

MINUTES OF THE DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, December 17, 1997

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 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, December 17, 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
Hillary Wylie
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: None

CALL TO ORDER: Board President Pat Hocken called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: Ms. Hocken stated that there was an addition to the agenda that consisted of an executive session with District counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to current litigation or litigation likely to be filed and concerning written legal advice.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Ms. Hocken introduced System Supervisor Jim Coffman, LTD's January 1998 Employee of the Month. Mr. Coffman was hired on December 30, 1991, as a part-time bus operator. He became a full-time bus operator in June 1993, and in July 1994, he was one of five bus operators selected to become temporary system supervisors (TSS's). Then, on January 25, 1996, Mr. Coffman was promoted to system supervisor. Prior to his promotion, Mr. Coffman had earned a three-year safe-driving award and had achieved correct schedule operation for more than three years. Mr. Coffman was nominated by a bus operator, who wrote that she had a great sense of comfort when Jim was on the radio. In addition, she wrote that his manner was always pleasant, he worked very

hard to help, had a great sense of humor, and was the best notifier of current LTD time.

Ms. Hocken presented Mr. Coffman with a letter of congratulations, a certificate, and a monetary award. Mr. Coffman stated that he truly enjoyed his job at LTD and the people he worked with. He thanked the Board for the award.

MOTION

VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Mr. Bailey moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for December 17, 1997, is approved as presented." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, and the Consent Calendar was approved by unanimous vote, 7 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the November 17, 1997, Special Meeting / Work Session and the minutes of the November 19, 1997, regular Board meeting. Ms. Hocken noted that she left the November 17 meeting at 8:05 p.m., and not 7:05 p.m., as was stated on page 10 of the November 17 minutes.

LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE (LCC) GROUP PASS: Ms. Hocken provided a review of meetings that she, Mr. Bailey, and staff had held with LCC Board member Kathleen Shelly, LCC Director of Purchasing Lloyd Raines, and ASLCC President Danny Armanino to try to work out a group pass agreement. She stated that an LCC group pass would provide a significant opportunity for LTD to reduce vehicle miles traveled, increase productivity, and reduce congestion in and around the LCC main campus.

Ms. Hocken stated that LTD had learned more about the issues at LCC, and LCC staff had learned more about LTD's issues. The number one issue for LCC was the cost of the program. A survey had been conducted among the students, who responded that \$10.00 was the most they would be comfortable with. Ms. Hocken wanted to offer a reasonable discount to LCC to get the program started. A preliminary price of \$11.16 per student per term was being reviewed. LCC was researching two options, student fees and registration fees, to raise the money. LCC also had looked at imposing parking fees, but that proposal was not favored.

Ms. Shelly stated that LCC staff appreciated that LTD was working with them to address the parking and transportation needs of the students, staff, and faculty. Mr. Raines stated that LCC had addressed the issue of assessing parking fees, which was not well received. He hoped to resolve, at the very least, a trial program to be implemented during the 1998-99 school year.

Mr. Bailey stated that the initial meeting was very productive. He believed that all the participants were committed to a solution. He had been unable to attend subsequent meetings.

Mr. Kleger stated that he observed that the buses to LCC were very full, and he asked if LTD would have the equipment to meet the additional capacity that a group pass program would create. Ms. Hocken replied that the fee would cover the cost of additional bus trips. Mr. Kleger stated that he favored the discount for the pilot program.

Ms. Murphy stated that she liked the trial-period concept, as it would attract new riders and reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles being driven to campus.

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board approves in concept a discount in per-participant price for a limited-duration group bus pass program with full-time students at the Lane Community College Campus." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote of 7 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken added that this initial program would focus on the main campus, but staff would look for a way to approach the downtown campus transportation issue.

MOTION

EXECUTIVE (NON-PUBLIC) SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1) AND ORS 192.660(1)(h): Ms. Hocken reiterated that an executive session had been added to the agenda for the meeting and called for a motion. Mr. Saydack moved that "the Board meet in executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1) and ORS 192.660(1)(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 and concerning written legal advice under ORS 40.225, ORS 192.660(1)(f), and ORS 192.502(8)." Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote of 7 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. The executive session began at 7:20 p.m., and ended at 8:05 p.m. District Counsel Greg Skillman was present for this discussion.

