

**MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING**

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on November 11, 1999, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held the regular Board of Directors meeting on Wednesday, November 17, 1999, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: (Vacancy, subdistrict 5)

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:38 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

**WORK SESSION**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:** a) Ms. Wylie reminded the Board members that the UO Alumni / Springfield Chamber Auction would be held on Friday, November 19, 1999, and LTD had reserved a table for the event. Several Board members were planning to attend. b) Ms. Wylie also announced that she was continuing to work with staff to hold a special Board Holiday Lights JoyRide event on December 16. She asked Board members to please hold that date open. c) Due to staff illness, Ms. Wylie announced that agenda items number 2 and 3 under Current Activities would be postponed to another date.

**TRANSPLAN UPDATE:** Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano was present to discuss the review process for the Draft TransPlan now that the public comment period had closed. He stated that each of the adopting jurisdictions were to provide input to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) about the review process in order to reach agreement about that process. In addition, if there was time at this work session, the Board could begin discussion on the substantive issues in the Draft TransPlan.

Mr. Viggiano reported that staff continued to prepare responses to the 160 questions that were received by the four jurisdictions, and it was expected that those responses would be complete in early December. In addition, each Board member was provided a notebook

that contained all of the written public testimony and a summary of the oral testimony received during the Draft TransPlan public comment period. Also available was a video tape of the testimony that was taken during the public hearings on the Draft TransPlan.

Mr. Viggiano introduced Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) TransPlan Project Manager Tom Schwetz to discuss the Draft TransPlan review process. A memo from Mr. Schwetz, included in the agenda packet, compared what might be a normal review process with a process that was suggested by the Friends of Eugene. Mr. Viggiano stated that the Board could advocate for either process or even a third process of its own design.

Mr. Bennett asked if someone other than the Friends of Eugene had made a suggestion for the review process, would that suggestion have been included as well, and how alternate process proposals were being decided. Mr. Schwetz said that any time alternatives were requested in the course of a public hearing, those requests needed to be addressed. If other alternative suggestions had come forth, those also would have been included in a discussion of the process. Mr. Viggiano added that the proposal from the Friends of Eugene was supported by many of the speakers at the public hearing as well as by some of the adopting officials.

Mr. Schwetz said that typically, following the public hearings, each adopting jurisdiction might meet to discuss the testimony and identify the issues that the individual members might have. At some point, a joint meeting might be held to determine what the common issues were. Basically, the focus was to get to a point where each jurisdiction was comfortable with the adoption of the plan.

The Friends of Eugene proposed a new process to form a citizen's advisory committee to take input from the community at large. The committee then would draft a set of strategies to be included in the new Draft TransPlan, which then would be presented to the four jurisdictions for adoption. Staff determined that this process would take longer than the six months that was suggested by the Friends of Eugene, possibly by four to six months, which would push the adoption out to the spring of 2001.

Staff were recommending that the jurisdictions agree to the typical process for the review and adoption of the Draft TransPlan. There had been extensive public involvement throughout the drafting period, and this process would have flexibility and would provide an opportunity to revise the Draft TransPlan.

Mr. Bennett asked if this recommendation was felt strongly by staff as a whole. Mr. Schwetz said that he believed that to be true. Mr. Bennett said that he had recalled reading some of Mr. Schwetz's comments on the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) recommendation in the Draft TransPlan, and he found those comments to be somewhat confusing. He asked Mr. Schwetz to clarify his position regarding the TDM recommendations.

Mr. Schwetz said that his comments were based on previous decision modeling and studies that had been conducted. In the decision modeling, local officials had indicated that they were not yet ready for mandatory TDM or pricing. During the pricing study that had been conducted, the consultants determined that the area was not yet ready for mandatory

TDM, but most likely would be ready to implement some form of mandatory TDM in the next 20 years.

Mr. Bennett then asked if Mr. Schwetz had read and considered the TransPlan Issues List that had been prepared by LTD staff and included in the agenda packet. Mr. Bennett wondered if Mr. Schwetz would be willing to support any of the issues, and particularly the suggestion for a stronger and earlier LTD role in development review issues. Mr. Schwetz said that he had read it, and he was in favor of further consideration of that suggestion. In areas where transit agencies were more involved in development review, Mr. Schwetz had heard that it could make a difference and was helpful. There was a good development review process in place that could be the framework in which LTD could do more.

