



Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard*
for publication on April 6, 2018.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
BOARD HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING**

Tuesday, April 10, 2018

5:30 p.m.

LTD Board Room

3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene (in Glenwood)

Public testimony will not be heard at this meeting.

A G E N D A

- | <u>Time</u> | |
|-------------|--|
| 5:30 p.m. | I. CALL TO ORDER |
| | II. ROLL CALL |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Wick <input type="checkbox"/> Wildish <input type="checkbox"/> Yeh (chair) |
| 5:35 p.m. | III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Minutes of the March 9, 2018, Board Human Relations Committee Meeting• Minutes of the March 19, 2018, Board Human Relations Committee Meeting |
| 5:40 p.m. | IV. DISCUSSION REGARDING 2018 GENERAL MANAGER CONTRACT RENEWAL |
| 6:30 p.m. | V. ADJOURNMENT |

The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. If you require any special physical or language accommodations, including alternative formats of printed materials, please contact LTD's Administration office as far in advance of the meeting as possible and no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. To request these arrangements, please call 682-5555 (voice) or 7-1-1 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).

MINUTES OF HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

Friday, March 9, 2018

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 7, 2018, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Human Resources Committee of the Lane Transit District held a meeting on Friday, March 9, 2018, beginning at 3:00 p.m., at the LTD Board Room, 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: Carl Yeh (via teleconference)
April Wick
Camille Gandolfi, Clerk of the Board
Roland Hoskins, Assistant General Manager Administrative Services
Kristin Denmark, General Counsel
Assistant General Manager Service Delivery Mark Johnson
Director of Human Resources David Collier
Lynn Taylor, Minutes Recorder

Absent: Gary Wildish

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL — Mr. Yeh convened the meeting of the Human Resources (HR) Committee and called the roll.

DISCUSS AND REFINE 2018 GOALS FOR GENERAL MANAGER — Mr. Yeh noted committee members received a handout entitled *General Manager 2018 Proposed Goals*, which contained proposals from each of the HR Committee's members.

Ms. Denmark reminded the committee that at its last meeting a decision was made to establish three broad goals, with specific items that came under those goals. She said the broad goals were:

1. Performance metrics
2. Community relations
3. Specific deliverables related to items of importance in the coming year

Ms. Denmark said she had developed some proposed definitions for those categories and items on the handout would fall under those different categories.

Performance Metrics

Ms. Denmark said there had been a discussion about tying this goal into the American Bus Benchmarking Group (ABBG) statistics. She said Ms. Jackson had suggested developing a process for LTD's continuous improvement in the ABBG criteria and Mr. Johnson could provide additional information about criteria of particular interest.

Mr. Johnson said ABBG focused on four areas:

- Financials - currently an important issue for LTD's Board. Included metrics such as cost per mile, cost per passenger, etc. Performance measures could address issues such as cost savings and efficiency
- Safety - the Board had expressed interest in the Vision Zero initiative
- Customer satisfaction - are LTD's customers being well served? Metrics and targets might be established around LTD's annual customer satisfaction survey

Ms. Denmark said the goals proposed by Mr. Wildish fell into the performance metrics category.

Mr. Yeh said the goals should be specific about the goals to which Ms. Jackson would be held accountable.

Ms. Denmark said that Ms. Jackson could provide recommendations to the Board on areas of focus for performance metrics, based on technical information provided by staff.

Mr. Johnson said the new ABBG report was issued last week and staff could review it and offer some recommendations for Board consideration, taking into account the specific measures listed by Mr. Wildish.

Ms. Wick agreed that the three broad goals were consistent with issues the Board frequently addressed at its meetings.

Community Relations

Ms. Denmark summarized that the first year of Ms. Jackson's contract the goal was to become involved in the community; the second year placed importance on building a relationship with the LTD Board and staff. Based on information provided by Ms. Jackson and proposals from committee members, she suggested the goal could be defined as continued relationship building with the community and LTD stakeholders in a manner that mirrored LTD's stated vision and goals. She distributed and reviewed a handout entitled What Drives Us that summarized the vision and goals. She said Ms. Jackson also stressed that the goal should include continued community building with the Board; relationship building with staff could be eliminated, with the focus now on the broader community and LTD stakeholders.

