

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Tuesday, February 8, 2005

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 4, 2005, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held a special meeting on Tuesday, February 8, 2005, beginning at 6:30 p.m., in the Woodleaf Village Community Center at 746 Woodleaf Lane, Eugene.

Present: Susan Ban, Vice President  
Debbie Davis  
Mike Eyster  
David Gant, Secretary  
Gerry Gaydos, President, presiding  
Dean Kortge  
Ken Hamm, General Manager  
Jo Sullivan, Clerk of the Board, Recording Secretary

Absent: Dave Kleger, Treasurer

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Board President Gerry Gaydos. Mr. Gaydos stated the Board's appreciation that members of the public were interested in LTD. He explained that the Board members had set the special meeting to hear from a group who had sent the Board a letter and others who might wish to speak. The group was calling itself the "LTD/ATU Community Committee." Those at the table introduced themselves. In addition to the six LTD Board members and LTD General Manager Ken Hamm, also present at the table were:

- James Mattiace, commissioner with Lane County Children and Families/Teacher at Springfield High School
- Jean Lobido, member of Eugene/Springfield Solidarity Committee
- Debbie Oresik, resident services coordinator, Metropolitan Affordable Housing
- Margaret Hallock, director, Wayne Morse Chair, University of Oregon Law School
- Joan Pierson, co-chair of citizens committee, and representing Faith in Action, an inter-religious justice and peace organization
- Curt Bylund, co-chair of citizens committee, co-chair of Jefferson/Westside Neighborhood Committee, and precinct person with the Democratic party
- Bob Baldwin, president of Lane Community College Employee Federation Classified Union
- Gavin Light, president, Springfield High School Student Association
- Michael Regan, Thurston resident and bus rider
- John VanLandingham, working as a lawyer for the Lane County Law and Advocacy Center, working on affordable housing and planning issues
- Ross McConnell, retired physician
- Someone with Head Start of Lane County

**PRELIMINARY REMARKS/ADDITIONS TO AGENDA:** Mr. Gaydos again thanked everyone for their interest and for being willing to meet on relatively short notice. He said that the Board was impressed with the committee's concern and willingness to meet. He stated that LTD did not sign

the letter that the committee had asked the Board to sign. Rather, the Board believed that the process should go on as it currently existed. The Board had tried not to have any process in the press, and were trying not to do anything other than to allow the labor negotiation process to move along.

Mr. Gaydos explained that the LTD bargaining team had been meeting with the ATU bargaining team since May. There had been assistance from two mediators from the State: Wendy Greenwald, an experienced professional mediator and head of the State Conciliation Service, and Paul Johnson, who had been brought in to assist Ms. Greenwald. Mr. Gaydos stated that the two teams had been bargaining in good faith and participating in the mediation process as provided by state law. That included the 30-day cooling-off period, which had now expired. He said that the LTD bargaining team had been willing to meet in accordance with the mediator's request and had fully participated in the process, with the goal of reaching an agreement. He explained that the Oregon collective bargaining law was very similar to the federal collective bargaining law. He stated that the federal law had been in place since 1935 with few changes, resulting in far more contracts than labor disputes or strikes. The Oregon law was amended in 1995 to remove mandatory fact-finding, which brought the model even closer to the federal law, leaving bargaining in the hands of the participants, which the Board believed was where it belonged.

Mr. Gaydos said that the LTD bargaining team had been very open with information and had information to share with the group that evening, and that the same information was on LTD's Web site. He said that the ATU bargaining team had had direct access to both LTD's insurance broker and insurance company, to enable the ATU to gather any information it needed regarding the health insurance proposal, rates for various plans, and how various changes to the plans may impact those rates. He said that LTD also had provided a great deal of information directly to the ATU bargaining team and had been willing and able to answer any questions the ATU had brought about LTD's proposal. However, he said, because of this community committee's interest and the community's interest in general, the Board knew that it was important to meet and that was why they were there that evening. Mr. Gaydos stated that the Board believed that labor negotiations must take place at the bargaining table; the mediation process that LTD and the ATU had agreed to was ongoing, and the Board remained very hopeful of reaching a resolution through that process.

