

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, July 17, 2002

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on July 11, 2002, 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, July 17, 2002, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Susan Ban
Gerry Gaydos, Vice President
Patricia Hocken, Secretary
Dave Kleger
Virginia Lauritsen, Treasurer
Hillary Wylie, President, presiding
Ken Hamm, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Robert Melnick

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 5:35 p.m. by Board President Hillary Wylie.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO AGENDA: Ms. Wylie added action item E., Purchase of Articulated Buses, and stated that adoption of the revised Purchasing Policy would be taken off the Consent Calendar and handled as a separate action item right after the Consent Calendar.

RETIREMENT OF BUS OPERATOR/ATU OFFICER PAUL HEADLEY: Ms. Wylie noted that retiring Bus Operator/ATU Executive Board Officer Paul Headley wanted to say a few words to the Board. Mr. Hamm talked a little about Mr. Headley's history with LTD since 1969, even before the beginning of Lane Transit District as a public transit system. Mr. Hamm stated that Mr. Headley championed employee causes and had been a union officer most of that time. Ms. Wylie said she had very much enjoyed serving as an ATU/LTD pension plan trustee with Mr. Headley, and that he was extremely knowledgeable about LTD's employees and history.

Mr. Headley shook hands with the Board members and said that he would be leaving them charged with the future of transportation at LTD and in the county. He noted the part that every employee and every Board member, from the beginning to current day, had played in building LTD. He said that LTD had grown from a liability in the community to a reliable part of the planning process, and that as he left, the Board was now charged with watching this and creating a transit district that would take care of the community. He cautioned the Board and staff to remember that someday they would be senior citizens and would lose their driving privileges, so what they did now would result in the service they received then. He complimented the current and past presidents of the Board for their participation in union and employee events. Ms. Wylie wished him well in his retirement.

WORK SESSION:

LTD Ordinance No. 36: Director of Transit Operations Mark Johnson stated that after the District lost its appeal on the court ruling regarding LTD's ability to limit signature gathering and other activities on the platforms at the Eugene Station, staff had been working with District counsel on needed revisions to Ordinance No. 36, Regulations Governing Conduct on District Property. Attorney Rohn Roberts was present for this discussion with the Board. He explained that one option for the District was to remove all prohibitions on activities. There were some disadvantages to that option, including that the station would become a public forum, so it would be difficult to control the environment and create the environment LTD wanted for its guests. He said that LTD had some responsibilities and liabilities regarding activities at the station, so being able to manage activities there was important to the District. A short-term advantage was that it would be easy to change the ordinance.

A second option was to allow only limited access to the boarding platforms, for passengers, employees, and people doing business with LTD. This would entail a change in ordinance language and new signage at the station. This change would not prohibit free speech activities, but that could not be the primary purpose of anyone on the platforms. Their primary purpose would be to use the service, and anyone engaging in other protected activities would be able to do so only until his or her next bus came. Mr. Johnson said that it was important to maintain a facility that was clean and where guests felt safe and were able to reach their buses unimpeded. A short-term disadvantage was that it would take more work to change the ordinance and prepare and maintain the signage. Staff and District counsel believed that both options would meet the court mandates, and thought they would address the issues presented by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) in its suit. Mr. Roberts had not yet been able to meet with the ACLU attorney, but planned to do so before the first reading of the revised ordinance.

Mr. Johnson said that staff recommended option 2, limiting access to the facility, so that the District could create and maintain a positive environment for guests and so that the Eugene Station did not turn out to be like it was when it was on 10th Avenue, with uncontrollable activities that made guest feel unsafe.

Mr. Roberts said that the downside of option 2 dealt primarily with enforcement: how to identify who was a passenger, etc. This option had been considered the last time the ordinance was reviewed, and one of the reasons it was not recommended at that time was concerns about enforcement. He said that since the Court determination was to limit LTD to using an effects-based ordinance (if activities are allowed, they can be prohibited only if they have the actual effect of impeding traffic, etc.), the District would have that problem anyway. It would be easier to go from limited access to more complete access than it would be to go the other way. He said that as the District grew, the station would be heavily traveled and should be limited to people using the system. Mr. Roberts said it was his intent to meet with the ACLU counsel, so that if the ACLU and LTD had differences of opinion about revisions to the ordinance, LTD would know that ahead of time.

