

**MINUTES OF DIRECTORS' MEETING**  
**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**REGULAR BOARD MEETING WORK SESSION**

Wednesday, February 20, 2008

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 14, 2008, 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, February 20, 2008, beginning at 5:35 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 East 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Gerry Gaydos, President, presiding  
Mike Eyster, Vice President  
Dean Kortge, Secretary  
Michael Dubick  
Greg Evans  
Ed Necker  
Mark Pangborn, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Clerk of the Board  
Karenlee Atkin, Minutes Transcription

Absent: Debbie Davis, Treasurer

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL** – Mr. Gaydos called the meeting of the Lane Transit District (LTD) Board of Directors to order at 5:35 p.m. and called the roll.

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT** – Mr. Gaydos welcomed the new Board member for Subdistrict 4, Mr. Ed Necker, and thanked him for attending the March 11 meeting, saying that the Board was looking forward to working with Mr. Necker as a member of the Board.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA** – None.

**BOARD CALENDARS** – Mr. Gaydos and Acting General Manager Stefano Viggiano were scheduled to be in Washington, D.C., for the United Front meetings from February 29 through March 3, 2008. Mr. Evans and Mr. Pangborn would be attending the American Public Transportation Association's Legislative Conference on February 8-11. The second public hearing on service was scheduled for March 10 in the Eugene library. The Springfield City Council meeting on February 19 was extended to its meeting on March 10, as not all issues were resolved. Mr. Viggiano would attend that meeting to continue discussions on unresolved issues regarding Pioneer Parkway. Mr. Gaydos suggested that either Mr. Eyster or Ms. Davis should also attend the Springfield meeting. The joint LTD Board/Springfield City Council was scheduled for February 25. Pioneer Parkway issues would not be discussed at that meeting.

## WORK SESSION

**2007 Rider Survey Presentation** – Mr. Gaydos welcomed Ms. Selena Barlow of Transit Marketing, LLC. Ms. Barlow has conducted rider surveys for LTD in the past (1999 and 2004), and was present to report on her most recent survey, conducted in October 2007.

Ms. Barlow said she would not go through the entire report, but rather would present an abbreviated version. She explained the methodology of the survey, and said that her team of trained surveyors did about 540 hours of surveying, with over-sampling on routes 30, 31, and 43, because of planning issues coming up on these three routes. They surveyed over the course of five days, distributing over 9,000 questionnaires, of which 7,794 (or about 85 percent) were returned. About 900 of these were riders encountered on more than one trip. She said she would be focusing on a sample of 6,800+ unduplicated responses for this presentation, and that a sample of this size had a margin of error of just over 1 percent. She added that 1.3 percent of the surveys were completed in Spanish.

Ms. Barlow, using a PowerPoint presentation, explained that the analysis of this data involved three components. The first was the summary analysis of the unduplicated responses, which was the basis of her presentation. The second was the raw data, which included geo-coding maps to look at origin-destination pairs. The third was a route-by-route analysis for planning.

Ms. Barlow summarized her presentation, highlighting these findings:

- LTD had a large segment of riders who rely on transit.
- LTD's ridership was younger and had a lower income than the overall population (fairly typical).
- The vast majority of riders were either employed or students or both.
- The vast majority of riders were primarily making commute trips.
- LTD had a large impact on the economics of the Eugene-Springfield area.
- Over 60 percent of LTD riders were choosing transit, as opposed to being dependent upon transit.
- Riders chose LTD over other forms of transit to save money, because no other transportation was available, and/or because someone else was paying their fares.
- Satisfaction had increased since the last survey.
- The most desired service improvements were later evening service and increased service on weekends.
- Pre-paid payment was prevalent; only 15 percent were paying cash.

Service Planning, Accessibility, and Marketing Director Andy Vobora said that "cash fares" also included day passes, which made the actual cash-paying ridership about 21 percent, still less than half that of other transit systems. He stated that LTD's efforts to increase the number of prepaid fares had been very effective.

Mr. Pangborn asked if there was anything that distinguished LTD from other similar systems. Ms. Barlow replied that LTD's long history with the University of Oregon (UO) was special, adding that LTD had captured the market of college students and young working people by making the system convenient and reliable. Mr. Vobora stated that LTD also had a higher-than-average number of "choice" riders (those who are not transit-dependent).