Mr. Gaydos said that as a public body, the Board was always interested in and appreciated public input, and that was why they were meeting that evening. He commended the citizens for their commitment, time, and efforts as LTD and the ATU moved toward successful resolution of ongoing labor negotiations.

Ms. Pierson also made some opening remarks on behalf of the citizens' committee. She said that initially this meeting was planned by the citizens' committee, who invited the LTD people to come and help inform them and the public about what was going on. She thought it was a little odd that because of legal requirements that LTD's meetings be held in a certain way that Mr. Gaydos was speaking first and she was speaking second. However, she said she wanted to say a few things on behalf of Eugene/Springfield Solidarity Network, which was doing a great deal of the committee work for this organization and on behalf of the committee. She said there was another irony or anomaly, in that LTD was a committee that worked strenuously, and an organization that worked in central Lane County, but was not elected by the public but appointed by the governor. She said it was her understanding that the governor was still standing back from any kind of intervention. She said that they were members of a public who had no recourse other than something like this since they could not vote LTD in or out, and came within hours of a devastating transit strike that would have handicapped the poorest and most needy among the public: the young and elderly, in

particular, and had come to this meeting grateful to the Union which listened to them on Saturday and was willing to postpone the strike. She said that it was her deep hope that they were in a situation where LTD could get what it needed in order to keep LTD going for people in this part of Oregon. She said they did not want LTD to run out of funds and cease and desist. On the other hand, she said, they cared very much for the people who worked for LTD, and understood their need for decent salary, working conditions, and benefits. Therefore, she said, they were there on behalf of the community, hoping there would be a community voice before something drastic happened, and hoping that they could help bring about (resolution); they were not mediators, but she thought they were reconcilers.

In response to the topic about elected or not elected, Mr. Gaydos replied that the governor, who appointed the Board members, was an elected official and had exercised his rights to change the Higher Education Board and other boards, and so there was responsibility. He said that everyone on the LTD Board felt a tremendous stewardship to the county, to the District, to all the people who worked in the District, and to ensuring that they could deliver the best service they could. From their perspective, he said, the Board was there to listen, and had the ability to provide some information if there were questions.

Ms. Pierson said the committee had a two-part agenda that consisted almost all of questions. She turned the meeting over to Margaret Hallock, who had initial questions about where things stood at that point.

Ms. Hallock thanked the Board for meeting with the committee, and thanked Mr. Gaydos for his reference to the Oregon and federal collective bargaining acts and awareness that nearly all labor negotiations were resolved without a strike or final implementation of the contract. She said that was what the committee's desire was, also. She said there were many ways for settlement to occur, and it was not unusual for the public to be involved in some way or another. She said that while the committee appreciated that LTD was engaged in the process as set out in state statute, it also was engaged in a public service, and she thought it was important that the public understand what was going on at the bargaining table. She said that the committee's highest and deepest hope was that LTD was able to find a resolution with the union without a strike or without implementing a contract that had not been agreed to with the union. She noted Ms. Pierson's statement that the Union had agreed not to strike in order to allow this kind of public process to occur. Ms. Hallock said that the committee's understanding was that LTD had implemented all or part of its final offer that had been submitted in December. She asked to know more about which parts of the contract had been implemented, and why, and what the Board's view was about how implementation would help find resolution through the process.

Mr. Gaydos said that the contract was being implemented in stages. He asked Andy Vobora, LTD's Marketing and Communications director, to respond. Mr. Vobora said that the implementation schedule had been posted on the Web site, and there was a copy for the committee. He explained that the implementation schedule was a staged schedule, including things like a cost of living increase, the medical plan change, and some other things that went into effect on February 1. Other work rule changes would be staged over time, as operator work sign-ups occurred later in the year.

Mr. Gaydos added that attempts were being made to schedule mediation before the current strike notice.

