

**AGENDA**  
**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**January 5, 2011**  
**5:30 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

- |           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| <b>1)</b> | <b>APPROVAL OF AGENDA</b>  | <b>1 min.</b>   |
| <b>2)</b> | <b>INTRODUCTIONS &amp; RECOGNITIONS</b><br><b>A. Farewell for Mary Dean:</b> Reading of Proclamation and recess for cake and punch ( <i>Sandra Romero</i> )  | <b>15 min.</b>  |
| <b>3)</b> | <b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b><br><i>Public Comment Note: This is the place on the agenda where the public is invited to address the Authority on any issue. The person speaking is requested to sign-in on the General Public Comment Form for submittal to the Clerk of the Board. When your name is called, step up to the podium and give your name and address for the audio record. If you are unable to utilize the podium, you will be provided a microphone at your seat. Citizens testifying are asked to limit testimony to three minutes.</i> | <b>10 min.</b>  |
| <b>4)</b> | <b>APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS</b><br><b>A. Approval of Minutes:</b> December 1, 2010, Regular Meeting.<br><br><b>B. Payroll:</b> November 2010 Payroll in the amount of \$1,614,074.12.<br>December 2010 Payroll in the amount of \$1,616,273.57.  | <b>1 min.</b>   |
| <b>5)</b> | <b>PUBLIC HEARINGS - None</b>  | <b>0 min.</b>   |
| <b>6)</b> | <b>COMMITTEE REPORTS</b><br><b>A. Thurston Regional Planning Council</b> ( <i>Sandra Romero</i> )<br><b>B. Transportation Policy Board</b> ( <i>Ed Hildreth</i> )<br><b>C. Urban Corridors Task Force</b> ( <i>Ed Hildreth</i> )<br><b>D. Citizen Advisory Committee</b> ( <i>Wilfred Collins</i> )<br><b>E. Pension Committee</b> ( <i>Joe Baker</i> )  | <b>3 min.</b><br><b>3 min.</b><br><b>3 min.</b><br><b>3 min.</b><br><b>3 min.</b> |
| <b>7)</b> | <b>UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None</b>  | <b>0 min.</b>   |
| <b>8)</b> | <b>NEW BUSINESS</b><br><b>A. Purchase of Dial-A-Lift Vehicles</b> ( <i>Ann Freeman-Manzanares</i> )<br><b>B. Federal Advocacy Services</b> ( <i>Ann Freeman-Manzanares</i> )<br><b>C. Vanpool Vehicle Purchase</b> ( <i>Ann Freeman-Manzanares</i> )   | <b>5 min.</b><br><b>5 min.</b><br><b>5 min.</b>                                   |

- |            |   |                |
|------------|---|----------------|
|            | <b>D. Discounted Bus Pass Program Approval</b> <i>(Mike Harbour)</i>            | <b>10 min.</b> |
|            | <b>E. Centennial Station Discussion</b> <i>(Mike Harbour)</i>                   | <b>15 min.</b> |
| <b>9)</b>  | <b>GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT</b>   | <b>10 min.</b> |
| <b>10)</b> | <b>AUTHORITY ISSUES</b>   | <b>10 min.</b> |
| <b>11)</b> | <b>MEETING EVALUATION</b>   | <b>5 min.</b>  |
| <b>12)</b> | <b>EXECUTIVE SESSION</b>  | <b>15 min.</b> |
|            | <b>A. Collective Bargaining Agreement - IAM Lodge 160</b> <i>(Mike Harbour)</i> |                |

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Minutes**  
**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**December 1, 2010**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chair Thies called the December 1, 2010, regular meeting of the Intercity Transit Authority to order at 5:30 p.m., at the administrative offices of Intercity Transit.

**Members Present:** Vice Chair and Citizen Representative Martin Thies; City of Olympia Councilmember Karen Rogers; City of Lacey Councilmember Virgil Clarkson (Alternate); City of Tumwater Councilmember Ed Hildreth; City of Yelm Councilmember Joe Baker; Citizen Representative Tom Green; Citizen Representative Eve Johnson; and Labor Representative Karen Stites.

**Members Excused:** Chair and Thurston County Commissioner Sandra Romero.

**Staff Present:** Mike Harbour; Rhodetta Seward; Dennis Bloom; Ann Freeman-Manzanares; Melody Jamieson; Jim Merrill; Ben Foreman; Emily Bergkamp, Karl Shenkel, Carolyn Newsome; Mark Kallas; Ed Rutledge; and Pat Messmer.

**Others Present:** Legal Counsel Tom Bjorgen; Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) member Roberta Gray; and Recording Secretary Tom Gow.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**It was M/S/A by Councilmember Hildreth and Councilmember Baker to approve the revised agenda as presented.**

**INTRODUCTIONS & RECOGNITIONS**

**A. Farewell for Tom Green.** Thies read a proclamation of appreciation to Tom Green, who served on the Authority since October 18, 2006. Green provided outstanding leadership and served as Chair from February 2008 to February 2010. Green also represented the Authority on the Transportation Policy Board as well as many ad hoc committees during his tenure. Green is leaving the Authority to pursue other endeavors. Green was recognized for his four years of dedicated service to the citizens of Thurston County and Intercity Transit.

Members and staff individually expressed their thanks to Green for his tireless work and service on the Authority and for his exemplary example as a leader and model for diplomacy and engagement.

Bjorgen said that he's seen two extremes of public administrators in his time. There's the Rohm Emanuel and Bob Haldeman type, who are highly competent, highly effective, and highly abrasive. And there's Tom Green, who's just as competent and

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 2 of 13**

just as effective, but who managed to replace the abrasiveness with humanity. And, the Rohm Emanuels and Bob Haldemans are a dime a dozen, they are thick on the ground, but Tom Green's are rare. Mr. Bjorgen said it's been a privilege to work with Mr. Green.

Green acknowledged everyone's comments and expressed his love of transit, as he believes in its mission and in helping humanity with a system coupled with the passion that he's found on the Board and staff. It is a fun place to work. He thanked Intercity Transit for the opportunity.

Thies presented Green with a clock as recognition for his service.

Thies recessed the meeting from 5:42 p.m. to 5:57 p.m. for a reception honoring Green.

### **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

Clarkson noted a discrepancy of approximately \$21,000 between the amount listed in the staff report and the list of property for surplus on Exhibit "A." The total for surplus property should reflect \$41,307.41.

**It was M/S/A by Councilmember Hildreth and Councilmember Clarkson to approve the consent agenda as amended reflecting a corrected total for the value of property to be surplus.**

- A. Approval of Minutes:** November 3, 2010, Regular Meeting; November 17, 2010, Special Meeting.
- B. Payroll:** October 2010 Payroll in the amount of \$2,292,639.70.
- C. Accounts Payable:** Warrants dated November 5, 2010, numbers 82269-82398 in the amount of \$248,053.44; warrants dated November 19, 2010, numbers 82399-82525 in the amount of \$919,775.36, for a monthly total of \$1,167,828.80.
- D. Surplus Property:** Declared the property listed as Exhibit "A" as surplus with the total amended to reflect "41,307.41."
- E. Bus Schedule Book Printing:** Contingent upon the adoption of the 2011 budget, authorized the General Manager to enter into a unit price contract with Rotary Offset Press, Inc., for a period of one year for the printing of bus schedule books.

### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- A. Thurston Regional Planning Council (TRPC).** (Provided 11/17/10).

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 3 of 13**

**B. Transportation Policy Board (TPB).** Hildreth reported the Board was briefed on the regional transportation funding program for Thurston County. Two grant programs include the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Transportation Enhancement Program. Total funding availability is approximately \$11.3 million for both programs. Intercity Transit is applying for STP and Enhancement funds. The Board agreed the matching amount should be 13% because of the current economy.

**C. Urban Corridors Task Force.** Hildreth reported the task force met on October 25 and agreed to consider Capitol Way and Martin Way as major transit corridors for the region, which connects south from Tumwater through Olympia north to Lacey. Members also agreed to consider Pacific Avenue and the eastside of Olympia as future areas of major transportation corridors that should be enhanced, such as signal coordination and other transit improvements. At the November 30 meeting, a consultant with Makers Architecture shared experiences and lessons learned of western Washington communities tackling similar linear corridor retrofits and redevelopment issues to better support transit and healthy community economies. Intercity Transit was recognized by Makers Architecture for providing 15-minute service headway along major transit corridors.

**D. Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC).** Gray reported members agreed to recommend adding a youth member from age 15 to 19 as a position on the CAC. The term of office is recommended to be one year with service limited to two terms.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Policy EX-0004 – Restricting Use of Tobacco.** Seward reported at the last meeting, the Authority tabled the recommendation and asked staff to conduct more research on electronic cigarettes as well as a name change to the policy, if electronic cigarettes were to be included in the policy. Resolution No. 09-2010 describes electronic cigarettes and usage as well as reflecting a name change to the policy.

Seward explained several staff members researched electronic cigarettes as well as interviewed employees who use electronic cigarettes. One significant aspect of the research and interviews was recognition that electronic cigarettes are not used as smoking cessation devices, which was of concern by several Authority members.

