

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, September 17, 2003

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on September 11, 2003, 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, September 17, 2003, beginning at 5:30 p.m., in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Susan Ban  
David Gant  
Patricia Hocken, Secretary, presiding  
Dave Kleger  
Virginia Lauritsen  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Kim Young, Minutes Recorder  
Jo Sullivan, Clerk of the Board (Minutes Recorder for Work Session only)

Absent: Gerry Gaydos, Vice President  
Hillary Wylie, President

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by Board Secretary Pat Hocken.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS/ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** Ms. Hocken commended staff on the new *Rider's Digest*. She said it was a very nice document, with all the information one would expect on schedules, as well as a lot of other good information on bus rapid transit (BRT), vehicles, etc.

Mr. Kleger stated that last spring he had accepted the appointment as chair of the Board Committee on Service, and that he would be getting into high gear with the committee. He said that they would want to be made aware of what was happening with service and kept up to date.

Mr. Hamm asked to add two agenda items for Board discussion. An agenda item on an LTD Brand Plan inadvertently had been left out of the packet and had been handed out at the meeting. Additionally, at a Board HR Committee meeting earlier in the week, Board Member Gerry Gaydos had asked that the Board discuss the University of Oregon (UO) arena location selection process and LTD's role in that. Mr. Gaydos was not able to attend the Board meeting, but thought this was an important discussion for the Board to have.

Mr. Hamm also introduced LTD's new director of Human Resources and Risk Management, Mary Neidig. He noted that she most recently had been employed by the State of Oregon, and before that had worked at Weyerhaeuser in the Cottage Grove area, and that she had approximately 28 years of experience in human resources and labor relations work, some at a high policy level for the State of Oregon and some more directly in labor relations. He stated that the staff were very excited about having her at LTD. Ms. Neidig provided some additional background information, stating that she had worked about half her career in private industry and half in the public sector. She had held a number of human resources-related positions, including direct human resources

work in the private sector. In 1991, she was appointed as the employer representative on the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. She spent five years as chair of the Appeals Board, another five as administrator of the Workers' Compensation Division, and then the remainder of the time as director of the agency that was responsible for Oregon OSHA and other regulatory programs, so the other half of her career had been around programs that related to employment and business operations.

#### **WORK SESSION:**

**EXECUTIVE (NON-PUBLIC) SESSION:** Mr. Kleger moved that the Board meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h), to consult with counsel concerning the legal rights and duties of a public body with regard to litigation or litigation likely to be filed, pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(e), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to negotiate real property transactions; and pursuant to ORS 40.225, lawyer-client privilege. Ms. Ban seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous voice vote. The executive session began at 5:45 p.m. District Counsel Roger Saydack, Dennis Percell, and Rohn Roberts were present for this discussion.

**RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION:** Upon a motion by Mr. Kleger and seconding by Ms. Lauritsen, the Board unanimously returned to open session at 6:05 p.m.

**UNIVERSITY OF OREGON ARENA LOCATION:** Mr. Hamm explained that Mr. Gaydos believed that LTD should assess the costs and transit service logistics associated with the various sites under consideration and weigh in on the location decision. Ms. Hocken asked about the University's process to solicit input. Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora said that the UO had contacted LTD last spring. At that time, staff had developed a matrix of the sites and had given the UO a numerical rating of each site from a transit service standpoint. He stated that Howe Field had the lowest (worst) rating on that list. LTD had not heard back from the UO since that time.

Mr. Hamm agreed with Mr. Vobora that Howe Field would be difficult for LTD to serve. Mr. Vobora explained that it would take a lot of coordination with the police and City to reverse streets, etc. A serious question for LTD was what would happen to LTD's daily ridership if the UO built parking for 2,000 cars on campus. He noted that he had not heard the 2,000-car number brought up by the UO, and that it certainly could not be in one facility. He stated that LTD did need to talk to the UO about how much parking the UO planned to provide. Ms. Ban noted the need to assess the environmental impact of adding that many cars. Mr. Hamm added that at one point UO Vice President Dan Williams had suggested placing the stadium near a BRT station.

Ms. Hocken asked if the analysis showed that the Howe Field site was better or worse than the Autzen site for LTD's operations, and if the plan would be to build a parking garage on the Autzen site, as well. Mr. Vobora said that for 15,000 people going to Autzen for a basketball game, a transit component probably would not be necessary. However, an arena at that location would remove additional football parking, which would require that a structure for parking be constructed in order to maintain the necessary number of spaces for football games.