Ms. Hallock asked if the District's plan was to meet with the union at the bargaining table in the presence of a mediator. Mr. Gaydos replied that it was. Ms. Hallock then said that since the process of implementation did not require implementation of the final agreement at the end of a particular period, this was of great concern to the committee. She said they were hoping to work through a period where there was neither implementation of a contract that wasn't agreed to nor a strike. She wondered if the Board could talk about its motivation and how that could help resolve the issue. It was her understanding that there were many parts of the agreement that had not been agreed to, and that not all parts of the final offer were even part of the last, best offer. She thought that going back to implement the final offer was not going forward.

Mr. Gaydos said he understood the point. He said that the Board had done the best it could do under how they understood the rules to accomplish the purposes of getting to an appropriate resolution under both the state and federal statutes, and that was where they would stay.

Ms. Hallock then asked if the District was preparing for a strike; for example, by hiring replacement drivers. She said that some people might believe that implementing the final offer might precipitate a strike. Mr. Gaydos said that the District was prepared for a strike prior to withdrawal of the strike notice.

Mr. Bylund said that Mrs. Hallock was asking why LTD implemented after withdrawal of the strike notice. He said that it was a simple question and that Mr. Gaydos was equivocating around it. He said that the committee got into this just to try to keep the buses going. He wanted Mr. Gaydos to say what he thought would happen to resolve the issue. He said that the committee wanted the Board as unhappy as it wanted the union, which was the definition of a contract. He said the committee realized the union was not going to get all it wanted, and he hoped the Board realized it could not get all it wanted.

Mr. Gaydos said he did not equivocate; rather, he had said that the District would be staying within the confines of the statute and doing what they believed was appropriate.

Ms. Hallock asked what the Board's relationship to the committee would be, given that LTD had implemented. She said the committee was hoping to do some public fact-finding and find out where the sides were. It was their understanding that at times negotiations were actually quite close. They hoped that some extra public attention would help move the parties. She said it made it difficult if one party was on the implementation path.

Mr. Gaydos said he also had stated that everything was on the Web site, and copies of the offer that was being implemented were available that evening, as well as the last, best offer. He said that those were available for anyone to see, and that the Board's purpose for being there was to listen to the public, because they were a public body. He said that LTD was trying to be as transparent as it could be throughout the process.

Ms. Pierson said that the committee was grateful to LTD for bringing the materials and for the effective Web site, and commended the Web site to the attention of the people in the audience.

Ms. Pierson said that another question for the Board was for the Board to lay out as briefly as possible what their major concerns were for making an agreeable settlement. She asked for the Board's assessment of the chief issues that were still unresolved, and said that they had received such information from the union.

Mr. Gaydos said that this information was at the bargaining table. Also, he called her attention to the final offer and the last, best offer to see some of those issues. He said it was very difficult to answer, in the sense that there were two offers, and the Board did not know that the union and LTD had been close to an agreement, if in fact they were, and the bargaining fell apart. He suggested comparing the two offers, and said that if the union had told the committee about an issue, then he thought they must have an issue with one of those, also.

Mr. Bylund said that a couple of concerned citizens had told him that they did not understand what was going on. He wasn't sure if they had access to the Web site to try to make sense of what was going on. He said he would be going back to them to explain what it was that LTD was trying to do to explain why implementation was the appropriate process. So far, he said, he had that LTD had agreed to meet with the mediator and was following the state and federal statutes and guidelines. He did not think that answer was adequate for those who were relying heavily on the system. He said he was at the meeting to find out where people stood. He thanked Ms. Ban for her letter to *The Register-Guard*, in which she spoke as an individual and not on behalf of the Board. He said it outlined some real concerns and issues around health care. He stated to the committee that when he saw people with really good benefits and health care, he did get a little jealous, but for a lot of the people riding the bus, their only health care was getting to work. He wanted to know what each member had to say.

Ms. Pierson asked if the Board could speak to the committee about the health care issue, and whether Ms. Ban could.

Ms. Ban said that, from her own perspective, she believed that the health care plan that LTD had offered and implemented for the union was a very, very fair plan, and one that allowed LTD to stay within the budget. She said that she also believed that as soon as the union members began to understand the circumstances around that plan, they would agree that it was a very fair plan. She stressed that this was her personal opinion and she was not representing the other members of the Board.