Allowing electronic cigarettes could potentially make it more difficult for the agency to enforce non-smoking rules at its facilities. If electronic cigarettes are allowed in facilities, they would potentially be allowed within buses. Electronic cigarettes, from a distance, are difficult to distinguish from a standard cigarette, which could create confusion to customers and create problems for the agency's security guards. Additionally, electronic cigarettes emit an odor. Although they do not omit second-

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 4 of 13**

hand smoke, the odor could be offensive to some people. Finally, the legality of the devices is unclear. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) ruled the devices are drug delivery devices subject to regulations. Because the devices haven't been recognized as a smoking cessation device and because of the problems associated with its usage, as well as comments and research demonstrating that usage of electronic cigarettes can be perceived as a gateway for smoking by youth, staff recommends restricting electronic cigarettes along with regular tobacco use from all Intercity Transit facilities.

**It was M/S by Citizen Representative Johnson and Councilmember Clarkson to adopt Resolution No. 09-2010, approving Policy EX-0004, Restricting Tobacco and E-Cigarette Use.**

Responding to questions, Seward described electronic cigarettes and how the devices are used. She described the odors associated as they were described to her by users. She also stated the e-cigarettes come in different flavors such as chocolate or strawberry, which can serve as an attraction for smoking by youth.

Hildreth asked about public notification of the non-smoking policy. Seward said the proposal includes an effective date of January 1, 2011, to afford time to discuss the policy with staff and discuss with security what forms of information should be posted to advise customers of the change. Harbour added that the agency doesn't currently allow electronic cigarettes in smoking areas. The policy implements current practice.

Hildreth questioned the exclusion of Intercity Transit in the title of section 2. Seward explained that standardization within titles limits the number of words. As the policy pertains internally to Intercity Transit, it wasn't necessary to identify the agency.

Hildreth asked about the legality of the policy in terms of defending the policy in court. Bjorgen said the policy is a proprietary rather than a governmental function. The agency is acting as the property owner as opposed to a regulator. Courts extend a greater scope of authority to agencies when it is acting in a proprietary capacity. Some rational basis is required, which is documented through the research.

Green expressed support for the policy and acknowledged the challenges posed to the agency for having to distinguish electronic cigarettes from standard cigarettes.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**A. DAL Mandated Lap Seatbelt Policy.** Bergkamp reviewed a proposal to implement mandatory use of lap seatbelts on Dial-A-Lift (DAL) service effective January 1, 2011.

Currently, there is no established policy regarding the use of seatbelts on DAL service. Fixed route buses are designed to absorb impacts much more effectively than DAL vehicles. There are safety and liability concerns with individuals who refuse to use seatbelts on DAL service. Currently, DAL passengers who refuse to use seatbelts are documented by the driver with dispatch notified. Occurrences are infrequent. Some people installed lap belts on mobility devices, and many users believe those devices are sufficient to secure them. However, those belts are designed for the user's posture and are not intended to secure the individual in terms of vehicle safety.

Although school buses and fixed route buses are exempt from seatbelt policies, the FDA indicates that transit operators may establish a policy requiring the use of a seatbelt and shoulder harness by all riders including those that use wheelchairs as well as those in vehicle seats if seatbelts and shoulder harnesses are provided in all seating locations. DAL vans include lap seatbelts, which fulfill the FDA requirement to implement a policy. Currently, DAL operators encourage the use of the seatbelt with some occurrences of passengers choosing not to use them for various reasons ranging from medical conditions that may be aggravated by seat belt usage. In those instances, written documentation from the doctor exempts them from usage.

Enforcement of the policy was addressed by the CAC. Drivers will be asked to contact dispatch for those clients refusing to use seatbelts, which will also be documented by the driver. Follow-up action and contact is planned for passengers who fail to comply. In most cases, education and information is effective in achieving compliance. In those cases where passengers continue to refuse to use a seatbelt, a seven-day suspension can be imposed.

Bergkamp shared some traffic statistics from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration on the use of seatbelts and reduction in serious injuries and the saving of lives. Essentially, the concern involves safety for both clients and the driver.

Johnson asked about potential confusion to DAL passengers who subsequently transfer to fixed route service, which doesn't require seatbelt usage. Bergkamp said regular buses do not have seatbelts installed. Additionally, the dynamics of DAL service involves more freeway travel at higher speeds than fixed route service.

Green asked about other systems implementing a similar policy. Bergkamp reported that feedback from other transit agencies reflect that some agencies include mandatory

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 6 of 13**

seatbelt usage on paratransit service. However, some of the confusion for requiring seatbelts is from the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which prohibits requiring a person traveling in a mobility device to do something different than another passenger. Because fixed route buses are exempt from seatbelt usage, a person in a mobility device cannot be required to use a seatbelt on fixed route service. Paratransit service however, is determined to be a dynamic service that is different from fixed route service and seatbelts can be required if they are available.

Stites referred to concerns from the driver's perspective and situations where passengers could perceive rudeness by the operator creating potential problems for the driver. She asked if the policy applies to caregivers of the DAL clients as well. Bergkamp advised that the policy applies to all passengers on the DAL vehicle.

**It was M/S by Citizen Representative Green and Councilmember Baker to adopt POLICY-DL-6259, Mandating Use of Lap Seatbelts, effective January 1, 2011.**

Green advised the agency to be sensitive in the enforcement of the policy because of the clientele. The agency needs to move forward slowly and ensure there is adequate education and time for passengers to adjust. Bergkamp acknowledged a slow approach is planned to include working with families, caregivers, and clients. DAL clients will receive a newsletter advising them of the policy.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**B. NIMS Certification.** Seward reported the request is for adoption of the National Incident Management System (NIMS) as the agency's framework for emergency plans and programs. Intercity Transit previously satisfied the requirement by sending Operations staff and other key personnel to NIMS training and participating in local exercises. Requirements changed requiring the agency to adopt the National Incident Management System. The agency engages in homeland security exercises occasionally as part of the Thurston County Emergency Management System. Currently, Intercity Transit doesn't receive funds from Homeland Security. However, future receipt of funds is dependent upon the agency adopting NIMS.

Green expressed support of the resolution as NIMS is the national framework for jurisdictions and organizations to work together during emergency response.

**It was M/S/A by Citizen Representative Johnson and Councilmember Clarkson to adopt Resolution No. 10-2010, adopting the National Incident Management System.**

**C. 2011 Budget Adoption.** Foreman reviewed the Authority's prior budget review process. The request is to adopt the 2011 budget of \$43,973,350.



## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 7 of 13**

Hildreth asked about the reason for the decrease in salaries in the budget for the Marketing Department. Harbour reported the temporary position assigned to the Commute Trip Reduction Program was eliminated.

Stites asked how the salary of the second coordinator position within the Marketing Department was established. Foreman advised the amount of \$4,350 is a position upgrade and includes hourly wage and benefits. He explained how one of the positions was eliminated and the remaining positions will assume the duties equally.

Johnson asked staff to address *The Olympian's* assertion that the agency's bus drivers are overpaid. Foreman replied the Authority approved the current contract, which will enter the last year of the three-year contract. The contract includes a 3.5% increase. Harbour said the contract is representative of other comparable transit systems. The wages are fair and reasonable.

**It was M/S/A by Councilmember Hildreth and Citizen Representative Green to adopt Resolution No. 12-2010 establishing the 2011 Budget.**

Clarkson commented on a local radio station's periodic reporting throughout the day of the agency's adoption of the 2011 budget prior to the Authority's action. Harbour advised the radio station received the agenda packet and apparently misunderstood the adoption was scheduled during the meeting. Staff will follow up with the station's representatives regarding the misunderstanding.

Johnson echoed similar comments of the media reporting on actions prior to the Authority's approval. Harbour acknowledged the media occasionally reported on outcomes prior to the Authority's approval. Staff contacted those resources regarding the incorrect reporting.

**D. Adopt Revised Drug & Alcohol Policy PO-HR-3511:** Ruttledge briefed the Authority on the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Federal Transit Administration's federal regulations that are required of all transit agencies. The agency is required to have a local policy and periodically, rules on the requirements change at the national level necessitating the agency to update its policy. Additionally, the policy must differentiate between local and federal regulations. In the past, federal regulations were distinguished by bold text. The only amendments before the Authority are those in bold colored font.

**It was M/S/A by Councilmember Hildreth and Councilmember Clarkson to adopt Resolution No. 11-2010, amending Intercity Transit's Drug and Alcohol Policy, PO-HR-3511.**

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 8 of 13**

**E. Add Youth Position to CAC.** Seward reported the request is whether to add another position representing a youth between the ages of 15 to 19 years to the Citizen Advisory Committee. The CAC recommends the addition to the current 19-member committee. Seward commended the CAC for its review process to add the position. Sixteen of the current 18 members participated in a survey. After the survey, there were two unresolved issues: the minimum and maximum age of the youth and the term limit. CAC members then thoroughly discussed the pros and cons of each issue.

Clarkson questioned whether the requirement for the youth to be in high school also pertains to home-schooled youths. Seward advised the CAC discussed home - schooling as well as homeless youth and agreed youths just need to be of high school age.

Hildreth asked about other criteria for selection of the student, such as a student in good standing or other criteria. Gray responded that the same criteria in terms of the youth's interest as well as the same type of screening for a CAC member would apply. Seward said the CAC didn't focus on the criteria prior to the approval of the Authority authorizing the position.

Rogers said one criterion that should be included is the youth must be a transit rider.

