

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, June 18, 1997

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on June 12, 1997, 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, June 18, 1997, at 7:00 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, Vice President  
Rob Bennett  
Patricia Hocken, President, presiding  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Mary Murphy, Secretary  
Roger Saydack  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: (One vacancy, Subdistrict 1)

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Board President Pat Hocken. Ms. Murphy was not yet present.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Hocken introduced the July 1997 Employees of the month, Facilities Maintenance Specialist Jim Hurst and Facilities Maintenance Generalist Mike Gilles. Mr. Hurst was hired on June 6, 1994, and Mr. Gilles was hired on August 7, 1995. They were nominated by a co-worker for their skills and dedication in making the move to the temporary Eugene Station as uncomplicated and easy as possible for the operators and supervisors, and for their commitment to doing the job well. When asked what made Mr. Hurst and Mr. Gilles good employees, Facility Services Manager Charlie Simmons said, "Jim and Mike are skilled craftsmen who have a can-do attitude. They confirmed this in April by renovating the east side of the old Sears building into a temporary Customer Service Center. They also constructed the new passenger boarding areas for the temporary Eugene Station. They both are very conscientious of customer service and the quality of their work and service. They enjoy working with LTD's employees, as well as their contact with bus riders and the public. They are real team players who respect one another's skills and are both dedicated to LTD's mission."

Ms. Hocken presented Mr. Hurst and Mr. Gilles with their certificates and monetary awards. Mr. Gilles said that he appreciated being recognized, which made their efforts worthwhile. He thanked the Board. Mr. Hurst said he also appreciated being recognized, since they spent a lot of time behind the scenes and it was nice to be brought to the front every once in a while.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Ms. Hocken asked for comments on subjects other than the budget, for which a public hearing would be held later in the meeting. Suzanne Cole of Eugene said that, in the spirit of accuracy, she wanted to point out that in the agenda packet, on page 16 of the minutes of May 21, 1997, the paragraph about the West 11th Park & Ride transpired after the executive session and not before, as recorded in the minutes. There was no other testimony.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Ms. Hocken stated that Ms. Cole believed that the executive session was held before the West 11<sup>th</sup> Park and Ride discussion at the May 21 Board meeting, rather than after, as presented in the minutes. Ms. Hocken could not remember the order, but assumed the tape would be clear. Ms. Sullivan stated that the order in which she transcribed the minutes at that meeting was West 11<sup>th</sup> discussion first and then the executive session. She also did not remember the order, but did not know why she would have recorded that paragraph first if it did not happen first.

Ms. Hocken stated that the Board would remove those minutes from the Consent Calendar and have staff check the tape regarding the order of the Executive Session and discussion.

MOTION  
VOTE

Mr. Kleger moved that the Board approve the remainder of the Consent Calendar. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor, and none opposed. The revised Consent Calendar included only the Resolution Reaffirming the Territory in the District within Which the Transit System Will Operate in Accordance with Oregon Revised Statutes 267.207(3)(a).

**CLASSIFICATION OF MARKETING PROJECT ASSISTANT:** Service Planning & Marketing (SP&M) Manager Andy Vobora explained that SP&M had utilized a position title Distribution Coordinator or Marketing Project Assistant for the past 20 years. It had been a struggle to keep the position filled because it had been funded through the temporary unclassified wage scale. He explained that temporary unclassified positions were not highly paid and did not receive benefits. LTD policy stated that unclassified temporary positions were to be used for specific tasks of a duration of three months or less. Therefore, staff were recommending that the position become a permanent, classified position at salary level 10, based upon a review of the job description and application of the District's point factoring system.

Mr. Vobora said he wanted to be clear that the Board would be adopting the correct number of FTE (full-time equivalent staff) when it adopted the budget later in the meeting, so he was asking that they approve the addition of one FTE.

Mr. Bennett asked why the position had been temporary. Mr. Vobora stated that the use of the position had varied over the years. Sometimes it was part-time; sometimes full-time. It currently was full-time, and had been for quite some time.