Mr. Kleger said that Mayor Torrey had asked him at one point if LTD had an opinion on the arena siting, and Mr. Kleger had referred him to Mr. Vobora. Mr. Kleger thought it might be good to bring Mayor Torrey up to date.

Ms. Ban thought that since LTD had developed a matrix that evaluated its preferences, it might be worthwhile to reinforce that at a strategic point. She thought it might be appropriate to send a letter from the Board restating and reinforcing the issues regarding transportation facilitation, reduced ridership, and environmental concerns at the sites.

Ms. Lauritsen wanted to be sure that the Board first relied on staff's opinions and judgments before writing a letter. Mr. Hamm explained that staff had done the analysis and provided it at the staff level, and had asked Mr. Williams to be sure LTD was involved at the staff level as the University went through the siting process, to consider the transit component. He thought that Mr. Gaydos thought that the Board may need to participate at the political level, as well, for a stronger message about the transportation issues, and to use football service as an example. Mr. Gant agreed. Mr. Hamm suggested that someone, or two, from the Board could meet with LTD and UO staff. The Board members requested that Mr. Gaydos represent the Board at the meeting.

Mr. Hamm noted that 20.8 percent of the people attending the first UO home football game of this season got there on LTD, which was an excellent modal split. He thought the City of Eugene also had indicated its concerns about where the arena would be built and what would be included in the project.

Ms. Hocken said it would be nice to know what kind of parking restrictions the City of Eugene might be considering at each of the sites, and whether the UO would be limited in what it could do at Autzen because of the need for football parking. Mr. Gant wondered if there would be covered parking and how that would affect the campus.

Ms. Hocken summarized that staff would do more research and then there would be a letter from the Board expressing LTD's concerns, and then staff would arrange a meeting for Mr. Gaydos and staff to meet with UO representatives. The other Board members were in agreement with this plan of action.

Ms. Hocken called a brief recess, from 6:23 p.m. to 6:35 p.m.

**EMPLOYEES OF THE MONTH** – August, September, and October 2003 – Service Planning and Marketing Manager Andy Vobora introduced the August Employee of the Month, Marketing Representative Cosette Rees. He praised Ms. Rees for her involvement in different community activities in Springfield and said she was knowledgeable and a great person to have on staff. He noted Ms. Rees' role as lead staff for the *Rider's Digest*. Ms. Rees expressed appreciation to the Board for the recognition, and said she shared the award with all those she worked with. She also expressed appreciation to Mr. Vobora.

Ms. Hocken noted that September Employee of the Month Terry Parker was unable to attend the meeting, and would be honored the following month.

Director of Transit Operations Mark Johnson introduced Bus Operator Maurice Brown, the October Employee of the Month. Mr. Johnson said that Mr. Brown was a courteous and friendly operator who went out of his way to help others. He noted that Mr. Brown was a two-time

recipient of the General Manager's Award for Excellence. Mr. Brown expressed his appreciation for receiving the award. Mr. Hamm spoke of Mr. Brown's friendly attitude and said LTD was lucky to have him.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION** – Ms. Hocken determined that there was no one wishing to speak.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING:**

**MOTION** **CONSENT CALENDAR** – Ms. Ban moved adoption of LTD Board Resolution No. 2003-035: "It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for September 17, 2003, is approved as presented." Mr. Gant provided the second. The Consent Calendar consisted of the minutes of the June 18, 2003, regular board meeting; July 16, 2003, canceled Board meeting; August 20, 2003, canceled Board meeting, and LTD DBE Policies and Affirmative Action Program.

**VOTE** The Consent Calendar was approved as submitted, as follows:  
 AYES: Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Ban, Gant (5)  
 NAYS: None  
 ABSENTIONS: None  
 EXCUSED: Gaydos, Wylie

**BRT PHASE 1 PROPERTY ACQUISITION** – Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn called the Board's attention to maps posted on the meeting room wall that showed the properties that LTD proposed to acquire. He said that all affected property owners had been notified of the process. If the Board approved the resolution before it, LTD's consulting firm, Universal Field Services, would arrange for the properties to be surveyed and appraised, and the firm then would enter into negotiations with the property owners.