Clarkson commented on the City of Lacey's experience for youths on various advisory boards and commissions and that many youths are applying for civic involvement, to help fulfill civic requirements for high school, or as a prerequisite for college. Should the Authority adopt the proposal there should be an expectation that the youth should become a rider.

Green noted that the criterion might eliminate many youths who are leaders within the schools who could contribute substantially to discussions. Currently, that criterion is not required of the Authority or the CAC.

Thies commented on the timing and suggested interviewing students in the winter/early spring and appointing students in the spring with the term ending when the school year ends the following year.

Authority members discussed timing and offered various opinions on the term of service and timing of year. Green suggested moving forward on the proposal and deferring the timing to the CAC for a recommendation on the appointment process.

**It was M/S by Citizen Representative Johnson and Councilmember Rogers to add a 20<sup>th</sup> position to the current 19-member advisory committee for a youth position, with a specific recruitment for 15-19 year-old youth.**

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 9 of 13**

Hildreth agreed that some type of involvement with the transit system is desirable of the youth. Thies acknowledged that the desired involvement of the student within public transportation is inherent within the motion.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**F. Citizen Representative Appointment.** Seward reported on the Authority's interview of four applicants for the Citizen Representative position. After completion of the interviews, the Authority agreed to appoint Karen Messmer to the position, for a term to begin January 1, 2011, ending December 31, 2013.

**It was M/S/A by Councilmember Baker and Citizen Representative Johnson to appoint Karen Messmer to the Citizen Representative position, for a term to begin January 1, 2011, ending December 31, 2013.**

Green reported he will contact all applicants that were interviewed, at the recommendation of Chair Romero.

**G. Reduced Monthly Pass Program for Agencies Serving Low-Income.** Harbour reported the proposal is to provide reduced cost monthly passes to organizations serving persons with low income. The program, if approved, will be advertised for submittal of applications for presentation to the Authority on January 5, 2011, with a specific recommendation for awards to agencies.

Harbour referred to draft materials consisting of a memorandum on the program details and recommendations and a draft application package. Additionally, Seward and Harbour met with a subcommittee of the Authority involving Rogers and Dean several times to review the program and resolve potential issues.

Harbour shared it is not the first time the agency has been asked to offer a similar program. Staff always recommended against the program as the agency already operates a heavily subsidized service by offering fixed route service at a much lower cost than other fares, and secondly, there were concerns with how to maintain some controls within a program. Lastly, the Authority expressed it did not want the agency to become a needs-eligibility agency determining who is eligible for reduced fares. The issue is whether local conditions changed to the point where the Authority may want to change its previous position.

The nation is experiencing an unprecedented economic downturn, and there is pressure on human service and government agencies to provide programs affecting basic needs. Secondly, the Authority is in a unique position to provide support in that the community supported the agency for increasing service. It's something that can be implemented at a minor cost by foregoing potential fare revenue. The recommendation

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 10 of 13**

is to provide \$200,000 in passes on a matching basis with Intercity Transit providing a \$100,000 match. If the agency elects to pursue the program, it will not lose revenue, as many of the riders would not have been using transit. Finally, many service agencies are facing a funding crisis with the change in Medicaid policies where Medicaid is no longer purchasing monthly medical passes for medical trips. Medicaid purchased approximately two-thirds of the passes last year. That will no longer continue because of the change in federal policy requiring trip-by-trip certification. The restriction takes away the person's ability to use transit for other purposes in conjunction with the medical trip and puts a burden on service agencies.

The subcommittee set several parameters for establishing the program:

- Assistance to human service agencies should be limited to reduced price passes.
- Assistance should be provided only to agencies and not individuals.
- Any assistance should require a match by the agency requesting the assistance.
- Assistance should be distributed to agencies as an annual grant. A competitive program would be established requiring agencies to identify who would be served, how eligibility will be determined, and how passes or tickets are distributed.
- The Authority should establish a maximum level of funding for 2011 of \$200,000 in passes or \$100,000 in cost.
- The program is recommended to be a pilot program for one year with a mid-year report on the status.

The intent of the program is to take a small step. It's not intended to address all needs. The request is to authorize the pilot, reduced-cost pass program.

**It was M/S by Citizen Representative Green and Councilmember Clarkson to adopt Resolution No. 13-2010, a Pilot, Discounted Bus Pass Program, and authorize staff to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for organizations serving persons with low-income to purchase reduced fare bus passes. Authorize the sale of up to \$200,000 of bus passes in 2011 for this pilot program.**

Clarkson asked whether staff foresees the value of the program changing in future years. Harbour advised that future value is not determined, but the Authority will be asked to consider the program on an annual basis if there is a continued need, at which time, the value will be established

Harbour responded to questions on the RFP process and what the proposals are required to address.

Thies noted that the agency is currently subsidizing 75% of all fixed route trips. Additionally, during the election last August, one of the major issues was expansion of

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 11 of 13**

service. Although the program doesn't expand service, it expands access to service to specific populations. To a degree, it appears the agency is seeking more money from sales tax while using the tax for another purpose. There is also the inherent difficulty of ending a program after implementation.

Johnson agreed with the comments on the voter approved sales tax increase and the appearance of giving service away and with concerns as to how citizens may perceive the program.

Rogers suggested the issue is a reduced fare rather than providing a free service. She suggested consideration of tying the program to an economic indicator as a way to end the program when the need no longer exists.

Green shared that he questioned the program and whether it's part of the agency's core mission. He agreed it is a part of the agency's core mission. The pilot concept is important as it conveys the agency's intent for testing the program.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**H. Cafeteria Plan Amendment.** Foreman requested the Authority adopt Resolution 14-2010, amending the Intercity Transit Cafeteria Plan. The resolution is necessitated by requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordability Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. New health care laws allow children less than 27 years of age to be covered under their parent's healthcare plan. The amendment was prepared by the agency's law firm in Seattle.

Foreman explained that the agency's plan pertaining to exchange policies really doesn't apply to the agency, but it is required because it prohibits forcing employees to use less cost plans because of the exchanges.

**It was M/S/A by Citizen Representative Johnson and Councilmember Baker to adopt Resolution No. 14-2010, amending the Intercity Transit Cafeteria Plan.**

### **GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT**

**Google Transit** is now streaming the agency's data. Customer Service is testing the trip planner for the next several weeks, which will be unveiled early next year. One Bus Away is also in process and will be unveiled in early 2011. Staff is assigning all bus stops with a number as part of the program's requirements. Both applications will be very beneficial to customers.

Marketing and Communications are planning activities for the agency's **30th anniversary**. Focus will be on employees, community, and customers.

## **Intercity Transit Authority Regular Meeting**

**December 1, 2010**

**Page 12 of 13**

**Wheel Options** was held during October 17-30 with 2,337 participants in Thurston County, one of the most active campaigns in the state. Fifty-seven worksites participated representing 43 agencies and businesses. The statewide grand prize winner was a telecommuter from the Department of Licensing who won \$2,500.

**Ridership** increased slightly in October with over 400,000 riders in a month despite the economy and furloughs representing a .05% increase in ridership.

**Sales tax** revenue increased by 4.7% in November. Year-to-date, sales tax is up by 1.2%.

The agency received the **certification of compliance** with the 401K plan that is good through 2014.

**Holiday activities** include the Jingle Bus, Toy Deployment to Santa's Castle at Joint Base Lewis McChord on December 11. The agency's annual banquet is on December 10 with presentations at noon. The banquet begins at 10:00 a.m. and ends at 4:30 p.m. Bloom is presenting information on the agency's **major capital projects** to the TPB on Wednesday, December 8. Projects are moving forward. The site at the landfill has 145,000 tons of soil for compression. Work is moving forward on options for the Olympia Transit Center as well as options for the Pattison Street expansion. The Authority will receive an update at its January work session.

The City of Olympia will likely not budget its share of the **Centennial Station** maintenance in 2011. Staff will discuss options at the Authority's January meeting.

**IAM negotiations** begin next week. Very few comparable systems settled on contracts.

**Snow removal** last week was handled well. There was some difficulty on November 29. The City of Olympia managed hills and trouble spots very well. Incidents were minimal.

There is no **CAC or Authority work session** in December.

Several sets of **solar lights** were installed at bus shelters.

Shenkel's developed a method of using **bio-diesel fuel** during cold and warmer weather to maximize the use of B20 over the winter months.

### **AUTHORITY ISSUES**

Rogers commented on a recent positive conversation with a fellow bus passenger who was having difficulty deciphering the transit guide.

Green thanked everyone for the recognition.

Clarkson reported on Dean's departure from the Lacey City Council. He's requested appointment to fill Dean's position on the Authority.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**It was M/S/A by Councilmember Baker and Citizen Representative Green to adjourn the meeting at 7:51 p.m.**

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**

**ATTEST**

---

**Martin Thies, Vice Chair**

---

**Rhodetta Seward  
Director of Executive Services/**

**Clerk to the Authority**

**Date Approved: January 5, 2011**

Prepared by Valerie L. Gow, Recording Secretary/President  
Puget Sound Meeting Services

PERIOD DATES: 10/24-11/6/2010						PAYDAY 11/12/2010						PERIOD DATES: 11/7-20/2010						PAYDAY 11/26/2010																																																					
	CODES		PAY PERIOD CHECK NO.	1ST CHECK AMOUNT	1ST TRANSFER AMOUNT		CODES		PAY PERIOD CHECK NO.	2ND CHECK AMOUNT	2ND TRANSFER AMOUNT		CODES		PAY PERIOD CHECK NO.	2ND CHECK AMOUNT	2ND TRANSFER AMOUNT																																																						
3	FIT		WIRE	59,404.73	59,404.73	3	FIT		WIRE	57,791.02	57,791.02	4	MT	8082.76	WIRE	16,165.52	16,165.52	4	MT	7948.47	WIRE	15,896.94	15,896.94																																																
5	AL/34	Life Ins.	Check	798.99	0.00	5	AL/34	Life Ins.	Check	2,082.11	0.00	6	DI/32	Disability In:	Check	976.15	0.00	6	DI/32	Disability In:	Check	2,476.17	0.00	7	HI/38	Health In1st	Check	9,059.00	0.00	7	HI/38	Health In1st	Check	252,109.00	0.00	8	TH/39	Taxed Hlth	Check	739.00	0.00	8	TH/39	Taxed Hlth	Check	739.00	0.00																								
9	CC/61	Child Care	Hofstetter	192.31		9	CC/61	Child Care	Hofstetter	192.31		10	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	0.00		10	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	0.00		11	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	793.99		11	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	739.99		12	CS/09	DSHS	EFT	616.50	616.50	12	CS/09	DSHS	EFT	616.50	616.50	13	CS/09	Stockard	Check	339.02	344.02	13	CS/09	Stockard	Check	339.02	344.02												
14	D1/98	D.Dep. #1	WIRE	7,007.98	7,007.98	14	D1/98	D.Dep. #1	WIRE	6,749.65	6,749.65	15	D2/97	D.Dep. #2	WIRE	21,795.82	21,795.82	15	D2/97	D.Dep. #2	WIRE	21,655.22	21,655.22																																																
16	GN/08	James	Check			16	GN/08	Riker	Check	0.00		16	GN/08	Riker	Check			16	GN/08	James	Check	0.00		17	GT/63	G.Ed.Tuit	Check	150.00		17	GT/63	G.Ed.Tuit	Check	150.00																																					
18	DC/97	Vgrd Empl	Wire	38,352.07		18	DC/97	Vgrd Empl	Wire	37,829.23		19	DC/22	Vgrd Emplr	Wire	26,669.93	65,022.00	19	DC/22	Vgrd Emplr	Wire	26,416.29	64,245.52	20	L2/29	401k Ln#2	Wire	2,440.50		20	L2/29	401k Ln#2	Wire	2,667.28		20	LN/29	401k Ln #1	Wire	7,871.81	10,312.31	20	LN/29	401k Ln #1	Wire	7,805.51	10,472.79	22	TTL VNGRD		75,334.31			22	TTL VNGRD		74,718.31														
23	LI/02	L&i	Check	20,610.21		23	LI/02	L&i	Check	20,510.15	0.00																																																												
24	MD/51	Mch.UnDues	Check	1,100.53		24	MD/51	Mch.UnDues	Check	1,100.72		25	MI/52	Mac.Initiation	Check	0.00		25	MI/52	Mac.Initiation	Check	0.00		26	MS/60		Check	0.00	0.00	26	MS/60		Check	0.00	0.00																																				
27	MS/60	Mayo draw	draw check	0.00	0.00	27	R1		draw	0.00	0.00	28						28	R2				0.00																																																
29	PA/66	Proj.Assist	Direct Dep	403.50		29	PA/66	Proj.Assist	Direct Dep	400.00																																																													
30	PN/04	PERS emple	EFT	24,675.20	0.00	30	PN/04	PERS emple	EFT	24,522.48	0.00	31	PN/04	PERS emplr	EFT	31,700.58	56,375.78	31	PN/04	PERS emplr	EFT	31,625.96	56,148.44	32	TTL PERS		56,375.78			32	TTL PERS		56,148.44																																						
33	R3/20	ICMA Ln#2	WIRE	261.07	0.00	33	R3/20	ICMA Ln#2	WIRE	261.07	0.00	34	RC/24	ICMA Emple	WIRE	6,473.70		34	RC/24	ICMA Emple	WIRE	6,567.74	0.00	35	RI/23	ICMA Roth	WIRE	125.00	125.00	35	RI/23	ICMA Roth	WIRE	125.00	125.00	36	RL/21	ICMA Ln#1	WIRE	1,207.75	1,468.82	36	RL/21	ICMA Ln#1	WIRE	1,207.75	1,468.82	37	RR/25	ICMA emplr	WIRE	3,235.71	9,709.41	37	RR/25	ICMA emplr	WIRE	3,338.48	9,906.22	38	TTL ICMA	<b>11,178.23</b>	<b>11,303.23</b>			38	TTL ICMA	<b>11,375.04</b>	<b>11,500.04</b>		
39	SD/26	Defr Empl	EFT	8,198.98		39	SD/26	Defr Empl	EFT	8,310.35		40	SR/27	Defr Emplr	EFT	3,788.63	11,987.61	40	SR/27	Defr Emplr	EFT	3,812.30	12,122.65																																																
41	UC/45	Un COPE		170.00		41	UC/45	Un COPE				42	UA/44	Un Assess	Check			42	UA/44	Un Assess	Check	534.00		43	UD/42	Un Dues	Check	4,509.18		43	UD/42	Un Dues	Check	4,456.66		44	UI/41	Un Initiati	Check	0.00		44	UI/41	Un Initiati	Check	0.00		45	UT/43	Un Tax	Check	1,998.00		45	UT/43	Un Tax	Check		0.00												
46	UW/62	United Way	Check	829.00		46	UW/62	United Way	Check	824.00		47	WF/64	Wellness	Direct Dep	275.50		47	WF/64	Wellness	Direct Dep	273.00																																																	
48	NET PAY (dir. Deposit)			382,995.30	382,995.30	48	Net Pay (Dir. Dep.)			375,232.87	375,232.87	50	TOTAL TRANSFER			<b>\$643,330.80</b>		49	TOTAL TRANSFER			<b>\$632,775.66</b>		51	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			<b>\$691,728.34</b>		50	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			<b>\$922,345.78</b>		52	GROSS EARNINGS:			599,448.48		51	GROSS EARNINGS:			595,871.01		53	EMPR MISC DED:			84,197.10		52	EMPR MISC DED:			318,526.30		54	EMPR MEDICARE TAX:			8,082.76		53	EMPR MEDICARE TAX:				7,948.47
54	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			<b>\$691,728.34</b>		54	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			<b>\$922,345.78</b>		55						55						56	TOTAL PAYROLL FOR MONTH:			<b>\$1,614,074.12</b>		56	TOTAL PAYROLL FOR MONTH:			<b>\$1,614,074.12</b>																																					