VOTE

EUGENE STATION SECURITY: Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn was present to discuss three recommendations addressing security at the new station.

EUGENE STATION SECURITY: FIRST READING, LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT ORDINANCE 36, 1997 REVISION, "REGULATIONS GOVERNING CONDUCT ON DISTRICT PROPERTY": Mr. Pangborn reviewed the recommended changes, which included revisions to Sections 1.05, 1.15, 1.20, and 1.30 of Ordinance 36.

Mr. Kleger asked about Section 1.15(10)(c) in which the District's right of closure was addressed. He asked if the reasons for closure list should not be limited to those listed, adding the word "not." Mr. Pangborn agreed.

Mr. Kleger then asked about the Exclusion of Non-district Vehicles, listed in Section 1.15(10)(e) and if the Mall Guides' vehicle would be excluded from District stations. Mr. Pangborn replied that signs would be posted that would describe which vehicles would be exempt from this exclusion.

Mr. Kleger asked about Section 1.14(13), which addressed packages brought on board District vehicles and whether or not folded-wire carts were allowed. Mr. Pangborn replied that the bus operators would make discretionary decisions about packages brought on board.

With regards to Section 1.15(21), Mr. Skillman stated that the earlier version of the ordinance contained a prohibition on obscenities and fighting words. That had been deleted in the newer version in favor of language that focused on the effect of the word on the person hearing it. Section 1.15(5) addressed disorderly conduct and physical or verbal fighting, and Section 1.15(6) addressed harassment and was the same language that was in the state statute on harassment. Section 1.15(6)(b) addressed abusive words or gestures made in a manner intended and likely to provoke a violent response. Those sections addressed the limited effects of the words. Section 1.15(21) addressed the effects of the offensive or threatening language, and was a judgement call as to whether someone's language was offensive enough to interfere with someone else's enjoyment of the system. Mr. Skillman further explained that obscenity, per se, was something that the District most likely would lose a legal fight on, but the effect on someone who was trying to enjoy the bus system would be easier to police.

Mr. Saydack noted that there were several places in the ordinance where LTD was proscribing conduct that could, in some cases, be constitutionally protected. Under this ordinance, LTD had the right to issue citations and revoke service, which could be punishable by monetary fines. He asked what the potential exposure to the Board or District was if the ordinance was enforced in a manner that was found to be in violation of state or federal law. He stated that there was a provision in the ordinance that prohibited violation of any state or federal law, and the ordinance defined certain other conduct as in violation of the ordinance, because what LTD was trying to do was manage behavioral problems that might occur within the transit system. But, when the ordinance went outside of the law that had been set by the state and federal legislature, Mr. Saydack asked what protection LTD would have if someone challenged the ordinance as unconstitutional.

Mr. Skillman replied that if someone challenged the ordinance and it was found unconstitutional, the ordinance would need to be changed. However, in terms of damages to the challenger, the harm would be if it were found that their constitutional rights had been illegally restrained. Mr. Skillman further stated that the remedies in the ordinance were exclusion from the bus system and, potentially, a citation, once that system was developed. The system for enforcing those citations would include an intergovernmental agreement, and someone could be fined a maximum of \$250. In addition, a hearing procedure incorporated into the ordinance would give someone the right to due process, which could dovetail into the contested

case hearing procedure. If a constitutional issue were raised that LTD might be vulnerable on, the process to handle that was written into the ordinance. However, if LTD were found liable to have impaired someone's constitutional rights, it could be a serious liability.

Mr. Saydack asked if the monetary fine was listed in the ordinance. Mr. Skillman replied that it was in Ordinance 36 and in ORS.267, the statute governing District operations. Mr. Saydack then asked if there were any aspect of Ordinance 36 in which Mr. Skillman questioned its constitutionality. Mr. Skillman stated that the issues that Mr. Saydack had brought up all were addressed by orienting constraints on an individual's behavior toward safety and comfort of the transit users. Areas of the station had been identified where restrictions would apply, such as solicitation of signatures, when it could impede the safe use of the system.

