

MINUTES OF HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MEETING  
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

February 14, 2006

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on February 13, 2006, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a meeting of the Lane Transit District Board of Directors Human Resources Committee was held at 7:30 a.m. on January 17, 2006, in the District's conference room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present:

Gerry Gaydos, Chair  
Susan Ban  
Mike Eyster  
Mark Pangborn, Interim General Manager  
Mary Neidig, Director of Human Resources and Risk Management  
Andy Vobora, Director of Marketing and Communications  
Diane Hellekson, Director of Finance and Information Technology  
Jo Sullivan, Clerk of the Board/Minutes Recorder

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Committee Chair Gerry Gaydos. All were present.

**LTD PENSION PLANS:** The issues for committee discussion were whether the Board wanted to bring both pension plans (LTD/ATU Pension Plan and LTD Salaried Employees Retirement Plan) to 100 percent funding and, if so, under what timeline. Both the fund manager and the actuary had recommended to the plan trustees that public pension plans should be at 100 percent. The Board Finance Committee also had discussed these questions at an earlier meeting. Mr. Gaydos expressed the need to educate people about these issues so that there was no sense of alarm. He said that getting to 100 percent was good but that there was no harm to employees or retirees in the meantime. The Committee discussed some alternatives to reduce the amount spent in the first years. Mr. Eyster was uncomfortable stating a percentage as a target. Mr. Gaydos said that the policy should say that it was a 20-year target, building for the future, and that there should be a review every year or every two years with the actuarial report. Mr. Gaydos said that the Board needed to agree on a rate between 7 percent and 8 percent.

Ms. Hellekson said that 7.5 percent with a 20-year amortization was used for the last draft of the Long-range Financial Plan. Mr. Gaydos said that as stewards of public money and employees' futures, he did not want it to take longer than that. This policy had been up to the trustees in the past; the Board had not considered it in any significant way.

It was agreed that at the Board meeting on February 15 Ms. Hellekson would give a combined report from the two committees for consideration by the full Board.

**EXECUTIVE SEARCH PROCESS:** Ms. Neidig handed out a proposed work plan/timeline for committee discussion. One option was to develop criteria for the selection of a new general manager and then move ahead to select a search firm closer to the date of selection. She recommended planning for nine months from the time the Board began selecting a firm until a new general manager was hired. The draft timeline showed discussion of the criteria and the duration for the interim general manager.

There was some discussion about the timeline for the planned communication audit. Mr. Vobora explained that an all-employee survey and internal communication audit were underway. This was different from the organizational assessment discussed by the Committee earlier. Ms. Neidig said that the Committee had talked about hiring a third party to help with employee relations. She suggested calling this “employee relations development” because it was about relations building. Ms. Ban said she would like to build in internal development criteria as part of this plan, so the general manager criteria would not be finalized until employee relations development was completed. A consultant named Tom Boyle was one possible third party mentioned to help with this program. Information gathered would help determine what criteria to use, and would include some time to do some work with the community.

Mr. Gaydos said that the HR Committee and Board did not need to be involved in the employee relations development process, but it was important to the timeline. Other issues affecting the timeline for a general manager search process were replacement of the maintenance director and federal funding for EmX.

Ms. Ban wanted to use the term “general manager for an interim period” rather than “interim general manager.” Mr. Gaydos said it could be just “general manager.”

**PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR INTERIM GENERAL MANAGER:** Mr. Pangborn said that this was a period of turmoil in the organization, so it was important to him to get out into the organization and reassure employees that the organization was solid and focused, and to point out to employees that he would be focusing on those strengths. Secondly, employees were confused about how the organization goes about making decisions. His point was that LTD has a way for identifying and solving problems, beginning within departments with employees’ supervisors. He had been emphasizing that he would be working with the elected officials of the union. He also saw the need to focus on employee relations. Ms. Ban noted the value statement at the beginning of *Looking to the Future*, which states that employees are LTD’s most important asset.

Mr. Pangborn said that he had begun to meet with key partner agencies as well. He also was focusing on the Board’s priorities from the December strategic planning workshop, including service, equipment, employee relations and communication, training and incentives, and health programs. He said that money was tight, and he would be looking for ways to do things more effectively. The budget would focus on executing the strategic plan effectively and efficiently.

Mr. Pangborn noted the Board’s former goals for Ken Hamm for 2003-04. He said that when the Franklin and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard EmX corridors were on the ground, the District would be looking at the next corridor and all the pieces (progressive corridor enhancement, etc.) and execution of the agenda that was in place.

There was some discussion about when a performance evaluation should be held and whether something other than the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) evaluation tool should be used. It was suggested that there be an abbreviated evaluation in six months, when Mr. Pangborn would report on these goals. There also could be a follow-up communications audit a year later.

Mr. Gaydos said that the Board owed it to Mr. Pangborn to give him feedback, but he did not want to rush that. He said the Committee would need to discuss the budget impact with Mr. Pangborn and with the general manager and government relations positions would be revenue neutral or not.

Ms. