

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, May 17, 2000

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on May 11, 2000, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held its regular monthly meeting on Wednesday, May 17, 2000, at 5:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17th Avenue, Eugene.

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

Absent: Gerry Gaydos

CALL TO ORDER: Board Vice President Rob Bennett called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m. Ms. Wylie was not yet present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: Mr. Kleger said that it might be useful to find out at this time when the Board might discuss the advertising program that was held over from the May 15, 2000, work session. Mr. Bergeron said that the discussion could occur at the end of the work session.

Mr. Hamm made the announcement on that all Board members were invited to attend the Comprehensive Service Redesign open house scheduled for May 24 and 25, 2000, from 10 a.m. until 7 p.m. both days at the Eugene Station's Customer Service Center.

WORK SESSION – LTD Security Program: Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson said that the security program was being presented outside of the budget process because of recent discussions about security in general. Mr. Johnson described the different elements of the security program and the various ways that security was provided at the Eugene Station and other LTD service areas. The mission of the security program was to create a safe and secure environment, which provided a feeling of wellbeing for employees, customers, and citizens of the community. Mr. Johnson discussed the goals of the program, such as the reduction of crime and the reduction of the fear of crime by LTD customers, throughout LTD's system. Another goal was to increase community involvement and create ownership in the LTD system by developing a sense of a transit community. This goal was accomplished through

Mr. Kortge asked about reducing the coverage of the current contractor. Mr. Johnson said that currently, LTD contracted with Downtown Eugene, Inc., to provide Mall Guides to patrol the Eugene Station area. Some Mall Guides would continue to patrol the station; however, staff believed a more formal approach to security would enhance security on the entire system.

Ms. Hocken asked about LTD's contribution to the Eugene Police Officer at the Eugene Station. Mr. Johnson said that LTD paid for one-third of a patrol officer who patrolled an 18-square-block area of downtown and provided limited dedicated service to LTD. LTD had no authority to schedule the officer's time and/or location. Also, there was an agreement to pay one-third of the benefits and wages for the Eugene Police Substation Manager.

Mr. Hamm added that because LTD had provided a significant presence in downtown Eugene, LTD needed to partner with the downtown business community. The business community had agreed to partner with the City of Eugene and with LTD in the downtown security effort, and while LTD may, in some cases, not receive the direct benefit of the security services, there was a definite benefit in partnering with those neighbors.

Mr. Kleger asked what LTD's relationship was with the Cahoots Van that was provided by Whitebird Clinic. Transit Security Administrator Rick Bailor said that Cahoots was a community response agency that provided a van with a Whitebird Clinic staff member and a paramedic on board. The Cahoots van worked directly through the Eugene Police Department dispatch to respond to people who were in need of a social-type agency, such as intoxicated people. The Police Department made the decision to have Cahoots respond to certain incidents. Mr. Kleger said there also were people who were having psychotic episodes, which could be very scary to the customers. Cahoots was a good response to those people, and most people thought well of Cahoots.

Ms. Lauritsen asked if LTD ever just called a taxi for those people. Mr. Bailor said that LTD had called for a taxi, and sometimes, even the field supervisor transported them.

Ms. Hocken asked Mr. Johnson to elaborate on the Springfield Station issues. Mr. Johnson said there was a problem with some young people at the station, but LTD did not own the property, so it had little jurisdiction to deal with those problems. On occasion, LTD had a difficult time getting adequate response from the Springfield Police. Staff met with the Springfield Police, and the two jurisdictions were working together cooperatively to research a lease for the station in order to provide jurisdictional authority to LTD.

WORK SESSION: BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) UPDATE: Planning and Development Manager Stefano Viggiano provided an update on the design process for Phase 2 of the BRT project. Phase 2 had been split into two segments, the first being from the Eugene Station west to Garfield Street, and the second being from Garfield west to the Seneca Station. The public workshop process had been completed for the first segment of Phase 2. There were two alignment options being considered. One was an option to use 13th Avenue for both directions of travel between Jefferson and Chambers. The other alternative would use 6th Avenue for westbound travel and 7th Avenue for eastbound travel. Mr. Viggiano displayed several maps of the design features of both options.