## West Eugene EmX Extension Project

Director of Planning and Development Tom Schwetz presented an update on the West Eugene EmX Extension Project. He said that in March, the Board would be asked to decide

on which screening alternatives should be carried forward into the next part of the process, which would be a much more intensive analysis.

Mr. Schwetz reviewed key meeting dates, including the January 29 meeting of the Corridor Committee, coordinated with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), which kicked off a discussion of the screening process. The next Corridor Committee was scheduled for the following day, February 21. Consultants were scheduled to present a draft screening findings report during the week of February 25, followed by continued coordination with the FTA and another Corridor Committee meeting on March 3, leading into the next evening when staff would meet with the EmX Steering Committee and ask them to make a recommendation to the Board. On March 19, the Board would be asked to review a draft final range of alternatives, and to consider the findings report, comments received in scoping, and all of the information funneling down to this decision. Final concurrence with the FTA was expected in late March and early April, and would lead into the alternatives analysis and draft environmental impact statement process. During this phase, several alternatives would be considered in detail, including detailed public comment, which would lead to a selection of preferred alternatives in approximately one year.

Mr. Schwetz said that the Purpose and Needs Statement approved by the Board in December 2007 served to determine criterion measures for the screening process. Because this process was preliminary in nature, there was not yet good information the engineering specifics for any of the alternatives. Therefore, new information could cause consideration of other alternatives at a later date. He stated that alternatives would be dismissed if they did not meet the project's Purpose and Needs Statement

Mr. Schwetz said that his team was developing a screening report that would explain in detail how the conceptual alternatives were generated, what the criterion measures were, and how those criterion measures would be applied to the screening process. The report would document the outcome of each phase of screening – both the rationale for keeping alternatives, and how other alternatives were eliminated from further consideration. The first level of screening was to determine whether an alternative would meet the purpose and need that had been established. The second level would use more specific criteria, based on the goals and objectives that were adopted, and the criterion measures approved by the FTA.

Mr. Schwetz then handed out maps of the alternatives being considered.

Mr. Gaydos stated that he would not be able to attend any of the meetings outlined by Mr. Schwetz at the beginning of his presentation. Mr. Kortge and Mr. Evans planned to attend the February 21 meeting.

Mr. Gaydos closed the work session and convened the regular meeting at 6:34 p.m.

**EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH** – The Board recognized Operations Supervisor Rick Thompson, as March Employee of the Month. Director of Transit Operations Mark Johnson said that Mr. Thompson had been an Operations supervisor since 2005, and had started at LTD as an operator in 2001. He was nominated by a co-worker, who appreciated Mr. Thompson's commitment to LTD and to the operators. Mr. Gaydos thanked Mr. Thompson for his service to LTD and presented him with a certificate of appreciation, a check, and a pin commemorating the award.

Mr. Thompson said that he appreciated everyone with whom he worked. He believed that LTD was a great organization, and he was proud of what LTD did for the greater community.

He noted that LTD's policy of hiring from within contributed to the feeling of "family." He thanked the Board for the award, saying it was a great honor.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

**Pauline Huston**, of 1025 Taylor Street, Eugene, read a prepared statement about LTD comments made at the January 29 Corridor Committee meeting, as follows:

Mr. Schwetz stated that LTD is the sole decider on the location of future BRTs in the city. This is not the case, and I quote from your memo dated 10/25/07 sent to Mayor Piercy from Angela Jones, then City Manager Pro Tem. 'Approval by the City Council and the LTD Board is a pre-requisite to the development of future BRT corridors in the city.' In addition, Section 7 of the intergovernmental agreement requires approval of both LTD and Eugene. If the two entities disagree, then the project cannot go forward.

Ms. Huston handed out copies of the memorandum, and left the meeting, not waiting for a response.

Mr. Schwetz clarified that he had actually said that the screening process, not the final determination of where things would be built, was the responsibility of LTD. The final determination was, indeed, a local decision by both the Eugene City Council and LTD Board. He added that, because the screening process leads to a resource-management decision, the FTA would make that final determination.