Mr. Yeh concurred with Ms. Denmark's suggestions.

Ms. Wick felt it was important to retain both Board and staff relationship building in the goal.

Mr. Johnson said all of LTD's efforts were geared toward serving the community and staff was actively engaged with many committees and groups through the community. He said Ms. Jackson's participation was at a higher level, through serving on various boards.

Ms. Denmark asked if the committee wished to include relationship building with the Board and staff.

Mr. Yeh agreed those could be included and would Ms. Denmark's suggestions would address one of his proposed goals.

Specific Deliverables

Ms. Denmark proposed defining the category as agency priorities that have already been agreed to by the Board and were approved within the budget and required the leadership of the general manager.

Mr. Yeh and Ms. Wick concurred with Ms. Denmark's overarching definition of the goal category.

Ms. Denmark asked if the committee agreed with including implementation of HB 2017, the state transportation bill, as a deliverable.

Ms. Wick agreed.

Mr. Yeh felt that there should be more specificity, such as the implementation of an annual pass program consistent with HB 2017 legislative intent.

Mr. Johnson commented that LTD's plan for the use of HB 2017 funds would need to include mandated items such as a pass program.

Mr. Hoskins pointed out that LTD was unlikely to receive those funds for a couple of years and it might be more prudent for the Board to focus on being prepared to implement programs once the funds were available, such as developing a process for how LTD would work with rural communities on distribution of funds that would flow through LTD to outlying areas in a way that would satisfy the state, LTD and those communities. He said another part of that how Ms. Jackson would work with the Board to assure that all parties were in agreement programs and policies such as a youth pass program or restructuring of the fare system. He said this was the building stage for preparing to implement programs when funds became available in the future.

Mr. Johnson suggested a deliverable could be to position LTD to take advantage of the funds when they became available.

Ms. Wick said building a relationship with Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) and rural community was an example of something that would have to be done to prepare for the funds.

Ms. Denmark said, based on committee feedback, a specific deliverable should be laying a foundation to achieve more specific goals when funding became available in the next year. She said another deliverable suggested by Mr. Yeh and Ms. Jackson was to manage the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) process and contract and guiding the Board so that adopting short- and long-range plans would be feasible for the next fiscal year.

Ms. Denmark said Ms. Jackson had also suggested as a deliverable improving processes for managing significant projects, such as fleet replacement, MovingAhead and revising the fare structure. She said that would also align with the Board's discussions about budgeting, cost savings and delivering good projects to the community.

Ms. Wick said her conversation with Ms. Jackson indicated the reason for that suggestion was that projects were well vetted with more checks and balances in the process.

Mr. Johnson agreed that improving internal processes would result in being able to present the Board with a full project plan.

Mr. Hoskins commented that when Ms. Jackson was hired there were a number of significant projects already in progress and it had been challenging to work with staff and the Board to keep everyone engaged. This was an opportune time to define the future with Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects, rather than just completely current projects. He said Ms. Jackson's idea was to have future projects well vetted and better managed, so the Board was fully informed at all stages.

Ms. Denmark said Ms. Jackson suggested that "success" of the deliverable of process improvement for significant projects could be defined by measures such as keeping the Board adequately informed, appropriately engaging the community, appropriate management of contracts, and achieving cost savings.

Mr. Yeh said some of those measures seemed qualitative. He was not opposed to qualitative as well as quantitative measures but asked Ms. Denmark to suggest some specific ways to determine how they could be met.

Ms. Denmark said that Mr. Wildish and Ms. Jackson had both suggested developing processes for improving LTD's cost-effectiveness, which could tie into what had just been discussed, as well as ABBG criteria. She asked if the committee would like to see that as a stand-alone fourth item under the category of Specific Deliverables.