Mr. Viggiano said that staff hoped to hold workshops on the second segment of Phase 2 beginning in the fall. Staff would spend the summer months developing alternatives. A decision by the Steering Committee would be delayed until the entire Phase 2 design work was completed.

Mr. Kortge asked if the 6th and 7th Avenue option had come up in opposition to 13th Avenue or because it would better serve bus riders. Mr. Viggiano said it had been proposed for both reasons. Mr. Kortge asked how the fairgrounds would be served if BRT operated on 6th and 7th Avenues. Mr. Viggiano said that other transit service would have to be designed to serve the Fairgrounds.

Ms. Hocken said that early on in the BRT process, it had been determined that BRT should remain out of the residential areas as much as possible and operate on major streets. One of the alternatives being considered for west of Garfield Street would be a residential alternative. She did not believe there was a neighborhood association that represented that neighborhood, and she wondered if staff had talked with people who lived in that neighborhood. Mr. Viggiano said that staff had not yet talked with those residents, but doing so would be part of the process. Typically, staff had gone door-to-door along the proposed corridors to ensure that each person had an opportunity to be heard. It would be difficult to do so in that particular neighborhood, and staff were considering a mailing to invite people to meetings to try to make them aware of what was being proposed.

Mr. Kleger believed that if BRT operated on 6th and 7th Avenue, there would be a loss of running time. Mr. Viggiano said that the running time difference was significant between 6th and 7th Avenues and the 13th Avenue option.

During the last workshop, the groups voted on the two proposed alignments. The vote was split, and a slight majority favored the 13th Avenue alignment. Mr. Viggiano said that he also attended a fairly well attended neighborhood meeting, in which the group was split 2 to 1 in favor of the 6th/7th Avenue alignment.

Ms. Wylie arrived at the meeting at 6:14 p.m.

With regard to Phase 1 of the BRT project, Mr. Viggiano reported that the preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) was expected to be released in June. There was a required 30-day review process, during which public comment would be received. It was hoped that workshops would be held with other jurisdictions to review the EA, and in September, staff would present the EA to the jurisdictions for a decision.

Ms. Hocken asked if the County Commissioners were expected to approve the EA as well, or to provide an opinion. Mr. Viggiano said that the County's role was unclear. Staff would ask the County what role it wished to have.

WORK SESSION: ADVERTISING REVENUE EXPANSION STRATEGIES: Public Affairs Manager Ed Bergeron said that staff were seeking direction from the Board regarding the Board's interest in pursuing various advertising expansion strategies.

There had been a successful program of advertising on the bus during the past 20 years, and it had grown into a healthy revenue source for LTD, and had established numerous partnerships within the community between LTD and individual businesses. As new sources of revenue were being sought, there were five areas that staff believed could be possible. Staff were interested in finding the right level of the advantages of creating additional revenue while keeping in mind what the community would find acceptable in terms of commercializing LTD.

Expanding the existing on-bus revenue program was one option, perhaps by using more square footage inside and outside of the bus for advertising to generate more revenues. LTD had been careful about that up to this point. There were some buses that carried no advertising and some that carried a limited amount, and, from time to time, LTD had experimented with full-wrap coverage.

Another option was to place advertising in bus shelters, particularly those along major corridors. Those could generate revenue as well as offer the advantage of lighting opportunities within the shelters. Other options included outdoor billboards placed at LTD facilities; advertisements within the transit stations, such as kiosk-type posters; and possibilities for revenues from advertising in LTD printed materials, banners on the Web page, or on the answering machine for people to hear while waiting for trip-planning assistance.

Staff hoped to get direction from the Board before spending a lot of time and money researching possibilities that the Board was not interested in.