Responding to a question from Ms. Lauritsen regarding the impact of the acquisitions on business parking, Mr. Pangborn said that the plasma center would lose four parking spaces and the Spring Garden restaurant also could lose one or two spaces.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved approval of LTD Board Resolution No. 2003-031 authorizing the Lane Transit District to acquire by purchase or the exercise of the Power of Eminent Domain certain Real Property necessary for the Bus Rapid Transit project as represented in the resolution. Mr. Kleger provided the second.

**VOTE** The resolution was approved as follows:  
 AYES: Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Ban, Gant (5)  
 NAYS: None  
 ABSENTIONS: None  
 EXCUSED: Gaydos, Wylie

**STRATEGIC PLAN/BOARD ACTION PLAN** – Senior Strategic Planner Lisa Gardner reminded the Board that it reviewed the draft plan in June. She said that it was staff's goal to have a more marketable, user-friendly version of the plan for general distribution, and circulated a prototype developed by Graphics staff Hannah Bradford for the Board's review. Mr. Hamm anticipated that the Board's November strategic planning retreat would include discussion of the Board's role in implementing the Strategic Plan.

The Board discussed a concern raised by Mr. Gant regarding the short- and long-term strategies related to taxation listed under the goal, "Maintain LTD's fiscal integrity." Mr. Gant expressed concern about the timing of those strategies given current economic conditions. He was concerned that those strategies could result in LTD becoming a target of anti-taxing or anti-transit organizations. Mr. Gant also was worried that a connection would be made between any taxing proposal and the fact the Board was appointed rather than elected. He stated that he would not be supportive of moving forward with any tax increases. Ms. Hocken noted that the Finance Committee had discussed the timing of any payroll tax increase. She said that before LTD adopted any increase, it would have conversations with the business community. She also noted that the statute enabling the increase stipulated that LTD must adopt findings that there had been an economic recovery in the area.

Responding to a question from Mr. Gant regarding the state law, Government Relations Manager Linda Lynch indicated that LTD must take ten years to implement any increase. No increase could occur before January 1, 2004. She clarified that the bill passed by the State Legislature had merely lifted the cap on the tax. Ms. Lynch did not think that the Board would pursue an increase soon but suggested that members might discuss the issue at the retreat.

Ms. Hocken shared Mr. Gant's concerns. She did not think the board should be overly specific in the strategies. With the concurrence of all members, the Board agreed with a suggestion from Mr. Hamm to delete the reference to the payroll tax increase, to delete the first two bullets listed under Long-Term Implementation Strategies (*Change state constitution to allow state gas tax dollars to flow to transit* and *Explore dedicated sales (excise) tax on cars*), and to revise the sixth bullet under long-term strategies to read "Continue to explore *federal, state, and local* funding options."

Mr. Kleger observed that access to the state gas tax dollars was an ongoing issue for transit and other alternatives to the automobile. The largest contributor to the structural imbalance in the statewide transportation structure was the voter-approved and –reratified prohibition on the use of those dollars for other than the automobile. Other modes could not generate sufficient money to make a competitive difference. While he agreed that this was not the time to approach the public for new taxes, he thought that the Board should keep those thoughts in mind. There was a serious, long-term funding problem that must be addressed at some time. Ms. Hocken said that Mr. Kleger's remarks were well-taken.

**MOTION** Ms. Lauritsen moved approval of LTD Board Resolution No. 2003-037: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the 2003 Strategic Plan as amended by the Board."  
Ms. Ban seconded the motion.

**VOTE** The resolution was approved as follows:  
 AYES: Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Ban, Gant (5)  
 NAYS: None  
 ABSENTIONS: None  
 EXCUSED: Gaydos, Wylie

**FTA GRANT APPROVAL – VEHICLE GUIDANCE** – Bus Rapid Transit Project Engineer Graham Carey joined the Board for this item. He reported that LTD had the opportunity to lead a research team that included the University of California's Partners for Advanced Transportation

and Highways (PATH), Caltrans, other operators, and various vehicle suppliers in the development of the interface requirements for lane assist technologies. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) was making \$350,000 available for the project, and Caltrans was supplying \$87,000. He said that no local funds would be required, and the project would save LTD money because the work that would be accomplished was work that LTD would otherwise have to pay for.

Mr. Kleger believed that the aggregate benefit of the final product, which would help LTD reduce the rights-of-way needed, was "huge."