Ms. Hocken asked about item #2 in the Friends of Eugene review process proposal, in which the proposal called for a two-month period in which citizens would have an opportunity to submit proposals for specific revisions for TransPlan, and the new Draft TransPlan would have specific written responses to proposals that were not included in the revision, including the reason they were not included. She asked if the proposed typical review process would include responses to public testimony. Mr. Schwetz said that staff were beginning to review the public testimony and would provide a fairly detailed response that the jurisdictions could use during deliberations. Issues would be grouped together. Responses most likely would not address each and every piece of testimony, but would cover the common themes and issues to the extent that staff could provide a common response. Specific suggestions would be forwarded to the jurisdictions, as well, for possible further review.

Ms. Wylie said that she was concerned that each jurisdiction provide a response explaining changes that were made to the Draft TransPlan as well as to the public testimony that was received. She thought it would be helpful for staff to develop a grid of key issues, and, to achieve continuity, that each jurisdiction be given a copy of the same grid. Mr. Schwetz said that staff were preparing to do that by using the structure of the TransPlan as a basis for categorizing the testimony.

Ms. Wylie said that she would like to see it refined even more so that each jurisdiction could vote on the same set of TransPlan revisions. She said that the fact that so many people provided testimony reflecting a great deal of interest in the community was of great importance to her. As a public body, the Board needed to respond to that. Mr. Schwetz said that once each jurisdiction had the opportunity to discuss and deliberate on the Draft TransPlan, staff hoped to organize a joint meeting to establish common issues and suggested revisions. It was important for staff to hear the issues of each of the adopting agencies.

Mr. Kleger said that he liked the idea of an issues grid, but he asked that staff include any statutory adjustments that may need to take place to respond to particular suggestions.

Ms. Hocken said that she did not believe that another round of public input would be useful at this point. Now it was time for the four jurisdictions to consider all that had been heard and read. This was a political process, and even though the public comment period had closed, all of the jurisdictions allowed time for public testimony at their regular meetings.

Mr. Kortge, Ms. Lauritsen, and Mr. Kleger agreed. Ms. Wylie agreed as well, but emphasized the need to respond to the public input. Ms. Wylie added that a huge effort would need to be made to ensure continuity during the process.

Mr. Viggiano added that some people may have the opinion that after seven years, it was time to move on and get the TransPlan adopted very quickly; however, now that the TransPlan finally was at the jurisdictional level for review and adoption, he thought it was important for the adopting officials to take the time to carefully consider all of the issues in order to make the best decision. Ms. Wylie added that she wanted to take the time to deliberate over the proposed changes, and if the process were not rushed, staff would have time to prepare the necessary materials.

Mr. Viggiano said that he was surprised by the December 2000 adoption date, but he believed the reason for that was the difficulty in scheduling work sessions for the Eugene City Council. MPC could decide that this issue should become a high priority for discussion by the four adopting jurisdictions at regularly scheduled work sessions.

Ms. Wylie asked about the funding for nodal development, and what role public funding would play in nodal development. Mr. Schwetz said that public funding could be used as "focused public investment," where infrastructure investment could be focused to encourage private developers to pursue nodal development, or as funding for a certain level of transit services to ensure that the nodal development worked.

Ms. Hocken said that what was needed at this meeting was an opinion from the Board about the TransPlan review and decision process, which she thought the Board had given. She said that she liked Ms. Wylie's suggestion about the issues grid, and she thought it would be appropriate to share with the other jurisdictions the Board's understanding of the information that would assist in the decision-making process. She also thought the Board's opinion of the level of response to the public input should be shared as well.

Mr. Schwetz said that staff thought that by the next MPC meeting, the four jurisdictions would have held at least one work session, and staff planned to share the results of those work sessions at the MPC meeting. Mr. Schwetz also thought it might be a good idea for the jurisdictions to begin sharing their issues lists. Ms. Wylie thought it was too early for that, as the Board had not yet had an opportunity to discuss its issues. Mr. Bennett and Ms. Hocken agreed.