Mr. Kleger said that the full-wrap was a customer service, comfort issue. The screen acted as a mirror back on sunny days, and water collected in the screen on wet days. The Board needed to consider this issue very carefully. The current *Click Oregon* black wrap seemed to make the bus hotter. He noted that on the 300-series buses, there was space above the window that resembled letterboard space that could be used.

Ms. Hocken said that she owned stock in Obie Media, Inc., which was the contractor that handled all the on-board advertising for LTD. She wanted to ensure that there was not a conflict of interest in her participation in this discussion. She observed that on the bus, there was space available on the inside that could be more utilized for advertising, so she thought an expansion there could be researched. She said that she had no problem with placing ads in the shelters and at stations. She was not sure about the billboard idea, but she thought advertising revenue from printed materials was acceptable. She also said that she was not sure about the answering machine advertising issue.

Mr. Kortge thought that advertising in the shelters made sense.

Ms. Wylie thought that it was important to continue with advertising revenues by expanding the advertising inside the bus and to shelters and stations. However, it was important to maintain good taste. People were attracted to or repelled by advertisements. She asked staff to research the additional advertising revenues, while maintaining good taste and taking Mr. Kleger's comments about the bus riders' concerns into consideration.

Mr. Bergeron said that the University of Michigan had researched the effect of covering the bus windows. The research had shown that when the windows were covered, people did not feel as safe on the inside because they could not be seen and could not see out quite as easily. Part of the appeal of the concept vehicle for BRT was the big windows.

Staff would conduct a market viability research process, research sign codes and other legal issues, and would bring their recommendations back to the Board for a decision.

Mr. Bennett said that the comments were good. He stated that he did not want to see advertising on the outside of the BRT vehicle. Everyone agreed that more income was needed and appreciated the revenue, but he thought the BRT system should be presented as a sleek, clean system that would be free of advertising. Ms. Lauritsen agreed, and thought that the new buses with only the LTD logo on the side looked good. Mr. Bergeron said that staff agreed about the BRT vehicle – that it should be clean without the advertisements.

JUNE 2000 EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Senior Systems Analyst Gery Sorg had been selected as the June 2000 Employee of the Month. Ms. Wylie introduced Information Systems Manager Steve Parrott, who would provide the background information about the selection of Mr. Sorg.

Mr. Parrott said that Mr. Sorg had been nominated by a co-worker who was very appreciative of Mr. Sorg's cheerful assistance. She wanted to thank him for the cheerful way he came to her rescue when she had computer problems or when she tried to fix something herself, and he had to figure out what she did wrong in order to make it work again. In addition, the Employee of the Month Selection Committee also considered Mr. Sorg's leadership in the Employee Association and his role as Chair of the Employee Council.

Mr. Parrott said that Mr. Sorg was the bridge between technology that LTD had and the users of that technology. He helped users establish what their business needs were and translated those needs into tools that they could use to get their work done. Mr. Sorg had a serving heart and wonderful people skills. The Information Services Department was very proud to have learned of Mr. Sorg's nomination for Employee of the Month. Mr. Parrott congratulated Mr. Sorg for the nomination and introduced him to the Board.

Ms. Wylie congratulated Mr. Sorg and presented him with a letter of congratulations, a certificate, and a monetary award.

Mr. Sorg said that he was honored to be selected as Employee of the Month. He said that he worked with so many dedicated and hard-working people at LTD, and to have been recognized as Employee of the Month from such an outstanding group was an honor. Mr. Sorg said that years ago, he had worked as a consultant to LTD's Information Services Department, and during that time he had been impressed with the widespread commitment of the employees at LTD to provide excellent service to the community. Now, as an employee, he said that he was equally impressed. The commitment at LTD was incredible, and one could feel the shared vision among the employees of making the Eugene/Springfield area and all of Lane County a

better place to live. Being able to work with the team at a time when LTD was experiencing many changes was truly a privilege, and he appreciated being a part of the entire effort.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: 1) David Hinkley of Eugene addressed the subject of the BRT in the Jefferson neighborhood. He said that the BRT concept appeared to be an intriguing system; a solution to the modern transit dilemma of more need than money. Combining the best aspects of bus and light rail, the BRT system was expected to provide enhanced light-rail-like service at a bus-line cost.