Ms. Wylie thought that the precedence for greater transportation security had been laid since September 11th.

In response to a request from Ms. Lauritsen to clarify this option, Mr. Roberts referred to the site map attached to Ordinance 36. The areas highlighted in red defined the boarding platform.

The areas in green highlighted what LTD referred to as an open area for public access. While that may not be legally required, Mr. Roberts thought that there was some intent at the time the transit station was being developed to have some areas that would be public by nature. Once that was done, any of the public activities were allowed. He said that in an effort to accommodate that and not be too restrictive, bearing in mind that LTD was a public body, that type of access would be limited to certain areas of the station and not allowed on the platforms. If paying passengers were using the station, once they were on the boarding platform, they would still preserve their first amendment rights, as long as they did not impede traffic or do other things that were effects-based provisions that applied to passengers as well.

Ms. Hocken asked how long, from an enforcement standpoint, people could be on the platform before they had to catch a bus. Mr. Johnson said that they would have to catch the next available bus. Mr. Roberts explained that the definition of "passenger" in the ordinance was a person who held a valid fare and was en route on a District vehicle or waiting for the next available District vehicle to that person's destination.

Ms. Hocken asked why the ACLU would think this would be an acceptable alternative. Mr. Roberts said that during discussions of the previous version and the alternative of closing the station to everyone but passengers, the ACLU response was that they would not like to see that happen, but would concede that they would not have control over it. Mr. Johnson added that the issue for the ACLU was one of limiting certain targeted activities rather than all activities.

Mr. Kleger said that he had been through two petition-gathering seasons and was gratified to see that petition gatherers were complying with the restriction on blocking traffic. He said that there were enough people in a hurry at the station who do not want to be bothered with anything, so there seemed to be some frustrated petition gatherers. He said that he remained concerned about anything that resulted in even perceived impediments to passengers. He thought the recommendation was about as good as the District could do, and said he was adamantly opposed to returning to a situation like the one LTD had on 10th Avenue, which was scary for guests and children, and sometimes even for him.

Mr. Roberts emphasized that this ordinance revision was not targeted at petition signature gatherers or any other specific groups. Rather, it was an attempt to try to manage the facility in a way to avoid a repeat of what happened at 10th Avenue. While there were times when there was not a lot of activity at the station so that it was not necessarily a problem for someone to be doing these activities there, there were times when it was a problem, and there would come a day when this would be very important.

Mr. Johnson and Mr. Roberts asked if there was general direction from the Board to proceed with either option. Board members were in agreement that option 2 was the better option. As a result, staff and counsel would revise the ordinance and take it to the Board for the first reading at the September Board meeting.

RideSource Facility: Special Transportation Program Manager Terry Parker and Senior Strategic Planner Lisa Gardner presented this topic for Board discussion. Ms. Gardner used a PowerPoint presentation to discuss general background and program needs, which were determined to be \$3.5 million for a new facility alone, without land. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) had appropriated \$1.3 million, with the promise of another \$500,000. However, the second amount was in doubt because of state budget shortfalls.

Ms. Gardner discussed the criteria and process for screening sites. Originally staff considered only sites that could be used for the co-location of a RideSource facility and a satellite maintenance facility for LTD in the northwest (industrial) part of town, to shorten "deadheading" (the distance a bus has to travel to the beginning of a route without generating revenue). Twenty-two sites were narrowed to three. Then staff began looking at sites for a RideSource facility only, to determine whether the search for a joint site was detracting from the RideSource facility needs.

Ms. Parker explained a site map showing destinations for RideSource service, spread throughout the Eugene/Springfield area. There were 162 sites that met the broad criteria for RideSource use. These were narrowed to 12 sites, almost all in the same area as the original site search. This number was reduced to seven viable sites in the west part of Eugene and on Q Street in Springfield. Combined with the original three sites, one of which was a duplicate in the second search, there were a total of nine sites for further consideration.

Ms. Gardner explained the next steps. Following Board direction regarding co-locating or finding a site for RideSource use only, staff would complete the screening process. One site would be selected for the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) screening process, which would measure impacts on neighbors, air and water quality, etc.