- MOTION Mr. Saydack moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves a one (1) FTE increase to the Service Planning & Marketing budget for the establishment of the Marketing Project Assistant position."
- VOTE Mr. Bennett seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none against.

**ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 1997-98 BUDGET:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson stated that the Board and Budget Committee had devoted quite a bit of time to this material in April. It was necessary to hold a public hearing and adopt the budget by resolution prior to June 30. The total budget figure was \$47,297,282, which included reserves for the general fund and capital fund. Of that amount, the total operating budget was \$17,478,227. Ms. Hellekson said there was a recommended change in the capital fund because the District had been unable to complete the purchase of the McKay property on West 11<sup>th</sup> during the current fiscal year. Therefore, \$160,000 from capital reserves would be appropriated for the purchase during FY 97-98. This did not change the appropriations total, shown on page 28 of the agenda materials. Total Capital Appropriations had increased by \$160,000 and Fund Balance Reserves had decreased by the same amount. Otherwise, the total was exactly the same as was approved in April by the Budget Committee.

Ms. Hellekson said it became clear to her in talking to a Board member that when discussing the budget detail in April and adopting the budget two months later, it was difficult to remember during the rest of the fiscal year exactly what the year-to-year comparisons were. It was easy to compare the budget to the actual and think it was on track, but when noting differences from the prior year, it was hard to remember what those differences were. To remedy that, staff would provide a budget update twice a year, including year-to-year changes, to make it easier to explain to the public and answer questions.

**Public Hearing on FY 1997-98 Budget:** Ms. Hocken opened the public hearing on LTD's proposed Fiscal Year 1997-98 budget. There was no testimony from the audience, and Ms. Hocken closed the public hearing.

- MOTION **Board Discussion and Decision:** Mr. Bennett moved approval of the Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 1997-98 budget and appropriating \$47,297,282 as represented in the Resolution. Mr. Kleger seconded.

Ms. Hocken commented that this was the budget that was approved by the Budget Committee that included the Board and an equal number of lay members. The budget had been subjected to the Board's and other public scrutiny.

- VOTE There was no further discussion, and the budget was adopted by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

**NEW LOW-FLOOR BUS PURCHASE:** Fleet Services Manager Ron Berkshire noted that in December 1996 the Board had approved an application for Federal Section 3 funds and reprogrammed Section 9 funds to purchase new buses, and the procurement process had begun in February. Staff were now asking the Board to proceed with the intent to award the

contract for new buses, and to authorize the general manager to contract with the chosen manufacturer. He explained that an employee committee had evaluated the proposals received from the manufacturers, and had developed a recommendation that would give the District the best value for its money.

Mr. Berkshire said that four manufacturers had responded to LTD's Request for Proposals (RFP). After the first step, determining approved equals, Neoplan had withdrawn from the process. Of the remaining three, Nova, New Flyer, and Gillig, it was determined that Nova did not meet the evaluation team's criteria, so was outside the competitive range. Best and final offers had been received from the two remaining manufacturers. After an extensive evaluation, the evaluation team recommended awarding the contract to Gillig for 14 low-floor buses, predominantly based on five criteria: better accessibility, seating configuration, superior turning radius, greater ground clearance, and low maintenance costs. The committee had considered bus features and quality, the cost, and each manufacturers' capability and performance. The New Flyer bus had the traditional transit look. Gillig offered a larger door clearance, and, although the exterior lines of the body might not meet some expectations for an advanced look, Gillig appeared to be the best step toward that goal. In terms of accessibility, both New Flyer and Gillig were adequate, but the New Flyer had more restrictions, such as a shorter, steeper ramp. Gillig also had a few more seats and less restricted legroom.

In rating the performance specifications, Gillig was judged to have a better turning radius. It also offered the same ground clearance as the current buses, which was better for hills and dips. Maintenance factors and costs were compared in several areas, including exterior body panels, body structure, component accessibility, and tires. Additionally, parts costs for the New Flyer could be considerably higher because of import duties, since New Flyer was a Canadian-based company. Gillig could deliver all 14 buses by September 15, 1998, in time for fall service implementation; New Flyer could deliver by December 31, 1998. The best and final offer price for New Flyer was a little more than \$800 per bus less than Gillig's, assuming the District went ahead with air conditioning. Gillig was less expensive on the alternatives.