He said that if LTD were serious about going forward with BRT, it would be worthwhile and crucial to discuss with the Board how to put it through the Jefferson neighborhood. However, he said it was clear that LTD was not serious. When one examined the year 2015 build-out of the BRT system, it became absolutely clear that the segment of 6th and 7th Avenues between Chambers and Charnelton was essential to the system. Without it, there would be no access to northwest Eugene. It was the fastest-growing section of the community, and was about one-quarter of the town. If LTD was not going to go out there, it was not serious about a system. Mr. Hinkley said that, to put it bluntly, if LTD were not serious about the system, he did not want LTD bringing a half-baked experiment that was going to fail into his neighborhood and tearing it up.

When LTD wanted to become serious, Mr. Hinkley urged that a route be planned that had a system that would work. He reiterated that the argument was that if 6th and 7th Avenues were not secured now for BRT, LTD would not get it. LTD already would have to fight the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for it, but every day that went by, one or more cars were added to the congestion, and it would become that much harder to get. Mr. Hinkley's argument was that now was the time to fight for it, and if LTD was not willing to do the fight, then it was not willing to put the system in, and there would be no point in tearing up his neighborhood.

2) Mr. Tom Lester of Eugene said that he had a correction to the April 2000 Board minutes. On page 7 of the minutes, with regard to petition gathering at the Eugene Station, Mr. Lester was paraphrased as having said, "LTD could take a friendlier approach and identify areas that were not high traffic areas that were under cover and out of the way." He said that he believed he had said to identify areas that were high traffic areas. Petitioners liked high-traffic areas in order to get more signatures per hour.

Mr. Lester then said that he also wanted to again address the issue of petition gathering at the Eugene Station. He said that it would be valuable to look to the Erb Memorial Union (EMU) at the University of Oregon campus as a model of how to deal with petitioners on a public facility. The EMU provided tables right in the front lobby, one of the most congested areas. It did not cause conflicts for people moving through, and it worked very well for them. The EMU had a scheduling system, and he encouraged LTD to take a look at their system for allowing petition gatherers.

MOTION **CONSENT CALENDAR:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board adopt the following resolution:
 "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for May 17, 2000, is approved as corrected.
 Ms. Hocken seconded the motion.

Ms. Hocken said that on page 11 of the April 19, 2000, minutes, there had been a conversation with Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora about the 5 percent Board discretionary service that was being proposed in the Comprehensive Service Redesign (CSR). Mr. Kortge had been paraphrased as saying that his concept of the 5 percent allocation was that of the 100 percent service plan, 95 percent of which would be dedicated to productivity service, while the other 5 percent would be used to address coverage and lifeline services. Ms. Hocken said that the Board was not committing 95 percent of service to productivity. She asked staff to correct that paragraph to reflect the correct percentages and allocations for the CSR.

VOTE There was no further discussion, and the amended motion carried unanimously by acclamation. The May 17, 2000, Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the April 19, 2000, regular Board meeting.

EMERGENCY ORDINANCE: AMENDED ORDINANCE NO. 36, GOVERNING CONDUCT ON DISTRICT PROPERTY: Mr. Johnson said that District Counsel was present to answer any questions. At the April 19, 2000, Board meeting, the Board had discussed and held a public hearing regarding changes to Ordinance 36, and specifically regarding signature gathering. The direction of the Board was to proceed with the staff recommendation to allow areas at the Eugene Station where signature gathering could take place. In addition, clarification was made in some areas that had been brought up by ACLU counsel Ed Gerdes and complainant Steve Lepponen. Staff believed Ordinance 36 was legally defensible as written; however, they agreed that some issues could be better clarified.

Since that meeting, LTD had been taken to court for a temporary restraining order to restrict LTD from enforcing Ordinance 36. The judge denied the order, and a hearing would be held in June, which was why staff were presenting an emergency Ordinance at this time. The amended Ordinance then would be in place in time for the June hearing.