Responding to a question from Mr. Gant as to how LTD got involved in the project, Mr. Hamm observed that LTD, through its involvement with the BRT Consortium and other planning and research efforts, had become a leader in the field and people were turning to LTD for leadership. He said that it was a natural evolution for LTD to become involved in this project, and that would occur at a low cost with a very large benefit.

Board members clarified the details of the grant application with Mr. Carey. Mr. Carey indicated that LTD would manage the project, oversee the research, and monitor progress; the majority of the research work would be done by the University of California-Berkely, which would also manage the project's finances. LTD staff would not be located in California, but there would be some infrequent travel involved for staff, which was included in the grant costs. He said that the staff involved included himself and Director of Development Services Stefano Viggiano.

Mr. Gant determined from Mr. Carey that the work involved investigating the application of the technology to various transit vehicles rather than research and development.

Responding to a question from Ms. Hocken, Mr. Carey said that he believed the idea for the grant had its origins in LTD's approach to the FTA for assistance in encouraging American manufacturers to make the type of modifications needed for BRT vehicles; the agency could not help LTD buy the needed technology, but it could give LTD the grant to help assure that the needed technology worked and could be integrated into the new vehicles.

**Public Hearing:** Ms. Hocken opened a public hearing on the item. There being no requests to speak, Ms. Hocken closed the public hearing.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger moved approval of LTD Board Resolution No. 2003-038: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board approves the proposed federal grant application for \$350,000 in federal funds to develop the interface requirements for lane assistance technologies, and authorizes the general manager to submit the application to the Federal Transit Administration. " Ms. Ban provided the second.

**VOTE** The resolution was approved as follows:  
 AYES: Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Ban, Gant (5)  
 NAYS: None  
 ABSENTIONS: None  
 EXCUSED: Gaydos, Wylie

**TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN PROJECT CRITERIA AND PROPOSED**

**PROJECT LIST** – Ms. Gardner reviewed the revised Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) allocations process, noting that in the past the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) divided funding by mode, which did not result in much funding for transit. LTD had been pushing for a more competitive multi-modal process, and that occurred when the area was designated a transportation management area (TMA) by the federal government, which gave LTD the opportunity to compete for money on the basis of established criteria that reflected local planning goals. She said that the local agencies proposed projects on the basis of the criteria, and those projects were summarized in the meeting packet.

Ms. Gardner noted the three LTD applications for funding: 1) passenger boarding improvements (\$648,000); 2) planning and engineering for the BRT Pioneer Parkway Corridor (\$1,200,000); and 3) Commuter Solutions transportation demand management (\$675,000). She noted that the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) had agreed to recommend to the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) that it reduce all requested amounts within the project planning and development funding category so that all projects would receive some funding.

Ms. Gardner recommended that LTD approve the funding requests. She noted that the MPC had considered the project list at its last meeting and would approve the list at its next meeting on October 9. Ms. Hocken, a member of the MPC, urged the Board to consider the projects in light of its priorities, and noted the constraint placed on LTD by the fact that some of the funding involved was dedicated and not available for other purposes. She said that because of the timing of the process, staff had to determine without initial input from the Board which projects made the most sense in the current environment.

Mr. Gant determined from Ms. Gardner that the timing for the next iteration of the process would be different. The current timeline was compressed because of State deadlines related to the State TIP. She indicated that if MPC was not able to approve the project list in October, approval would be postponed to November 2003; that would mean that the local projects would not be included in the published draft State TIP, but did not preclude them from being included in the final State TIP.

Ms. Gardner called attention to replacement pages 104-106 for the Board packet.

Mr. Gant requested that the Board schedule a future work session on the TIP process. Ms. Gardner indicated that the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC) would reevaluate the criteria prior to the next TIP cycle, and suggested that after that the Board might consider holding a work session to discuss the process and provide input into the criteria developed by the TPC.

**MOTION** Mr. Kleger moved approval of LTD Board Resolution No. 2003-039: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board approves the LTD STP-U funding applications for the fiscal year 2004-2006 Transportation Improvement Program, which requests \$648,000 for Shelter Replacement; \$1,200,000 for BRT Pioneer Parkway Corridor Planning and Engineering; and \$675,000 for the Commuter Solutions Program, and authorizes the general manager to submit the application. Ms. Ban provided the second.