**ITEMS FOR ACTION AT THIS MEETING**

**MOTION Consent Calendar** – Mr. Eyster moved adoption of LTD Resolution 2008-004: It is hereby resolved that the Consent Calendar for February 20, 2008, is approved as presented. Mr. Evans provided the second. The Consent Calendar consisted of approval of the minutes of the January 16, 2008, Regular Board Meeting.

**VOTE** The Consent Calendar was approved as follows:  
 AYES: Dubick, Evans, Eyster, Gaydos, Kortge, Necker (6)  
 NAYS: None  
 ABSTENTIONS: None  
 EXCUSED: Davis (1)

**MOTION LTD Road Map – Strategic Plan** – Mr. Kortge moved approval of LTD Resolution 2008-006: "It is hereby resolved that the LTD Board of Directors approves the February 2008 *LTD Road Map*". Mr. Evans provided the second.

The discussion was led by Mr. Viggiano, who stated that the strategic plan was updated every year. In the current year, staff had added a "Brand Plan" and LTD's 10 Valued Competencies, as well as a goal reflecting these additions. Staff also recommended that the strategic plan be called *The LTD Road Map*.

The *LTD Road Map* included Performance Objectives, Short-Term Strategies, and Long-Term Strategies for each Goal. *The LTD Road Map* would be updated each year, and performance objectives would be reviewed.

In response to Mr. Necker's question, Mr. Viggiano confirmed that the materials that were mailed to the Board contained all of the recommended changes to *The LTD Road Map*.

## VOTE

*The LTD Road Map* was approved as follows:

AYES: Dubick, Evans, Eyster, Gaydos, Kortge, Necker (6)

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: None

EXCUSED: Davis (1)

## ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING

### Board Member Reports:

Board Finance Committee – Mr. Kortge said that staff had prepared a revised Capital Improvements Program, which included some assumptions about the payroll tax, large planned projects, an increase in accessible service needs, and an increase in fuel costs. Director of Finance and Information Technology Diane Hellekson said that the Finance Committee would be considering both the Capital Improvements Program and the Long-Range Financial Plan at the March meeting. There were issues associated primarily with the Long-range Financial Plan that would have an impact on future service. She explained that the Board Finance Committee had reviewed a staff proposal of a balanced Long-range Financial Plan, which allowed the addition of services. Ms. Hellekson noted that there could be a negative impact on service in the future if any of the assumptions changed in the wrong direction. If increasing costs of accessible services could not be controlled, the fixed-route service might need to be decreased in order to fund additional accessible service. Ms. Hellekson handed out materials, saying that they would be presented and discussed at the March meeting.

Board Service Committee – Mr. Evans said that the Board Service Committee had met earlier in the day, spending most of their time on the route review, considering all of the changes recommended by staff after the initial public hearing on February 11. The Committee was feeling more cautious about service additions due to the changing economy. Part of the issue was that LTD had come through a period of great success, but it could become more difficult to support the same level of service. Mr. Dubick said that route productivity must be the main criterion by which service decisions are made. The final decision was scheduled to be made at the March 19 meeting of the Board, following a second public hearing on March 10. Staff and the Service Committee asked for a little more direction from the Board.

Mr. Vobora handed out copies of the "Annual Route Review 2008 Service Change Summary for FY 08-09." He said that the Committee considered the three separate service categories: (1) adding service to River Bend, which was critical in order to support the opening of the new hospital, and adjusting route 12, which had been running over capacity; (2) setting aside funds for contingencies and deleting unproductive trips, such as those on routes 3x and 7x, and the Saturday trips on route 28; and (3) possibly adding service and more direct routing on the Veneta and Junction City routes, which currently were not meeting rural-community productivity standards. Mr. Dubick added that it also would be necessary to address the overcrowding situation on route 78.

Mr. Evans expressed concern about cutting service around the reservoir, saying that it was important to keep the issue of transit dependency in mind in addition to considering route productivity. Mr. Vobora stated that staff had reviewed these concerns when they were brought up in the public hearing. They had considering reducing the route to "lifeline" trips—

one in the morning, one in the evening—for those who commute, but that would not address any of the midday needs. The route could either remain the same, providing about 84 miles of service for about 12-15 boardings, or make a clean break by providing more direct service to and from Veneta, which had a bigger population base, and also had transit-dependent needs. He added that this was a very difficult decision to make.