The specific changes pertained to definitions of boarding platform areas that were not limited to the Eugene Station, such as Park & Rides and remote stations. In addition, a definition of shelters and stops was added. There also was an addition of an emergency language clause that was required to adopt the amended Ordinance at this meeting. It would take a unanimous vote of the Board to adopt the Emergency Ordinance.

MOTION VOTE Ms. Hocken moved that Ordinance 36, 2000 Revision, be read by title only. Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none opposed.

Ms. Wylie then read the Ordinance by title: "Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, 2000 Revision, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property."

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Kortge then moved the following resolution: "It is resolved that Lane Transit District Ordinance 36, 2000 Revision, is hereby adopted as an emergency ordinance and will take effect upon adoption." Mr. Kleger seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Kortge, Lauritsen, Wylie, Bennett, Hocken, and Kleger voting in favor, and none opposed.

PROPOSED 2002-2005 STIP REQUESTS FOR COMMUTER SOLUTIONS PROGRAM/TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS: Mr. Bergeron said that the agenda item summary from Commuter Resources Coordinator Connie Bloom Williams outlined the current thinking among the partner jurisdictions with regard to how the program might change in the years 2002 through 2006. Staff were presenting the issue to the Board so the members could have time to think about it and to review it with staff to determine how it fit with the Board's concept of the future of the program. This was in preparation for the adoption of the request by the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC).

The current timeline for the process was that staff would begin discussions with the Board, and the Board would have a month to consider the request, or if it liked the direction immediately, it could endorse the program at this meeting. Later in May, staff would present the same information to the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), which was made up of senior planning staff of the partner jurisdictions. TPC would be prioritizing the projects for presentation to the MPC for adoption in July.

Ms. Williams had briefed the Board during the past two months about the Commuter Solutions Program, but as part of the State Transportation Improvement (STIP) process, projections were made two years in advance about how the program might evolve. The program had achieved a great deal of success. The program flowed from the LTD Strategic Plan and had evolved from a commuter-based program to a community-based program.

Mr. Bergeron then highlighted the new project proposals for Fiscal Year 2002 – 2005.

Ms. Wylie asked if some of the proposed projects were currently occurring or if they all were projected to occur in the future. Mr. Bergeron said that most of the proposed projects were continuations of existing programs. Those that he highlighted were new additions and represented growth in the program. Ms. Wylie asked if there was a regional coordinator. Mr. Bergeron said that was Ms. William's current position.

Mr. Kortge asked about the \$487,500 expense for the year 2002, and if it was continuation money or new funding. Mr. Bergeron said it was the proposal that the partner jurisdictions would forward to ODOT for new funding for the year 2002. Currently, the program was funded at approximately \$250,000, and there was about \$200,000 in additional requests that would go to ODOT for the 2002 – 2005 year. LTD matched the grant funding at 10 percent in addition to the housing of the program.

Ms. Hocken asked if the grant recipient would be LTD. Mr. Bergeron said that was correct. Ms. Hocken then asked if priorities had been set as to what would be eliminated if the funding were reduced. Mr. Bergeron said that the partner jurisdictions would be reconvened to decide

the priorities. The school program likely would be very high on the priority list even without funding.

Ms. Hocken then asked about the past issue of ODOT putting Park & Ride funding in the same pot as TDM funding, which created some problems for LTD as an agency. Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch said that the answer was somewhat elusive. LTD looked at the issue as two separate categories, but state funds put allowable uses together because of the federal funding categories. Mr. Hamm added that when one program was expanding and there was only so much money going into the pot, the potential was for that program to siphon off from another part that was just as essential. Maybe Park & Rides were being partially diminished at the expense of another program. Staff would provide more information at the June Board meeting.

Mr. Kortge asked how a four-year budget request that kept salaries level for four years could be turned in. Mr. Bergeron said that the answer was that the salaries included benefits and the specific amounts were worked out with the LTD match. The requests that were forwarded to ODOT were not required to include that level of detail.

