scoping issues were identified, the District may have to complete additional technical work to address those issues.

Ms. Loobey said that the trip to Washington, D.C., was a productive trip, with good meetings. She said that Mark Van De Water, of Senator Hatfield's staff, and DeFazio's legislative Assistant were very supportive and helpful. She said also that she was impressed with Senator Hatfield's grasp of all the local projects, including the money, status, rate of return on investment, etc., and that they had spent one and a half hours with him. She added that she spoke with his key staff about the issues throughout the year.

Ms. Hocken said that one of the interesting things about the trip was that the group as a whole considered themselves a group, rather than individual jurisdictions, and were very

interactive. The group supported the priorities for the region, which was unheard of in Washington, D.C.

Monthly Financial Report: Ms. Calvert asked if Finance Administrator Tamara Weaver was still nervous about how good the revenues looked. She had seen a Labor Department report that said that the economy was pretty flat. Ms. Loobey noted that overtime hours were up, and Ms. Weaver said that in three to six months, they might hear that the local economy had turned around.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Montgomery moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Billings seconded, and the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 9:10 p.m.


Board Secretary