Mr. McConnell said, as a retired physician, that everyone had health care when he was practicing in 1952; 20 percent paid cash, and 20 percent did not pay. He said that his son had been developing interactive Internet in-source medicine for the developing countries. Ms. Pierson interrupted to get the discussion back to the planned discussion. She said they would discuss his issue at a later meeting and pass it along if it seemed to be fruitful for the LTD Board.

Mr. Bylund was looking at what the union had sent the committee. He said that the union had sent 20 points to them, and to be fair, they wanted to ask to narrow it down a little, to find out the main sticking points and what was happening. He said he understood that the District was negotiating, and he was glad that was happening and that the Board had not presupposed anything. He thought that the purpose of the committee was to find an alternative solution other than implementation or strike. However, there was now implementation, so he thought that the logical conclusion was that without an agreement in the next few weeks, there would be a strike, although, he said, he could be wrong. He said that many people would be impacted by a strike, including his own niece and nephew who went to school on the bus, and his very disabled neighbor who took care of his son, who needed the bus to get medicine. He said the wonderful drivers had taken care of his family very well, and that driving was not an easy job, especially when they had to put up with the public. He said he knew this was difficult, but he wanted to narrow it down a little and be able to take back to his constituents a real answer as to what the problems were.

Ms. Pierson asked the Board members if there was anything from Mr. Bylund that they could respond to.

Mr. Gaydos said, speaking personally, that there was no one on the Board who had an agenda. He said that they were there to try to serve the public; they gave up time to try to ensure that the transit system existed. He explained that, year after year, the Board looked at budgets and made projections, trying to figure out what was the best balance, both for the present and the future of LTD. He said that they would not be involved if they did not care about transit and the employees of the District as much as or more than the committee did. He said that what the public needed to understand was that the Board was trying its best to balance in their own minds what was going on, just as the committee was trying. As part of that balance, the Board was saying that a process was in place; there was a union, there was management, and there was a process that had to be followed. The Board was following that process the best it could, and was doing the best it could to do that balancing and to ensure that Mr. Bylund's niece and nephew continued to have the opportunity to use the bus. He said that the Board did not want to have a strike, and this was not an attempt at a power play; rather, it was an attempt to be responsible, and they had to stay within the confines of the negotiation process.

Ms. Pierson asked if other members of the citizen's committee had questions for the Board.

Bob Baldwin said that in his eight years of union involvement at LCC, the college had never attempted to impose a settlement. In fact, he said, there was specific language that stated that the union would not strike and administration would not impose. He said he had seen bargainings go well into the second year, which was done because they understood that serving the students was their first priority and settling was second. He asked the Board why they were not willing to go at least another 35 days without exercising their right to impose a settlement.

Mr. Gaydos said that LTD and the ATU had been bargaining since May. Part of the issue, he said, was that in looking at the budget and increase in costs without implementation, LTD would start accruing greater and greater costs along the way. He said there was no provision for no strike and no implementation.

Michael Regan said that the question of implementation was done; it was not something that any of them wanted, and he thought the Board had figured that out. He said he rode the bus five or six times a week and knew a lot of the drivers. He tended to support the drivers on a gut level just because he saw them do their job so well. He said that the Board did not realize how much the drivers were their best advertisement. He said that LTD's drivers, with the handicapped people that LTD had to transport, went way over and above what they needed to do, and he tended to support them. He added that he had been through labor negotiations where people had lost their jobs over unions striking over health care. On the other side, they were saying they did not want to pay for health care, but did not understand that they were already paying for health care because the premiums were coming out. At this point, Ms. Pierson interrupted and said that she was going to cut him off. Mr. Regan asked how they were going to get through this and if they were doing any good.

John VanLandingham said he had no questions.

Debbie Oresik said that at one point the committee had talked about involving an independent auditor to look at LTD's financials. It was her understanding that the union had expressed an

interest in that and was willing to split the cost of having an audit done. She asked if that would be something that the Board would be willing to do.