Mr. Kortge stated that he was very hesitant to vote for any expansion at that time, other than RiverBend, saying that the current financial climate could require cuts in the near future, and he would not want to add a service only to have it removed should cuts be required.

Mr. Necker stated that he believed the fiscal impact of any changes must be balanced with the personal side. He was concerned that staff had stated at the community hearing that if any services would be cut, others would be added. Mr. Vobora said that had been the recommendation of the staff at that time, but that was before learning of the long-range financial plan information presented earlier in the evening. Mr. Necker stated that testimony at the hearing was almost entirely in opposition to the changes. Mr. Vobora agreed, but added that he was surprised that no one from the City of Veneta, City of Junction City, or either Chamber of Commerce had not offered any positive comments at the hearing, since they had all heard about these changes and had expressed agreement with them prior to the hearing. Mr. Necker confirmed with Mr. Vobora that no decision would be made until after the March hearing.

Mr. Eyster also expressed concern about the proposed changes. He said that he had come to expect “miracles” from the staff, and had hoped a miracle could be created to resolve this dilemma. He stated that this Board had made decisions in the past that were based on rider-need, and not necessarily on productivity. However, he said that he had become persuaded that cuts would need to be made somewhere, and therefore the question of productivity became even more important.

Mr. Evans stated that he understood Mr. Eyster’s position, but believed that service should have been increased around the reservoir based on the growth in Elmira and the other surrounding communities.

Mr. Vobora agreed that the route between Veneta and Eugene had seen significant growth. He added that staff were confident that the two recommended trips would meet the standards

Mr. Dubick said that it was very difficult to maintain a trip that was considerably below LTD’s standards, while at the same time denying new service for so many other deserving areas.

Mr. Gaydos requested that staff prepare a memo defining the rationale for the belief that cuts to service might be required in the next year or two. Mr. Vobora said that it was more a matter of reviewing the productivity of all routes should a cut be required. Mr. Dubick reiterated that it was important that LTD add only services that were most likely to increase the productivity of the route. Mr. Pangborn cautioned that new service often takes time to mature; it was possible that the productivity of new service might not be determined in only a few months.

Service Planning Manager Will Mueller stated that he believed a year and a half of history would be enough for staff to feel comfortable making a call about the productivity of a new service. He went on to say that in order for staff to be able to present actual recommendations at the next hearing, they would need a clear sense of the Board’s direction.

Mr. Gaydos expressed the opinion that the suggested changes would be productive. Mr. Eyster asked if the Board was in agreement about the need to add the 78 route and the

two runs on route 93, in addition to the new RiverBend route, and that the route around the reservoir should be cut. Everyone agreed, and no dissenting opinion was expressed.

APTA Board Report – Mr. Evans reported on the APTA conference he attended in Orlando, Florida, on January 25. The Authorization Task Force was using the name “GREENTEA,” to reflect sustainability concerns, for the title for the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU. He said that the Task Force would be asking Congress for operational funds to assist transit districts around the country. There were major capacity issues; increasing demands for service; and an inability to meet those demands based on fuel costs, labor costs, and other considerations. There was a need to fund paratransit service, which would be in higher demand due to the aging population. He added that there was a lot of uncertainty for the 2009 transportation funding request, because only one of the front-running candidates for president of the United States, Senator McCain, had a transportation agenda, and it dealt exclusively with Amtrak.

Mr. Evans said that he had participated in a conference call on February 19 with transit board members across the country, adding that discussions would continue during the trip to Washington, D.C., in March, where he also would be meeting with the new authorization committee to craft the agenda that would go before Congress.

Mr. Viggiano said that the schedule to include the APTA recommendation in the authorization bill was very compressed. In order to have a decision by October 2008, there would be a series of meetings and fairly intense discussions in the coming months.

Mr. Evans added that the committee also was talking about carbon tax credits and a variety of other methods to maximize both financial and infrastructure resources.