Mr. Berkshire said that the committee felt very strongly that even though the Gillig bid was a little higher, in terms of customer service, repair and maintenance costs, and reliability, Gillig had an advantage. Staff knew how well Gillig supported its equipment from beginning to end, even if the warranty had expired, if LTD identified defects. Staff had no experience with New Flyer, but had talked with users. New Flyer had a pretty good warranty program and supported its equipment, but LTD would have to engage in more negotiations with them before agreement.

Mr. Saydack asked if staff had inspected buses of both manufacturers on-site. Mr. Berkshire replied that the Board had been present when a Gillig low-floor bus was on the property, and a New Flyer bus had been on the property just the day before. Mr. Kleger said he had seen the New Flyer bus. He said that there would be some accessibility difficulties in some locations with any low-floor bus, but he did like the longer ramp of the Gillig.

Ms. Murphy thanked Mr. Berkshire for a good presentation, and asked where luggage racks would be placed. He replied that they typically would be above the windows on a standard bus, much like on an airplane, although without doors. There were some concerns about where to place luggage racks on low-floor buses; they might go over the front wheel wells. Gillig had manufactured some buses for Hertz; Mr. Berkshire had photographs of those.

Ms. Murphy wondered about vandalism involving reading lights or headphones. Mr. Berkshire said he had not heard of any transit districts using headphones. Individual reading lights had been used successfully; vandalism did not seem to be a problem.

Mr. Saydack wondered about the fuel efficiency of the two buses. Mr. Berkshire said that the New Flyer and Gillig used the same drive train, engine, and transmission. The Gillig bus was lighter than the New Flyer, which may provide better fuel mileage.

Mr. Saydack then asked about the structure, in terms of crash worthiness and customer protection. Mr. Berkshire said that both buses had been through the required Altoona crash testing and were rated above the minimum standards that manufacturers had to meet.

Mr. Bennett asked about seating arrangements. Mr. Berkshire stated that New Flyer was resistive to alternatives for seating, lights, etc., but had agreed to send pricing after some "arm twisting." Gillig had been willing, and LTD can change seating arrangements without resistance.

Mr. Bailey asked if there were differences in emissions. Mr. Berkshire said there were not.

Ms. Hocken asked who had participated on the employee evaluation team. Mr. Berkshire replied that there were employees representing maintenance, transit operations, and ADA accessibility issues.

Mr. Saydack asked if the Board was being asked to approve a specific accessories package. Mr. Berkshire said it was not; staff would like the authority to move ahead with the intent to award the contract, and there would be time to discuss amenities before the buses were manufactured. Suggested amenities included air conditioning, reading lights, and luggage racks. Staff would welcome other suggestions from Board members. Options would remain open until the first part of 1998.

**MOTION**

Mr. Bailey moved that the Board approve the following resolution: "The LTD Board of Directors hereby resolves that LTD staff have the Board's approval to proceed with intent to award and authorize the General Manager to contract to purchase 14 new low-floor buses from Gillig." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett said there should be a serious discussion about the amenities, involving careful consideration and weighing of possible amenities. Ms. Hocken thought it would be appropriate to have another Board discussion in another couple of months, and said that the Board might like to see what perimeter seating and luggage racks might look like.

VOTE There was no further discussion, and the resolution was approved by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Ms. Hocken said that the Board had been scheduled to hold one executive session to discuss labor negotiations. However, the Board needed to extend the executive session to deal with two other matters. A revised version of the agenda had been distributed, noting that the Board needed to meet in executive session to discuss the appraisal of the Fred Meyer site, labor negotiations, and potential litigation regarding the Thurston Station.

MOTION Mr. Saydack moved that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions and ORS 192.660(1)(f), to consider records that are exempt by law from public inspection pursuant to ORS 192.501(6), regarding information relating to the appraisal of real estate prior to its acquisition; and pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations; and pursuant to ORS 192.66091)(h), to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed. Mr. Bailey seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. The Executive Session began at 7:48 p.m. Property appraiser John Brown and District Counsel Joe Richards were present for this discussion with the Board.