Mr. Gaydos replied that LTD was audited every year by a CPA firm. The last few years, the firm was from Salem. He explained that the audit was a public document and available to everyone, and that it was an expensive process. The most recent audit was completed that fall, and an intensive federal audit also was completed last year. He said that the Board's job was to truly care about the employees, to truly care about being stewards and understanding that LTD was using a lot of local, federal, and state dollars to try to keep the system operating. From a management perspective, he said, or a board of directors' perspective, the Board had to have those audits. Since those audits were available to the public, he said, the Board did not believe that another audit was necessary, nor would they support spending money for another audit, but they were certainly willing to share the audit, and the public was invited to watch the budget process and attend to hear the auditor report back to the Board.

Ms. Hallock said there seemed to be some dispute about the actual costs of different proposals that were on the table, essentially the health care costs. She thought the concern was that there was not an agreement about the fundamental numbers for those costs. Mr. Gaydos reiterated his opening comments that at the request of the mediator, LTD had had the broker and the health insurance company available to try to answer those questions, so the District had tried every way it could to try to get that accurate information for the union. He said that the Board was not there to try to portray anything improper; they were trying to get the best information they could and provide that to the union.

Ms. Hallock asked if that was written up anywhere in a format that anyone on the committee or a CPA could look at. Mr. Vobora replied that it was posted on the front page of the Web site and in the documentation that was being passed around that evening. That included the costing out of each component of the contract proposal. Ms. Hallock said she had seen that and it just stated the costs. Mr. Vobora replied that it compared costs. Ms. Ban wanted to clarify that it was not the Board's job to mediate the contract. That was the job of the mediating team. The Board's job, she said, was to set the financial parameters for that team, and they had done that after several years of very intensive looking at a strategic plan and a budget that forecast eight years out what LTD could afford and could not afford. What happened at the bargaining table, she said, was really between the bargaining team and the union. She said that the Board had been asked for several portfolios of benefits, with different numbers attached to each of those. She noted that the comparisons between the different offers were on the spreadsheet on the Web site. She explained that the reason the numbers kept moving was that in the conversations, the parameters of the plan kept moving.

Ms. Pierson said that the committee would be meeting again and looking at the financial information. She said the committee had the statement from the union that they would help pay for a CPA if that was needed. She said the committee was really asking the Board for some indication that they may consider this and the committee could negotiate it with them in the future, but if the Board said no, that was all right.

A female at the table said she wanted to explain how the idea of the committee seemed to her. She said that LTD had the choice to implement a contract that the union did not agree to, and the union had the choice to strike. She heard many people in the community not wanting that to happen and she wanted to see how she could help. She noticed that there were some disagreements in numbers. She said that often happens--it's not that someone is wrong; it's that

there are different perspectives. She thought that if people could work together for a little while, they could see things more clearly to come to a solution. She hoped that there would be no strike, which there hadn't been. She also had hoped there would be no implementation, which there had been. She knew there was a process, but said that if the union had followed the process as closely as the Board seemed to think it needed to, they already would be on strike. She said that Mr. Gaydos had said that LTD was ready for a strike, but she did not think the community was ready for a strike.

Mr. Gaydos explained that the union had given the strike notice, so LTD had to be ready for a strike. He said that no one was ever ready for a strike or wanted one to occur. However, LTD still had to prepare because people depended on them.

Ms. Ban said she thought she was hearing from the last speaker that their interpretation of the Board's decision to implement was that they were prompting a strike or pushing for a strike. The speaker said that was not correct, but that implementation is often the thing that causes people to go on strike. She said they had different opinions, but she wanted the Board to imagine a place where someone could look at the numbers and help people agree so there wouldn't have to be a strike or implementation. She said that was why they were there, and she was feeling a little frustrated.

Ms. Ban said that that place should happen in the bargaining room with the brokers whom LTD had made available for them to look at the numbers. She said that this was part of the bargaining process. The female speaker said that they were looking for an alternative to a strike, and she did not feel that the Board was open to some alternative that could avoid a strike.

Mr. Gaydos said that the District was providing the committee with all the information that it had; anyone could look at those numbers; they could contest the numbers or provide any information they had that could help people see numbers differently. He reiterated that LTD was trying to get some mediation scheduled. When the female speaker said there was no hope, he said, there was a period of time before March 7 or the current strike date when mediation could occur, but it would occur within the mediation process and would not occur because a community group comes together and believes that it can cause that mediation.