Mr. Skillman further stated that when the ordinance was drafted, staff and counsel looked at what were the most dangerous areas, or the areas where someone's use of the station or system could be impeded by someone else's exercise of their constitutional rights. For that reason, under Section 1.15(23)(b), the ordinance stated that no person could canvass, seek signatures on any petition, collect money, solicit sales, etc., on any District vehicle or within five feet of any vehicle doorway, etc. It did not cover every area of the station, and there were some areas within the station where someone could make a public statement or collect signatures.

Mr. Saydack asked if some of the aspects of the ordinance went beyond impeding use. He cited Section 1.15(21), which addressed offensive or threatening language, "...in such a manner as to interfere with a passenger's use and enjoyment of the transit system." Mr. Saydack thought that enjoyment was subjective, but that "use" was not necessarily subjective. He said that it was one thing for someone to threaten someone in a bizarre manner that would impede that person from using the system, but if someone were giving a political speech, singing a song, or reading from the Bible, which might interfere with someone else's enjoyment of the station, he did not see how that could be proscribed. Mr. Skillman thought that type of conduct could be proscribed on a bus. There were Supreme Court cases on incidents inside buses and other vehicles, as those were not considered public forums. Areas in the station, however, could be considered public forums. The ordinance could not state that people could not be obscene in those areas, but it could state that a person or persons could not impede someone's use of or the normal flow of traffic in the station.

Ms. Hocken stated that it occurred to her that "use and enjoyment" needed to be more clearly defined. She thought that enjoyment did not necessarily mean having fun, but rather the full use of the property. She thought that was the legal meaning as intended in the ordinance.

Mr. Saydack asked if there were aspects of the ordinance that pushed the limits of constitutionally protected behavior. In order to try to maintain order and provide for a safe environment, as was the purpose of the ordinance, he asked if LTD was being too aggressive or doing anything that any court had not said was within the rights of a transit district in trying to accomplish the purposes that LTD was trying to accomplish. He thought the Board should get a legal opinion on that.

Mr. Skillman responded that Section 1.15(21) was a rewrite of what was already in the ordinance. He understood that it was a concern of staff, and the ability to enforce such things as obscene and obnoxious language and other actions by riders that might interfere with other riders would be difficult. He agreed that if an aspect of the ordinance pushed the District into an area where someone might sue the District about it, discretion should be used, and that section should be removed from the ordinance. Removing those sections would create more management problems. He thought that the enjoyment issue was somewhat ambiguous, but the statements about impeding the use should remain in the ordinance. He could not say whether or not some of those particular words had been upheld in a court of law.

Mr. Kieger stated that in regard to "enjoyment," it was his impression that, historically, that referred to the practical use versus the theoretical use. Mr. Skillman stated that it was redundant; use of the transit system was the same as use and enjoyment of the transit system.

Mr. Bennett stated that he thought LTD should be aggressive in protecting the rights of all riders. A broad spectrum of people should be allowed to enjoy the station and the buses. Several groups currently were discussing this issue as it related to many areas, such as downtown mall areas.

Ms. Wylie brought up the issue of Section 1.15(7) regarding food and beverages. She thought it seemed contradictory to state that people could carry commuter cups onto the bus, but that no eating or drinking was allowed on the bus. Mr. Skillman replied that it had been stated this way in the previous ordinance, and it was a practicality. Mr. Pangborn added that for those who ride the bus to the grocery store and want to take their groceries home on the bus as opposed to those who stopped at a fast food restaurant and wanted to eat their lunch on board the bus, a happy medium was reached that allowed people to carry their food and drinks on board in closed containers. Their food or drink would still be available to them when they deboarded the bus.