PERIOD DATES: 11/21-12/4/2010						PERIOD DATES: 12/5-18/2010					
PAYDAY 12/10/2010						PAYDAY 12/24/2010					
	CODES		PAY PERIOD CHECK NO.	1ST CHECK AMOUNT	1ST TRANSFER AMOUNT		CODES		PAY PERIOD CHECK NO.	2ND CHECK AMOUNT	2ND TRANSFER AMOUNT
3	FIT		WIRE	59,995.46	59,995.46	3	FIT		WIRE	58,769.30	58,769.30
4	MT	8121.59	WIRE	16,243.18	16,243.18	4	MT	8155.31	WIRE	16,310.62	16,310.62
5	AL/34	Life Ins.	Check	790.75	0.00	5	AL/34	Life Ins.	Check	2,107.40	0.00
6	DI/32	Disability In:	Check	937.01	0.00	6	DI/32	Disability In:	Check	2,506.30	0.00
7	HI/38	Health In1st	Check	6,752.50	0.00	7	HI/38	Health In1st	Check	252,698.50	0.00
8	TH/39	Taxed Hlth	Check	739.00	0.00	8	TH/39	Taxed Hlth	Check	739.00	0.00
9	CC/61	Child Care	Hofstetter	192.31		9	CC/61	Child Care	Hofstetter	192.31	
10	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	0.00		10	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	0.00	
11	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	740.58		11	GN/08	Garnish	Manual	406.83	
12	CS/09	DSHS	EFT	616.50	616.50	12	CS/09	DSHS	EFT	616.50	616.50
13	CS/09	Stockard	Check	339.02	344.02	13	CS/09	Stockard	EFT	339.02	344.02
14	D1/98	D.Dep. #1	WIRE	7,087.35	7,087.35	14	D1/98	D.Dep. #1	WIRE	6,640.46	6,640.46
15	D2/97	D.Dep. #2	WIRE	21,533.06	21,533.06	15	D2/97	D.Dep. #2	WIRE	21,658.76	21,658.76
16	GN/08	James	Check			16	GN/08	Riker	Check	0.00	
16	GN/08	Riker	Check			16	GN/08	James	Check	0.00	
17	GT/63	G.Ed.Tuit	Check	150.00		17	GT/63	G.Ed.Tuit	Check	150.00	
18	DC/97	Vgrd Empl	Wire	37,966.07		18	DC/97	Vgrd Empl	Wire	38,645.70	
19	DC/22	Vgrd Emplr	Wire	26,542.30	64,508.37	19	DC/22	Vgrd Emplr	Wire	26,747.18	65,392.88
20	L2/29	401k Ln#2	Wire	2,679.84		20	L2/29	401k Ln#2	Wire	2,814.81	
20	LN/29	401k Ln #1	Wire	7,750.69	10,430.53	20	LN/29	401k Ln #1	Wire	7,882.40	10,697.21
22	TTL VNGRD			74,938.90		22	TTL VNGRD		76,090.09		
23	LI/02	L&I	Check	18,195.06		23	LI/02	L&I	Check	20,393.21	0.00
24	MD/51	Mch.UnDues	Check	1,100.53		24	MD/51	Mch.UnDues	Check	1,100.72	
25	MI/52	Mac.Initiation	Check	0.00		25	MI/52	Mch.Initiation	Check	0.00	
26	MS/60		Check	0.00	0.00	26	MS/60		Check	0.00	0.00
27	MS/60	Reverse Ste	draw check	-167.29	0.00	27	R1	Rollins draw	draw	204.02	0.00
28					0.00	28	R2				0.00
29	PA/66	Proj.Assist	Direct Dep	400.00		29	PA/66	Proj.Assist	Direct Dep	400.00	
30	PN/04	PERS emple	EFT	24,542.29	0.00	30	PN/04	PERS emple	EFT	24,621.68	0.00
31	PN/04	PERS emplr	EFT	31,614.76	56,157.05	31	PN/04	PERS emplr	EFT	31,717.68	56,339.36
32	TTL PERS			56,157.05		32	TTL PERS			56,339.36	
33	R3/20	ICMA Ln#2	WIRE	261.07	0.00	33	R3/20	ICMA Ln#2	WIRE	261.07	0.00
34	RC/24	ICMA Emple	WIRE	5,916.39		34	RC/24	ICMA Emple	WIRE	6,319.49	0.00
35	RI/23	ICMA Roth	WIRE	405.76	405.76	35	RI/23	ICMA Roth	WIRE	405.76	405.76
36	RL/21	ICMA Ln#1	WIRE	1,207.75	1,468.82	36	RL/21	ICMA Ln#1	WIRE	1,207.75	1,468.82
37	RR/25	ICMA emplr	WIRE	3,026.65	8,943.04	37	RR/25	ICMA emplr	WIRE	3,234.52	9,554.01
38	TTL ICMA	10,411.86		10,817.62		38	TTL ICMA	11,022.83		11,428.59	
39	SD/26	Defr Emplee	EFT	8,839.40		39	SD/26	Defr Emplee	EFT	8,609.67	
40	SR/27	Defr Emplr	EFT	3,992.64	12,832.04	40	SR/27	Defr Emplr	EFT	3,854.58	12,464.25
41	UC/45	Un COPE		160.00		41	UC/45	Un COPE			
42	UA/44	Un Assess	Check			42	UA/44	Un Assess	Check	525.00	
43	UD/42	Un Dues	Check	4,410.49		43	UD/42	Un Dues	Check	4,393.86	
44	UI/41	Un Initiatn	Check	0.00		44	UI/41	Un Initiatn	Check	0.00	
45	UT/43	Un Tax	Check	1,956.64		45	UT/43	Un Tax	Check	0.00	
46	UW/62	United Way	Check	860.00		46	UW/62	United Way	Check	834.00	
47	WF/64	Wellness	Direct Dep	273.00		47	WF/64	Wellness	Direct Dep	273.00	
48	NET PAY (dir. Deposit)			384,963.47	384,963.47	48	Net Pay (Dir. Dep.)			377,694.58	377,694.58
	Paychecks			3,309.78			Paychecks			4,673.88	
50	TOTAL TRANSFER				\$645,528.65	49	TOTAL TRANSFER				\$638,356.53
51	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			\$686,324.01		50	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			\$929,949.56	
52	GROSS EARNINGS:			597,767.29		51	GROSS EARNINGS:			602,156.45	
53	EMPR MISC DED:			80,435.13		52	EMPR MISC DED:			319,637.80	
	EMPR MEDICARE TAX:			8,121.59		53	EMPR MEDICARE TAX:			8,155.31	
54						54					
55	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			\$686,324.01		54	TOTAL PAYROLL*:			\$929,949.56	
56						55					
						56	TOTAL PAYROLL FOR MONTH:			\$1,616,273.57	

## TRPC Members & Representatives

**City of Lacey**  
Virgil Clarkson

**City of Olympia**  
Stephen Buxbaum

**City of Rainier**  
Dennis McVey

**City of Tenino**  
Ken Jones

**City of Tumwater**  
Ed Stanley

**City of Yelm**  
Robert Isom

**Town of Bucoda**  
Gary Givens

**Thurston County**  
Cathy Wolfe

**Intercity Transit**  
Sandra Romero

**LOTT Clean Water Alliance**  
Cynthia Pratt

**Thurston PUD**  
Paul Pickett

**Olympia School District**  
Allen Miller

**North Thurston Public Schools**  
Chuck Namit

**Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation**  
Pending

**Nisqually Indian Tribe**  
Willie Frank  
James Slape

### Associate Members

**CAPCOM**  
Karen Valenzuela

**Economic Development Council of Thurston County**  
Joseph Beaulieu

**Lacey Fire District #3**  
Gene Dobry

**Puget Sound Regional Council**  
Norman Abbott

**The Evergreen State College**  
Paul Smith

**Timberland Regional Library**  
Emmett O'Connell



REGIONAL VISION • COOPERATION • INFORMATION

## PRE-AGENDA Friday, January 7, 2011 8:30-11:00 a.m.

The TRPC pre-agenda provides our members the opportunity to review the topics of the upcoming TRPC meeting. This information is forwarded in advance to afford your councils and boards the opportunity for discussion at your regular meetings. This will provide your designated representative with information that can be used for their participation in the Regional Council meeting. For more information, please visit our website at [www.trpc.org](http://www.trpc.org).

### Consent Calendar

### ACTION

These items were presented at the previous meeting. They are action items and will remain on consent unless pulled for further discussion.

- a. Approval of Minutes – December 3, 2010
- b. Approval of Vouchers
- c. Approval of CY 2011 Funding Awards Process – In December TRPC reviewed the Transportation Policy Board recommendation for how to conduct the 2011 transportation funding process. No issues or concerns were identified. TRPC is asked to approve the funding process. This action will commence the call for proposals.
- d. Approval of the Scope of Work - 2011 RTP Amendment – TRPC keeps the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) up to date with an annual review and amendment process. Approval of the proposed scope of work kicks off the 2011 amendment process. TRPC discussed this topic in December.

### Special Recognition – Pete Swensson Retirement

### RECOGNITION

### RTIP Amendment – WSDOT – I-5 Ramp Meters

### ACTION

WSDOT proposes adding ramp meters to the northbound on-ramps at Nisqually Road and Marvin Road interchanges. TRPC is asked to take action at the first hearing of this project in January because this is part of a fast-tracked congestion mitigation collaboration between Joint Base Lewis McChord and WSDOT.

TRPC is asked to take action on the proposal in January.

### Intercity Transit – Major Capital Projects

### PRESENTATION

Intercity Transit is heavily dependent on the availability of state and/or federal funds to complete major capital projects. The two primary sources of these funds have been the State of Washington Regional Mobility Grant program and annual discretionary grants, or “earmarks”, through the federal budget. The Regional Mobility Grant program has funded the Martin Way Park-and-Ride facility and the Hawks Prairie Park-and-Ride facility. Federal discretionary grants have funded the purchase of new buses and the Olympia Transit Center project. Intercity Transit staff will provide policy makers an informative briefing on the status of these major capital facility projects.

### 2011 State Legislative Session

### DISCUSSION

The Council will continue its discussion on Legislative plans and strategies in light of election outcomes.

### Call for Written Officer Nominations

### INFORMATION

As called for in the TRPC by-laws, the Chair will solicit nominations for office in writing from all voting member representatives. At the February meeting, as part of the election process, the Chair will present the slate of nominees to be considered for each position as well as taking nominations from the floor.

### TRPC 2011 Operating Budget

### ACTION

Each January, TRPC adopts a consolidated agency operating-budget that reflects the approved Regional Work Program as well as contract work.

Presented to Council for review and action.

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8-A**  
**MEETING DATE: January 5, 2011**

**FOR:** Intercity Transit Authority

**FROM:** Ann Freeman-Manzanares, 705-5838

**SUBJECT:** Purchase of Dial-A-Lift Vehicles

- 
- 1) **The Issue:** Consideration of the purchase of nine Dial-A-Lift vehicles.
- 
- 2) **Recommended Action:** Authorize the General Manager to issue a purchase order to Schetky Northwest Sales for the purchase of nine Dial-A-Lift vehicles pursuant to Washington State Contract #6209 in the amount of \$806,787.
- 
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** The Procurement Policy states the Authority must approve any contract over \$25,000.
- 
- 4) **Background:** The purchase of eight replacement and one expansion Dial-A-Lift van is included in the 2011 budget and identified in the Strategic Plan. These are replacing 2004 model year vehicles which exceeded their expected lifespan and are ready to be retired. The expansion vehicle will address the yearly addition of 2000 service hours and allow us to better address peak pull-out and periodic maintenance issues.
- The State of Washington completed a competitive Request for Proposal process for Light to Medium Duty Accessible Cut-Away transit vehicles. El Dorado vehicles, represented by Schetky Northwest Sales, was selected for this vehicle class. Intercity Transit is eligible to purchase off this contract as a member of the Washington State Purchasing Cooperative. The State has confidence in Schetky Northwest Sales ability to perform and believes the price to be fair and reasonable.
- Intercity Transit staff concurs with the State's assessment regarding fair and reasonable pricing and their ability to perform. Staff has confidence that these vehicles are mechanically sound and will serve our customers well.
- 
- 5) **Alternatives:**
- A. Authorize the General Manager to issue a purchase order to Schetky Northwest Sales for the purchase of nine Dial-A-Lift vehicles pursuant to Washington State Contract #6209 in the amount of \$806,787.

