

## MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

### LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, December 16, 1998

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on December 10, 1998, 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 16, 1998, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Kirk Bailey, President, presiding  
Pat Hocken  
Dave Kleger, Treasurer  
Dean Kortge  
Virginia Lauritsen  
Hillary Wylie, Secretary  
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager  
Susan Hekimoglu, Recording Secretary

Absent: Rob Bennett, Vice President

### **II. CALL TO ORDER**

Board President Kirk Bailey called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. Ms. Hocken was not yet present.

### **III. WORK SESSION ON 1999 LEGISLATIVE ISSUES**

Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch was present to discuss the meeting with local legislators that took place on Monday, December 14, 1998. She stated that the legislative session would begin on Monday, January 11, 1999. Following the discussion with legislators, Ms. Lynch had prepared additional information to provide the legislators in terms of the Willamette Valley train service and the budgeted money that LTD contributed to Special Transportation.

Mr. Kortge stated that the whole idea of gaining support for the train via a feeder bus system seemed to be a very complicated legislative issue, and he asked how realistic it was. Ms. Lynch responded that the current train service already was complemented by throughway motor coaches that provided service between Eugene and Portland. What was proposed were similar systems that would operate from the Medford / Grants Pass area, the Burns area, and one or two locations from the coast. Those throughway buses would not operate daily, but several days each week. That proposal was more of a budget proposal that



could be administratively accomplished. Amtrak operated the throughway motor coaches between Eugene and Portland, and it had not cost the state anything.

Mr. Kortge also mentioned Representative Prozanski's comment about how important it would be to have all transit districts lobby with a unified voice. He asked if that were even possible. Ms. Loobey responded that it had been done for about 20 years under the umbrella of the Oregon Transit Association (OTA). The OTA was an active association that met monthly. Ms. Loobey currently was the president of the OTA. During the legislative session, the OTA offices were moved to Salem. The most active OTA participants for the ongoing lobbying efforts on behalf of transit in the state had been Dick Feeney and Bernie Bottomly of Tri-Met and Ms. Loobey.

Ms. Lynch added that she believed that more was better during legislative sessions, and it would be nice to get 20 different transit districts to lobby; however, realistically, that was very difficult to accomplish. That was the reason for the formation of the OTA – to represent all the interests. She thought that Representative Prozanski might prefer to see each transit district represented, but that would be difficult to accomplish.

Ms. Loobey stated that in the state of Oregon, transit districts could take multiple forms. There were elderly and handicapped operations in every county that typically were either non-profit or volunteer driven. Except for Tri-Met and LTD, all other transit districts in the state were funded by property taxes, Special Transportation Fund (STF) cigarette tax money, or fundraisers.

Mr. Kleger suggested that he and Ms. Lynch get together to discuss ways in which passenger and freight rail could work together.

Ms. Hocken arrived at the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Ms. Lynch stated that she would be turning her attention to Salem and would be working out of the OTA office. She would be in the capital most days. She would have a computer with a modem and a cell phone. She was developing a good bill tracking system that would list bills that the District was working on and what the impact of those bills might be. She anticipated a couple dozen bills to track, and she would write regular briefings for the Board agenda packets. She also would welcome direction or suggestions from the Board.

Mr. Kortge asked what Ms. Lynch meant by tracking bills that might have an impact on the District. He wondered if that would be a comprehensive list, such as OSHA regulations, etc. Ms. Lynch responded that she would track all bills, including operation and administrative bills.

Ms. Lauritsen suggested that a debriefing be provided in each month's Board packet. Ms. Wylie suggested an occasional verbal report as well as an update in the agenda packets, and other communications as needed.



Ms. Lynch stated that she would be back before the Board in January to discuss the federal agenda.

## **V. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING**

### **A. CURRENT ACTIVITIES**

**1. Board Member Reports: Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC):**  
Ms. Hocken reported that the MPC had not met during the month of December.

Statewide Livability Forum: Ms. Hocken stated that this committee meets on a six-month schedule, and there was nothing new to report since the November Board meeting.

BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input:  
Ms. Hocken stated that a BRT Steering Committee meeting was held during the past week. The Steering Committee recommended to the LTD Board a preferred design alternative for the Franklin / UO Segment of the pilot corridor. The LTD Board would be making a decision on that recommendation during this meeting.

Ms. Hocken added that she believed that the Steering Committee members represented a good cross-section of the community. Both City Councils were represented, as was the Lane County Planning Commission. In addition, there were representatives of the business community on the Steering Committee.

Mr. Bailey asked staff to provide an update about the Lane County Planning Commission and the requested change in the wording of the BRT policy statement in TransPlan. Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano responded that staff had been meeting with the three planning commissions as part of the TransPlan update to discuss the BRT policy. The discussions had gone well, and each one of those groups had agreed that the policy wording change made sense.

Staff had learned, however, that at a meeting on December 15, 1998, the Lane County Planning Commission had further discussions about BRT in general and the policy, even though it was not on the meeting agenda. Steve Moe, who was a Glenwood resident as well as a member of the Lane County Planning Commission, brought up the issue. Mr. Moe had been very actively involved in the BRT corridor design work for the Glenwood segment. He participated in the Glenwood design workshops during the past several weeks. The Glenwood segment was controversial because some of the alternatives that were being considered would restrict access to some of the Glenwood businesses that now had unrestricted access into their driveways.

As a result, staff were considering other options that had developed during the public planning process that might achieve LTD's goals of exclusive right-of-way through Glenwood as well as to address the access concerns.

Springfield Station Steering Committee: Ms. Wylie reported that this Steering Committee did not meet in December. However, it had met since the last Board



meeting. On page 31 of the Board packet, there was a map indicating the eight possible sites that had been selected for further study. All were on "A" Street or Main, with the exception of the current site.

Participation in Springfield Chamber Depot Holly Days Event: Ms. Wylie reported that the event was well attended. The bus was decorated with lights, and people appreciated LTD's involvement.

**2. Monthly Financial Report:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson reported that the first four months of the fiscal year were summarized in her report on page 8 of the agenda packet.

Fare revenues were slightly lower than expected. Customers were shifting from paying cash fares to purchasing pass instruments, which indicated a loyal ridership base and repeat riders. That fit in with the long-term plan, but not so well with the short-term budget plan; however, it was close to projected fare revenues, and Ms. Hellekson was not concerned at this time.

The payroll tax was paid quarterly, and the District normally could expect to receive the first quarter of its fiscal year revenue during the month of October. However, this year, the payment was not received from the Department of Revenue until November. More than \$2.6 million was received in November, which meant that for the end of the first five months of the year, LTD had collected 50 percent of its budgeted payroll tax revenue.

Ms. Hellekson would provide reports for both November and December to the Board at the January Board meeting.

Ms. Hocken asked how LTD recorded the revenue from the state and payroll taxes. Ms. Hellekson replied that the State in-lieu-of taxes were accrued on a quarterly basis, but the payroll tax transfers were not as easily assigned to a particular collection period. The tax accrual policies will be reviewed, and a report provided at a later date.

**3. University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC) Study Preliminary Results:** Ms. Hellekson said that there was a transportation studies group at the UNCC that studied performance of transit districts nationwide. The sample pool grew larger each year, and LTD had been included in the study in all five years of its existence.

The initial results were received, and LTD was ranked 18<sup>th</sup> in this latest study. During previous years, LTD had been ranked as high as 17<sup>th</sup> and as low as 25<sup>th</sup> in the national pool, and always had been in the top 20 percent. Remaining in the top 20 percent was a goal of LTD's long-term strategic plan.

Staff intended to provide the full report to the Board as part of a comprehensive review on the overall performance of the District.





Ms. Hocken asked if staff knew anything about the rankings of the peer group districts. Ms. Hellekson replied that information had not been included in the preliminary results that were received.

Mr. Bailey asked if it was known how two other districts -- Newport News and Las Vegas -- had jumped so high in the ratings. Ms. Hellekson said that there were differences in how statistics were reported to the FTA on the part of other transit properties. In some cases, a district would make a reporting change that could temporarily increase or decrease relative performance. In most cases, dramatic changes in relative performance were the result of rapid growth, major service reductions, or some other significant change in service occurring during a relatively short period of time.