Ms. Hocken noted that in the BRT video, someone was shown on the bus drinking from a commuter cup. She thought a consistent message needed to be made. As a process check, Ms. Hocken stated that the first reading of the ordinance was to be held at this meeting, with the second reading to occur in January. She asked if the process could be moved back one month to allow for all the questions to be addressed. Mr. Pangborn stated that the intent to have the first reading was to address questions, and if there were none, to go ahead and have the first reading.

Ms. Hocken then asked how closely LTD had worked with counsel for the City of Eugene in terms of the mall ordinance. Mr. Skillman stated that he had obtained an advance draft copy of the revised Mall Ordinance, and had incorporated as many parts of it as applied to LTD's situation. Mr. Saydack stated that he thought it was useful to have that to use as a check against what LTD was doing.

Mr. Skillman added that he also had looked at Tri-Met's ordinances and incorporated common language. Mr. Pangborn stated that LTD had used Tri-Met's ordinance in drafting the original Ordinance 36.

In regard to how aggressive LTD wanted to be in this ordinance, Mr. Skillman cited the challenge to the City of Eugene's ordinance in 1984 by a gentleman who was selling jokes on the street corners. Because the ordinance at that time was very broad, the gentleman was able to challenge it in the Supreme Court and got the ordinance changed. Mr. Skillman thought that it was important to have a due process procedure in place to address problems as they arose.

Mr. Saydack stated that he was very interested in maintaining a safe, orderly environment at the station. He encouraged Mr. Skillman to consider state law and to not go beyond that law and what that law could govern. He thought it was adequate to rely upon and enforce a law that was already in place.

Mr. Kleger, referring to the food and beverage issue, stated that he thought it might be worth including a reference to spillage prevention as that constituted the risk to safety. Mr. Skillman replied that doing so would create an enforcement issue to whomever was to enforce it, by making choices about what looked as though it might spill and what did not. It was simpler just to state that no open containers were allowed. Mr. Kleger then stated that the issue of someone slipping on what's spilled may be in a more general provision of the ordinance that addressed safety. Mr. Skillman stated that the statement could be as restrictive as LTD wanted it to be.

Ms. Hocken asked about Section 1.15(20) regarding weapons and whether firearms were included. Mr. Skillman replied that there was a statute that prevented LTD from policing firearms. As long as someone has a valid permit to carry a concealed weapon, they were allowed on the bus; however, it was stated in that section that illegal or unlawfully possessed weapons of any kind were not allowed.

Ms. Hocken asked what was the definition of the boarding platform as stated in Section 1.15(22). She was concerned about the provision that only passengers and District personnel were permitted on any District station boarding platform. Mr. Skillman stated that there was no definition of a boarding platform, but there were definitions for passengers. The purpose of the statement was to keep people from loitering, panhandling, etc., along the covered section of the boarding platform as a safety concern.

Ms. Hocken stated that she was concerned that this would be open to subjective enforcement. She noted that the new owners of the McDonald Theatre

building were hoping to turn the back side of that building, which currently housed the LTD lounge and construction office, into a retail establishment that would attract both bus users and others. It also was a goal of the Eugene Station Committee to attract retail along the outer areas of the station. She was concerned about restricting people from walking across the boarding platforms. Mr. Pangborn stated that in the case of the McDonald Theatre, the owners of the building owned a right-of-way in front of the building, which looked like it was part of the platform, but was actually part of their property. Ms. Hocken stated that this could be open to subjective enforcement. LTD was not likely to enforce it against someone who was crossing the platform to get to the retail area, but might enforce it against someone who was thought to be an inappropriate person to be in the area, such as someone who was loitering about.

Mr. Skillman stated that the intent was exclusively for safety reasons to keep other activities other than boarding and deboarding buses off that platform. Mr. Saydack cautioned that LTD be careful about anti-loitering. Enforcement clearly had to relate to safety and be enforceable. Ms. Hocken thought there was a conflict in the message, and it should be more clearly defined.

Mr. Kleger suggested that the section be reworded to limit anyone's right to block or impede LTD customers' movement on the platform, particularly during major pulses.