B. Defer action. There is a four month delivery timeframe for these vehicles.

---

6) **Budget Notes:** The 2011 budget includes \$998,000 for the purchase of nine Dial-A-Lift vehicles.

---

7) **Goal References:** Goal No. 2: *"Providing outstanding customer service."*

---

8) **Reference:** N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8-B**  
**MEETING DATE: January 5, 2011**

**FOR:** Intercity Transit Authority

**FROM:** Ann Freeman-Manzanares, 705-5838

**SUBJECT:** Federal Advocacy Services

---

1) **The Issue:** Consideration of a one-year contract extension to Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs for the provision of federal advocacy services.

---

2) **Recommended Action:** Authorize the General Manager to execute a one-year contract extension with Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs to provide federal advocacy services on a retainer basis of \$6,000 per month.

---

3) **Policy Analysis:** The Procurement Policy states the Authority must approve any contract over \$25,000.

---

4) Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs (GTHGA) was selected early in 2008 to provide advocacy support services in Washington, D.C. for our federal grant requests. For continued support in 2011, staff proposes to exercise the contract's third of four option years.

Obtaining federal transit funding is a highly competitive process whether received through the congressionally designated earmarks or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) discretionary programs. Funds are made available in a dynamic economic and political environment that is ever changing and characterized by uncertainty even in the best of times. The uncertainty of future federal funding available to local agencies is particularly apparent given the current highly charged debate in Washington, D.C. surrounding federal fiscal year 2011 appropriations and authorization to extend or replace SAFETEA-LU, the funding and authorization bill that governs United States federal surface transportation spending.

It has been helpful to have GTHGA'S advocacy support "on the ground" in Washington, D.C. Identifying and staying in touch with appropriate members of Congress and the Senate and their staff is essential to a successful effort to secure funding. This type of advocacy is difficult to do from the outside. One recent example of success in securing federal funding with the help of GTHGA

and Senator Murray was the 2008 earmark for design and the 2009 earmark to be used on construction for our Olympia Transit Center expansion project.

Other examples of federal funding success from 2008 forward includes funds for replacement buses: \$2.3 million of ARRA stimulus funds awarded in 2009; federal earmarks totaling over \$2.1 million between 2008 and 2010; and 2010 State of Good Repair grant funding from the FTA for \$2 million for replacement buses.

Our past success in securing federal funding cannot solely be directly correlated with GTHGA's advocacy efforts, but they have been working on our behalf in Washington, D.C. since 2008 to help achieve the success we experienced. Staff recommends continuing to use the talents and experience of GTHGA in helping to influence decision makers and helping to keep us informed on issues that make us more competitive for future discretionary federal funding.

---

5) **Alternatives:**

- A. Authorize the General Manager to enter into a one-year contract extension with Gordon Thomas Honeywell Governmental Affairs for federal advocacy services on a retainer basis of \$6,000 per month. This will assure continued support as Congress considers the 2011 and 2012 transportation appropriations and writes the new transportations authorization bill.
- B. Decline the option and allow the current contract to lapse. The earmark effort would return to being a staff exercise.

---

6) **Budget Notes:** The 2011 budget includes \$68,500 for federal advocacy services. This was an oversight and should have been budgeted at \$72,000.

---

7) **Goal Reference:** Securing grant funds for the development of capital projects and the purchase of vehicles supports Goal No. 2: *"Provide outstanding Customer Service."* It also supports Goal No. 4: *"Provide Responsive Transportation Options."*

---

8) **References:** Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell Governmental Affairs Report



## **Federal Funding Prospects in 2011 – An Early Look**

by Dale Learn & Nate Potter, Gordon Thomas Honeywell – GA (GTHGA)

As in any new Congress changes can occur, especially when there a new party in power such as will be in the US House of Representatives. This memo is intended to give a general analysis of all the potential options that may be available in 2011 to secure federal funding for critical projects. Overall, we expect some changes to occur and we must be ready to adapt our strategy accordingly. We are confident this can be done successfully.

### **CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING**

On Thursday, December 16, 2010, nine Senators walked out of the GOP caucus meeting and indicated they would no longer support the FY11 Omnibus Appropriations bill that was intended to fund all functions of the government through September 30, 2011. This was a surprise to most. For weeks, these Members had been working with the majority and indicated full support for the package. Included in that \$1.108 trillion dollar spending bill were 6,500 congressionally directed spending items (i.e. “earmarks”) worth more than \$8 billion. Instead of the Omnibus bill, the Congress has passed another Continuing Resolution (CR) until March 4, 2011 where the fate of federal spending for 2011 and of the earmarks in that bill will be made. The last time Congress flipped to a new political party in the majority, in 2006, the final decision on the budget also slipped into the following year. GOP leaders and Members in the Senate insist that the objections to the Omnibus were primarily about process and not substance. “The reason he [Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid] doesn’t have the votes is because members on this side increasingly felt concern about the way we do business,” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell said. “For many, it’s not about the substance, but about the process.”

While we now have to wait until late-February/early-March to likely learn the final resolution of the FY11 Appropriations bills and that of the earmarks, we have to be prepared to adjust to a new paradigm and use our expertise, advocacy and political influence to get federal funding in any potentially new process.

Elections have consequences. The GOP captured the House and narrowed their deficit in the Senate by running on an anti-Washington, DC and anti-spending platform. They are now asserting themselves and preparing for a split Congress next year. The GOP also continues to contrast itself politically with the Obama Administration. This is evident when it comes to the discussion surrounding congressionally directed spending. The House and Senate Republicans

1201 Pacific Ave, Suite 2100  
Tacoma, WA 98401  
Phone: (253) 620-6500  
Fax: (253) 620-6565

[www.gth-gov.com](http://www.gth-gov.com)

203 Maryland Ave., NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Phone: (202) 544-2681  
Fax: (202) 544-5763

have now instituted a moratorium on earmarks for next year, although at this point all Senators retain the right to seek specific funding provisions for their states. The House moratorium seems to be more encompassing, though there are already efforts underway to carve out exemptions from what is defined as an “earmark,” including allowing projects that are considered “infrastructure,” such as transportation, US Army Corps of Engineers and water projects. In areas such as Defense funding, there are rumblings that Members are trying to redefine earmarks and starting to use definitions such as “Member Program Adjustments.” What is clear is that while the political rhetoric for a moratorium is popular, many are starting to get uncomfortable with the notion of the President having most, if not all, the power in determining where federal dollars go. For example, on the Senate side, a vote was conducted on November 30, 2010 to ban earmarks for the next three years. It failed 39-56. As time goes on we can anticipate more defections on this issue and will likely see support for a process where Members will have direct political influence on federal spending (*see below*).

The practical result of what has developed over the last month is that the hope for securing congressionally directed spending in the House appropriations bills for FY12 seems to be low (outside of possible exemptions that may arise of things like “infrastructure”). However, as of now, individual Senators retain the right to decide whether to seek earmarks for projects in their states. Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and most Democratic Senators have stated they support the constitutionally determined right of Congress to control the “power of the purse.” Senator Reid has stated that “we have a constitutional obligation, a responsibility to do congressionally directed spending. I think I have an obligation to the people of Nevada to do what is important to Nevada, not what is important to some bureaucrat down here with green eyeshades. So I am not going to personally back off bringing stuff back to Nevada.” Most Democrats continue to support Senator Reid on congressionally directed spending, including our two US Senators: Patty Murray and Maria Cantwell.

Several senior Republican Senators, such as Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, Thad Cochran of Mississippi, Susan Collins of Maine, Kit Bond of Missouri, James Inhofe of Oklahoma and Richard Lugar of Indiana, have concurred with Senator Reid and the majority of Democratic Senators. Senator Murkowski (R-AK), stated recently that “the notion that Congress would abdicate its constitutional duty and turn federal spending over to government bureaucrats is wrong and goes against the Constitution’s mandate that says the power of the purse lies with the legislative branch of government. Furthermore, an earmark moratorium will not reduce the level of spending by one cent or decrease the deficit. We recognize that we need to stop out-of-control spending, but let’s make sure that the action we take actually translates into spending and deficit reduction rather than just messaging.”

Senator Lugar echoed this perspective by stating that “I oppose the Senate Republican Conference voluntary moratorium on so-called “earmarks.” At a moment in which over-spending by the federal government perpetuates annual deficits of over \$1 trillion a year, the Congress is being asked to debate a Congressional earmark spending resolution which will save no money even while giving the impression that the Congress is attempting to meet the public demand to reduce spending. Instead of surrendering Constitutional authority to Washington



bureaucrats and the Obama Administration, Congress should focus on reducing spending on both entitlement and discretionary spending programs.” The result is the practice of including these items in appropriations bills will likely continue in the Senate. Both our Senators have indicated they will be accepting and requesting projects.