Mr. Kortge then asked where new money would go if the funding were increased. He said that he could not determine, by looking at the project proposal list, which programs would receive new money, with the exception of the new staff member request. Mr. Bergeron said that the new programs included Education and Awareness research, the administrative assistant, the establishment of a Transportation Management Associations (TMA) program, and the Youth and Parent School/Activities/Special Events program.

Ms. Hocken said that she would like to wait until the June meeting to learn more about the other projects before taking action on the STIP request. She was concerned about the issue of other projects that LTD had and whether those would affect the ODOT funding for TDM. Mr. Bergeron said it would be fine for the Board to wait until June to take action.

BOARD MEMBER REPORTS: 1) MPC. No MPC meeting had been held since the April Board meeting. 2) Statewide Livability Forum. Ms. Hocken said that she would like to be replaced as the Board representative on the Forum. Ms. Lauritsen and Mr. Gaydos had expressed interest. Ms. Wylie appointed Ms. Lauritsen as the Board representative with Mr. Gaydos as an alternate. Ms. Hocken said the Forum met three times each year. The next meeting was scheduled for June 6, 2000. 3) BRT Steering Committee. The Committee had not recently met, and staff had nothing to add to the update that had been provided on May 15, 2000. 4) Springfield Station Steering Committee. The Committee would meet on June 1, 2000, to make a site selection. Mr. Viggiano reported that the Environmental Assessment (EA) was not yet completed, pending approval by the State Historical Preservation Board. There were no historic issues, but it was required for the EA.

Staff would ask the Committee to make a recommendation on a site, and if for some reason an issue was raised with regard to the historic issues, which was unlikely, the Committee would be reconvened at a later date. Once the Committee recommended a site, it would be presented to the Springfield City Council and then to the LTD Board for approval.

Ms. Wylie asked staff also to review the traffic mitigation issues with the Committee. Mr. Bennett asked if there was additional information on the parking mitigation. Mr. Viggiano said staff were pursuing the parking mitigation issue, but had no answers to date.

APRIL FINANCIAL STATEMENTS: Finance Manager Diane Hellekson reported that LTD was in good shape for the first 10 months of the fiscal year, and staff were expecting to finish the year on budget.

The Agenda Item Summary expressed uncertainty about the Self-Employment tax, and Ms. Hellekson provided an update. She said that the State of Oregon was more than one month behind in processing returns. To date, fewer than 15 percent of the returns had been processed. Some additional money was received at the end of the previous week, which put the total close to right on budget.

Two years ago, the Oregon Department of Revenue (DOR) reported both to Tri-Met and LTD that the Self-Employment Tax program was not Y2K compliant, and it would be expensive to bring it into compliance. The DOR required that LTD and Tri-Met split the expense proportionately. The agreement was that DOR would charge the expense out over the two-year life of the project. However, the DOR did not do that, and the charges were made during the last two months. LTD's share was 13 percent of the total expense. Staff believed the Self-Employment Tax would be on budget for the year, but would be artificially low due to the administrative cost for compliance work.

Ms. Hellekson also reported that fuel prices were beginning to stabilize, and it appeared that staff had budgeted appropriately for next year.

GENERAL MANAGER REPORT ON APTA CONFERENCE: Mr. Hamm requested that the Board allow him to have a regular spot on the informational portion of the monthly agenda for a General Manager report. Board members agreed to the request.

Mr. Hamm had attended the recent American Public Transportation Association's (APTA) Operations and Paratransit Conference in Houston along with two other staff members. While there, he met with Edward Thomas from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Mr. Thomas continued to campaign for BRT in two particular areas. One area was how to make BRT more competitive by improving the criteria that was used in the new start funding option. Because new start funding was slanted toward rail projects, BRT projects were not rating well in that process. The other area was his concern that the BRT properties were not pushing hard enough to try to get bus manufacturers to move forward with the type of vehicle that he agreed ought to represent BRT applications.