Ms. Wick suggested including cost-effectiveness in the other deliverables instead of making it a separate item.

Mr. Yeh agreed with Ms. Wick. He recognized that his proposed goal related to a plan for 3electrification, sustainability, renewable energy and emergency preparedness might not be appropriate as a specific deliverable and asked how it could be addressed in the general manager goals so that those things would become a priority. He did not want the organization to lose sight of those issues. Ms. Denmark agreed it should not be a deliverable because the Board had not yet taken a position on that. She said the subject could be included on a Board agenda item for discussion.

Mr. Johnson said Mr. Yeh's proposal was about sustainability and movement forward on LTD's sustainability goals.

Mr. Hoskins said there were a number of ways to influence LTD's sustainability, such as through the CIP process. If the Board established some policies regarding sustainability, those could be used as guidelines during project development to assure everyone was working towards the same goal with a focus on sustainability.

Mr. Yeh asked if emergency preparedness should be a goal.

Ms. Wick felt it was important that the goals for Ms. Jackson and the things she would be held accountable for and evaluated upon were things that were in LTD's strategic documents rather than things that Board members might be passionate about.

Ms. Denmark said the COA process would prepare the Board to make informed decisions about short- and long-range plans and determine how issues of particular interest could be included in those plans.

Mr. Yeh hoped to see a deliverable related to his proposed goals on fares. He asked if any of the items could be achieved in the coming year.

Mr. Johnson said he expected the fare management project team to make good progress during the coming year and a plan would be in place for implementation. He felt that was an achievable deliverable.

Mr. Yeh hoped to see a goal to move away from paper fare. Ms. Wick said that was consistent with the Board's discussion at its recent retreat, but felt as long as that was contained within the broader goal it did not need to be specifically identified as a deliverable as part of the general manager's evaluation.

Mr. Yeh preferred to see fare management as a standalone deliverable as that was important to the Board; it did not need to be specific about an anticipated outcome.

Ms. Wick supported including fare management as a standalone in the draft of proposals goals, and other Board members could provide their feedback.

Following further discussion, Ms. Denmark summarized that she would draft the proposed goals at a high level and indicate it was a Board priority to focus on LTD's fare structure without providing any specific outcomes. She said the expectation was that the general manager would provide leadership in that endeavor.

Mr. Yeh emphasized that he was not trying to advocate for a specific result.

Ms. Denmark said a draft of proposed general manager goals would be provided to the HR Committee at its March 19, 2018, meeting for approval and recommendation to the Board at its March 21 meeting.

DISCUSSION REGARDING 2018 GENERAL MANAGER CONTRACT RENEWAL — A spreadsheet comparing compensation packages for administrators of local jurisdictions and agencies and comparable transit districts was distributed to committee members.

Ms. Denmark conveyed Ms. Jackson's thoughts on a contract. She was interested in another three-year contract and determining fair compensation comparable to that of other transit district general managers. She was concerned about her total compensation package being less than LTD's prior general manager, specifically with respect to retirement benefits. She was flexible in terms of package components. She was adamant that the general manager evaluation process was less ad hoc and better defined, such as having the survey of agency heads be an exhibit to the contract. She was particularly interested in clearly defining performance feedback from stakeholders and LTD employees.

Ms. Wick said those issues were in alignment with her previous discussion with Ms. Jackson, particularly the need to standardize who would be asked to evaluate her performance instead of reinventing the process each year.

Ms. Denmark said the Board would be establishing goals for the coming year that would include the second half of 2019 and her contract was scheduled to expire in November and it was likely that a new contract would include an increase in the compensation package. She pointed out that the compensation increase and performance evaluation were not synchronized. She said the committee could develop a proposed contract at its March 19 meeting.

Ms. Wick agreed with the importance of standardizing the annual evaluation process.

Mr. Yeh said based on the spreadsheet Ms. Jackson's salary appeared to be appropriate, but he agreed with the need to adjust some other components.

