

Spokane Transit Authority
1230 West Boone Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201-2686
(509) 325-6000

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Draft Minutes of the July 20, 2006, Meeting
City Council Chambers
808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brian A. Sayrs, Small Cities, Chairman
Dick Denenny, City of Spokane Valley
Richard Munson, City of Spokane Valley
Mark Richard, Spokane County
Todd Mielke, Spokane County
Allan Gainer, City of Cheney
Nancy McLaughlin, City of Spokane
Brad Stark, City of Spokane
Al French, City of Spokane

STAFF PRESENT

E. Susan Meyer, Chief Executive Officer
Jim Plaster, Director of Finance and Administration
Steve Blaska, Director of Operations
Kim Traver, Light Rail Project Manager
Various Other Staff Members

PROVIDING LEGAL COUNSEL

Laura McAloon, Preston, Gates & Ellis LLP

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

GUESTS

None

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chairman Sayrs called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm and conducted roll call.

2. **RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

None.

3. **PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS**

The following citizens expressed their desire for the continuation of the light rail project:

Nick Nickoloff, Harry Bright, Richard Bryant, Warren Mumpower, Janice Raschko, Gary Pollard, Frankie Arteaga, Melissa Ahern.

Clarence Troxell said Spokane needs a better bus system instead of spending money on light rail.

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

A. **Revised Tariff Policy**

At 6:00 pm, Mr. Sayrs opened the public hearing. There were no comments from the public. Mr. Blaska made a short presentation on the revised tariff policy, the main objective of which is to increase ridership by making the system more user-friendly. There would be no increase in fares. The Taskforce and the Operations and Customer Service Committee have both recommended approval of the revised policy. Mr. Mielke asked where the new fare instruments could be purchased. Mr. Blaska replied at the farebox and customer service locations. Eventually they will be available at vending machines. Mr. Munson asked how long it would take to educate the public. Mr. Blaska said other transit agencies advised STA to keep it simple at first with just a few new options so the education process would not be lengthy. Mr. Denenny said the change should be put into effect now before the implementation of the new farebox system at the end of 2006. Ms. McLaughlin asked if the monthly pass would be on a rolling calendar basis, i.e., buy one on the 10th of the month and it is valid until the 10th of the next month. Mr. Blaska concurred. A function of the new Smart

Card is that the value can be reloaded and a recoverable serial number would be associated with it. So if the card is lost, it could be tracked and the residual value given to the customer. Mr. French complimented staff on these efforts to increase customer service and he thought the vending machine idea was excellent. The Smart Card would also allow senior rate fares. At 6:10 pm, the public hearing was closed.

B. Service Planning

At 6:10 pm, Mr. Sayrs opened the public hearing. Citizens Jim Celto Vache and Kathleen McCorgary commented in favor of increased service on the #35 Northwest Terrace route. Mr. Howell, STA's Planning Manager, made a presentation on service options on the #35 route. He explained that currently ridership is very low at 3 boardings per day on each segment of the route. At the time of the October 2005 service change, it was agreed to eliminate service in the Northwest Terrace and Linwood areas but the Board requested that the situation be reviewed at a later date. One staff proposal is to continue the same route with peak service only at 30 minute frequency at no additional cost. The second option is to extend service to Nine Mile and reduce frequency to 45 minutes with no midday service at any additional cost. Based on public feedback from option 2, staff proposes a revised option 2 to extend the route further and include the Windriver retirement facility with a frequency of 45 minutes. Mr. Mielke asked if the annexation of the Park Place area that has been approved for residential development of between 300 and 400 houses has been incorporated in the planning process. Mr. Howell said it had. Bus riders coming from this area would still have to change at the Five Mile Park and Ride to get downtown. Mr. Mielke suggested another Park and Ride at the vacant lot at the bottom of the Francis hill by the Zip Trip to assist with the traffic congestion coming from the north. Mr. Howell said a park and ride in that area has been consistently researched but resources have been used for other areas with a greater need. Another option would be to utilize churches in the area that have parking available during the week. Mr. Munson asked what is the estimated increased ridership should the revised option 2 be approved. Mr. Howell said it would probably be more than anticipated and once implemented in September, the neighborhood would be canvassed and feedback sought. The public hearing was closed at 6:29 pm.