Ms. Wylie asked about the original site that was being considered for purchase for a co-located facility, and whether LTD could afford to buy land now. Ms. Gardner said that the first site still was being considered. Director of Finance Diane Hellekson explained that the satellite piece was in the Capital Improvements Program as being debt-financed and paid back with local funds, but there were some funding issues with the RideSource part. She recommended taking this issue to the Board Finance Committee in September to discuss how to obtain the additional funding to meet the program needs.

Mr. Gaydos recalled hearing that there were operational savings with a satellite facility because of reduced deadheading. Ms. Gardner cautioned that the District would not realize those savings until a satellite facility actually was built in the future, but there also could be savings as a result of buying land now instead of sometime in the future. She said that the District currently was at the 1998 service level, given the recent service cuts, and it would be awhile before service levels returned to the growth rate predicted to warrant a satellite facility.

Mr. Gaydos asked if the Gateway BRT corridor would play a role in this decision. Mr. Hamm noted that the Glenwood facility was near the Phase 1 corridor. He said that future BRT corridors could play a role, and that the District should analyze future needs to try to anticipate where the greatest need would be. He said that the Glenwood facility still had fairly substantial room for growth, in terms of vehicle parking area, and that staff should outline projections for the Board.

Ms. Hocken thought that the Board needed more information and that the opportunity for co-location was still very important.

Ms. Gardner explained that in the next screening process, three sites would be reviewed, including one or two for each option (co-location or RideSource only). The Board did not have to select a direction that evening; however, staff did not want to take more than one site through the NEPA process, since it was expensive.

Ms. Hocken said that one thing that should be included in the analysis was what LTD likely would realize in the sale of the parcel if it decided not to build the joint facility after buying the land.

Mr. Kleger asked Ms. Parker about the lease on the current RideSource facility. She explained that it had seemed unlikely that the lease would be renewed for another year, but it had been. Staff were trying to avoid making two transitions if the lease was not renewed again. Another issue was how long money would be available. She explained that this was the biggest project that the Oregon Public Transit Division of ODOT (not ODOT itself) had funded.

Ms. Ban wondered if staff had considered purchasing one lot of a double lot, with the option to purchase the second one in the future. Ms. Gardner said that staff had been talking about this possibility.

Mr. Hamm noted that population projections were being considered. Ms. Parker said that development being seen in the north and northwest of the local area mostly was for older couples, not families with children. There were some big questions about where the community was seeing the kind of development that RideSource would need to follow.

Ms. Wylie said she would expect maybe three choices in September, with a staff recommendation for one, because Ms. Parker knew what the real needs were. She said that the Board had liked the co-location of facilities, and needed to know if that was still feasible. Ms. Gardner said that staff could bring better financial and cost information to the Board in September. Mr. Kleger said he strongly encouraged co-location if feasible, but agreed that the Board needed more information. He said he did not want to jeopardize the Public Transit Division agreement, and did not want RideSource to have to move twice.

This concluded the work session, and the Board took a break from 6:30 p.m. to 6:40 p.m.

EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH: Director of Finance Diane Hellekson introduced the July 2002 Employee of the Month, GL/Grant Accountant Todd Lipkin. She said that Finance had stress and deadlines, but also had fun, and that Mr. Lipkin was one of the people who contributed to that. She said that his attitude was that nothing was outside his job description, that his technical skills were outstanding, and that people sought him out for problem-solving.

Mr. Lipkin thanked Ms. Hellekson and Accounting Manager Carol James and said that it was easy to be successful at a place like LTD, with supervisors who helped staff accomplish what they needed to do, and that it was nice to have the support of people who believed in him. Ms. Wylie presented Mr. Lipkin with his pin, certificate, and other awards.

Director of Transit Operations Mark Johnson introduced the August 2002 Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Arline Link. He noted that it was the third time she had been selected as the Employee of the Month, and that she had been the Employee of the Year in 1985. He stated that she had been a good employee in every aspect of her job and was a very compassionate, caring person who made sure that other employees received flowers and cards. He said she did lots of little things for people without asking for credit, including for the people who rode her bus. He said that Ms. Link was called Grandma by many of her young riders, and that she also was very involved in the community.