Mr. Necker stated that paratransit received special transportation funds based on the state cigarette tax. While there were no extra funds in the 2007 session or in the 2008 supplemental session, it was likely that funds might increase for the 2009 session. He said that LTD should maintain its advocacy where appropriate because of this possibility for more funding.

Mr. Viggiano stated that there probably was a much better chance for state funding than federal funding, though both should be pursued.

Mr. Eyster asked if the reason the presidential candidates had no agenda regarding transportation was that they did not have enough information to establish a position. Mr. Evans replied that part of APTA's agenda would be increase the profile of the industry as a whole and to be more aggressive about articulating transit's message.

Mr. Viggiano offered the opinion that, based on the known history with each of the main presidential candidates, it can be expected that Senator McCain will continue to advocate for a reduced federal role in transportation, in addition to being against earmarks. Senator Clinton has been a strong advocate for public transportation, and the expectation was that Senator Obama also would be an advocate for public transportation.

**Government Ethics** – Mr. Viggiano introduced Chris Schultz from the Ulum Group, who informed the Board that the new Government Ethics law that had been passed by the state legislature in 2007 had significant changes that would affect the LTD Board. The new law applied not only to members of the Legislature, but also to members of the LTD Board and all local governments. He said that LTD was in an interesting position because Board members were public officials who could be influenced, while LTD also was trying to influence state

representatives. Therefore, LTD had to be aware of the new law from "both sides of the table."

Mr. Schultz said that there were three things in the Government Ethics Commission's memo that should be especially highlighted. First, there were new quarterly reporting requirements. The Statement of Economic Interest that was filed annually would now be required on a quarterly basis. Mr. Pangborn said that staff would ensure that Board members had the forms they needed when they needed them, with timely reminders for when they needed to be completed and sent in.

Second, there was a new \$50-per-annum gift limit. This limit applied not only to Board members, but also to members of their families. Meals counted as gifts, so when Board members attended conferences or had meals with vendors, it would be important that LTD pay for these meals, which were a legitimate business expense. Mr. Schultz strongly urged Board members to keep very careful records of any meals or other gifts.

Mr. Eyster asked if campaign contributions made as a private citizen would fall under the aegis of this new law. Mr. Schultz said that a candidate could not accept a \$51 meal, but could accept campaign contributions in any amount.

Mr. Schultz added that anytime a Board member was invited to an event due to his or her position with LTD, and for which the public would have to pay admission, it was likely that this would fall into the category of a gift, and therefore must have an aggregate value of less than \$50 per year.

The third item was that gifts of entertainment were banned entirely. Mr. Schultz said that a lawsuit was currently pending on this aspect of the new law because people could be "tripped up" inadvertently, since the record-keeping requirements were unclear. Until this was resolved, he strongly recommended that LTD Board members and staff always pay for themselves for any event or meal.

Mr. Schultz ended by saying that the Government Ethics Commission would answer questions by telephone. He encouraged Board members to contact the Commission with any concerns.

**Springfield City Council/LTD Board Joint Meeting** – Mr. Viggiano said that the February 25 joint meeting of the Springfield City Council and Board would begin at 6:00 p.m., and that a light dinner would be served beginning at 5:30 p.m. The agenda included an overview of current ridership, with a focus on Springfield; a comparison with other transit districts; a review of the free-fare analysis; a review of the rail study; and an overview of how service in Springfield would be affected by the Pioneer Parkway EmX. The meeting would then review options for Franklin Boulevard through Glenwood. When the Franklin EmX was developed, the investment in Glenwood was minimized, with the idea that the street eventually would be redeveloped with double lanes. Mr. Viggiano was pleased to report that the stakeholder group for the project had recommended a very innovative design for Glenwood that included double EmX lanes in the middle of the street. The overall right-of-way would be almost twice as wide as the current street. The design accomplishes a long-term vision for that corridor in support of redevelopment. The design was scheduled to be reviewed by the City Council on March 10. The joint meeting presented an opportunity for Board members to encourage Council members to support the EmX lane as part of the eventual design. Mr. Viggiano referred to a "talking points" document, which included many of the reasons that the EmX lanes made sense.