Mr. Collier said he would prepare calculations of total compensation based on all factors in the package. He was continuing to gather information from other agencies, and that data would also be provided to the committee for comparison purposes. Mr. Hoskins added that the Salem transit agency was the best comparator on the spreadsheet.

Mr. Yeh asked Mr. Collier to provide the value of each component within the compensation package. He said the committee could discuss specific numbers at its March 19 meeting.

Ms. Denmark said the committee's timeline was good. A decision did not need to be made at its March 19 meeting and could extend into April if the committee wished.

Ms. Wick said she was beginning a new job with Lane Community College that could affect her availability for daytime meetings.

Mr. Hoskins announced that he had accepted a position with TriMet and would be leaving LTD. He had enjoyed working with the Board and staff over the past three years and watching the agency's transformation under the leadership of Ms. Jackson and the Board.

Ms. Wick and Mr. Yeh both congratulated Mr. Hoskins and thanked him for his service to LTD.

NEXT MEETING — The next meeting of the Human Resources Committee was scheduled for March 19, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT — Mr. Yeh adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

MINUTES OF HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

Monday, March 19, 2018

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on March 12, 2018, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Human Resources Committee of the Lane Transit District held a meeting on Monday, March 19, 2018, beginning at 2:30 p.m., at the LTD Board Room, 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: Carl Yeh, Chair (called in)
Gary Wildish
April Wick (absent)
AJ Jackson, General Manager
Sheila Crawford, Executive Assistant
David Collier, Human Resources Manager
Mark Johnson, Assistant General Manager
Camille Gandolfi, Clerk of the Board
Kristin Denmark, General Counsel
Marina Brassfield, Minutes Recorder

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL — Mr. Yeh convened the meeting of the Human Resources (HR) Committee and called the roll.

MOTION APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES — Mr. Wildish moved to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2018, Human Resources Committee meeting as presented. Mr. Yeh provided the second.

VOTE The motion passed as follows:
AYES: Wildish, Yeh (2)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
EXCUSED: Wick (1)

FINALIZE 2018 GOALS FOR GENERAL MANAGER — Mr. Collier presented a spreadsheet outlining comparison between different salaries and benefits of general managers and other comparable positions. Mr. Wildish said the issues were covered well; he didn't know what types of measurements American Bus Benchmarking Group (ABBG) used, and he thought it would be great for the general manager to pick out the ones that were most important. Mr. Wildish said that he thought number three responded to April Wick's concerns around ongoing items in the three-year plan. He said what was most important for him were the explanations; they really honed down to specifics. Mr. Wildish said that overall he was pleased with the document.

Mr. Yeh asked about Objective 1; he said that he wondered if Mr. Wildish was comfortable with Mr. Johnson picking the criteria. Mr. Wildish said yes, LTD staff was much more familiar with terms and laws than the Board or the HR Committee. He added that section 3 talked about the long-range transit plan. Mr. Wildish thought it was a nice way to do the process and a good way to track things. Mr. Yeh said that he concurred. He said that he wondered if Ms. Wick sent

comments. Ms. Denmark said Ms. Wick did not have any comments about the goals other than what was echoed but did have comments in the contract section.

Mr. Yeh asked Mr. Wildish for comments on Objective 2. Mr. Wildish said that he had none, and he thought it looked fine. Mr. Yeh said that he agreed. He said it was further honed with more explanation. Mr. Wildish said that he liked the way Objective 3 was set up because it explained things that needed to get done that year. It helped them know what projects to prioritize when resources became available. Mr. Wildish added that the COA was important and they needed to get Phase I done, so LTD knew where they were headed. He said that he was comfortable with the objectives.

MOTION Mr. Wildish moved to take the 2018 Goals for the General Manager to the greater Board. Mr. Yeh provided the second.