C. Federal Fiscal Year 2006 FTA Section 5307 Program of Projects and Budget, and Grant Application.
Due to a lack of requests this public hearing was cancelled.

5. CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) REPORT None. The committee did not meet in July.

6. BOARD ACTION: CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Sayrs asked if any of consent agenda items should be removed. Hearing none, **Mr. Munson moved to approve consent items 6 A through G. Mr. Denenny seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

A. Minutes of the June 15, 2006, Board Meeting.

B. Minutes of the June 15, 2006, Study Session.

C. June 2006 Vouchers. Approve voucher and warrant numbers 539344 through 539945 totaling \$2,429,059.41.

D. Transit Related Cooperative Street Project Revision.

E. Award of Contract for Replacement of Garage Doors.

F. Award of Contract for up to Seven (7) Fixed Route Vans.

G. Board Member Travel – Citizen Advisory Committee Conference.

7. BOARD ACTION: OTHER ITEMS

A. Revised Tariff Policy

As presented in the public hearing. Mr. Blaska said the recommendation is to approve the resolution and also to approve three free fare days: December 1, 2 and 3 since the fareboxes will be installed at that time. **Ms. McLaughlin moved to approve the revised tariff policy and free fare days as presented. Mr. Richard seconded and the motion passed unanimously.**

B. Federal Fiscal Year 2006 FTA Section 5307 Program of Projects and Budget, and Grant Application

Mr. Howell asked for Board approval to submit this application in the amount of \$7,713,238 in federal funds for preventive maintenance and \$1,928,310 in local funds. Mr. Mielke asked for a point of order. He said he was confused since this item was struck from a public hearing and now it was being considered as an action item. Ms. Meyer explained that the required minimum of ten requests was not received on this subject therefore the hearing was cancelled. **Mr. Munson moved to approve the item as presented; Mr. Denenny seconded.** Mr. Richard asked that public testimony be allowed. **Mr. Munson moved to hold a public hearing; Mr. Denenny seconded and the motion carried.** Mr. French asked whether a hearing was really necessary. Ms. McAloon said the Board could accept public comment on Mr. Munson's earlier motion to approve the item without formally opening a public hearing. **Mr. Munson withdrew his motion and Mr. Denenny his second to hold a public hearing.** Mr. Mielke said this is just an authorization to apply for the funding. Should the funds be received would the item come back to the Board for approval regarding distribution? Ms. Meyer said the funds would be used for preventive maintenance. Mr. Richard asked if the local funds were a match and had to be provided by STA in order to receive the federal funds. They are and have been budgeted for preventive maintenance. Ms. McAloon said the motion on the floor at present was Mr. Munson's original motion to approve the item. Mr. Sayrs said he would accept any public comments. There were none. **Mr. Munson's motion to approve the item as presented carried unanimously.**

C. Service Planning

Mr. Howell recommended the Board approve revised option 2 to provide service to the Northwest Terrace area and also extended service north on Nine Mile Road with the understanding that midday service in both the Linwood and Northwest Terrace areas would be eliminated. **Ms. McLaughlin moved to approve the item as presented, Mr. Richard seconded and the motion carried unanimously.** Mr. Munson said this would be a test case and it should be brought back in the future for further review.