VOTE

**Return to Regular Session:** The Board unanimously returned to Regular Session at 9:00 p.m.

**RATIFICATION OF AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION/LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT LABOR AGREEMENT:**

MOTION Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "The LTD Board of Directors hereby ratifies the 1997-2000 labor contract between Lane Transit District and Local 757, Amalgamated Transit Union as tentatively agreed to on May 14, 1997, and shown in the 'Tentative Agreement - Draft 1.1,' with corrections as noted during executive session." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Bailey said that he was very excited that LTD was able to come to an agreement with the bargaining unit. He recalled that before this contract, the existing contract had run out, and he was very excited about reaching agreement before that happened again, and hoped the entire organization was, as well.

VOTE The motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. Ms. Hocken thanked everyone for his or her hard work in making this happen.

**THURSTON STATION CONSTRUCTION:** Planning & Development Manager Stefano Viggiano explained that bids for Thurston Station construction had been opened the previous week, at a time when staff were preparing the agenda materials. Staff were still investigating the construction bids and did not have a staff recommendation in time to be included in the agenda packet. He stated that the Thurston Station would be a significant Park & Ride location for Thurston, Deerhorn, and other areas. It also would function as a transfer point and hub for feeder routes and for people transferring to express routes, and as a turn-around for buses at the end of the line. The station would have space for 100 stalls and adjacent property for an additional 100, if needed. There would be an on-site bus turn-around and room for two bus bays. Amenities included passenger shelters, driver restrooms, lighting, benches, landscaping, and passenger information.

Mr. Viggiano explained the issues of the Jasper Road extension and buses entering Main Street. He said that as part of the project, in order to provide access to the Park & Ride, an access road was being built. The road also eventually would be an extension of Jasper Road. There also were some intersection changes that needed to occur.

Mr. Viggiano stated that the construction bid estimate had been around \$543,000, with \$547,000 approved in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). Current available funding included \$365,000 in STIP grant funds, approved two years ago, and \$125,000 from Lane County for half the cost of the off-site improvements, for a total of \$540,000.

The District had received four bids, from Delta Construction, Centerline Excavation and Construction, Eugene Sand and Gravel, and Wildish Construction Company. The apparent low bid, from Wildish, was \$767,422, which was 41.3 percent over estimates.

Mr. Viggiano introduced John Lawless of TBG Architects & Planners, Inc., the architects who had prepared the bid estimates. Mr. Lawless handed out a bid overview. He stated that the Thurston Station had been envisioned as a "signature facility" for LTD and included high-quality, low-maintenance materials and a lot of parking. General contractors, who were more typically building contractors, had been expected to bid. However, those who did bid were more pavement oriented. He said that his firm may have made a miscalculation on how those bidders would approach the bid. He stated that the on-site utility work and paving were bid tightly and competitively. However, he said, bidding for the platforms, shelters, etc., caught the architectural firm tremendously off-guard, and they had been trying to determine how and why their estimates were so far off.

Mr. Lawless said that the small increments of shelter, restrooms, and platform were detailed to achieve a landmark appearance, with small economies of scale. For instance, the cost of the steel structure was bid more than two times what they normally would have expected, based on a poundage basis. He outlined the firm's other explanations for the high bid prices that were listed in the handout, including a tight electricians market, and bids 20 percent higher in certain industries than the estimator had been told they should be one month previously. He said that all bidders were at the same level, so it was not an isolated incident.

Ms. Hocken asked who was requiring the storm sewers and why they were so large. Mr. Lawless explained that those were a component to the eventual extension of Jasper Road to the south, as one element of an eventual bigger system. The City of Springfield was requiring the storm sewers because the current system was at capacity. Ms. Hocken asked if this was part of the project that the County was prepared to pay half of; Mr. Lawless said that it was.

Mr. Lawless also discussed possible project reductions. He said that there did not seem to be much that could be reduced in terms of grading and pipe costs, since those types of construction were mandated, with the exception of a small portion of the landscaping. Amenities such as the shelter and bike storage facility could be eliminated, but that would take away the chance for this station to be a signature facility.