Las Vegas had a massive expansion during the last year, which included operating multi-passenger, articulated buses up and down the "strip." Las Vegas was experiencing high ridership on those buses.

The study results favored high ridership, low cost per ride, and a low fare per ride, but it did not favor subsidies. So, if a transit property had a very productive run, such as in Las Vegas, it was rated more favorably.

**4. Year 2000 (Y2K) Compliance:** Information Services Manager Joe Janda was present to answer questions that the Board might have. He said that LTD did not have too many internal Y2K issues. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) had required transit properties nationwide to review their mission-critical systems and were asking the transit district to send a letter of compliance to the FTA. The letter was due by June 1999.

The biggest concern to staff was the external environment in the community, such as power, contractors, and LTD's banking institution. Staff were reviewing LTD's emergency plan. The Glenwood site had its own power generator and 30 days worth of stored fuel. The Eugene Station was part of the first priority area of the Eugene City emergency grid. Staff were making arrangements for portable power that could be brought in to the high-use shelters.

Ms. Lauritsen asked, in addition to fuel and power, what else might be unavailable in the event of a Y2K emergency. Mr. Janda responded that LTD had a 30-day supply of fuel, but that in the event there were disruptions to the fuel delivery system, the State had an emergency plan that prioritized the fuel delivery mechanism, and transit was a high priority on that list.

Ms. Lauritsen asked about telephone communications. Mr. Janda replied that locally, it was not expected to be a problem. LTD's own telephone system was 100 percent compliant, and the regional telephone system appeared to be in good order.

Mr. Bailey asked if the FTA was in compliance. Mr. Janda replied that he did not know.



Mr. Kleger asked to what degree LTD's medium- to high-tech equipment had old-style embedded chips with calendars. Mr. Janda replied that none of the equipment on the buses was calendar based. However, in the fueling system, those chips were being replaced. The radio system was in compliance. The mechanical systems for the facilities were in compliance as well.

Ms. Hocken noted that in the letter from the FTA, it was mentioned that there could be funding available to ensure that transit properties were compliant with Y2K. Mr. Janda responded that he interpreted that as applying to the large-scale Intelligent Transportation Systems and applications where code was written.

There being no further discussion about the Y2K problem, Ms. Loobey announced Mr. Janda's resignation from LTD. After his many years of exemplary service, he would be moving to Washington with his family. Mr. Janda assured the District that he would maintain contact, and he would continue to work as needed on a contracted basis. Mr. Bailey thanked Mr. Janda for his years of service to the District.

**5. Update on City of Eugene Nodal Development Project:** Mr. Bailey stated that this item would be forwarded to the January Board meeting.

**6. Radio System Update:** Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson provided a brief history of the project for the design and installation of a new mobile data radio system. Due to ongoing problems with the implementation of the new system, staff had decided to terminate the contract with GMSI, the contractor for the project, and look to the United Pacific Insurance company for relief.

The system would be evaluated during the next few weeks to determine what the next step would be, and staff would continue to provide updates to the Board. LTD now had a voice system that was in good working order. New, good, and useable equipment had been installed in the buses; however, the data system was unsatisfactory.

Mr. Kortge asked about the number of purveyors of radio systems. Mr. Johnson replied that there were more and more available; however, four years ago, there really were just a few.

Ms. Lauritsen asked who would be evaluating the current system. Mr. Johnson responded that an industry specialist and someone with whom LTD previously had worked on the project would provide a full evaluation and recommendations about what could be done to rectify the situation.

Mr. Johnson also reported that staff had been in contact with the FTA, the funding source for the radio system, and had kept them apprised of the situation. The FTA had assured staff that the funding was not in jeopardy. Mr. Johnson would provide another update to the Board in February.