With the two chambers and those within the political parties having such wide differences on this issue, the bottom line for now is that securing funding through the traditional appropriations process in FY12 may be different than in the past. However, with all challenges come opportunities. We believe those that adapt to this new environment the quickest will be positioned to make the most gains. In light of the recent election results and significant potential for legislative gridlock related to appropriations, it is very important to continue marketing to the agencies and program managers who can work for our priorities through pre-positioned competitive grant funding and other support mechanisms. We anticipate doing this while at the same time working through the Senate process of seeking congressionally directed funding. This would ensure that whatever process ends up dominating in the end, we are covered and have maximized our opportunities to get funding for our projects.

Fortunately, we have long believed that working Capitol Hill is only one component of a successful government relations strategy. We employ aggressive outreach and marketing techniques to connect our clients to key decision-makers throughout the federal government. GTHGA specializes in creating program opportunities for our clients and have a long record of accomplishment in securing corresponding federal funds, whether through Congress or from the agencies. These processes are often more involved and can take more work than the traditional earmarking process, but GTHGA has this history of success in these areas and will adapt our strategy should it become necessary.

As we begin to strategize about our activities for 2011, we will further emphasize our ongoing federal marketing efforts and also take advantage of alternative congressional funding activities such as those outlined below. There is still a lot of action going on behind the scenes. The final decision on how to handle the FY11 issues in late-February/early-March will give us some understanding how the year will go on these issues. We will keep you apprised of the latest developments. It is likely we will have to employ multiple methods simultaneously with the strong possibility one or more are what survives as the prevailing process. Please let us know if you have any questions or require additional information.

## **CONGRESS WILL STILL BE DIRECTING AGENCY SPENDING**

Despite the press indicating that congressional influence over agency spending and priorities would narrow with any diminishment of earmarks, in reality, Congress will continue to hold significant control over agency spending and will still be in a position to direct most of it. This is especially true of entities in a state like Washington, which have senior appropriators like Senator Patty Murray and Rep. Norm Dicks and other senior congressional members.

There will still be an annual budget process by which Congress will write the 12 appropriations bills. Only a very small portion of those bills and their accompanying reports have been dedicated to earmarked funding in the past. The bulk of those reports and bills contained language focused on directing the broader programmatic activities of federal agencies. It is common today for that language to be focused enough to be targeted without naming individual projects so that only one or a few can compete for the dollars. Should there be a change in the earmark policy of Congress; more Members will look to including directed language as a method to ensure their needs are taken care of. The various methods of including language are spelled out in more detail below.

## **REPORT LANGUAGE**

Report language is a place where directed spending activities will occur, as it is a currently utilized and accepted form of providing direction to agencies. For years, before and during earmarking, Members of Congress have told agencies in which type of projects to invest and how to carry out various programs through report language. Very little of this report language is challenged since it deals with such detailed elements of an agency's activity and agencies play a risky game if they do not follow the priorities set out for them in Congressional report language.

## **SOFT EARMARKS**

Soft earmarks continue to be a practice used to ensure that agencies provide funding to various applicants through competitive programs. In fact, earmarking got its start through soft earmarks. While direct soft earmarks that specifically name a funding recipient will likely not occur under any ban in the House, there are ways that soft earmarks can be crafted to ensure that funds are directed to a specific recipient or that the agency develops a specific type of funding solicitation. This is also important considering that agencies would be dealing with a lot more discretionary funding than they have had previously and do not have the man-power to give a thorough enough review. We saw this occur with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA or "federal stimulus") funds. One of the reasons federal stimulus funding has yet to be spent is due to the lack of man-power available to implement and oversee the funds. Congressional input will not only be politically wise to comply with but also practically needed with any reduction in traditional earmarking.

## **FOCUSED FUNDING PROGRAMS**

This started in the FY11 House Defense bill after the House Democrats prevented for-profit companies from requesting earmark funds. The chairman of the Subcommittee, Rep. Norm Dicks, developed a competitive funding program that was focused on providing dollars to small companies for innovative research. This was outside the existing Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) process and was very focused on DoD priorities. This program is likely to survive in some form when the final FY11 bills are finished in late-February/early-

March and could start a larger trend in non-DoD programs such as transportation, justice, interior, housing, energy and water infrastructure.

## **CONGRESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT IN THE COMPETITIVE FUNDING PROCESS**

Members of Congress have always weighed in through calls (creatively called “phone marking”) and letters to agencies (“letter marking”) to request funding from federal grant programs. Like the methods detailed above, if there is a reduced earmarking process, Congress is likely to look at increasing their activities in those areas, and may even expand their involvement into other types of funding solicitations. Congressional impute will become critical to a successful funding request under that scenario.

In our experience the key to gaining congressional engagement through phone and letter marking is to make the process as easy as possible – generally offices want to weigh in and help constituents, but if the process is extremely difficult then they will find it easy to turn away. Typically a letter followed up with a senior staff or Member call can greatly increase a grant application’s chances. We would craft the letter and prepare staff and/or the Member for such a call, which would make it easier on the office and thus more likely to help.

## **DIRECTED POLICY**

Although it can be a long process, the practice of getting Members to introduce legislative policy that is narrow enough to make a project the only, or one of few, possible recipients of federal funding is still a well used method. It would likely increase should earmarks diminish. Advocacy would be made on the language that fits a project(s) or program and then the staff/Member would follow up with a letter and call to the receiving entity on which project the Member intended to receive the money. This is much like the process of congressional engagement in the competitive funding process (*see above*) but on the front and back end rather than just the back end. This is also an effective method should a critical project that needs federal assistance does not currently fit into the eligibility criteria of a grant program. The grant program is crafted or simply amended so the project is eligible.

## **AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION**

Legislation such as the Defense Authorization Act, Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) and the reauthorization of the surface transportation bill (SAFETEA-LU) are vehicles that are pending and have had substantive and specific influence by Members of Congress in the past, including directed spending for projects. It is unknown if any earmark limitation would impact these pieces of legislation or would just include the appropriations process. There will be much political pressure by Members on the committees of jurisdiction to have some influence on how authorized money is allocated. In fact, a lot of the discussion on any exceptions on the House side as to what constitutes an “earmark” focuses on these types of bills. For example, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is currently the largest House committee with 74 Members, and most of the Members get on the Committee to

specifically fight for local projects in the reauthorization legislation. Other authorization bills that are similarly authorized include ones involving passenger rail, Coast Guard, MARAD, parks and Section 8 housing.

## **CONCLUSION**

The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress may make several changes to how entities seek and secure federal funding. There is still much that is unknown at this point, and it certainly is possible that little will change once the current rhetoric subsides. What we do know, however, is that Members of Congress will not easily give up their influence over how federal funding decisions are made. The methods they employ to secure federal funding may get more complicated and could take more effort on our part. The good news is GTHGA has extensive experience and success with all of the known methods of achieving positive federal budget results for clients. We also have shown an ability to adapt to new processes that may be created in these changes times.

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8-C**  
**MEETING DATE: January 5, 2011**

**FOR:** Intercity Transit Authority

**FROM:** Ann Freeman-Manzanares, 705-5838

**SUBJECT:** Vanpool Vehicle Purchase

---

1) **The Issue:** Consideration of the purchase of 47 vanpool vehicles.

---

2) **Recommended Actions:** Authorize the General Manager, pursuant to Washington State Contract 06310, to issue purchase orders to:

- Karmart Automotive Group for the purchase of twenty-three, 7-passenger Dodge Grand Caravans in the amount of \$520,876.
- Columbia Ford for the purchase of twenty-one, 12-passenger Ford Econolines in the amount of \$512,870 and three, 15-passenger Ford Econolines in the amount of \$79,097

The total cost of this purchase is \$1,112,843.

---

3) **Policy Analysis:** The Procurement Policy states the Authority must approve any contract over \$25,000.

---

4) **Background:** The State of Washington competitively bids their van contracts awarding to the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder for each vehicle class. Intercity Transit is eligible to purchase off this contract as a member of the Washington State Purchasing Cooperative. The Office of State Procurement has confidence in Karmart's and Columbia Ford's ability to perform and believes the price to be fair and reasonable.

Intercity Transit staff concurs with the State's assessment regarding fair and reasonable pricing and their ability to perform. Staff has confidence that these vehicles are mechanically sound and will serve our vanpool customers well.

---

5) **Alternatives:**

A. Authorize the General Manager, pursuant to Washington State Contract 06310, to issue purchase orders to:

- Karmart Automotive Group for the purchase of twenty-three, 7-passenger Dodge Grand Caravans in the amount of \$520,876.
- Columbia Ford for the purchase of twenty-one, 12-passenger Ford Econolines in the amount of \$512,870 and three, 15-passenger Ford Econolines in the amount of \$79,097

The total cost of this purchase is \$1,112,843.

- B. Defer action. To purchase 2011 model vehicles, orders must be placed prior to factory cut-off but no later than March 31, 2011.

---

6) **Budget Notes:** The proposed 2011 budget includes the purchase of 46 replacement vanpool vehicles. These vehicles are funded 80/20 through a state grant up to \$26,000 per vehicle. This purchase also includes the replacement of one vanpool vehicle involved in an accident which will be reimbursed through insurance.