Mr. Lawless explained that if the District wanted to make changes, the normal protocol would be to award the contract that way it was and make changes to the contract within a predetermined dollar amount. Mr. Bennett said he was not interested in doing it that way. In his experience, making the changes ahead of time resulted in greater savings. He wondered if the District could start all over again.

Ms. Murphy wondered if there was a possibility of using City Block Grant money for the increased sewer requirements. She said that it would benefit both the City and the County to put in the sewer. Ms. Loobey did not know the answer, but said it might be a timing problem, even if LTD, the City, or the County were eligible. Current plans were that LTD would be reimbursed by the County for up to \$125,000 of the right-of-way work, which would be about half the cost.

Mr. Saydack said he was impressed with the emphasis on the signature facility, and said that LTD would be constructing several of those. He thought there was some value in having them look comparable to one another, and wondered if there were any economies involved in standardizing some of the features. Mr. Lawless said this was a good point, and the architects had spent a lot of time with the project team talking about that. The caution was to not make them generic; they needed some neighborhood context as well as being identifiable. He said that there were some features that would work in Springfield, at the University of Oregon (UO), downtown Eugene, and at local stations. He said they could be built as a series of repetitive modular components that would lend themselves to reconfiguration in design concepts. Unfortunately, the economies would come from making them in bulk and stockpiling them.

Mr. Viggiano added that staff believed that for the bus rapid transit (BRT) system, the stops needed to be clearly identified as BRT stops, with the same type of shelter. The Thurston Station was more significant than a Park & Ride; it would be a station, a transfer point. The District had always tried to design stations so that they fit in with their surrounding environments (for example, the UO Station and the Parkway Station).

Mr. Viggiano outlined the options for proceeding with the project. One option was not to proceed, if the Board viewed the project as so expensive that it was not worth doing. It was staff's opinion that LTD needed a facility in east Springfield, for the east end of the metropolitan



area. The Board might ask if this was the best place and the right design. Mr. Viggiano explained that even though construction costs were higher than expected and LTD would be paying \$120,000 to \$130,000 for an access road, the advantage of this site was that the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) would provide the land with a long-term lease, so the District would not have to purchase land. Also, this location was a prime location for transfers, express service, and an ending point for the corridor. Therefore, staff believed this to be an extremely important and needed facility for the District.

If the Board were to proceed with the project, the options were to go out to bid again; award the contract and reduce costs through deductive changes; or award the contract and build as bid. Mr. Viggiano said that staff believed that the current bids were competitive, and probably would not come in lower unless significant changes were made in the project. Additionally, if the project were rebid, the District could miss the construction season; it would not have the station for fall service implementation; there were not many discretionary items in the project; and it would be difficult to predict inflation costs resulting from the delay. If the contract were awarded and deductive changes were used to reduce costs, approximately 5 percent of the project costs could be saved.

Mr. Viggiano also discussed some redesign options, such as using a prefabricated shelter, deleting the driver restrooms, or eliminating some discretionary landscaping. He added that eliminating the driver restrooms was not a popular solution with bus operators, because the closest restrooms would be at the Springfield Station in downtown Springfield. In the future, the Thurston Station restrooms may be the only option for feeder service operators.

If the District were to build as bid, the additional funding could come from STP funds for the West 11th Park & Ride project, for which \$740,000 had been included in the draft STIP and still needed to be approved formally. Also, the Board could decide to use the \$170,000 that had been allocated for Springfield Station relocation next fiscal year, or some of the \$198,000 for passenger boarding improvements. The Section 9 funds were all currently allocated. Some local capital funding could be made available.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff recommended awarding the contract and trying to make deductive changes that would not compromise the long-term viability of the project. Essentially, this would mean trying to make sure the final construction cost equaled the current bid price, since expected change orders for a project normally are budgeted at 5 percent of the construction cost. Staff recommended using STP funds currently allocated for the West 11th Park & Ride facility, since that project was uncertain. If a decision on that facility were made, LTD might have to identify supplemental funding for that project.