Mr. Pangborn stated that staff would make revisions and bring the ordinance back to the Board for further review.

Mr. Saydack stated that he was very concerned about violating constitutional rights; however, he complimented staff and counsel, saying that the draft was a very good effort and a fine piece of work.

Mr. Kleger asked if the District might want to restrict the lighting of flames within the station. He was referring to Section 1.15(19) regarding flammable substances. Mr. Pangborn replied that if there were damages related to the lighting of a match or lighter, enforcement would fall under destruction of property.

Ms. Murphy, referring to Section 1.15(15) regarding repulsive odors, stated that the Eugene Public Library had an issue of enforcement around that topic, and she asked if that had been resolved. Mr. Skillman stated that it was a tricky issue, since what might be repulsive to one person might not be to another. The way it was worded was that it would not be enforced until it caused a nuisance or extreme discomfort to District passengers or employees. This was another subjective, discretionary issue. Mr. Kleger added that this issue had been handled well in the past, and usually dealt with people who were grossly unclean.

EUGENE STATION SECURITY: COMMUNITY POLICING STATION AT EUGENE STATION: Mr. Pangborn continued his presentation by stating that a goal of the Community Policing Station was to help convince the community that the new

bus station was safe. This would be accomplished by a police presence at the station. Staff were recommending that the Board approve funding to support the Community Policing Station for the next two fiscal years, after which time LTD's participation would be renegotiated.

Mr. Bennett asked what the square footage of the policing office was. Mr. Pangborn replied that it was 880 square feet. The office would be located in the 1099 Olive building with exposure both to the street and the station.

Ms. Wylie asked about the office space, and if it would be used by other officers or the Mall Guides. Mr. Pangborn replied that it would be, but that uniformed officers would be dispatched from the main police station in Eugene.

Ms. Wylie then asked about the \$12,000 in lost retail space revenue, and why the Community Policing Station would be open only four days per week. Mr. Pangborn replied that staff hoped that the City would move other functions to that location with the intent to keep the office open longer. The Mall Guides would work out of the same facility. The Mall Guides and the police had a very good working relationship.

Mr. Bennett discussed what likely would be the most effective. LTD currently shared the cost of a uniformed officer who could be visible several times per day and would use this space as a base. A Community Service Officer (CSO) would be important as a reference person, but the location also would become a place for other officers to check in. He also asked how effective the Mall Guides were. Transit Projects Administrator Rick Bailor replied that the Guides were perceived as very professional eyes and ears to the police. LTD operators did not view the Guides as a representative of the police department; however, they did know that the Guides could get to the operators quickly as they entered the station.

Mr. Bennett thought CSOs would not be as visible, since they were not uniformed, sworn officers. Mr. Bailor replied that the CSOs did wear a uniform but did not carry a gun. They carried a two-way radio that was directed to police dispatch. Mr. Bailor stated that his interpretation of what the CSO was to be used for was not to act as a police officer or Mall Guide, but to keep the community policing station open.

Mr. Bennett asked if having the community policing station there with the Mall Guides and the LTD share of the uniformed officer would be as effective or more effective than beefing up the support for the existing officer and Mall Guides. Mr. Pangborn replied that the value of having a sanctioned, licensed Community Policing Station within the Eugene Station could be measured by the community's perception of how safe the station would be. Staff believed that because a CSO was a member of the Eugene Police Department (EPD), calls for help would have more value.

Ms. Murphy stated that she had talked with a former member of the EPD, who said that he was not sure that using a CSO would increase the sense of security. The people who would be most likely to be in violation of rules and laws would be those who knew that CSOs did not have the ability to arrest. She was concerned about the level of service expectations and outcomes.

Mr. Saydack thought that having a facility in the station would give the public a strong perception of safety. A uniformed officer would be more effective, but would not be at the facility at all times. The facility must be open, and a CSO would be able to do that. There was a value of having a constant police presence.