Ms. Wylie presented Ms. Link with her pin, certificate, and other awards. Ms. Link said she did not feel that she was anything special, and that the 200 drivers she worked with were all wonderful people. She said she felt as if she got to play with a Tonka toy everyday and that all those other people had to play with her.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Wylie opened the meeting for audience participation. (1) Michelle Lowe of Eugene said that she had a problem with an ad currently on the sides of the buses, which said, "Smile, your mother chose life." She wondered what LTD's stake was in preaching to women regarding private choices, how those ads were paid for, and whether LTD subsidized the ads in any way. Mr. Hamm explained that the bus ads were managed by a contracted agency. LTD had some restrictions on that program, but had created a public forum. Service Planning & Marketing Manager Andy Vobora said that 100 percent of the advertising fee was paid directly to Obie Media Corporation and Obie paid LTD a contractually-agreed-upon fee for the year.

Ms. Lowe then wanted to know if her group could put its own message on the site of the bus. Mr. Vobora replied that the language would be reviewed by Obie, and anything that incites violence would not be allowed, so it would depend on how the ad was worded and looked. Ms. Lowe said that the current message was not as sweet as it sounded. She said that Eugene had just lost its only abortion provider that day, and a lot of people were upset about that. She also wondered why LTD had pulled the Planned Parenthood "Joe Sperm" ads off the buses. Mr. Vobora said that this ad had been running on two buses for eight weeks and would run out in about a week. LTD did not pull the Joe Sperm ads off the buses; rather, the paid time for the ads had run out. Mr. Hamm thanked Ms. Lowe for her input and said that staff would continue to review the situation.

(2) Arline Link of Springfield wanted to note for the record that she had not heard complaints about the current ads, but had heard complaints about the Joe Sperm ads.

MOTION

CONSENT CALENDAR: Ms. Hocken moved approval of the three sets of minutes found in the Consent Calendar. (The purchasing policy update had been removed from the Consent Calendar earlier in the meeting.) Mr. Kleger seconded, and the motion passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Ban, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the June 17, 2002, joint meeting with the Springfield City Council; the June 17, 2002, special meeting/work session; and the June 19, 2002, regular Board meeting.

VOTE

PURCHASING POLICY RULES UPDATE: Purchasing Manager Jeanette Bailor explained that this was the first Purchasing Policy update since 1994. The day before, District counsel had discovered that the portion of the policy that dealt with raising the bid threshold now required a public hearing, so that change was being pulled out of the policy until September. Otherwise, there had been a lot of procedural changes that were included in the policy update.

Mr. Kleger noted that the first sentence of the policy referred to the "LTD Board of Assistant General Managers," and should be changed to "LTD Board of Directors." Additionally, Section 3.9.3 of the policy also referred to contested case proceedings, which the Board had done away with. That was left over from a previous version and should not be included in the policy that evening.

Ms. Hocken asked if there might be a case where someone would contest a bid. Ms. Bailor explained that this was covered in other places in the policy that referred to protested bid procedures.

MOTION Mr. Kleger moved approval of LTD Resolution No. 2002-031: "Resolved, the LTD Board of Directors hereby adopts the Purchasing Policy and Rules, as revised July 17, 2002, with the appropriate adjustments noted earlier (changing the wording from 'Board of Assistant General Managers' to 'Board of Directors,' and striking any reference to contested case procedures from the policy). The motion was seconded and the resolution was adopted by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Ban, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE

WEST EUGENE PARKWAY TRANSPPLAN AMENDMENTS: Senior Strategic Planner Lisa Gardner called the Board's attention to page 28 of the agenda materials for that meeting and noted that Eugene Planning Director Jan Childs was present to answer questions. Ms. Gardner stated that the Eugene and Springfield City Councils had taken action to recommend approval of these amendments, and the Lane County Board of Commissioners was scheduled to take action on them on July 24 or July 31. She made sure that the Board members had received the TransPlan replacement pages, which were part of what the Board would be approving.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved, seconded by Mr. Kleger, that the LTD Board of Directors adopt LTD Resolution No. 2002-028, A Resolution Adopting Revisions to the Eugene-Springfield Transportation System Plan ("TransPlan").