Mr. Saydack asked to see the site drawings. They included a 12' by 16' restroom, a 20' by 30' main shelter, covered bicycle parking, and parking for 100 cars. Mr. Viggiano said that the second 100 spaces would be less expensive to construct because that project would involve only parking, landscaping, and lighting.

Mr. Bailey asked what percent the Eugene Station had been bid over estimates. Mr. Viggiano replied that the Eugene Station bids were 18 percent higher than estimated. A large estimating firm from Portland had been used for the Eugene Station estimates.

Ms. Loobey asked if it had been known, at the time the Thurston Station was being programmed, that LTD would have to pay half the costs for Jasper Road access. Mr. Viggiano replied that LTD knew it would have to provide access to the station. Because the County would be contributing funding, a more substantial road would be built right away. This would benefit LTD and made sense from a community expenditure standpoint. The road had been planned for 1999 at the earliest.

Mr. Bailey asked about staff's rationale for recommending the use of the West 11th Park & Ride STP funding. Mr. Viggiano said that it made sense to staff to use available grant funding before using local capital. LTD had been successful in receiving this sort of discretionary capital money in the past. The District was not yet sure where it might locate on West 11th. Since the District was looking for smaller sites than originally envisioned, that could mean the release of some money to other projects.

Mr. Bailey wondered if this rationale applied also to the Springfield Station. Mr. Viggiano said that it did, but that there was a lot of interest in Springfield for going ahead with the project. Using the funds for the Thurston Station would mean taking all of the relocation money and more.

Mr. Bennett said that unless he heard something compelling from the other Board members, he could not support the staff recommendation. He said it was one thing to argue that because of the bidding environment the last couple of years' capital projects had come in over budget, but 41 percent seemed very unusual. He said that he would hope, not knowing the rules LTD had to follow, that the District could approach the low bidder from a construction management point of view, and they would do some kind of fee basis to get the costs down. He said he thought this was a very important project and he did not want to change the design. He thought the Board should reflect on the fact that to succeed in getting people to use the facilities, LTD needed to compete and have people believe it was worthwhile to be there. He hoped there was a way to start over with some "guesstimates" between the architect and the contractor.

Purchasing Administrator Jeanette Bailor said that some public agencies were doing projects by construction management. It was a fairly new process, and somewhat difficult to meet federal regulations. It had not yet been used in transit districts; the City was using the process with a different funding source and different regulations. She said she did not yet know how to use construction management for LTD, but she hoped there was a way because she hoped to use it on future Park & Ride projects. However, it is not legally permissible to negotiate with the low bidder, or any bidder, to change the scope of the work and determine a new bid price.

Ms. Hocken asked how long the Board had to reject or accept the bid, and suggested forming a subcommittee. Ms. Bailor said that the bids were valid for sixty days, and the bids had been opened two weeks ago.

Mr. Saydack wondered if delaying the project would mean jeopardizing the availability of that property under the same terms and conditions. Mr. Viggiano said it would not.

Ms. Hocken said she understood Mr. Bennett's position, but thought that without substantial changes to the design there would not be great savings. She said there obviously were some great problems with the estimates, and wondered if anyone else could estimate. Mr. Viggiano said that the best test of the estimate was the bid, and four people bid very carefully. In his opinion, the estimate was wrong.

Ms. Loobey asked what would happen if the project were to be phased differently, such as putting in the storm system, parking paving, lighting, etc., but not the shelter, and considering that to be a later improvement. Inflation would play a part, but maybe there were things about the design that could be changed to make a difference. Mr. Viggiano said that this could be done and the Park & Ride would be usable, but not attractive. It was a short-term answer, and a separate, small project actually could drive up the price, so the District may not save money in the long run.

Ms. Hocken thought it would be a mistake to not build a shelter, because the Park & Ride would not be used.

Mr. Bailey liked the idea of a working group or committee. He said he had a hard time with a 41 percent difference, but agreed that the project needed to go forward in some fashion within a reasonable time.