Mr. Bailey stated that the role of the CSO and community policing station was to provide a sense of station security. The CSO would not patrol, but would be there to receive complaints, etc. Currently, there was nothing like that even remotely close to the station. As for the outcome, Mr. Bailey had information about how the community policing station worked in the University area. He said that the station had a dramatic positive impact on that area, and he believed it would have the same impact at the LTD station.

Mr. Kleger stated that he traveled through the downtown station area often, and he strongly urged the Board members to adopt the proposal in both parts. LTD needed to continue the presence not only in the station itself, but in the surrounding area as well. Bus operators and residents in the vicinity were not just concerned with the station, but about the whole zone. The combination of both the community policing station and LTD's increased security together would provide for enhanced safety, both in perception and in reality. Mr. Kleger thought it was needed to correct the mistaken impression and to keep the security problem from boiling over.

Mr. Bennett asked if staff had considered a private LTD staff security approach. Mr. Pangborn replied that it had not been considered because in the context of the Board's joint meeting with the Eugene City Council, a value was seen in exploring the issue of the community policing station. The value to LTD would be that the presence of that policing station most likely would deter potential criminal activities from taking place at the station, such as drug dealing, enabling LTD to focus energy on other behavioral activities. The third part of Mr. Pangborn's proposal would address how LTD would take its own responsibility to monitor behavior on the station platform.

Mr. Bennett asked what the total cost for security would be on an annual basis. Mr. Pangborn replied that the cost would be \$152,000 per year, not including the third part of the proposal that he had yet to address.

Ms. Hocken asked what the prospects were that the Downtown Eugene, Inc. (DEI), and the Midtown Merchants would contribute toward an additional CSO to keep the policing station open six days per week, ten hours per day. Mr. Pangborn replied that the Board of DEI had approved the plan and were polling the members to increase the dues to cover that cost. The Midtown Merchants were collecting

donations to cover their portion of the cost. Mr. Bennett stated that the DEI proposal had a good chance to be funded. Mr. Pangborn added that the Police Department was very supportive, but was constrained with regard to funding assistance.

EUGENE STATION SECURITY: RECOMMENDATION FOR ADDITIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AT THE EUGENE STATION: Mr. Pangborn stated that this was the final consideration for station security, which addressed the question of personnel specifically assigned to supervise the station platform. He said that one of the goals for the station was that, at least when the station opened, LTD had adequate and appropriate staffing to create a safe and efficient operation and that Ordinance 36 immediately be implemented in order to set the standard right from the beginning. Staff requested an increase of 1.8 FTE for additional field supervisors for a six-month trial period, at a cost of \$53,000. Those supervisors would provide sufficient staffing so that the platform could be covered by one supervisor eight hours a day, seven days a week.

Mr. Bennett asked if the platform supervisors would be identifiable as LTD representatives. Mr. Pangborn replied that staff were considering uniforms for all field supervisors. The field supervisor had the authority to enforce Ordinance 36 by writing citations, excluding people from the station and/or service, etc.

Mr. Bennett asked what would happen after the six-month period. Mr. Pangborn replied that, currently, staff did not know how the station would operate, and would reevaluate the process following the six-month period. This initial period would cover the station platform through the implementation of new service in September.

Ms. Hocken stated that there were two motions for consideration by the Board, and there being no further discussion, she called for the first motion.

MOTION

Mr. Saydack moved approval of the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposal to provide space for a community policing station and funding for one Community Service Officer in the new Eugene Station, effective March 18, 1998." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 7 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

MOTION

Mr. Kleger moved approval of the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board approves the recommendation to increase the staffing of the Eugene Station for a period of six months, with the cost for this increased staffing to be transferred from the FY 1997-98 operational contingency fund." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 7 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

SPECIAL RECOGNITION: Ms. Hocken asked the Board members to take a moment to recognize Roger Saydack's contribution to the Board. Mr. Saydack's

term expired at the end of December, and he chose not to be reappointed. Ms. Hocken presented Mr. Saydack with a wooden bus and a plaque. Mr. Saydack stated that it had been a privilege for him to serve with the other Board members. He said that he had learned a lot by seeing first-hand an operation of government when it was really operating at its best. He also said that the reason we had the system of government that we did in this country was because of committed staff and Board members like those at LTD.