Mr. Kleger said that he was on the record as being in favor of this amendment. He wanted to make it clear that he thought that if the community had started discussions about how to plan to solve the West Eugene transportation problems 20 years before, they might have found a better solution than the West Eugene Parkway would be, but that did not occur. He thought that if the Parkway were not built, there would be a price for not doing it, and if it were built, there would be a price for building it, as well. He said that nothing would turn off the increased travel and population, and nothing would turn off the increased hazard that it brought about when mixing two different movement patterns on a street running at or near capacity. He stated that the financing structure was relatively inflexible: it was possible to get money for a capital solution, but difficult to get money for a policing solution and to sustain policing solutions. He said that the alternative strategies that had been presented by several organizations, including 1000 Friends of Oregon, sometimes referred to as the LUTRAQ (Land Use Transportation Air Quality) strategies, were admitted to take something like 20 years to be effective. His belief was that they would take more like 30 years in this particular location, or even as long as 40 years. He said that if the through traffic presently on a shared right-of-way on West 11th Avenue remained on West 11th, the availability of space in the main thoroughfare of that corridor for anything like BRT was probably nil. He did not think that ODOT would release the space under any circumstances without having somewhere else to put its through traffic. As a result, he said, he thought that the Parkway probably was the best solution. He said he was also strongly committed to doing what the voters had said should be done; that was what the Board as public officials had a responsibility to do even if they were not thrilled to do it.

Ms. Hocken said she thought it was clear that there was a need for transportation improvements in the West Eugene area, which the West Eugene Parkway was proposed to help address. She said that she lived in the neighborhood and knew the traffic on West 11th and how overcrowded it was, with even more development going in on West 11th Avenue. She said that even though the West Eugene Parkway might not be the perfect solution in an ideal world, she thought it was the solution that would work to help relieve the traffic on West 11th and provide the

ability of people who lived west of Eugene to get on the state system. She also thought that it was very important for the metropolitan area's relationship to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to move ahead with this project. She stated that a lot of the funding for local transportation improvement came from the Oregon Department of Transportation, and for this area or region to refuse to accept money that was available for funding this project could jeopardize the area's ability to obtain funds for other projects that were very important to the area, such as the Beltline/I-5 interchange. Because of the transportation problems that needed solving and because of the relationship with the Department of Transportation, it was critical to move head with this project.

Mr. Kleger said that building the Parkway would not do more than buy some time, and the application of what were called LUTRAQ strategies to the West 11th corridor still needed to be done. Just building the Parkway and doing nothing more would leave the community in the very same situation in 25 or 30 years. He wanted to make it clear that just stopping with the Parkway was not adequate. He said it would take an active commitment by all the jurisdictions working together to carry that kind of effort forward, even when the pressure was off once the Parkway was built.

Mr. Gaydos said that he had lived in Eugene/Springfield for 25 years and talked about those issues in the Metropolitan Area Planning Advisory Committee (MAPAC). To a great extent, a lot of history had occurred since this roadway started, and the planning had adjusted because of people's concerns. He said that one of the beauties of this community was that people had the desire, the intellect, the emotion, the commitment, and the love for the community to raise issues and to cause things to be different than they otherwise would have been. Because of that, this project was very different than it would have been 20 years before. He said that it continued to be a project on which the staff, who were people of good faith and goodwill, were doing their best to listen to all of the concerns of the public, and had done so for nearly 20 years. He said that to ever believe that a public works project would solve or cause all problems for eternity was a little bit foolish in his eyes. He believed that from a statewide relationship standpoint, from a desire to recognize the needs of people in West Eugene, and from the Coast east, this project was very important. He said that public safety was a very important part of life, and creating a roadway that allowed for safer travel was important. He said that this project was not just a West 11th project—it was a statewide project, an ODOT project that was well thought out. He said it was not perfect, but it had been adjusted and worked well.

Ms. Wylie stated that the Board had heard many hours of testimony on the West Eugene Parkway and had been through many meetings about this issue.

Mr. Gaydos apologized for not being present at the hearing on this issue, and said he had looked through all the related documents given to the Board. He said he was totally supportive of the project, not because he thought it was the ultimate solution, but because he thought the community needed to move on and that this was a situation that would improve the community and state. However, he said he would have to abstain from voting because he had been out of town and did not attend the public hearing. He said he had read most of the written submittal, but knew from years on other commissions and committees that a lot happened on the oral side. He urged the group to vote yes and to support this amendment, and said that he thought the City Council was courageous to vote to support it and that he hoped the other jurisdictions would support it, as well. He said he thought it was something that would assist the community in continuing its efforts to be a prime place to live. He encouraged those who dissented to continue to dissent and to continue to use voice mail, e-mail, and public appearances.