Mr. Bennett said that he had made his case, but also said that it was a very important project. He did not want to skinny the appearance of the project, and he thought that Mr. Viggiano made a compelling argument that the four bids all looked at the same specifications, and Wildish was the low bidder. Absent changing the approach to doing the project, which he would do, he agreed that new bids would not be substantially different. He said he thought that Mr. Viggiano made those points accurately. Mr. Bennett said it would be foreign to him to try to proceed on this kind of basis, since it was not consistent with what he considered to be good business. He said he would not be able to vote for the project, but he could be out-voted.

Mr. Saydack said he agreed with the last three speakers. He thought a committee was a good idea; that LTD should consider not building the shelter in this configuration; and he could not go with the 41 percent difference, but wanted to do the project right. He said that LTD viewed the Thurston Station as an important facility because they could see the future. However, there were not many people like that around. He thought that if LTD built a modest shelter, the demand would come and the political support would be there, just like with the Springfield Station. He thought that a committee should study Ms. Loobey's suggestion, and suggested membership the same as on the Eugene Station Committee.

Mr. Kleger said he was not sure the Board would have a quorum in the foreseeable future, and had about 15 days to make a decision. The committee would need to have the authority to act on the Board's behalf. Ms. Hocken suggested a telephone conference call, if needed.

Ms. Loobey asked about the consequences of forming a committee. Ms. Bailor said that the bids were opened on June 5, and the District had 60 days to award the contract. Service Planner Will Mueller mentioned the narrow construction window, and said that staff would need to know the Board's decision very soon in order to meet the printing deadlines for the Rider's Digest.

Ms. Loobey said that if the Board was committed to doing something by the fall bid and was not comfortable with the 41 percent difference, a committee could look at options to reduce costs. The Board also could reject all bids and examine ways to reduce construction costs. That would let contractors know where the Board stood in relation to the bids. Ms. Hocken said this was not her position.

Mr. Saydack asked if it would have to go to the Board if the committee were to concede to eliminate the shelter. Ms. Bailor said that reducing the project by \$200,000 was a substantial change, so the District would have to reject the bid. Mr. Lawless said it would take two to three weeks to prepare new bid documents, and Ms. Bailor said that the bid period could be as little as three weeks because the contractors were familiar with the project, so new bids probably could be opened in six weeks.

Ms. Hocken appointed Ms. Murphy, either Mr. Bailey or Mr. Kleger, whoever might be available during the necessary meeting times, and herself to a committee to study this issue during the next two weeks.

**PROCEDURES FOR RECEIVING PUBLIC TESTIMONY:** Ms. Hocken noted that a resolution adopting procedures for receiving public testimony was adopted at the May Board meeting. Since then, the attorney had responded to a question raised by Board members by suggesting a minor revision to the resolution. The revised was found on page 46 of the agenda packet for the June 18 meeting.

MOTION  
VOTE

Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the Resolution adopting procedures for receiving public testimony, as amended. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which then passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed.

**MPC REPRESENTATIVE:** Ms. Hocken informed the Board that the next meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) would be held on Thursday, July 10, when both LTD representatives (Mr. Bennett and Ms. Hocken) would be out of town. Mr. Viggiano added that the agenda would include an update on transportation projects.

Ms. Hocken appointed Mr. Bailey to represent the Board at that meeting.

**ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:**

**Board Member Testimony:** Mr. Kleger said that he had testified before the Senate Revenue Committee on behalf of the Special Transportation Fund (STF) Committee.

**August Meeting Canceled:** Ms. Hocken reminded the Board that the regular July Board meeting had been canceled for lack of a quorum. There was still a possibility that a work session would be held in July.

**State Supreme Court Hearing:** Ms. Hocken announced that the State Supreme Court had decided to hear the salary initiative case. The hearing was scheduled for September.

**Joint Meeting with Springfield City Council:** Ms. Hocken stated that the letter received from City Councilor Greg Shaver, included in the agenda packet, was somewhat disappointing. The Board would have an opportunity to hold a follow-up discussion to the May 27 joint meeting at a later date. Ms. Murphy noted that the Springfield Council would be on vacation in July and August.

MOTION  
VOTE

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Bailey moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, and Saydack voting in favor and none opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

  
Board Secretary