PLEDGE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS: Ms. Hocken circulated a pledge for interested Board members to read and sign. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County had circulated the pledge, which related to International Human Rights Day. This pledge respected diversity and honored human rights. The City of Eugene would collect the signed pledges for possible publication.

BUS RAPID TRANSIT: POLICY WORDING IN TRANSPLAN: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano was present to discuss the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) policy with the Board. He reminded the Board that this policy had been developed and shared with the City Councilors of Eugene and Springfield and with the Lane County Board of Commissioners. Informal approval had been given by those jurisdictions; however, the City of Springfield had suggested some minor changes. The changes were highlighted on page 64 of the agenda packet. There were two other minor changes suggested by District counsel. He stated that if the Board approved of the changes, the revised wording would be included in the draft TransPlan. There would be an opportunity for further review when the draft TransPlan was distributed to the jurisdictions for review in 1998.

Ms. Hocken stated her concern that the Board had already presented the previous language to the other jurisdictions, and what their reaction would be to have revised language presented again. Mr. Viggiano did not think that there would be objection to the revisions, but there was the option to revert to the previous language, which had been agreed to.

Mr. Bennett stated his concern about the wording under the Policy Definition/Intent section, "all or most." He stated that the positive characteristics should not be qualified in that manner. Mr. Viggiano stated that he would remove "all or most" from that statement. The revised statement would read, "These positive characteristics include the following:"

MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the BRT policy wording in the draft TransPlan is to be revised as recommended by staff and Board discussion this evening." Ms. Murphy seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 7 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

VOTE

IMPLEMENTATION OF REVISED ADMINISTRATIVE SALARY SCHEDULE: Mr. Pangborn stated that at the November 1997 meeting, the Board

had adopted a revised administrative salary schedule with the direction that the General Manager consider the details of the schedule's implementation. Mr. Pangborn presented the revised Market-Based Administrative Salary Schedule to become effective June 29, 1997.

MOTION

Mr. Bennett moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the attached revised Market-Based Administrative Salary Schedule be made effective June 29, 1997." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion.

Mr. Saydack asked if there were any other changes than the implementation date. Mr. Pangborn stated that some titles had been corrected.

VOTE

Ms. Hocken called for a vote on the motion, which carried by unanimous vote of 7 to 0, with Bailey, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, Murphy, Saydack, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION: Ms. Hocken stated that there was an invitation to the Lane Council of Governments Dinner on January 8, 1998. If any Board members were interested in going, the District would host the cost to attend. She stated that it would be a good opportunity to meet with elected officials from other jurisdictions. Interested Board members were asked to call Executive Secretary Jo Sullivan.

In addition, Ms. Hocken noted that LTD had received a Certificate of Recognition for its Commuter Solutions Program from the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency. She congratulated Commuter Solutions Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams for her work in that area.

Ms. Wylie stated that she was interested in the Steering Committee Assignments agenda item on page 80 of the agenda packet, particularly since the committees were to be formed in January, 1998. Ms. Hocken stated that this item could be postponed until the January meeting. She thought the appropriate Board members to serve on the Springfield Station Steering Committee were Ms. Wylie and Ms. Murphy, as the two Springfield representatives, and Mr. Kleger, who was a regular bus rider and who would be most likely to use that station. In regards to the BRT Steering Committee, Ms. Hocken thought she would appoint Mr. Bailey, Mr. Bennett, and herself.

Mr. Bennett asked if the steering committees would be discussed again in January. He stated that he carefully had read a letter that was received from Greg Shaver, and he was concerned about postponing the discussion. Mr. Pangborn stated that the letter should be discussed in the context of the steering committee, so it would be moved to the January meeting as well. Ms. Murphy concurred with Mr. Shaver's letter that Springfield be well represented on the BRT Steering Committee. Ms. Hocken stated that these issues would be discussed at the January meeting of the Board.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, Ms. Hocken adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.


Board Secretary