VOTE There was no further discussion, and the vote on the resolution to adopt revisions to the Eugene-Springfield TransPlan carried 5 to 0, with Ban, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor, no one opposed, and Mr. Gaydos abstaining. Ms. Wylie stated that LTD Resolution No. 2002-028 had been adopted.

Mr. Kleger expressed thanks to the staff for their incredible work on this project. Ms. Hocken said that some of the testimony the Board had heard said that they felt like transit was not enough a part of the solution in West Eugene. She agreed that LTD had a lot left to do to be part of that solution, and thought that the LTD Board should be committed to having transit help solve the transportation problems in West Eugene, along with the West Eugene Parkway. Ms. Wylie agreed.

BRT NAME: Public Relations Representative Sue Aufort explained that at the June Board meeting Dave Funk of Funk/Levis & Associates described the process of a recommended name for the bus rapid transit (BRT) system. The Board had asked that the BRT Steering Committee review the recommendation. On July 2, the BRT Steering Committee voted 6 to 1 to encourage the Board to approve the name that the BRT Naming Committee had recommended, and directed staff to conduct a trademark search on the name. Staff had conducted that search and found that "Q" was used for a lot of different products, buildings, etc., as well as by a local radio station as a nickname, but was not used by another transit property. LTD next would ask for a trademark release from the owners of the local radio station.

The Board also had asked staff to talk to former Board member and BRT proponent Rob Bennett about the name. Kathy Wiltz of the District's advertising agency, Mr. Hamm, and Mr. Bennett had met to discuss the process and criteria, and Mr. Bennett had liked the name and was very supportive of it. Ms. Hocken said she was resigned to the name, and Ms. Lauritsen said she did not like it. Ms. Ban commented that the District had created a process to recommend a name, and she had great respect for the creativity that had resulted in the recommendation.

Ms. Wiltz told the Board that one of the wonderful things about LTD was that it was known all over the country for the innovative things it did, such as the group pass and being 100 percent accessible before that was mandated. LTD had now come up with a name that no other transit district in the country was using. She thought that "Q" was the strongest match for the criteria, and explained her reasons for that belief. Mr. Hamm said that the idea was to give BRT a name early so that by the time BRT was on the street, people would associate the name with it.

MOTION Ms. Ban moved adoption of LTD Resolution No. 2002-017: "Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors approves "Q" for the BRT system as recommended by the BRT Naming Committee and the BRT Steering Committee, contingent on securing a trademark release from Cumulus Broadcasting Company. If the release is not available, the BRT name is to be reconsidered at a future Board meeting." Mr. Gaydos seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Ban, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed.

BRT STATION DESIGN: Director of Development Services Stefano Viggiano explained that an early decision about BRT station design was that all stations would have generally the same look. Staff now were asking the Board to approve that design, which was an important decision. He explained that many early designs had been narrowed to two, and that the BRT Steering Committee had recommended one of them, designated "Masted Sails." Staff were comfortable with both designs, Masted Sails and Masted Wings. Additionally, absent Board member Robert

Melnick had reviewed both designs. His preference was for Masted Sails, but he also agreed that either would work well.

Mr. Viggiano discussed costs for the two designs. Using the Masted Sails design would be somewhat more expensive, although both types of station would be well below budgeted figures.

Ms. Wylie said she had thought that the stations would be more elaborate, and wondered if they would have fare sales equipment and other amenities. Mr. Viggiano replied that there would be fare machines, passenger information, benches, and other amenities.

Architect Harriet Cherry was present at the meeting and explained the background for this design recommendation. She said that the architects had wanted to design the shelters first and the other amenities would be included later. The goal for the design was an image of fast, new, and not a typical station. She explained more of the technical aspects of the two designs, and said that although the look would be as light and airy as possible, both would be structurally sound. Another goal was to be able to see through them without obstruction. One stop would be at Dad's Gate at the University of Oregon (UO), which was an historical gate and could not be blocked or obstructed. Also, it was desirable since people feel safe without vertical obstructions. The shelters would have two levels of lighting, with a lower level when the station was closed.

Mr. Kleger said he really liked the Masted Sails design, and wanted to know how much wind it would take to lift the sail off the pole. Ms. Cherry said that the architects had not done that research, but would do so. Mr. Hamm said he had experienced a similar design suspended by solid rods, and it generally was able to withstand winds.