VOTE The motion passed as follows:
AYES: Wildish, Yeh (2)
NAYS: None
ABSTENTIONS: None
EXCUSED: Wick (1)

DISCUSSION REGARDING 2018 GENERAL MANAGER CONTRACT RENEWAL — Mr. Collier put together an updated salary survey for general managers of other transit districts and other comparable organizations. He said that he ranked the salaries in order, so people could see where LTD fell. He also costed everything out, so committee members could see how much benefits were, such as sick leave and other allowances.

Mr. Collier explained that Ms. Jackson was concerned about some differences in her current contract with LTD, when compared to general manager contracts in other, smaller districts. The biggest area of difference was the retirement. He explained that the former LTD General Manager was in an old plan which had a greater retirement contribution, so that was one big difference. Mr. Collier said there was some difference throughout vacation and sick leave accrual, but those benefits were based on length of service so they would increase.

Mr. Wildish asked about the operating budget and clarified that the sheet was not talking about the general budget. He said that he thought they were the same thing. There was discussion about the difference. Mr. Wildish said that he thought the number of employees was a better measurement, rather than budget.

Ms. Denmark said there were a few important things the HR Committee needed to discuss including the financial package, the evaluation process, and the timing of a new contract combined with an evaluation process. Ms. Denmark explained that the district had typically done the evaluation at the beginning of the year, but Ms. Jackson's new contract started December 1, 2018; so, if the evaluation was done in January 2019 she would have possibly just gotten a financial increase in the new contract. She said that she wondered if a delayed evaluation made sense.

Mr. Yeh said that he wondered about scheduling and timing. He clarified the current contract ended November 30, 2018, and the new contract began December 1, 2018. Mr. Wildish said the district could do an evaluation in September or October 2018. Mr. Yeh said possibly; he added it would help the district get back on a schedule aligned with the contract renewal. Ms. Jackson said she recommended extending the existing contract by one month and aligning the evaluation

with the new contract to start January 1, 2019. Ms. Jackson explained that her current contract would stay under its existing terms, and ideally, the setting of goals would go into effect January 2019. She was willing to extend her contract by two months if needed. Currently, the evaluation was required to be done by the end of January. Ms. Denmark said they could extend the contract. Ms. Denmark said the financials would be figured out much earlier than the new contract would start, likely within next four months.

Ms. Denmark was unsure if there was a benefit in doing an evaluation if the evaluation was not tied to opportunities for a financial raise. Mr. Wildish agreed and said that he thought they should be done together. Ms. Denmark said the goals could be aligned with the fiscal year, but then she wondered if goals should be aligned with the calendar year or fiscal year. She added that the goals could be extended.

Mr. Yeh said that if the Board chose to forgo a formal evaluation tied to financial incentives, he still wanted some sort of evaluation, even if it was scaled back. He thought the Board doing a deliberate review of the district and the general manager was good practice and should be done regardless. Mr. Wildish said that he thought an evaluation and the agreement should be closely connected because it made sense. He said sometimes it was hard to tell how much had been done until sitting down and doing an evaluation. It put the district in a better position to create goals based on performance. If they were not tied together, it was unclear whether the evaluation would be important. Mr. Yeh said it would be important, but maybe not for this current end of the contract. He said that he thought they would then have the opportunity to do tweaking of goals. Mr. Wildish pointed out that Ms. Jackson was willing to extend her contract and work with them.

Ms. Jackson told the HR Committee she would ideally like a three-year contract. She suggested it was important to look at the cost of a three-year contract, and annually evaluate whether or not she was meeting goals. If she was not, the district should discontinue the contract. Ms. Jackson said if an organization was not giving the general manager a raise, they should be getting rid of that general manager. Ms. Jackson said she would hate not to be thinking about financial stability for three years.

Mr. Wildish said even if the contract extended until the end of January 2019, the Board could do better at completing timely evaluations in the future than was done that year, so they are done in conjunction. Mr. Yeh said that he agreed. Mr. Wildish added that he thought it would set the pattern for future years.