**VI. EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Mr. Bailey introduced Customer Service Representatives Lanier Lobdell and Pam Wick, who had been selected as the



January 1999 co-Employees of the Month. They were nominated by someone who witnessed them assisting an elderly gentleman who was unaware of his situation and unable to ride the bus because of his physical condition. The nominator said that Ms. Lobdell and Ms. Wick "epitomized what humanity really was when dealing with some of our most difficult customer relations," and described the situation she witnessed as "a genuine act of selfless compassion and professionalism."

Mr. Bailey then presented both Ms. Lobdell and Ms. Wick with a letter of congratulations, a certificate of achievement, and a monetary award. Ms. Wick stated that she was quite honored and expressed her gratitude to the Board. Ms. Lobdell thanked the Board for the recognition for customer service.

**VII. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** Tom Lester of 1826 Lincoln Street in Eugene was present to discuss the UO/Franklin segment of the bus rapid transit (BRT) system. He asked the Board to give consideration to rerouting the transit line through the University Campus on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue via Kincaid Street. The University was one of the oldest density nodes in the whole metropolitan area, and next to downtown Springfield and downtown Eugene, it probably was the biggest. The idea that the major permanent transit line between our two cities would not go through the heart of the University ran counter to nodal development theory. He urged the Board to take a good hard look at doing that despite its immediate problems that might be perceived. He thought it was important for the Board to look at that prior to endorsing a preferred alternative design.

### **VIII. ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

MOTION  
VOTE

**A. Consent Calendar:** Mr. Kortge moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for December 16, 1998, is approved as presented." Ms. Lauritsen seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the Minutes of the November 18, 1998, regular Board meeting.

**E. Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR) Schedule:** Mr. Bailey stated that this item was being brought forward on the agenda to accommodate staff availability. Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora was present to discuss the time line for implementation of the CSR. Staff were not asking for the Board to take formal action at this time; however, comments on the timing and process were being sought.

Mr. Vobora provided a brief history of the CSR process as well as an overview of the elements of the CSR and the time line. He stated that while staff would begin the CSR process now, changes would not be made until the year 2000.

Ms. Hocken asked how the CSR fit into the BRT pilot corridor schedule, and if the first segment of BRT would be in place by the time the CSR was implemented. Mr. Vobora replied that the CSR would precede BRT by a full year and would encompass the downtown shuttle study, the Autzen Stadium planning, and how regular service related to BRT. Once the segments of the BRT pilot corridor were in



place, the Annual Route Review (ARR) would address the service redesigns in the BRT segment area.

Ms. Wylie asked if staff used software to plan routes. Mr. Vobora replied that was another project that was underway at LTD. Staff were reviewing scheduling software packaging to replace the older system that had been used. Ms. Wylie thought that once it was all programmed, staff should be able to see how a change impacted the rest of the area. Mr. Vobora agreed, and said that this new scheduling software would computerize several pieces of work that now took weeks to do by hand.

Mr. Bailey asked how the CSR related to the ARR. Mr. Vobora replied that the ARR would address service adjustments in September 1999. Staff would present the ARR to the Board in January and were anticipating only providing service fixes this year. There were no major additions or deletions planned.

Mr. Kleger asked if staff were doing any pre-development of feeder services to BRT during the CSR work. Mr. Vobora replied that the only experience with feeder service was the #38/39 Bailey Hill service. It had not been particularly successful because it was not feeding into a BRT line, but rather a regular trunk line. There could be a case where feeder service would be implemented, but most likely only to an area that had no previous service.

**B. Application for Federal Section 5307 Capital Funding:** Transit Planner Lisa Gardner was present to discuss two grant applications with the Board. Ms. Gardner explained that the 5307 Grant application was a formula grant, which paid for the annual capital expenses that were approved through the Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The application was for \$1.7 million, which included 5307 funds and Surface Transportation Program funds.

Mr. Kortge asked if this was part of the radio funding. Mr. Johnson responded that these funds were used to purchase the hardware and software for the new radio system.

Mr. Pangborn added that the entire radio project cost \$1.6 million, of which 80 percent was federally funded. The equipment was the smaller portion of the total system, and LTD remained obligated for the \$1.6 million. The contractor had defaulted, so LTD was pursuing satisfaction through the bonding company. If the specifications were met, LTD would remain obligated to pay, so the funds needed to remain available to LTD. However, if the contractor and bonding company did not meet the specifications, then another series of negotiations would take place.