D. Updated Policies for Vehicle and Facilities Advertising

Ms. Myers advised that this item has created a lot of conversation at the Citizen Advisory Committee and Operations and Customer Service Committee, and Board Study Session levels. The purpose of the updated policy is to set standards in the way STA and the contracted advertising agency operate. The majority of other transit agencies already have such a policy in place. STA has been advertising since its inception but without a formal policy. Ms. Myers advised that three key areas were discussed at length in the meetings: alcohol and tobacco, political campaigns, and firearms. The section pertaining to firearms has been rewritten to be included in the alcohol and tobacco part, and this section (item 7) has been left as prohibited from being advertised. The political campaigning section has been removed from the prohibited list, meaning that STA would continue to allow it. As a result of the recommendations of the Citizen Advisory Committee, wording

has been added to give the CEO final say regarding the administration of the policy. Mr. Richard said there had been some confusion at the committee level as to which items should be included in the prohibited list. Ms. Myers said that the wording is at the Board's discretion. **Mr. Denenny moved to accept the recommended policy striking item 7 (prohibition of alcohol, tobacco, and firearms), Mr. Richard seconded.** Mr. French asked if there was a federal prohibition on tobacco advertising. Ms. McAloon said that bus advertising is considered the same as billboards. Tobacco ads have been struck from broadcast media but not billboards. Mr. Mielke said there are billboard restrictions on tobacco to the extent that it cannot be advertised within a certain number of feet from schools and other places where children would congregate. Ms. McAloon said the advertising agency would have to comply with federal regulations. Mr. Stark asked about the ramifications of accepting political advertising since it may indicate that STA agrees with the message of the advertiser. Ms. McAloon said that the law does not allow STA to take a position on a ballot or candidacy issue. Candidates for political office may advertise with the required disclosure as to who paid for the advertisement. Mr. French recalled the bus wrap "United We Stand" and that complaints were received indicating the public thought STA was supportive of the war. Consequently, STA should probably avoid any kind of political advertising. Mr. Munson quoted the first amendment right to ask for votes and he did not think the public would object to STA selling political advertising. He added that he was neutral on gambling advertising but had no problem prohibiting alcohol, tobacco and firearms so long as the armed forces were not prohibited from advertising due to the firearms prohibition.

Mr. Richard believes the advertising agency will be in compliance with federal regulations. Regarding political advertising, **he offered an amendment to the current motion that would prohibit advertisement either for or against any STA-related ballot measure. Mr. Munson seconded the amendment.** Ms. McLaughlin agrees with the amendment to the motion but not with the original motion. She is not in favor of removing item 7 and would like gambling added to the prohibitions. Mr. Denenny asked if the board members were to approve the amendment, would it be considered control of content. Ms. McAloon said once the discussion is over she requests that the motion be tabled so she can research the legalities. Control of content is not generally allowed under the first amendment. Mr. Mielke has a concern with the freedom of speech issue and would support giving Legal Counsel some time to do the research. However, the motion and the second should be dealt with at this time. Mr. Mielke said the purpose of advertising is to maximize revenue for STA. There are strong prohibitions on tobacco advertising in areas where children congregate and he believes there should be no advertising for tobacco on the buses. **Mr. Richard withdrew his amendment to the motion and Mr. Munson withdrew his second.** Mr. Sayrs requested that staff bring back information to the Board on the legalities as requested. Mr. Munson asked the procedure for revisiting this motion; does it have to be the side that voted against to bring it back? Ms. McAloon said it is the side that voted for it. Mr. Munson said he would vote against it. Mr. Mielke said the majority of the Board could bring back an item for future consideration. **Mr. Mielke proposed a friendly amendment to the current motion. He requested that item 7 be struck with the exception of the tobacco language. The friendly amendment was accepted by Mr. Denenny and Mr. Richard, the second.** Mr. Munson said he remembered hearing that friendly amendments were not appropriate for governing bodies such as this one. Ms. McAloon said that could apply for the Rules of Procedure for the City of the Spokane Valley, but not to STA. Mr. Munson said it was a change in the Roberts Rules of Order. Ms. McAloon said the Roberts Rules of Order adopted by STA was the 1982 version and these stand unless amended. Mr. Mielke expressed concern about enforcement action should the advertisements prove unlawful. Would such action be against STA or the advertising agency? Mr. Sayrs said the purpose of this policy is to be a guideline for STA. Ms. Meyer said there is time sensitivity to this item since the contract with the current advertising company ends in December and the Request for Proposals has to go out soon. Mr. Munson asked that Legal Counsel research the federal laws for alcohol and firearms advertising in addition to tobacco. Ms. McLaughlin said the Board should wait until the research is completed before a motion is voted on. She wanted to compel the Board members to do what is best for minors and added there are plenty of other advertising options to