MOTION

Ms. Lauritsen moved adoption of LTD resolution NO. 2002-029: "Resolved, that the LTD Board of Directors approves the 'Masted Sails' BRT Station Design as recommended by the BRT Steering Committee." Ms. Hocken seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Ban, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed.

VOTE

PURCHASE OF FIVE ARTICULATED BUSES: Director of Maintenance Ron Berkshire said that in June 2001 the Board had given staff direction to purchase five articulated buses. Staff looked for an existing contract with another agency, and found that TriMet in Portland was in the process of securing a contract with New Flyer Industries. TriMet had given LTD permission to tag onto that contract. There would be a pre-award audit in the next week, and Mr. Berkshire anticipated proceeding with the contract in August. He said that the detail of the pricing had not yet been set, but the price for LTD's buses, delivered to Eugene and including the automated vehicle locator/global positioning system (AVL/GPS), would be between \$445,000 and \$450,000 per bus. There also would be some spare parts to purchase and some acquisition costs.

Mr. Kleger asked about delivery time. Mr. Berkshire said that LTD already had been queued into the New Flyer production schedule for four to five months. The buses currently were scheduled for production early in 2003, and LTD probably would receive them in February or March. However, that timing could not be certain until a contract had been signed. Mr. Kleger wondered about New Flyer buses' readiness to hit the road on arrival. Mr. Berkshire said that TriMet and Seattle had had good success with New Flyer buses. He explained that there were three manufacturers of articulated buses in the nation: Neoplan, North American Bus Industries (NABI), and New Flyer. Neoplan was struggling. Mr. Berkshire was not familiar with NABI, although Los Angeles did a lot

of business with them. New Flyer had been around a long time and other properties said their buses worked well.

Ms. Hocken asked what Mr. Berkshire knew about New Flyer's wheelchair lifts and whether the space was large enough for all types of wheelchairs. He said that LTD would be ordering low-floor buses with flip-out ramps, and that the next Gillig buses LTD ordered would use the same ramping system. Accessibility would be no less than on the current Gillig low-floor buses. Mr. Kleger said that he had been aboard recently-built New Flyers and that they were really pretty well done, and that he had seen the biggest wheelchair used by LTD's guests enter them without difficulty. Mr. Berkshire added that LTD would have some control over the interior design and that there were no issues with the ramps.

As an aside, Mr. Berkshire said that LTD continued to work with AVS on the ramps on the AVS buses. AVS had a prototype bus in Texas and was almost through testing it. Passenger response was good. When AVS was satisfied that the new ramping system was successful, LTD's buses would be retrofitted. Mr. Hamm gave AVS credit for wanting to go the extra mile to prove its products worthy of the marketplace.

MOTION

Ms. Lauritsen moved approval of LTD Resolution No. 2002-030: "Resolved, the LTD Board of Directors hereby gives approval for staff to proceed with the purchase of five articulated buses as programmed in the Capital Improvements Program, and authorizes the general manager to contract with New Flyer Industries for purchase of five low-floor articulated buses." Mr. Kleger seconded.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Board needed to include a caveat about the price differential. Mr. Berkshire said that this purchase was budgeted in the CIP at \$475,00 per bus, so the current estimate was under that amount. The figures used that evening were from a New Flyer quote to TriMet, so he thought that price was beginning to solidify. Ms. Hocken said she would be comfortable even with the amount in the budget, because it already had been approved by the Board. Mr. Kleger asked how these buses would be financed, and Mr. Berkshire replied that LTD would use debt financing for this purchase.

VOTE

There was no other discussion, and the resolution passed by unanimous vote, 6 to 0, with Ban, Gaydos, Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, and Wylie voting in favor and none opposed. Ms. Hocken thought it was exciting that LTD would be able to accelerate its purchase of these buses, because and they would help alleviate problems with full buses.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Board Member Reports: Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC)—Ms. Hocken and Mr. Gaydos both attended the July 11 MPC meeting. Ms. Hocken said that the topic that generated the most interest was amending the MPC bylaws to have a representative of ODOT or the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) serve as a voting representative. The proposal from MPC, which will go back to the governing bodies for review, was to have a senior staff representative from ODOT. The OTC Board member from this area, Randy Pape, did not want to serve in that role on MPC, but it seemed that the representative needed to be someone who could vote on behalf of ODOT, at either the regional or area manager level. She said that this requirement was part of the federal requirements in terms of who had to be part of the conversation when adopting transportation plans that qualify for federal money. She said that MPC also discussed the rules for the OTIA bonding funding and the STIP for 2004-07, which ODOT was starting to work on. Board

BRT Committee and BRT Steering Committee—Ms. Hocken said that the Board already had discussed the items discussed at the BRT Steering Committee (the BRT name and BRT station design).

