

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

ADJOURNED MEETING

December 27, 1983

Pursuant to notice given at the December 20, 1983 regular meeting and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, an adjourned meeting of the Board of Directors of Lane Transit District was held on Tuesday, December 27, 1983 at 7:30 p.m. in the Eugene City Hall.

Present: Peter Brandt, Treasurer
Janet Calvert, President, presiding
Janice Eberly, Vice President
Judy Nelson
Glenn E. Randall
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

News Media Representatives:
Tom Detzel, The Register-Guard
John Selix, KUGN-Radio

Absent: Ted J. Langton
Larry Parducci

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY BOARD PRESIDENT: After calling the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and calling roll, Ms. Calvert stated that she was glad to see everyone who was able to attend the meeting in spite of the icy road conditions. She remarked that during the past week the transit district had been fulfilling the needs of the community in this regard.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Ms. Calvert opened the meeting for public contact on items of general interest. She asked that anyone wishing to speak about particular agenda items wait until that point on the agenda. There was no one in the audience who wished to speak.

MOTION APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Mr. Randall moved that the minutes of the November 15, 1983 regular meeting and the December 20, 1983 regular meeting be approved as distributed. After seconding by Ms. Nelson, the motion carried unanimously.
VOTE

BUDGET COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR DISPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL REVENUES: Ms. Calvert stated that the Board members had received their agenda notes and materials on this issue. Ms. Loobey commented on an issue that was raised after the Budget Committee deliberations, that of lowering the fares in addition to the other recommendations in Option 1. She called attention to her memo to the Board in the December 20 agenda packet, and stated that, should the Board be questioned about the issue, staff wanted them to be aware that it was discussed internally and for the reasons listed in the memo, it was not raised through the subcommittee process to the Budget Committee and Board.

MOTION

Mr. Brandt moved that the Board approve the Budget Committee recommendation for disposition of funds detailed on pages 14 and 15 of the December 20 agenda packet. Mr. Randall seconded the motion.

Ms. Eberly stated that she had given this issue serious thought since the November Budget Committee meeting, and said she would like to recommend that the amount of the productivity bonus be lowered to \$200 for full-time employees and \$75.00 for part-time, with the remainder being put aside in the same kind of categories but with goals to be met, to be available for rewards or incentive programs. She felt the District was in need of a stricter incentive program, and said she was somewhat uncomfortable with the way the issue had been presented without some guidelines and a stricter incentive program for the future.

MOTION
TO
AMEND

Ms. Eberly then moved to amend the amount of money for productivity bonuses in the main motion from \$300 to \$200 for full-time employees and from \$100 to \$75 for part-time employees, with the remainder put aside for an incentive plan to be structured by the Board. Ms. Nelson seconded the motion.

Ms. Nelson stated that her rationalization for the second was somewhat the same as Ms. Eberly's. She had concerns about the lack of structure in the employee incentive rewards in Option 1, and some concerns with the employee incentive rewards in public agencies such as the District.

Mr. Randall agreed with the idea of a structured incentive reward system, but felt it should be set up for the future. He thought the employees, due to the write-up in the paper, knew they were going to get the \$300 and it was his opinion that the direction should not be changed in mid-stream. He thought it would be good to structure an incentive program for the future, but not to take the money the Budget Committee had appropriated to do so.

VOTE ON
AMENDMENT

With no further discussion, the vote was taken on the amendment to the main motion. The amendment failed three to two, with Ms. Eberly and Ms. Nelson voting in favor, and Mr. Brandt, Ms. Calvert, and Mr. Randall voting in opposition.

Ms. Nelson then stated that, for the record, she had had several concerns about Option 1 all along, which she voiced at a prior meeting. Specific to the fact that Option 1 was chosen, she voiced concerns about money for the employee productivity bonus being money raised through state and federal funding, as well as the payroll tax. She said that working through the change in the budget had been a productive learning experience for her, and she had a lot of hindsight about the expectations of employees concerning the productivity bonus as a result of the media involvement. She said she was not faulting the media, that the issue was well laid out, but the expectation was that employees, for all practical purposes, saw this money as being already available to them. She suggested that in the future, in dealing with funding alterations, when the opportunity is awarded to the staff to go back and look at funding sources, particularly when there is additional funding, that the Board have an opportunity to have information presented to them by the Budget Subcommittee before there is

so much staff or media involvement. She said she thought the Board was well represented on the Subcommittee, but that the four options which were presented all included the same revenue sources, and no other options had been available for discussion.