Ms. Denmark clarified that the HR Committee wanted a couple month extension for the current contract under its current terms, and the new contract would start February 1, 2019, assuming the evaluation was satisfactory. The evaluation for 2018 would be done prior to December 30, 2018, with the financial package set by February. She said every year it would be more natural. Everyone was in agreement. Mr. Yeh wondered if a motion was needed. Ms. Denmark thought it would be a good idea to talk through all the issues, and she would take good notes. Then, toward the end of the process, all the details would be included in the document, and a recommendation would be given to the full Board to accept the document. She added there would likely be a few recommendations, one to extend the current contract and the second to do a new contract. Ms. Denmark said they would take one nice package to the full Board unless some prior input was needed. Mr. Yeh said that he did not think full Board input would be needed. Mr. Wildish said that he thought the HR Committee needed to have some ideas before returning to the rest of the Board. He said that he thought it would be okay to move forward, and the HR committee needed to explain their entire rationale to full Board.

Ms. Denmark said the HR Committee also needed a more detailed discussion of what the evaluation process looked like. Ms. Denmark said they needed to put more specificity in the contract, so the process was agreed upon in advance. Mr. Yeh said the Board needed to formalize who it got input from. Ms. Denmark said that was one issue, and clarified they needed to identify which stakeholders would be asked and what questions.

Mr. Yeh recalled a list of potential people completing the evaluation included about 25 to 30 people. He thought they could condense it to those they absolutely needed feedback from. Mr. Wildish explained there were 23 names on the list that year, but some were later added. It turned out Ms. Gandolfi did not receive responses from those cities, or they responded and said they didn't have anything to report. Mr. Wildish said they also added legislative individuals who were involved with LTD in 2017. They also included two county commissioners. Mr. Wildish thought they should go back and see where they got comments because they did not want to send 50 evaluations and only get ten back. Ms. Gandolfi added she had responses received so they could sort through who offered the most valuable input.

Mr. Yeh pointed out those responses also had a lot to do with who the person who was in the position. He wanted to make sure the Board was seeking input from people in positions with useful information. Mr. Wildish thought results could be impacted by the fact different Board members were assigned different people to solicit feedback from. Mr. Yeh said the process was somewhat haphazard the past year. Mr. Yeh said that he thought they could throw out a few ideas on who they definitely wanted to ask, and have a draft list of stakeholders to solicit input from. For example, he wanted to hear from at least one rural person/organization/committee person and parks and recreation person. Mr. Wildish saw school districts and city managers as having valuable information. Mr. Wildish did not think legislative representatives would be as important since they would be coming off a short session. He thought they could come up with a more meaningful list.

Ms. Jackson explained the key thing the Board wanted to know was whether LTD was being managed according to stakeholders in the community. It was important to know what they thought because it was a direct reflection of Ms. Jackson's performance. She said the district could select two or three key committees in which they have key stakeholders assigned including the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), Accessible Transportation Committee (ATC), and the Budget Committee. All were individuals who represented different parts of the community and saw the district superficially as buses but also saw the internal management of the district. For example, SPC could see projects, progress, or lack of progress. Ms. Jackson thought people who had a connection to LTD would fill out a survey because they were already giving a lot of time to the organization. She said those people saw things getting better or worse. Mr. Wildish said as they made the list, Ms. Jackson's points were worthy of consideration. Those individuals would be more inclined to complete an evaluation, they would have more knowledge of LTD over a period of time, and their input might be more valuable.

Ms. Denmark suggested Ms. Gandolfi put together a list of individuals contacted last year and those mentioned during the meeting. Mr. Wildish suggested collecting a certain number of people, maybe from 15 to 20 stakeholders. Ms. Denmark said the list could be compiled and circulated before the next meeting, as well as templates of questions that were asked in the last evaluation. She explained it would be helpful for people to look at the list and questions on their own and come back with suggestions.

In regards to the list of stakeholders, Mr. Yeh said that he preferred highlighting specific positions, rather than specific people, so there was consistency from year to year. Ms. Denmark

agreed it should be positions; then the committee had discretion from year to year on who exactly they wanted to contact.