General Manager's Report: Mr. Hamm noted that the Bus Rodeo would be held the following Sunday. Salem Area Transit would be participating with LTD in this skills test course. He invited Board members to attend if they could. The LTD/ATU picnic was scheduled for Sunday, August 4. Since LTD had not held an employee awards banquet earlier in the year, employees would be recognized for their achievements at the picnic. Mr. Hamm reminded the Board that there would be no August Board meeting, and said that he would be gone for two weeks. Mr. Hamm mentioned several significant meetings, including a meeting in Portland with Richard Krochalis, the new Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Region 10 administrator. He and his grants staff person also took the train to Eugene and met with LTD staff on July 16, so that they could learn more about BRT and the Springfield Station. LTD staff also had a meeting with the ODOT Region 2 manager, Jeff Scheick, because LTD had been running into some access and signal issues at the Springfield Station, and things seemed to be moving a little better. Mr. Gaydos and Mr. Hamm had met with Eugene City Councilor David Kelly and Eugene City Manager Jim Carlson to talk about BRT and the schedule. Mr. Gaydos said there was good communication and that Councilor Kelly had said to not fail to use the City Councilors as advocates for BRT, which Mr. Gaydos thought was important. Also, Mr. Gaydos thought that Councilor Kelly now had a different understanding of the financial situation as the reason for contingencies in BRT deadlines. Mr. Hamm also reported that Bill Millar, the president of the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) had visited LTD on July 9, and that some of the Board members had been able to attend lunch with him. He had been at a conference in Portland and wanted to learn more about LTD and BRT. Mr. Gaydos said that staff of the local area's congressional delegation were present, as well as representatives of the cities and county, so that they all had the opportunity to hear support for BRT from the other jurisdictions and APTA. He thought it was a good start on communication and firming up relationships.

Monthly Financial Report: Director of Finance Diane Hellekson said that Finance staff were in the process of completing the year-end close, which took longer than monthly reporting processes, so a report was not included in the packet. A preliminary (unaudited) report would be mailed to the Board before the end of the month. She mentioned some preliminary results, and reported that on the revenue side of the picture, LTD was less than 1 percent under budget in cash fares. The group pass program finished the year above budget, in spite of the loss of some technical employees. Special services had a very positive year. Two of the three taxes (self-employment and state-in-lieu) finished above budget for the year. The self-employment tax appeared to be very stable despite the effect of the local economy on payroll taxes. Payroll tax results also were good news because staff had been managing since last fall to a projected total of 2 percent less than was received the previous year. However, LTD actually received 2 percent less than budgeted, which was 1 percent, or about \$165,000, better than expected. She said that there was no bad news on the expenditure side—the District had effectively managed all of the major expenditure categories. Ms. Hellekson stated that LTD had made appropriate strides in terms of managing its financial situation and had developed a very strong base on which to grow. She added that the final report from the auditors would be presented in November.

Mr. Hamm commented that managing to the budget was something done by all the staff in the room, as well as others. He gave Ms. Hellekson credit for giving staff the heads-up and strategizing with staff about the budget issues, and said that every staff member who managed a portion of the budget understood that the District needed to make major adjustments during the

past year and offered ideas about how to do that, and ideas came from every level of the organization. He said he wanted to acknowledge this team because everyone pulled together and made difficult decisions, and would continue to do so.

Department Reports: Director of Human Resources and Risk Management Dave Dickman announced that in mid-June, Mel Schoppert, the International Vice President of the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), had passed away, and Ron Heintzman had just been named as his replacement. Mr. Dickman said that Mr. Heintzman no longer would have day-to-day dealings with the District in the administration of its contract, but likely would be the chief negotiator in future negotiations on the District's contract with ATU.

ADJOURNMENT: There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.


Board Secretary