Mr. Schwetz said that Tom Stinchfield of Lane County was preparing materials for the Board of Commissioners' discussion on December 1, and he was attaching to his agenda item the preliminary lists of issues from both LTD and the City of Eugene. Ms. Hocken reiterated that LTD's list was at a staff discussion level at this time, and the Board had not had the opportunity to discuss those issues.

Mr. Bennett asked that it be made very clear that the list was very preliminary, and the Board had not yet discussed the issues. Mr. Viggiano added that the list should not even be considered a staff recommendation at this point, but rather a preliminary list of possible issues that was written as a result of staff discussion.

Mr. Kleger said that some of the items on the list had extremely significant fiscal impacts, such as committing to alternatively-fueled buses, which would double the cost of each bus. Ms. Hocken added that the Board Finance Committee also was considering staff work on free or reduced transit fares.

Mr. Viggiano asked the Board to provide feedback about the issues list and provide direction to staff about the types of issues the Board wanted to review, such as only transit related issues. Ms. Wylie said that the issues grid would assist the Board in responding to all the various issues. Mr. Bennett said that he hoped the Board would discuss nodal development issues. Ms. Hocken added that the Board needed to be concerned about issues that would impact pedestrians and bicycles, because she believed that the community had expectations of LTD to be involved in all forms of transportation decisions.

Mr. Bennett said that he wanted to address the issue of alternative fuels as the ramifications could be very serious, but the issue needed careful consideration. Ms. Hocken added that the Board needed to provide direction toward the level that alternative-fuel buses might be included in TransPlan and suggest ways that a policy could be implemented.

Mr. Schwetz said that regardless of which direction the issue of alternative-fuel buses took, if the Board were to decide to commit to alternative-fuel buses, the TransPlan could be viewed as supportive of that effort.

Ms. Loobey said that she was hopeful that the Board would believe in the premise that it was as much an actor around TransPlan as any of the jurisdictions were, and that any transportation system investment that was being made by virtue of TransPlan was LTD's business because resources were scarce. While LTD's main focus of business was transit-related, LTD also had a large role in transportation systems management, as did the other jurisdictions, and the LTD Board was a leader in the transportation field.

Mr. Bennett said he was interested in LTD's role in development review. He wanted to see the results of the survey of other communities about transit's role in that area. Mr. Schwetz said that he would provide that information to staff for sharing. Ms. Loobey added that nearby examples included the westside light-rail nodal development in Portland, where development was occurring along both sides of the light rail line. Mr. Bennett said that his particular interest was in community examples and how development really worked. There were certain fundamentals in development that could not be ignored, and he wondered if those fundamentals got in the way of what otherwise would enhance the transportation system in a community.

Mr. Kleger said that the issue of location requirements for certain new development, such as social service agencies, was of concern to him. He cited the recent example in Eugene where a state land use goal virtually was ignored by a state agency that located its offices both outside of nodal development and in an area not directly served by transit. He thought it was important to try to create and enforce local policies in response to the state's expectations that would encourage compact development.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie adjourned the work session at 6:32 p.m.

**REGULAR BUSINESS:** The regular business portion of the meeting was called to order at 6:40 p.m.

**DECEMBER 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH:** Ms. Wylie introduced Bus Operator Ronda Murray, who had been selected as the December 1999 Employee of the Month. Ms. Murray was hired in August 1996, and already had ten Employee of the Month nominations in her file. She also had earned awards for three years of Correct Schedule Operation and two years of Safe Driving.

One of Ms. Murray's most recent nominators had praised her in glowing terms, saying that she had "personality plus," and that the ride was absolutely fun because of Ms. Murray and her interactions with the other riders. Another customer said that Ms. Murray always was pleasant, no matter what, and treated all passengers fairly. A co-worker stated that Ms. Murray was an extremely loyal and dedicated employee who knew what customer service meant. Her supervisor added that Ms. Murray's work ethic could not go without mention and that she demonstrated pride in LTD each and every day.

Ms. Murray said that she really enjoyed working at LTD. She was a people person, and she loved her job. LTD was a good company to work for, and she appreciated the award.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** 1) Charles Biggs of Eugene stated that he had given testimony during the Draft TransPlan hearing, in which he advocated for subsidized bus service to the nodes. He thought it made a lot of sense because that was where the majority of the transit lines were, and that was where the densest population was. Subsidized bus service would encourage further development in those nodes, and getting people in the nodes out of the congested corridors would free up space for those people who lived outside the nodes.