generate revenue without resorting to advertising the “vices.” Mr. Sayrs asked if these types of advertising were prohibited, would it change the amount of revenue generated. Ms. Meyer said she did not believe STA has ever run an advertisement for alcohol, tobacco or firearms. It would, however, reduce revenue if gambling and political advertising were prohibited. Ms. McLaughlin urged the Board to not introduce advertising that has not formerly been allowed and include gambling in that prohibition. Mr. Denenny called for the question. Mr. Sayrs ruled that the motion in question requires a two-thirds majority. Mr. Mielke asked about item 5 which pertains to nudity and sexual excitement. Ms. McAloon said the language was drawn from another transit agency’s policy as defined in Washington State’s statutes and the criminal statutes as relating to sex offences. Regarding profane language, item 9, there is a significant body of case law defining what is considered to be profane language. Mr. Sayrs said if this policy is adopted, the RFP goes out and later the policy is changed, the terms of the contract with the vendor are changed. Ms. Meyer said the RFP could be requested with and without the items in the policy, specifically item 7. Mr. Sayrs asked if there would be an objection to staff doing this. Mr. Richard and Mr. Munson did not agree. Mr. Mielke said the Board has asked Legal Counsel to research federal restrictions in respect to alcohol and firearms and to bring that information back to the Board. Mr. Stark asked if an amendment could be made such as “federal law supersedes” Ms. McAloon said this was a moot point since federal law always supersedes any action taken by this Board. Mr. Denenny called for the question. Mr. Sayrs asked if there was any objection to ending the debate at this time. Mr. Denenny said Mr. Sayrs had overridden him. **Mr. Sayrs said it had been moved and seconded to accept the recommended policy as updated and amended (striking item 7 with the exception of the tobacco language). The motion passed with Ms. McLaughlin, Mr. Munson and Mr. Stark voting against.** Mr. Sayrs did not vote. Mr. Richard said he would like to formally raise an objection to the Chairman’s decision to supersede Roberts Rules of Order in the last process and to take that under consideration. Mr. Sayrs said he did not believe he violated the Rules of Order but would take it under advisement.

E. Eastern Washington University Eagle Pass Contract Renewal

Mr. French moved to authorize the CEO to execute the contract for the Eagle Pass program from September 15, 2006 through June 15, 2007 with Eastern Washington University with a contract amount of \$321,782 and up to two, one-year extensions. Mr. Gainer seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

F. Award of Contract for Comprehensive Transit Plan

Mr. Traver said that four proposals were received. A selection committee met and decided on a two step evaluation process: a written evaluation and oral team interviews. The committee unanimously recommended the award of contract to Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates in an amount not to exceed \$442,448 for development of the Comprehensive Transit Plan (Transit 2020) with a target completion date of the end of 2007 with a request to reserve the additional budget previously approved of \$618,750, for later consideration. Mr. Munson asked if two motions would be appropriate. First, approving the \$442,448 appropriation and the second giving the CEO authorization to increase the amount to \$618,750. Mr. Sayrs agreed. Mr. Traver said he was not seeking full authority for the \$618,750 at this time, just the lower amount. **Mr. Munson moved to approve the Award of Contract to Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates for the development of a Comprehensive Transit Plan by December 2007 at \$442,448 with the balance of the budget reserved to support this task, as required. Mr. Gainer seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Munson asked if Mr. Traver could come back to the Board if necessary for the balance of funds. Mr. Plaster said the CEO has the authority to amend any Board-awarded contract up to 15% as long as it is within the budgeted amount. No further motion is necessary at this time.