Mr. Kortge asked if more money would be spent to replace the hardware. Mr. Pangborn replied that a good portion of the equipment was universal; however, there also was a portion that was proprietary to the contractor. Ms. Gardner stated that if there were a need for new radio equipment, that request would be included in the CIP process next year.





Public Hearing: Mr. Bailey opened the public hearing on the District's federal section 5307 capital grant application. There being no comment from the audience, he then closed the public hearing.

**MOTION**

Board Discussion and Decision: Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the proposed 1998 Section 5307 federal grant application for \$1,741,600 in federal funds and authorizes the General Manager to submit this application to the Federal Transit Administration for approval." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken asked about the state's involvement in the grant process and if the \$1.7 million were formula money. Ms. Gardner replied that this year's 1998 allocation was \$1.83 million. This application included \$1.3 million of the 1999 allocation and \$250,000 that were carried over from last year's allocation, so a balance of about \$350,000 would be carried over to next year's Section 5307 application.

Ms. Loobey added that the Section 5307 monies were formula monies. Congress appropriated an amount of money each year for the Section 5307 program, and then a formula, based on population density, applied to every transit district in the country. LTD's allocation also was determined by how much was appropriated by Congress. There also was money that was earmarked specifically to LTD for capital projects under the Section 5309 funding program, such as for the Eugene Station and BRT. No one else could touch those funds, and the allocation was not built on any formula. It had to do with the efforts that were made during the United Front lobbying effort to Washington, D.C.

Ms. Hocken asked about the Surface Transportation Program (STP) money, which had a higher federal participation. She asked if the 89.73 percent was entirely federal money, or if the state contributed. Ms. Gardner responded that it was entirely federal money that was transferred through the state. The local match varied according to the project. Mr. Pangborn added that the state received highway money at a lower match rate.

Ms. Hocken asked if the 89.73 percent rate was unique to Oregon. Mr. Pangborn replied that it was an Oregon rate, and different rates applied to different states. Ms. Loobey added that there were no state general funds included.

**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey called for a vote on the motion to approve the grant application. The motion passed by unanimous vote, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Loobey added that if the population of Eugene was more than 200,000, the STP funds would come directly to LTD and would not be passed through the state.

**C. Application for Joint Partnership Program for Deployment of Innovation Funding:** Ms. Gardner stated that the FTA recently established a new public/private Joint Partnership Program for Deployment of Innovation (JPP). The purpose of the JPP was to encourage the development of innovative programs and technology in



the mass transportation industry. LTD had submitted a letter of interest to the FTA to request funding for the development of a bus rapid transit concept vehicle.

The BRT vehicle design would be developed in partnership with the Gillig Corporation. There was not a dedicated funding source for this program, and it was not yet clear what the time frame was, but staff were aware that the FTA was very interested.

Public Hearing: Mr. Bailey opened the public hearing on the District's proposal for funding through the Joint Partnership Program for Deployment of Innovation. Hearing no public comment, he closed the public hearing.

Board Discussion and Decision: Mr. Kleger stated that Mr. Bennett had rightly identified a significant marketing issue. If the bus did not look new and innovative, it would not attract people to ride it.

Mr. Bailey noticed that in the proposed motion, there was no reference to the actual dollar amount. However, it was noted in the actual grant proposal at an amount of \$130,000. Mr. Bailey stated that it could be made a part of the motion. He commented that he was very pleased to see this project. During his trip to the American Public Transit Association (APTA) annual meeting, this was one of the two issues that came up during the BRT discussions. He thought it was another opportunity for LTD to be a national leader and assist the FTA.

Ms. Loobey added that there was another benefit to this partnership with Gillig. The president of Gillig was the Chair of the vendor element of APTA. As more competition for these buses occurred in the future, the long-standing good relationship with Gillig would benefit LTD.