Mr. Biggs said that he had conducted a very quick study of the Coburg Road area. He used 1993-94 average daily traffic volumes, and made an estimate based on the density of nodes, how many nodes there were, and the different node types. His conclusion was that subsidized bus service would relieve congestion by 45.6 percent. He thought that would be a big plus for the community.

Mr Biggs further stated that investing \$30 million in bus rapid transit (BRT) to alleviate the commuter problem, which was 30 percent of the problem, seemed rather extravagant. He said that if the Board were to go forward with the BRT on the east-west corridor, he would ask that LTD also perform a one- to two-year pilot study of the north-south corridor with a subsidized node program to determine how viable that would be.

In addition, Mr. Biggs said that he had telephoned LTD to ask what the dollar value was of getting a person out of his or her car and onto the bus, and he was unable to get an answer. He thought that would be a real important factor to stress as LTD advocated for increased ridership.

2) Mr. Rob Zako of Eugene had signed up to speak, but had left the Board meeting prior to this portion of the meeting.

There being no further audience participation, Ms. Wylie closed this portion of the meeting.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** The Consent Calendar for November included approval of the minutes of the October 27, 1999, special Board meeting, and the revised FY 1999-2000 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program.

Ms. Loobey referred to page 6 of the October 27, 1999, minutes of the LTD Board meeting, under audience participation, in which Mr. Nordin of Cottage Grove had addressed the Board about service to Cottage Grove. Mr. Nordin had thanked various members of the staff by name for securing bus service to Cottage Grove. Ms. Loobey thought it left an inaccurate impression. In fact, staff did not secure bus service to Cottage Grove, but provided assistance and advice as needed and responded to questions as they were asked. Staff maintained a professional distance from the entire political process having to do with service to Cottage Grove. She did not want someone to read the minutes and gather the wrong impression.

Ms. Hocken suggested that "in securing bus service to Cottage Grove" be deleted from the sentence. Staff thought it was okay to revise the minutes in this way since the minutes reflected a summary or paraphrase of what was said at the meetings.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Mr. Kortge moved that the Board adopt the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for November 17, 1999, is approved as presented and amended." Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, and Kortge voting in favor, and none opposed.

**ACCEPTANCE OF INDEPENDENT AUDIT REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1999:** Finance Manager Diane Hellekson was present to introduce Charles Swank of Grove Mueller and Swank, P.C., who would present the audit report and answer questions. The audit report was distributed earlier to the Board members.

Mr. Swank said that the independent audit report met the requirements not only of generally accepted auditing standards, but also of the State of Oregon and the federal government. He then reviewed the highlights of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

Mr. Swank said that at the completion of the audit procedures, the auditors did not have recommendations that they felt were necessary to bring to the Board. The auditors believed that LTD staff did a very good job, and he commended staff for their efforts and assistance to the auditors.

**MOTION**

Ms. Lauritsen moved the following resolution: "Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors accepts the Independent Audit Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1999." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett said that he was proud of the effort LTD made. One of the most important responsibilities the Board had in its oversight status was to make some judgement about whether LTD was using its resources carefully and accounting for them carefully. He thought

that Ms. Hellekson did a very fine job and helped create a better understanding of the issues for him and others. He was very pleased with the audit results.

Ms. Hocken brought attention to the Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs that was contained in the audit report. There were no findings or questioned costs, but the page was required to be in the report.

**VOTE** There being no further discussion, a vote was taken on the motion, which passed unanimously, with Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, and Kortge voting in favor and none against.

**REVISION OF ORDINANCE 24 GOVERNING DISTRICT BOUNDARIES:** Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora stated a second reading and adoption of LTD Ordinance 24, which described the territorial boundaries of Lane Transit District were required in order to change the District's service boundary.

**MOTION** Mr. Bennett moved that the Lane Transit District Ordinance 24, an ordinance describing the territorial boundaries of the District, be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, and Kortge voting in favor and none against.