G. Continuation of Light Rail Project

a. Discussion of Draft Ballot Resolution

Mr. Traver presented a summary of the light rail project to date. The next phases of the project would include preliminary engineering, establishing a real estate acquisition plan, and completing the final environmental impact statement. However, the Board had indicated its intention to seek concurrence from the public in the form of an advisory vote prior to any further continuation of the project. The resolution presented includes the following proposition:

“Should STA use its available resources, including tax revenues, for the continued development of a light rail system between Spokane, Spokane Valley, and Liberty Lake, but not to include final design and construction of a light rail system, and resulting in no decrease in current overall bus, paratransit, or rideshare services or increase in the current transit sales tax of six-tenths (0.6) percent?”

Mr. Mielke found three places in the documents with apparently varying ballot language. Ms. McAloon said the wording in Exhibit A should be the same as in Section 7 of the resolution. The title of the resolution will not be forwarded to the voters. The proposed ballot language is in Exhibit A. Mr. Sayrs said that the use of the words “system-wide” should be changed to “overall” to match the wording in the resolution. Mr. Sayrs said the point of the advisory vote would be to ensure the public had a say in whether additional funding would be provided to the project. Mr. Munson commended the effort of staff in the light rail project but said he could not support its continuation without providing a detailed financing package. He considered the ballot wording too vague and the public would think voting “yes” would amount to supporting funding for the project, yet the financial impact on STA is not known at this time. He suggested setting a special Board meeting in August in order to debate and decide what the financing options are, and propose a two question ballot as follows: “Are you, the public, willing to pay for this based on the approved financing package and if not, will you allow the use of STA funds to complete the planning process so that when the opportunity arises, the funds will be available?”

Mr. Richard said his understanding was that the voters would be asked to approve the funding for preliminary engineering and right-of-way acquisition; however, other items are also included. He concurs with Mr. Munson’s concerns and would not recommend asking the voters for a “blank check.” He added the fact that any funds appropriated to the light rail project would have an impact on STA’s funding and raise a concern when returning to the voters in 2008/2009 to ask for a continuation of the sales tax. He agreed to an August special meeting with a date to be determined. Ms. McAloon informed the Board that an advisory public vote has no binding effect on the Board’s decisions. She said she had not included acquisition of right of way in the ballot wording due to the fact that the Board could face legal challenges to its authority as a result. Mr. Stark said he did not agree with an advisory vote but preferred a complete funding package to go before the voters in November for a regular vote. He moved to table the issue and, in the interim, set a special meeting for the Board to discuss light rail options, and form an Ad Hoc Committee composed of Mr. Munson, Mr. French, Mr. Denenny, and Mr. Mielke to draft language for the November ballot. Mr. Sayrs said there appeared to be several motions and to choose one to start. **Mr. Stark moved to table the agenda item, Mr. Munson seconded.** Mr. Sayrs agreed that the motion be postponed. **Mr. French said perhaps it would be appropriate to make a motion to defer the item to a specific meeting as a single motion. This is a friendly amendment to which Mr. Stark and Mr. Munson agreed. The special meeting would be August 17 at 5:30 pm.** Ms. Meyer said a regular Board meeting in August had not been scheduled. Ms. McAloon said August 4 is the deadline for the September election and September 22 is the deadline for the general election in November. Mr. Traver said that the project is currently at a standstill and will not continue without a positive advancement from the Board. Mr. Richard said he would not be able to attend a Board meeting on August 17. Mr. French reminded the Board that he expressed his desire two months ago to go to