Mr. Hamm also met with Ron Tober, who previously was the director of the Cleveland Regional Transit Association (CRTA), and who now was with the Charleston Transit District. Both of the properties were part of the consortium for BRT. Mr. Hamm had gained more information from another general manager's perspective on the consortium and on BRT in general.

Another meeting that Mr. Hamm had was with Larry Miller of Gannut Fleming, which was a firm that potentially could assist staff and the Board with the development of specifications for the Design/Build process of the BRT.

Mr. Hamm said that at the Product Show, one of the bus manufacturers displayed a small, propane-turban-electric bus application, and Transit Operations Manager Mark Johnson was able to view and learn more about the real-time informational software that the Transit Operations staff were considering.

In addition, Transit Planner Will Mueller attended to present information about LTD's BRT project and to present the BRT Video. People were impressed with the project and LTD's approach. Overall, it was an impressive, beneficial opportunity.

Mr. Hamm reported that staff were involved in ongoing discussions with Jeff Geiger, the manager of the McDonald Building, and with Chez Ray regarding moving tables outside of the restaurant and onto the Eugene Station Plaza for eating space. It was agreed that it would make the area more inviting. It appeared that a lease would be generated to remove LTD from liability. Mr. Hamm asked if the Board had any concerns about the process. Mr. Hamm thought it would be an asset to the "people place" that LTD had created to have complementary activities created that adjoined it and would make it a friendlier people environment.

Mr. Bennett asked Facilities Services Manager Charlie Simmons for his thoughts on the project. Mr. Simmons said that the intent when developing the Eugene Station also was to develop adjoining areas. Staff had concerns about how that area was controlled, and after consulting with legal counsel, it appeared that language would be included in the lease that would spell out LTD's expectations for such things as cleanliness. Mr. Simmons also hoped to be involved with the design of the area, and it was hoped that with Architect Eric Gunderson's assistance, a design workshop would be held with all parties involved.

Mr. Hamm said that Mr. Geiger was very supportive. There already was a mural designed for the wall of the building that faced the Station. The Board indicated its consensus to Mr. Hamm to proceed with the plans for the area between the Station and the McDonald Building.

Mr. Hamm also said that he would provide a regular report to the Board via memorandum regarding what he was doing, who he was meeting with, etc. It would serve as a communication tool for the Board to evaluate and provide feedback to him about the direction he was taking. He believed this was an important communication tool, particularly during the first six months to one year of his employment.

Ms. Hocken asked him to report on his meeting with LCC President Jerry Moskus. Mr. Hamm said that he would include a report on that meeting in his first memorandum to the Board.

Ms. Lauritsen suggested that Mr. Hamm stagger his memorandum so that it did not coincide with the Board meeting week.

APTA BOARD MEMBERS SEMINAR: Ms. Wylie said that the seminar would be held on July 23 through 27, and she recommended that at least two of the members go. She and Ms. Lauritsen had attended the seminar last year, and found it to be very informative and valuable. She thought it also was valuable for people who supported the Board as well. Interested members were to contact staff for more information.

MONTHLY STAFF REPORT: Mr. Kleger asked about the Youth Pass slogan, "License to Ride," and if it implied a right in spite of Ordinance 36. He thought 'license' had a limited meaning, and he asked staff to check into it.

Mr. Kortge asked about the Bus Roadeo. Mr. Johnson said that Board members were welcome to participate in the novice competition, or to participate as judges for the bus operator competition, or to just come for the fun and food. The event would be held on July 16, 2000, with the winner of the operator competition going to San Francisco to compete in the National Bus Roadeo at the APTA Annual Conference.

Ms. Wylie noted that LTD's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report again had been awarded the Government Finance Officer's Association (GFAO) Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting. She congratulated Ms. Hellekson and staff for a job well done. Ms. Hocken added that many agencies that received this award had their reports prepared by an outside auditor. LTD prepared its report internally, and so it really was LTD's award.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further discussion, Ms. Wylie adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.



Board Secretary