**VOTE** The resolution was approved as follows:  
 AYES: Hocken, Kleger, Lauritsen, Ban, Gant (5)  
 NAYS: None

ABSENTIONS: None

EXCUSED: Gaydos, Wylie

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

#### **PEACEHEALTH/BUS RAPID TRANSIT PRESENTATION**

Brian Terrett, Director of Public Affairs and Communication for PeaceHealth, provided a PowerPoint presentation on PeaceHealth's proposed RiverBend campus. Mr. Terrett's presentation included information about the proposed master plan for the hospital, which included details about the general layout of the site, including the location of the hospital-related buildings, conceptual information about the 800 housing units planned for the site, the layout of the roads serving the campus, and the BRT route that would serve the hospital campus. Mr. Terrett also provided information about the proposed tree preservation plan, stormwater management approaches for the site, and location of non-transportation-related public facilities.

Mr. Terrett briefly discussed PeaceHealth's plans for its Hilyard campus, reporting that the organization intended to invest in expansion of the site and would maintain a Level 4 trauma center at that location.

Mr. Terrett showed the Board an animated simulation of the appearance of the hospital from the various vantage points, including from the air, from the roads that would pass it, and from across the river. The animation also included the interior of the hospital lobby. Mr. Terrett invited questions.

Ms. Ban asked about the timing of the planned intersection improvements at Beltline and Gateway. Mr. Terrett indicated that those improvements would occur in Summer 2004. He noted PeaceHealth's contribution toward the cost of those improvements. Ms. Ban asked how the road construction would affect the construction of the hospital. Mr. Terrett said that there would need to be continuous communication about construction activities among the parties involved. He said that the improvements did not have to be in place for the hospital to open its doors. However, the Pioneer Parkway extension would have to be completed for the hospital to open. He noted that much of the construction staging needed could be located on the site because of the size of the parcel involved.

Board members thanked Mr. Terrett for the presentation. Mr. Terrett thanked the Board for the opportunity to make the presentation.

**LTD BRAND PLAN** – Mr. Vobora provided background information on the LTD Brand Plan. He reported that an employee team had been formed to work on the plan. Ms. Hocken also had participated in meetings. Team members had done both internal and external research about what made LTD unique and effective. He confirmed, in response to a question from Ms. Lauritsen, that a consultant assisted the effort. Mr. Vobora said that employees were excited about the opportunities the plan presented.

Mr. Vobora discussed three possible brand structures that an organization could adopt: 1) monolithic, 2) endorsed, and 3) multi-brand. Each structure was described in a memorandum



Mr. Vobora distributed to the Board entitled *Affirmation of Brand Structure*. Mr. Vobora said that the LTD brand team believed that the "endorsed" structure best fit LTD. He indicated that the Board would have an opportunity to review the plan at the next meeting.

Mr. Vobora asked Ms. Hocken to comment on the process. Ms. Hocken said that the issue before the brand team was what it wanted customers to see and remember: Did it want the community to focus on LTD as an organization, or on the services offered by the organization? She said that the team had been very close to what the Board arrived at in its strategic planning, which she believed gave validity to the process. Mr. Vobora added that the staff would identify unique brand characteristics to see where gaps existed and to attempt to make those characteristics truer and to reinforce them. That could be accomplished through a variety of ways, including graphics presentation and even how the telephone was answered. Mr. Vobora said that LTD already had strong brand recognition in the community and it could build on that.

Ms. Lauritsen suggested that making changes to reinforce the brand could be expensive. Mr. Vobora concurred, but said that changes that other organizations might have to consider, such as alternations to their logos, were not an issue for LTD because its logo was very recognizable and did not need to be changed. However, there could be changes in the color and application of the logo.

Responding to a request for clarification from Mr. Kleger, Mr. Vobora confirmed that the brand approach was intended to identify services such as RideSource, EmX, and fixed-route bus service as LTD services while recognizing their individual characteristics. Mr. Hamm added that the approach was a way to set standards, such as graphics standards, but it was also a way to tap into the mission and vision of the organizations to set standards in other areas. He believed that incremental changes might be all that was required in many cases.

Mr. Vobora said that the effort was very close to the organization's core values and guiding principles. He thought it was a way for employees to "put some meat on the bones" when they considered the values and principles by identifying things that employees could do to make those things more true of the organization. He said that the team would reconvene to discuss how to implement the plan over time.