**VOTE**

Ms. Wylie then read Ordinance 24 by title only: "Lane Transit District Ordinance 24 (1999 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District." Additional copies of the Ordinance were available to those present.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger then moved the following resolution: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors adopts Lane Transit District Ordinance 24 (1999 Revision), Describing the Territorial Boundaries of Lane Transit District." Mr. Kortge seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, and Kortge voting in favor and none against.

**VOTE**

**BUDGET TRANSFER – COTTAGE GROVE SERVICE EXPENSE:** Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn stated that this had been an anticipated transfer pending the outcome of the election in Cottage Grove. Staff were proposing to begin limited shuttle service between Cottage Grove and Creswell on January 3, 2000, and regular service between Cottage Grove and Eugene on February 6, 2000, to coincide with the implementation of winter bid service. Cottage Grove businesses and self-employed persons earning income within the Urban Growth Boundary would become subject to LTD's tax on January 1, 2000.

A transfer from Contingency to Transit Operations was proposed while staff worked to incorporate the addition of Cottage Grove into the FY 2000-2001 budget and the Long-range Financial Plan. There would be two sources of revenue during this period – fares and payroll and self-employment taxes. The payroll taxes would be one quarter off, while the self-employment taxes would not be collected until April 15, 2001. Cash fares were not expected to be significant.



Mr. Bennett asked if the Contingency fund would be reimbursed. Mr. Pangborn said that those funds would be built back into the Contingency fund over time as the revenues were collected.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if those expenses covered the entire cost of operations. Mr. Pangborn replied that the total cost of service was being calculated at \$72.00 per hour. These would be additional operating hours using current part-time bus operators and existing equipment.

Ms. Hocken said that by law, LTD had to consider spending in terms of accuracy in the budget, but if LTD collected more than what was budgeted for revenues, it did not have to be concerned. Mr. Pangborn further explained that, typically, staff made a conservative estimate of expected payroll and self-employment tax revenues in the current-year budget, and made corrections after the exact amount was known.

**MOTION**

Mr. Kortge moved approval of a Resolution authorizing the transfer of \$86,000 from General Fund Contingency to Transit Operations in order to begin service to Cottage Grove.

**VOTE**

Mr. Bennett seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous vote, with Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, and Kortge voting in favor and none against.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS:** A) Metropolitan Policy Committee. Ms. Hocken said that the November meeting had been canceled, and she had nothing to report at this time. B) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Lauritsen was unable to attend the November 4 meeting, and therefore, had no report. C) BRT Steering Committee / Public Design Workshops / Walkabout Input. Mr. Viggiano reported that two focus groups for Phase II, West Eugene, were being held and were useful to assist staff with preparation for the public workshops that would begin in January. The intent of the focus groups was to identify some of the key issues for discussion at the public workshops. The next BRT Steering Committee would be held on December 7, 1999. D) Springfield Station Steering Committee. Ms. Wylie reported that the Steering Committee would meet on November 18 to make a recommendation to the Board on a preferred site. E) Meeting in Cottage Grove. Ms. Hocken reported that she and Mr. Kortge had attended a meeting with interested citizens in Cottage Grove on November 10, 1999. She thought that the meeting went very well. There was much interest in the bus routing, and there were some questions about the payroll and self-employment taxes.

Ms. Wylie asked if there was any further information about the property that Mr. Nordin had suggested the Board consider for a possible bus station in Cottage Grove. Mr. Vobora said that he had made an inquiry, but did not yet have an answer. Mr. Kortge added that it was quite premature to think about that yet.

Mr. Vobora stated that not many people from the business community had attended the meeting, and staff would look for more opportunities, such as the Cottage Grove Chamber Board meeting that was scheduled in early December, to provide information to the community.

Items F and G were postponed to later in the meeting in order to accommodate the schedules of several people in attendance.

**SPRINGFIELD STATION: GREYHOUND CO-LOCATION:** Transit Planner Micki Kaplan was present to discuss the concept of partnering with Greyhound for a multi-modal facility at the Springfield Station. Ms. Kaplan reported that she had discussed the issue both with Greyhound and with Springfield City staff. The Springfield City Council had not yet formed an opinion.

Greyhound staff had indicated that it was uncertain if Greyhound would move to Springfield. They had commissioned a market study to determine the demographics of their ridership, which should be complete by the end of November. If the study concluded that a large portion of Greyhound riders originated in Springfield, Greyhound may further pursue discussion a possible shared facility with LTD. If most passengers originated in Eugene, the possibility of relocating to Springfield likely would not be considered further.