the public with a double ballot measure asking for a vote to fund the project and if the response to that question was no, to ask if the project could be continued in the short term. It should be a priority not to jeopardize the 2008 ballot for continued sales tax funding for STA. Mr. Munson said it is important to talk about what should be discussed at the special meeting. The Light Rail Steering Committee was given instruction by the Board to give specific funding options which they did. However, those funding options have not yet been debated by the Board and a determination has not been made. The current ballot language gives no indication of how the project would be paid for, and there is a limitation as to how much the public is going to be asked to fund. Mr. Sayrs considers that STA's priority is to make sure the bus service is of high quality and dependable for the long term. He is very sensitive to any issue that may arise which may threaten the bus system and opposes putting a funding measure on the ballot in 2006 because of the 2008 ballot. He added that additional funds are not needed to do the required step of engineering, which results in the acquisition of right of way. Fiscal responsibility requires that no extra money be spent than is necessary. The engineering and planning is required to preserve the right of way for future generations. Currently in the Spokane Valley, there is the potential for an extension of a couplet and STA needs to be involved in the planning process now or there will be a conflict in the future, and public criticism as a result.

Mr. Richard said there is a motion on the floor to continue the item. Mr. Sayrs urged the Board not to put off a decision since this could be costly in terms of losing time. It would, for example, take at least six months after the vote to start action on a contract for a consultant to do the environmental impact study and 18 months to complete. Mr. French said the difference between a September and November ballot is forty-five days. Mr. Munson called for the question. Mr. Sayrs said **the motion is to postpone the discussion to a special meeting on Thursday, August 17, 2006, at 5:30 pm at the Spokane City Council Chambers. The motion passed with Mr. Gainer opposing. Mr. Stark moved to form an Ad Hoc Ballot Committee composed of Mr. Munson, Mr. Mielke, Mr. French and Mr. Denenny. Mr. Denenny seconded.** Mr. Richard is concerned about the make up of the committee in that it does not include a representative of the small cities but it includes two representatives of the City of the Spokane Valley, and asked that Mr. Gainer replace one of them. **Mr. Munson withdrew his name and Mr. Gainer said he would be willing to join the committee.** Mr. Denenny said that in order to begin the work of the committee they would need direction from the Board. Mr. Stark said he noted from the Board that they would like to see a ballot presented in November, and present funding options to the public. So the intent of the committee would be to incorporate these issues. Mr. Mielke wanted to confirm that the intent of the Ad Hoc committee was to prepare ballot language to be brought before the Board at the special August 17 meeting. The deadline for filing ballot language for the November general election is September 22 at 5 pm, according to Ms. McAloon. The regular STA Board meeting is scheduled for September 21. Discussion ensued regarding the choice of the special Board meeting date in August. Mr. Richard said he was supportive of the meeting concept but not the date since he would be on vacation at that time. Mr. Sayrs said **the motion currently on the table was to form an Ad Hoc Ballot Committee composed of Mr. Gainer, Mr. Mielke, Mr. Denenny and Mr. French. The motion passed with Mr. Mielke opposing. Mr. French moved to reconsider the motion to set August 17, 2006 as the special meeting date, Mr. Denenny seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.** Ms. McAloon said the Board may wish to ask staff to research the dates and times the Spokane City Council Chambers may be available. **Mr. Stark moved to direct staff to find a date and time convenient for the Board for the special meeting in August, Mr. Richard seconded and the motion passed unanimously.** Mr. Munson said the public should understand this is a very important topic and the Board wishes to move in a manner in which the public appreciates the issues. It is not that the Board is against light rail or stopping the project.

8. BOARD INFORMATION

- A. Committee Minutes. As presented.