Ms. Ban spoke of ShelterCare's experience in brand identification and said it worked very well. The value that had endured was that the experience focused employees back on the organization's values and mission; employees' job satisfaction was increased and they had a renewed sense of pride in their work.

## **CURRENT ACTIVITIES**

### **Board Member Reports**

**Metropolitan Policy Committee** – There was no further report.

**BRT Steering Committee and Board BRT Committee** – There were no questions.

**Coburg Road Stakeholder Committee** – Ms. Ban said that the committee received the draft staff report and several members had expressed concern about the future impact of BRT on

Coburg Road on existing businesses. She said that staff had done a good job in responding to those concerns and incorporating them into the report. She believed that LTD had work to do in building trust with some committee members.

**Board Strategic Planning Committee** – There was no report.

**Board Finance Committee** – Ms. Hocken said that the committee met the previous day and reviewed the results of the most recent legislative session and discussed the role of the Finance Committee, the Human Resources Committee, and the Board in contract negotiations. She anticipated that the committee would develop an overall negotiating strategy.

Director of Finance and Information Technology Diane Hellekson noted that the committee report should state that the committee's last meeting before September 16 was on June 3 rather than June 16.

**Region 2050 Policy Advisory Committee** – There was no report.

**Human Resources Committee** – Mr. Gant reported that the committee had discussed the contract negotiations roles and process and the evaluation tool the Board used to evaluate the general manager.

**Statewide Livability Forum** – There was no report.

**General Manager's Report** – Mr. Hamm said that he and Ms. Sullivan would work on a calendar of upcoming events for Board members. He reported that LTD had served 11,921 riders to and from the last University of Oregon football game, and the District had received several favorable comments about the service. It took less than 75 minutes to clear all riders from the stadium.

Mr. Hamm acknowledged the work of Ms. Hellekson and her staff, reporting that LTD had received a certificate of achievement from the Government Finance Officers Association for excellence in financial reporting. Ms. Hocken commended staff for their work, noting that most other agencies receiving this award did not perform the work in-house, like LTD staff did.

**2003 Legislative Report** – Ms. Lynch provided an update on the State legislature. She distributed a compendium of legislation that had been tracked throughout the session that showed the outcome of each bill that had been tracked. She noted that the federal Senate transportation appropriations bill included \$11 million for LTD; differences between the House and Senate versions would be worked out in conference committee, but she believed the District could assume that the Springfield Station was fully funded. She said that \$6 million for phases 2 and 3 of BRT also were included in the bill. Ms. Lynch anticipated that she would have a final analysis of legislative actions soon.

Mr. Hamm commended the work of Ms. Lynch on behalf of LTD and said that the most recent legislative session was an exceptional one, given the budget pressures that existed at both the state and federal levels. Board members acknowledged the work of Ms. Lynch with applause.

**Monthly Financial Report** – Ms. Hellekson reported that payroll tax receipts for July-September were slightly down but she saw no reason for concern at this time. She noted that LTD was looking closely at its ridership numbers due to the continuing decline that had been

reported. She believed that implementation of the Automatic Passenger Counting Project would help to ensure that boardings were accurately counted as she thought it likely that the manual counts led to undercounting.

Ms. Helleckson reported that, following an arbitrator's decision on employee health care contributions, an open enrollment period for all employees had been established, and in the worst case scenario the additional cost to LTD for the balance of the fiscal year would be \$225,000. Responding to a question from Ms. Lauritsen, Director of Human Resources and Risk Management Mary Neidig said that the decision to establish the open enrollment period was an LTD decision; LTD was not instructed to do so by the arbitrator. LTD had determined that this was the right thing to do.

Ms. Lauritsen asked for the total amount above the \$225,000. Ms. Hellekson indicated that the cost would be \$350,000 for the prior and current years' premiums. Some of that (approximately \$100,000) would be assigned to fiscal year 2003. There was some money to address the remaining balance, and the expenditure would be budgeted in fiscal year 2004.

**BRT Update** – There was no additional report.

**Springfield Station Update** – Mr. Kleger reported that a meeting of the Springfield Station Design Review Committee was scheduled for September 23, 2003, at 4 p.m. Mr. Hamm encouraged Board members to view the Springfield Station construction site if they had an opportunity.

The meeting adjourned at 8:36 p.m.



---

Board Secretary