Ms. Lauritsen asked Ms. Gardner to further explain the 50 percent funding aspect. Ms. Gardner explained that if this proposal were to be funded, the FTA would provide 50 percent of the total cost. How the other 50 percent was divided among LTD and Gillig had not yet been determined. It could be cash or in-kind match.

Ms. Lauritsen noted If LTD were to allocate \$1,000 in in-kind contributions, for instance, there still would be cash involved in paying the salaries of the staff in-kind time. Ms. Gardner stated that staff time allocation for vehicle development was included in the BRT grant. Mr. Viggiano added that LTD could not use federal funds as local match; however, the staff time was allocated.

## MOTION

There being no further discussion, Mr. Kleger moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the submittal of the attached project proposal for the Joint Partnership Program for Deployment of Innovation for a BRT Concept Vehicle." Ms. Wylie seconded the motion.

Mr. Kortge asked if the Board typically approved applications after they were submitted. Ms. Gardner clarified that this was not an application; however, due to timing, the letter of interest had to be submitted prior to the Board meeting.



**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor; none opposed.

Mr. Viggiano added that vehicle development most likely would take five to six years, so a decision would still need to be made as to what vehicle would be used for the BRT pilot corridor implementation.

**D. Franklin/VO Bus Rapid Transit Segment Design Alternative:**  
Mr. Viggiano asked if the Board had any questions or comments from the discussion that was held at the December 14, 1998, work session.

Mr. Viggiano discussed the question raised by Mr. Lester earlier in the meeting about directing service through campus. He said that it was an option that staff had considered. As Mr. Lester had said, it would serve a major market and provide excellent access to the University. The drawback was that traveling on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be slow going since it was highly congested with pedestrians and bicycles. At the east end of campus, 13<sup>th</sup> and Kincaid was the most congested block in the community. Buses now took several minutes just traveling from 13<sup>th</sup> and Alder to 13<sup>th</sup> and Kincaid. Operators often complained about how difficult it was to get through that area.

In addition, Mr. Viggiano noted that the University was not receptive to the idea, and the University was a very important partner for LTD. Also, when the concept was mentioned at the design workshop, it did not generate much support. For those reasons, none of the alternatives provided for bus service on 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Ms. Wylie asked how many blocks it was from 13<sup>th</sup> and Agate to Franklin and Agate. Mr. Viggiano replied that it was one short block. If BRT were to travel through campus, a stop most likely would be placed at 13<sup>th</sup> and University streets.

Mr. Kleger recalled that this issue had been discussed during the rail feasibility study. Mr. Viggiano added that it had been shown on one of the maps, and the University had voiced its opposition to it at that time. An option that currently was being considered was operating a shuttle through the University area that would link the east side of campus with the west side of campus, connecting to downtown and the Valley River Center. It would use a smaller vehicle, and time would not be such a strong factor.

Ms. Hocken stated that the Steering Committee had been reluctant to give up the two-way guideway. It appeared that the regulatory and community support would not materialize; however, some community members on the Committee believed that it could come in the future as gridlock occurred. The Steering Committee was convinced that option A-2 was the best LTD could do at this time.

Mr. Bailey stated that the Steering Committee had come a long way, and he commended Mr. Viggiano and staff for the hard work.



Mr. Kleger suggested that since option A-2 called for more tree removal, staff should take a great deal of effort to scope out the options for the trees well in advance. Mr. Viggiano stated that staff would look into relocating the trees rather than removing them.

**MOTION**

Mr. Kortge moved approval of the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that Alternative A-2 is selected as the preferred BRT alignment for the Franklin/VO segment of the pilot corridor." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Kortge stated that he liked the Franklin/VO Alternative Evaluation matrix. Ms. Hocken added that there were several members of the Steering Committee who had recommended ways of presenting this information.

Ms. Hocken said that she had attended both of the design workshops, and Mr. Viggiano had been accurate in stating that there was not much support for the routing on 13<sup>th</sup> through the University.

**VOTE**

There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously, with Bailey, Hocken, Kleger, Kortge, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, and none opposed.

**Adjournment:** There being no further discussion, Mr. Bailey adjourned the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BOARD SECRETARY