---

7) **Goal Reference:** Goal No. 4: *"Provide responsive transportation options."*

---

8) **References:** N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8-D**  
**MEETING DATE: January 5, 2011**

**FOR:** Intercity Transit Authority

**FROM:** Mike Harbour, 705-5855

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Grants Awards for the Discounted Bus Pass Program

- 
- 1) **The Issue:** Whether to approve the award of grants under the Discounted Bus Pass Program.
- 
- 2) **Recommended Action:** Approve the grant awards illustrated in Attachment A.
- 
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** The Discounted Bus Pass Program is a new program approved by the Authority in December 2010. The Authority must approve the award of any grants under this program.
- 
- 4) **Background:** The Authority approved a pilot Discounted Bus Pass Program in December 2010. The program allocated up to \$200,000 in monthly bus passes for distribution to non-profit and government agencies in our community serving low-income persons. Monthly passes are available to these agencies at 50% of the regular cost through this program. The program is a pilot program and applicants were required to complete a grant application defining eligibility, how the passes will be used, and how matching funds will be provided. The deadline for submittal was December 22, 2010.

Twelve applications were received by the deadline. All applications were reviewed to ensure all appropriate documents were attached. The applications were then evaluated by Mike Harbour, General Manager; Emily Bergkamp, Dial-A-Lift Manager; and Rhodetta Seward, Executive Services Director.

Attachment A includes the organizations which applied, amount of passes requested, the proposed grant amount and a brief description of the clients served by the program. The total value of requested passes is \$105,495. The proposed grant award amount is \$52,747.50.

After evaluation of the applications, the evaluation team proposes grants be awarded to the twelve applicants for this program.

5) **Alternatives:**

- A. Approve the grant awards illustrated in the Attachment A.
  - B. Approve awards to selected agencies.
  - C. Delay awards to a later date.
- 

6) **Budget Notes:** The proposed grant award will have a maximum financial loss for Intercity Transit of \$52,747.50. This assumes that all monthly passes provided through this program are purchased at full price without this program. The program will not increase operating costs but could reduce revenue by the above amount.

---

7) **Goal Reference:** This addresses two goals of the Authority, Goal 1: *"Assess the transportation needs of our community."* Goal 4: *"Provide responsive transportation options."*

---

8) **References:** Attachment A: Recommended Discounted Bus Pass Program Grant Awards.



Attachment A: Recommended Discounted Bus Pass Program Grant Awards

Organization	Adult	Youth	Value	Grant Amount	Notes
Behavioral Health Resources	550	660	\$26,400	\$13,200	Program serves mentally and/or behaviorally disabled persons. Passes are for transportation to BHR appointments, medical, etc.
Capital Clubhouse	220		\$6600	\$3300	Serve chronically mentally ill persons. Passes are for low-income clients unable to meet transportation needs.
Community Youth Services	475	490	\$21,600	\$10,800	Serve at-risk youth. Passes provide needed transportation for access to programs and to assist in obtaining independence.
Drexel House	395		\$11,550	\$5775	Serve homeless and disabled single men and women. Passes are used to provide essential transportation to Drexel House residents. Drexel House is a combined emergency shelter, transitional housing facility.
DSHS Community Service	495	110	\$16,500	\$8250	Serve persons in the WorkFirst program. Passes provide essential transportation to participate in the program.
Family Support Center of South Sound	110		\$3300	\$1650	Provide case management services to homeless and at-risk adults and families. Passes will be provided to case-managed families in the homeless services program.
New Market Skills Center	220	220	\$9900	\$4950	Program will provide passes to low-income students to travel to program.
Olympia Union Gospel Mission	110	22	\$3630	\$1815	Serve homeless clients. Passes are to provide transportation to allow transition from program.
Out of the Woods Family Shelter	43	3	\$1335	\$667.50	Serve homeless families. Passes are for essential transportation.

Panza – Camp Quixote	55		\$1650	\$825	Serve homeless tent city. Passes allow access to jobs and other services.
Senior Services for South Sound	46		\$1380	\$690	Program provides transportation to clients not yet eligible for reduced fare passes.
Thurston County, Public Health and Social Services, Veterans' Assistance Fund	55		\$1650	\$825	Program is for veterans and eligible dependents with focus on veterans in shelters or being released from correctional facilities.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2774</b>	<b>1505</b>	<b>\$105,495</b>	<b>\$52,747.50</b>	

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**AGENDA ITEM NO. 8-E**  
**MEETING DATE: January 5, 2011**

**FOR:** Intercity Transit Authority

**FROM:** Mike Harbour, 705-5855

**SUBJECT:** Funding for Maintenance and Operation of Centennial Station

- 
- 1) **The Issue:** To determine how to approach the funding of the maintenance and operation of Centennial Station without the City of Olympia's participation.
- 
- 2) **Recommended Action:** Provide direction to staff on next steps to address the funding and maintenance of Centennial Station.
- 
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** The Intercity Transit Authority assumed ownership of Centennial Station in 1993 and entered into interlocal agreements with local jurisdictions to fund maintenance of the facility. Changes to this funding arrangement are policy issues requiring Authority action.
- 
- 4) **Background:** Prior to 1993, the Amtrak depot was located in East Olympia just off Rich Road. A group was gathered (Amtrak Depot Committee) to investigate potential sites for a new facility. The Centennial Station site was owned by Thurston County and was used as a gravel borrow pit, but was no longer in use. The county gave their concurrence to develop a facility on that site.

The county was initially responsible for the program. The Washington State Department of Transportation funded the original parking area and platform using park and ride funds. The depot committee expanded its focus to develop the new site. The county made staff available to help manage construction of the site.

As the facility progressed, the county began backing away from ongoing operation of the facility. The cities and port have direct legal authority to operate such facilities, but Intercity Transit was designated to take the role. At the time Intercity Transit assumed the role, it was agreed the other jurisdictions would participate in its operational expenses based on how Thurston Regional Planning Council dues were then collected.

The 2011 allocation of expenses is:

Thurston County	27%	\$16,600
Intercity Transit	25%	\$15,730
City of Olympia	18%	\$11,067
City of Lacey	16%	\$9837
City of Tumwater	6%	\$3689
Port of Olympia	6%	\$3689
City of Yelm	2%	\$1230

With the transfer of responsibility from the county to Intercity Transit, the county deeded the property to Intercity Transit, and the Amtrak Depot Committee granted all rights that they might claim to improvements at the site.

The original discussion with the jurisdictions was they would fund staffing at the facility. It turned out we had an energetic volunteer committee and an even larger interested group of volunteers who assumed the staffing role. Funding was needed to maintain and operate the station. The 2011 budget for the station is \$71,000 with local jurisdictions required to pay \$61,481. The City of Olympia's 2011 share of these costs is \$11,067. The Intercity Transit share is \$15,370.

Interlocal agreements are in effect with all parties to fund the station's maintenance and upkeep through 2013.

- 
- 5) **Alternatives:** The Authority has several alternatives:
- A: Direct staff to call a meeting of all involved jurisdictions to discuss future funding of Centennial station.
  - B: Assume the City of Olympia's share in 2011.
  - C: Reduce expenditures on the station by \$11,067 in 2011.
  - D: Assume full funding of the station's maintenance and operation in 2012 or at the end of the current interlocal agreements.
- 
- 6) **Budget Notes:** Assuming the City of Olympia's share of funding in 2011 will require an expenditure of \$11,067. Assuming full costs of maintaining and operating the station will increase Intercity Transit's annual costs by approximately \$45,000 per year.
- 
- 7) **Goal Reference:** Goal 2: *"Provide outstanding customer service."* Goal 4: *"Provide responsive transportation options."*
- 
- 8) **References:** N/A

**INTERCITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY**  
**AGENDA ITEM NO. 12**  
**MEETING DATE: January 5, 2011**

**FOR:** Intercity Transit Authority

**FROM:** Mike Harbour, 705-5855

**SUBJECT:** Collective Bargaining Agreement between the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 160 and Intercity Transit

- 
- 1) **The Issue:** Whether to approve a collective bargaining agreement between Intercity Transit and the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 160 (IAM).
- 
- 2) **Recommended Action:** Approve the proposed agreement.
- 
- 3) **Policy Analysis:** The Authority must approve any collective bargaining agreements between Intercity Transit and organizations representing employees.
- 
- 4) **Background:** The IAM represented the Intercity Transit's maintenance employees since 1994. A one-year contract was negotiated for the 2010 year due to the uncertainty of future funding. This contract gave IAM employees a 3.5% general wage increase in 2010. This matched the ATU contract for 2010.
- A three-year contract is proposed. The details of the proposed contract will be discussed in Executive Session prior to a vote on the proposed agreement. The parties meet again on December 29, 2010, to finalize an agreement. It is possible there will not be agreement on the contract at the time of the Authority meeting. In this case, the progress of the negotiations will be reviewed in Executive Session, and the Authority will be asked to approve a contract at a later date.
- 
- 5) **Alternatives:** The Authority may approve the proposed collective bargaining agreement or direct staff to return to negotiations.
- 
- 6) **Budget Notes:** The collective bargaining agreement will dictate wage and other benefit costs for IAM-represented employees over the next three years. IAM represents approximately 12% of Intercity Transit employees.
- 
- 7) **Goal Reference:** N/A
-

- 8) **References:** A summary of the proposed agreement will be provided at the Authority meeting.