Ms. Calvert commented that the purpose of a subcommittee is to winnow out options that do not seem feasible and to discuss and work out things that are not likely to be voted on, and that there would be no point in having a subcommittee if all the work were done at the full Board level.

Ms. Nelson said that perhaps something to consider when sums of money at this level are involved would be to have another opportunity for discussion by the full Board.

Ms. Eberly stated that she understood what Ms. Nelson was saying and that she would like to add a couple of notes about the process and how it worked itself out. She said she had served on the Budget Subcommittee and had discussed all the options, but that the actual Budget Committee meeting had created additional questions for her and had given her reason to take a more reflective attitude about the entire package. She stated that she was very supportive of much of Option 1, but personally uncomfortable with the amount of money for the productivity bonus. She added that this had no bearing on her feeling for the performance of the staff and management at LTD; that she found more and more reasons all the time to sing their praises.

VOTE ON
MAIN
MOTION

With no further discussion, the vote was taken on the main motion. The motion carried four to one, with Mr. Brandt, Ms. Calvert, Ms. Nelson, and Mr. Randall voting in favor and Ms. Eberly against.

Ms. Calvert stated that she felt the Board had learned a lot from this process. She thought it had been a useful process and said she found it refreshing that the Board members had been able to discuss how they disagree and yet be friendly and open and accepting of each others' points of view.

ORDINANCE NO. 25: Ms. Calvert opened this issue by stating that its purpose was to change the amount of the employer's excise tax from six-tenths of one percent (.006) to five-tenths of one percent (.005) for part of the fiscal year. She noted that if the ordinance was to be put into effect immediately, it would have to be approved as an emergency ordinance by unanimous vote.

Ms. Eberly asked what the time period would be if it were not passed as an emergency ordinance. Ms. Calvert replied that the ordinance would have to be read at two regularly scheduled Board meetings and would not affect the payroll tax until April.

MOTION
VOTE

Mr. Randall moved that Ordinance No. 25 be read by title only. Mr. Brandt seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote. There were enough copies of the ordinance for all who were present to see a copy.

Ms. Calvert then read Ordinance No. 25 by title only: "Ordinance No. 25, An Ordinance Imposing an Excise Tax on Employers, Providing for Administration, Enforcement, and Collection of the Tax, Terminating the Application of Amended Ordinance No. 20, and Declaring an Emergency."

MOTION

Mr. Randall then moved that the Board adopt Ordinance No. 25 as presented on pages 17-37 of the agenda packet. Mr. Brandt seconded the motion.

Mr. Brandt asked if the dates on the ordinance were correct and what would be the difference between using the last six months of the fiscal year as opposed to the middle six months. Mr. Pangborn replied that if the ordinance passed, staff would notify the Oregon Department of Revenue the next day, and they would notify District taxpayers that taxes paid for payroll from October, November, and December of 1983 would be paid at the lower rate. This would insure that the money would be received during this fiscal year. He stated that staff had not computed revenues and expenses for the next fiscal year, and the Board and Budget Committee would be able to decide later what they wanted to do with the payroll tax rate for FY 84-85.

VOTE

The vote was then taken on Ordinance No. 25. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

MOTION

Mr. Randall moved, seconded by Ms. Nelson, that the meeting be adjourned. Ms. Nelson commented that the Board members had all received their informational materials for the Board meeting, and since all the action items had been taken care of and since driving was hazardous that evening, she would prefer to adjourn rather than discussing the information items.

Ms. Eberly mentioned that she had called the schedule information telephone number during the icy road conditions, and that she had been told exactly how to get to the bus and was reminded that it was a ten-cent fare day. She wanted to commend the staff for their helpfulness in providing information during those weather conditions.

VOTE

With no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 7:56 p.m. by unanimous vote.


Secretary