

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE COUNTY MASS TRANSIT DISTRICT

May 29, 1975

The board of directors of Lane County Mass Transit District met on May 29, 1975 at 7:30 A.M. in the Eugene Hotel in Eugene, Oregon, pursuant to adjournment from its meeting of May 20, 1975.

Present:

Richard A. Booth
W. Gene Davis
Daniel M. Herbert, President, presiding
Kenneth H. Kohnen, Vice President
Glenn E. Randall, Secretary
Fred C. Dyer, General Manager

Absent:

Jack J. Craig, Treasurer
Ruth Shepherd

Mavis Skipworth, administrative secretary, served as recording secretary for the meeting.

Mr. Herbert introduced Jean Johnson, attending as a representative of League of Women Voters of Central Lane County.

HB 2890 INCOME TAX MEASURE: Mr. Kohnen presented an overview of HB 2890 with the proposed amendments. He specified the changes from the bill as submitted by the board. As amended, (1) the tax would apply to the entire taxable income of every resident and to non-residents' income from sources within the district which are subject to tax under the Oregon law; (2) corporations having income from within and outside the district would have to allocate that portion of income earned within the district using a 3-factor formula; (3) the tax would be a tax on income, not a surtax, although there could be a surtax; (4) the tax would be limited to 1% of the taxable income; and (5) the bill would include the provision that any ordinance adopting an income tax must be referred to the voters of the district. He advised that the provision allowing a credit for payroll taxes paid remains in the bill.

Discussion followed on the difficulty of administering the tax on persons living out of the district but earning income from within the district, and allocation of income from businesses operating within and outside the district. Mr. Kohnen said he had discussed with Mr. Bryson the possibility of modification in the wording of the measure.

Mr. Kohnen moved to recommend that Section 2.(1.a) be changed to make the tax applicable to taxable income of non-residents derived from personal services earned within the district. Mr. Herbert seconded the motion and it carried. Mr. Herbert asked Mr. Dyer to consult with Mr. Bryson on wording and to carry it to the legislature.

TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: Mr. Herbert opened discussion of the Transit Development Program with the suggestion that it be covered page by page for Consideration of adoption. He noted that to accomplish the goals by the criteria standards set forth, consideration should be given to striving for 30 minute frequency during evening hours. He suggested that a section be included showing high and medium levels of service with a desirable response time for all categories.

Referring to Chapter III. IMPROVEMENTS, Mr. Herbert said he did not believe that the transportation section of the Metropolitan Area 1990 General Plan is fully represented in the statements included in the TDP in its present form and suggested a more complete inclusion. He also referred to the Lane County General Plan and noted that several items are contradictory in the Findings. He suggested that a staff member discuss this with the county.

Mr. Davis expressed concern for the adopted goals and objectives of the district to provide a prototype system that includes provisions for the specialized requirements of the physically limited and elderly. Mr. Dyer said that more and more interest is being exhibited at state and federal levels toward accomplishment of service to a broader spectrum of the community, affecting and providing financial assistance to meet the goals, as well as withholding financial assistance if not meeting meeting them. Mr. Booth asked if the board should reconsider their 1975/76 adopted goals and pay the taxi fare of those persons requiring special service. Mr. Dyer advised the the law does not allow the district to contract with the private sector.

Responding to a question by Mr. Davis, David Rynerson advised that the Transit Development Program is written to conform to federal planning requirements included under Appendix A, but the district is not told exactly what it must do with the funds or how to run the bus company, but the content statements do describe such issues as coordination of public agencies. Mr. Davis expressed concern in approving a TDP that contains items with which he does not agree.

Mr. Herbert expressed concern about the implementation of the Transit Development Program with the limitations that are imposed by the maximum employers payroll tax and suggested the board should address that issue, asking the staff to give specific information on this to influence budget procedure.

The meeting was adjourned to Tuesday, June 3, 7:00 A.M. at the Eugene Hotel to continue discussion of the Transit Development Program.


Recording Secretary


Secretary