B. Miscellaneous Correspondence. As presented.

Mr. Mielke returned to item 7. As a member of the Ad Hoc Committee, he wanted to make sure what committee members are expected to bring back to the Board since Mr. Munson expressed his view of a dual question ballot. He wanted to ensure the direction of the entire Board was for a dual question ballot. The consensus of the Board was for a dual ballot question. Mr. Richard said the Board needs to contemplate the ramifications of the sales tax ballot measure in 2008 by asking for a full funding light rail ballot measure in 2006. The first action would be to use existing funds for the purposes of limited actions and that sometime in the future, better orchestrated with the timing of the 2008 ballot, a ballot measure be considered. Mr. French offered another item for discussion at the August meeting. There will be a gap of approximately two months in funding for the light rail project staff through a November vote, and there should be some effort on behalf of STA to provide that funding. Mr. Traver said staff is projected to be funded through the end of September and pending one final invoice from the consultant, there is approximately \$130,000 available from the grant. Those funds could be used to sustain staff until November. Continued modeling work could also be done. Ms. Meyer said there may be funding to support staff but perhaps not enough work for them to do. Mr. Stark asked that the Board move on to the next item. Mr. Richard said not to leave staff hanging but to ask them to return in August and tell the Board what tasks they could fulfill in the following two months. Mr. Traver said he could imagine staying busy through September assisting the Ad Hoc committee and closing out the consultant's contract. Mr. Mielke said there is also lot of groundwork associated with real estate projects and pre-screening consultants for environmental work.

9. CEO REPORT Another public hearing has been added to the September 21 Board agenda: The Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity Commitment. There is an annual requirement to update the plan and it will include any statutory changes since the last update.
10. STAFF REPORTS None.
11. NEW BUSINESS None.
12. BOARD MEMBERS' EXPRESSIONS None.
13. EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 8:40 pm, Ms. McAloon announced that the Board would adjourn for an Executive Session for the following purposes:

Considering the selection of a site, the acquisition of real estate by lease or purchase, or the sale of real estate when public knowledge regarding such consideration would cause a likelihood of increased or decreased price.

Discussion with Legal Counsel representing STA in litigation or potential litigation to which STA, the STA Board of Directors, or STA employees are, or are likely to become, a party, when public knowledge regarding the discussion is likely to result in an adverse legal or financial consequence to STA.

While the provisions of the open public meeting law do not apply to planning or adopting the strategy or position to be taken by the Board during the course of ongoing collective bargaining and grievance proceedings, we are announcing our intent to discuss these matters also.

The STA Board of Directors will reconvene in open session at approximately 9:00 pm. If it becomes necessary to extend the executive session, a member of the staff will return to announce the time at which the STA Board will reconvene. If any action is to be taken as a result of discussions in the executive session, that action will occur at the open public session.

At 9:00 pm the Board of Directors reconvened and Chairman Sayrs declared the meeting back in open public session.

Mr. Richard moved to approve the settlement of the personal injury claim in the amount approved by Legal Counsel. Mr. Munson seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

14. Cable 5 Broadcast Dates and Times of the July 20, 2006 Board Meeting:

Saturday, July 22, 2006	4:00 p.m.
Monday, July 24, 2006	10:00 a.m.
Tuesday, July 25, 2006	8:00 p.m.

15. Next Committee Meetings (STA Southside Conference Room (unless otherwise stated), 1229 West Boone Avenue, Spokane, Washington):

Operations & Customer Service Committee	September 6, 2006, 1:30 p.m.
Light Rail Steering Committee	September 7, 2006, 2:00 p.m.
Citizen Advisory Committee	September 13, 2006, 5:00 p.m. (Northside)

16. Next Public Hearings – Thursday, September 21, 2006, 5:30 p.m., City Council Chambers, 808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, Washington., Spokane, Washington, to discuss:

Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goals
Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Commitment

17. Next Board Study Session, Thursday, September 21, 2006, 4:15 p.m., City Council Chambers, 808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, Washington

18. Next Board Meeting, Thursday, September 21, 2006, 5:30 p.m., City Council Chambers, 808 West Spokane Falls Blvd., Spokane, Washington.

19. ADJOURNED

With no further business to come before the Board, Mr. Sayrs adjourned the meeting at 9:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Watson
Executive Assistant to the CEO
& Clerk of the Authority