Mr. Bylund asked if implementation could be rescinded. Mr. Gaydos said he did not know the answer to that. He asked the committee to remember what he said earlier, that the implementation was staged so that there were opportunities for adjusting, until mediation absolutely failed and there was a strike. He said that even then, at some point there would be a resolution of some kind.

Mr. Bylund said that when he joined the committee, he thought their main goal was to identify the specific issues keeping LTD and ATU from settlement. He said he still had not, other than the information from the ATU, identified any specific issues keeping LTD and ATU from settlement, other than the process. He asked if the process needed to change, or if issues needed to be identified so that the public could make a good, honest decision about how to feel about this.

Ms. Ban asked if he was asking that public have an opportunity to know how to feel. Mr. Bylund said he thought the public was owed an explanation as to what specific issues were keeping LTD and the ATU from settling. He thought they deserved that because they were the ones being affected. He added that he was very grateful that the Board was there that evening, because it showed that they truly did want to find a solution to the problem. But, he said, if the Board honestly could not speak for its bargaining team, and if the Board had outlined the parameters for the



bargaining team, maybe those parameters needed to be changed, or maybe the implementation needed to be rescinded, and maybe the ATU needed to be asked again to go through the process of giving a little more time. He said that his sincere hope was that, absent identifying specific issues keeping LTD and the ATU from a settlement, "we" could come to a settlement. He did not see how he could explain it to people unless the Board identified those specific issues. He said there was a lot of innuendo and a lot of stuff flying around and people writing letters to the *Register-Guard* and other media places, so people were speculating and were paranoid.

Ms. Pierson interrupted to ask if there was some response from the LTD Board. Mr. Gaydos said that the Board's response had been and would be that LTD was as open as it could be. People could look at the budget process, at projections, and at figures, and LTD was doing the best job it could, and bargaining would stay at the bargaining table.

James Mattiace said that the meeting was not going as well as the committee thought it would go. He said that they understood that the Board had fiduciary and community responsibilities to make sure that LTD stays solvent for the next 25 or 30 years or more, and understood the Board's perspective that monetary issues with a long-term effect needed to be solved now. He said he had talked with Assistant General Manager Mark Pangborn, who had directed him to the Web site. He had looked at the budget and had a number of questions initially, but most were solved by looking at the Web site. He said there were some other monetary questions that he wanted to ask about. He said that one of the possible ways to propose settlement or at least talking points outside the bargaining process was to have a CPA cost the union's proposal and if it was paid for by the union, LTD would not accept the results if it did not have a financial stake in the CPA. He said that was one of the reasons the committee was asking LTD to pay half the cost of a CPA, so it would accept the results. His second point was that the committee was really hoping to get from the Board, verbally, what their objections were, from their perspective. He said there also were some issues that the ATU had brought to the committee that were not financial, such as issues involving right to manage, time of employees, etc. From his perspective, those were secondary issues, and he thought that maybe only the wage and health care issues were being implemented. He said that if the employees had a good health care plan and adequate wages, then those secondary issues might not be so heightened right then. He wondered if one step toward solving the problem would be to take those issues off the table. He said that since these were issues the committee received from the ATU, he was interested in knowing if this in actuality was what was happening, or if the Board had a different explanation of what those other issues actually meant or what their effect would be (such as payment for time for relieving other drivers, time for writing reports, discipline for writing false reports). He wondered if the Board could direct the bargainers to take those off the table so they could focus on the health care and wages issues.

Mr. Gaydos said, first, that a lot of work rules do have budget implications, so he wanted the committee to understand that. Second, he said that was exactly what occurred at the bargaining table, so as a Board they were not going to get into that.

Ms. Hallock said that the committee had hoped for a dialog on how they could proceed together on some of these issues, but that obviously would not occur that evening. She said that she hoped LTD would not implement the work rules that were part of the final offer. She said that now that the community was engaged and wanting to know more, if they could keep the situation from escalating further, she would ask the Board not to take actions that might escalate the dispute. She said they probably had figured out that implementing procedures that were not agreed to were, at a minimum, controversial, and would not help to reach resolution.