Ms. Kaplan reported that Greyhound would need approximately 2,500 square feet of building space and a total of 15,000 square feet for the entire operation. She said that there was room at the Les' Service Center and Canopy site, but not at the U.S. Bank site.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if there was anything available nearer to the Eugene Station, if Eugene was the site destination that Greyhound was considering. Ms. Kaplan said that she did not have an answer to that question, but she was aware that Greyhound also was considering sites in Eugene. Mr. Kortge asked if Greyhound might consider a Glenwood site, and possibly a shared site with BRT facilities. Ms. Kaplan said that she had mentioned to Greyhound staff that there could be other opportunities for LTD to partner with Greyhound.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if Greyhound would share the results of its market study. Ms. Kaplan said that Greyhound planned to share the results with LTD, and she would share that information with the Board.

Mr. Bennett asked Ms. Lauritsen if she had heard if a multi-modal facility had support in Springfield. Ms. Lauritsen said that people were talking about it, but that there were many other issues currently under consideration, and the entire issue of a multi-modal facility would need to be explored further. She was in favor of it, and she believed that the community would be in favor of it as well.

Ms. Kaplan said that staff would be presenting information about the Springfield Station at the December 6 Springfield City Council meeting, and there could be an opportunity to discuss the concept of a multi-modal facility at that time.

Mr. Kleger stated that very early in the Springfield Station Steering Committee process, there was much interest expressed in providing a multi-modal transit/rail facility that shifted as decisions were made about the rail corridor. However, there were no objections at that time to the multi-modal concept.

Mr. Bennett was concerned about confusing issues, the number of issues, and seeking support in Springfield before LTD considered the issue further. Ms. Wylie thought this issue was in tune with other thinking about downtown Springfield development. Ms. Lauritsen added that while there was much support for the concept in Springfield, there also was concern about the financing of such a project. People also were concerned that Greyhound

should improve service to other towns in the area and not just to those along the I-5 corridor. Ms. Wylie said that there also was the possibility that a multi-modal facility with Greyhound would further support locating a café or coffee shop inside the station.

Ms. Kaplan then displayed photographs of and discussed an existing multi-modal facility in Wenatchee, Washington, and planned facilities in Everett and Tacoma, Washington.

Ms. Kaplan reviewed a list of possible advantages and disadvantages of a multi-modal facility. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch had researched the issue of possible new funding opportunities for the Springfield Station if it were multi-modal, and determined that there were no significant special funds set aside for multi-modal facilities.

Ms. Wylie asked if the South A site could be expanded in either direction if it were selected. Ms. Kaplan replied that there were two tax lots, and LTD could purchase a second tax lot for expansion purposes.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** Mr. Kortge moved that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege. Ms. Hocken seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, Kleger, and Kortge voting in favor and none against. The Board entered Executive Session at 7:40 p.m.

**MOTION  
VOTE**

Upon motion by Ms. Hocken and seconded by Ms. Lauritsen, the Board unanimously returned to regular session at 8:25 p.m.

**BOARD MEMBER REPORTS, CONTINUED:** F) Finance Committee Meeting. Ms. Hocken reported that the Finance Committee had met just prior to the Board meeting, and the Committee discussed the free or reduced fare concept that had been raised at the TransPlan hearings as well as capital funding issues for the next few years. Ms. Hocken said a staff presentation would be made at the December Board meeting on the fare issue, and, following further research, staff also would present more information about the capital funding issue to the Board. G) Executive Search. Mr. Kortge reported that five candidates would be interviewed on January 21 and 22, 2000. Each candidate would be invited to bring his or her spouse or significant other. A schedule of interview events for each candidate had been distributed to Board members. The schedule for Friday, January 21, included orientation panel discussions with various staff groups, a BRT presentation, a tour of the LTD facilities, and a Board reception with the candidates in the evening. On Saturday, January 22, the Board would interview each of the five candidates, then conclude with a Board dinner and deliberations period. The Board liked the schedule grid that had been presented, and further logistics of the schedule would be discussed at the December Board meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There was no further discussion regarding any other informational items in the Board packet, and Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.



Board Secretary