In response to a question from Ms. Denmark, Mr. Yeh clarified the HR Committee needed to establish a list of positions to get feedback from as part of the evaluation process and did not need to do more than that. Ms. Denmark said yes, and added it was the Board's responsibility to do the evaluation by scheduling it and choosing questions. It was up to the Board or Board president how the work was delegated; she said that she did not think it needed to be included in the general manager's contract. She thought it would be important to keep in their bylaws.

Ms. Denmark said in terms of the process, they would back up the start date to February 1, 2019, with the evaluation happening by January 30, 2019. She added realistically, the evaluation would happen during the January 2018 Board meeting, which still had the Board working through holidays. Mr. Wildish clarified approval of the evaluation would happen at the January 2018 Board meeting. Ms. Denmark said yes, and explained the rest of process needed deciding at a future meeting. She added that last year's information would be sent out, as well as a template for the evaluation.

Mr. Yeh said the final component was to figure out the financial package. Ms. Denmark offered to provide feedback on how other organizations had moved around compensation packages. Mr. Wildish wanted to be sure that information on the table discussed earlier in the meeting was accurate. He wanted to ensure the operating budget was, in fact, the operating budget (or, the general fund – not the budget including projects). The numbers still important but were not representational of uniform, core activities. Mr. Johnson said Salem was comparable, and that number shown was their operating budget; it was pretty comparable to LTD. Mr. Wildish wanted a fair analysis to present to the Board. Ms. Jackson explained the budget included RideSource and Point to Point, which was why it was reflected as \$62 million. Ms. Jackson also thought a number of employees was a better indicator because it was difficult to tell what was in another district's budget.

Mr. Yeh said one difference between the current and previous general manager's benefits was the retirement package. He was in favor of doing something to give more clarity in the agreement around that area. Mr. Wildish had not studied the numbers enough yet. He thought the discrepancies were worth more evaluation. Mr. Wildish wondered about vacation accrual. Mr. Wildish clarified Ms. Jackson had 22 vacation days plus an additional 80 hours. Mr. Collier said the last evaluation gave Ms. Jackson an additional 80 hours, which he broke over two years. Ms. Jackson thought it was 80 hours per calendar year. Mr. Collier was unsure they understood that when looking at the contract. Mr. Collier was unsure whether they were going forward with that every year. Ms. Denmark said Ms. Jackson likely would not get fewer vacation days than that number. Mr. Collier explained the accrual rate went to 27 days after the fourth year and 32 days after the ninth year. Mr. Wildish said the additional five days would come into the second year of her agreement. Mr. Collier said yes. Ms. Denmark said typically Ms. Jackson accrued at the rate of other management but might get something on top of the regular accrual.

Mr. Yeh said it sounded like the HR Committee agreed on the idea of having a more specific number for vacation days going into the new contract. Ms. Denmark would provide language and the agreement from the last contract amendment. Ms. Johnson would get to 27 days at four years, and would accrue at the regular rate of LTD employees; however, that did not prohibit the Board from giving her something on top of the regular accrual rate, such as the addition of 80 hours. Mr. Wildish thought the Board did not understand the normal accrual rate, and that the rate applied to the general manager and all other employees. He thought it was a great

opportunity for the Board to become aware of the total compensation plan and how it also applied to other employees. Mr. Yeh agreed with the statement. Mr. Wildish asked what the blue line meant on the salary chart; Mr. Collier explained the numbers.

Mr. Yeh and Mr. Wildish discussed Ms. Jackson's contract briefly. Mr. Yeh saw a difference in car allowance and thought they could get comparatives between the previous general manager and current general manager contracts. Mr. Wildish that the original contract was unique to Ms. Jackson because she had a moving allowance; he did not think they had to stay where they were. It was appropriate to look at those things and adjust them. Ms. Jackson explained discrepancies between car allowances in her contract and the previous general manager's.

NEXT MEETING — The next meeting of the Human Resources Committee was scheduled for

ADJOURNMENT — Mr. Yeh adjourned the meeting at 3:38 p.m.