Ms. Ban said again that this was part of the mediation process and she was hoping that was exactly what people were going to be talking about as they met. She said that the Board's concern was that they did not give direction at that level of detail. They gave direction in terms of what is manageable in an overall budget that they believed was responsible for the transit system and the employees.

Ms. Pierson said that if this was what was pushing dispute and disagreement, then maybe it was part of the Board's responsibility.

The question was asked if the Board was present in bargaining. Mr. Gaydos said that it was not. The speaker said she rode the bus a lot and heard a lot of support for bus drivers. She said she thought she would hear people talking negatively about them, but she did not. She said it was a really wonderful system and she hoped that the Board could take good care of the human resources as well as the good care they took of the other resources.

Ms. Pierson said that she gave the Board a great deal of credit for how well the system had been running, as well as for their concern that it go on running and that it be there for the community. She wanted to remind the Board that at the lower end of the Willamette Valley, February was a cruel month, and referred to more suicides in February than in other months. She said it was a terrible time for the disruption of the life of the community and for people's sociability and being able to get around for pleasure as well as the things they needed to do out of necessity. She said she was hoping that before the meeting ended the Board would speak out to the public. She said that the committee members were hearing from people with questions about what was going on and why the negotiations were stuck, with no resolution that would satisfy everyone, where everyone would give a little bit, but where everyone would feel that what they were getting was worth the giving. She said that the Board had a roomful of people and some media there that evening, and she wanted to give them a chance to lay out for those present very briefly what the difficulties were as they saw them, what the difficulties were that were in the way to a solution.

Mr. Gaydos said he knew that it was frustrating to some, but he said that the Board supported the bargaining team and believed that the mediation process was the appropriate process, and hoped that there would be agreed-upon mediator times, and trusted that both LTD and the ATU bargaining unit, with the assistance of the professional mediators, would solve those problems. He reiterated that that was really the appropriate place to do that. He said that public pressure was brought to bear by advertisement, by community, by taxpayers, and the Board got to hear from many people. He said that the Board appreciated those present for being there and for their concerns and questions. He said that the Board believed in the process, as he had said at the beginning of this conversation.

Ms. Pierson said that they all wanted that to go forward effectively, but they were very worried because it had been weeks and weeks and months that the process had been going on with no real resolution.

Mr. Bylund said he was sure that the Board heard about people who filled out the 132 form in Column D, which he explained was filled on the subject wages of the employees of a business. He said that if the employees could not get to work, there would be no subjective wages to pay an LTD tax on.

Ms. Ban said she wanted the committee to know that the Board members were on the Board because they cared deeply about the people who were riders, and honored and respected the

drivers. She said that the drivers were very important and were the front line, the "LTD relations committee." She said that once a month the Board got introduced to new drivers and she was moved by it often, about the stories she heard. She stated that all of her clients depended on the bus, and that she would not be in that seat if she did not care deeply about the bus system. She said that the Board had been deeply, deeply worried since May, and had been worrying about this for a very long time. She said she wanted to put it in perspective, that this was not something that the Board took lightly or with a cavalier attitude.

Ms. Pierson stated that the group would continue to meet as a citizen's committee and would continue to be open to information and questions from other citizens in the community, and open to ongoing discussions with the Board. She hoped that the Board would remain open to them and to the committee's process, and also to the union and the citizenry. She said that the committee would not go away until they were sure the buses were going to run and the drivers were going to smile. She thanked the Board.

Mr. Gaydos thanked Ms. Pierson and the committee for taking on this effort and for caring so much about the District because it was a service and, as he said earlier, everyone was there because they cared about the District and about delivering that service. He thanked everyone for coming, and said that if they wanted to meet again they could contact LTD. However, he said, the Board's position would remain consistent, but they had listened and would discuss a lot of the issues that the committee had brought up that evening.

Ms. Pierson asked the citizens' committee to remain.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Gaydos adjourned the LTD Board meeting at 7:35 p.m.

  
Board Secretary

Q:\Reference\Board Packet\2005\03\Special Mtg 03-29-05\BDMIN Special 02-08-05.doc