**Pioneer Parkway EmX** – The Pioneer Parkway EmX Project was being reviewed by the City of Springfield. Staff presented 30 percent design drawings to Springfield on February 4, thinking they could be worked through in one session. To date, there had been two full working sessions, and a third one was scheduled. The project was moving forward. Mr. Viggiano handed out a report describing the pending design issues. The most significant issue was property owner concerns. It appeared that a few of the property owners on International Way did not support EmX as a concept, and seemed to be concerned about allocating two lanes for EmX, when future traffic might require more lanes for automobiles. The issue had not been resolved. It was expected that the Council would be reluctant to move forward until that issue was resolved, which staff hoped would occur prior to March 10.

Mr. Gaydos encouraged Mr. Viggiano to show the Council some of the Origin & Destination study results, both for the EmX route, and showing that Springfield residents were using transit more frequently.

Mr. Viggiano stated that another minor issue had to do with the station location on Harlow Road.

Mr. Gaydos said that the Springfield Station had been a real benefit to the community.

**Fare Free Service Analysis** – Mr. Gaydos congratulated Mr. Vobora on his analysis of fare-free service, saying it was very helpful, and that it should be discussed more in the broader community and within the Eugene City Council.

Mr. Vobora had researched and assembled a report showing the operational and financial impact of a fare-free system on the District. The report showed what some of the cost savings would be, and described places where a fare-free system had been successful, and what aspects in those communities had made them successful. Ultimately, the report showed that a fare-free system would not work in the Eugene-Springfield community today, due to the loss of \$5 million in revenues at a time when the system already was overtaxed and in need of more service. Mr. Pangborn said that if there were any extra funds available, they should be used to get more people on the bus and provide more services.

Mr. Kortge said that the report was excellent, and that it was important for people to understand that the Board had grappled with finding a balance on the issue of fares, and had taken the philosophical position that some payment was required.

Mr. Vobora said that the report would be shared with the Springfield City Council at the joint meeting. He suggested that it also be included on the LTD website in the reports and publications section.

**Rail Systems Analysis** – Mr. Schwetz handed out a rail systems analysis that had been sent to the Eugene City Council in response to their request that LTD review these options. There has been some confusion in the media and elsewhere about what each mode of transit entailed, including light rail, street cars, and bus rapid transit (BRT). The analysis clearly showed the distinctions among these transit modes, including an estimated cost per mile for installation. Mr. Schwetz pointed out that the report showed that bus rapid transit, at \$3 million to \$25 million per mile, had the lowest cost among the high-capacity rapid transit options. He called the Board's attention to a table comparing various streetcar lines in the country, and another comparing light-rail lines.

Mr. Schwetz said that bus rapid transit was a good fit for the community and helped set the stage for potential light rail in the future.

Mr. Evans expressed frustration that the issue of BRT was being rehashed. He said that the reality was that about eight to ten years ago LTD and the community went through a process and agreed on BRT as the preferred mode. One line had been built, another was in progress, and a third was being discussed. He thought the City Council and the public should be reminded why LTD, the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC), and TransPlan took this direction with bus rapid transit.

Mr. Schwetz stated that in the Findings report, staff talked with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) about this issue. The FTA needed to have LTD verify the validity of the arguments, so that had been done in the report.

Mr. Eyster asked about a possible newspaper story to reiterate that the decision was made by the community years ago and was still a good decision. Mr. Vobora said that staff had discussed some sort of outreach effort after first talking with the city councilors who raised the issue.

Mr. Gaydos commented that both of these issues had been well researched and were easy to read. He thanked the staff for the reports.

**Monthly Financial Report** – Ms. Hellekson stated that payroll tax receipts were pretty good, but that there were serious problems with fuel costs that would require a supplemental budget at the end of the fiscal year. Also, staff would be bringing a supplemental budget to the Board in March because the Medicare Brokerage was coming on line sooner than expected. She said that the good news was that the State in-lieu-of-payroll tax money had been found, although LTD had not yet received it. Finally, she reported that LTD would be undergoing a federal triennial review. The Board would not be involved, but would receive a report after the review was completed.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Gaydos thanked Mr. Necker for his first meeting as a Board member, and then adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

---



Board Secretary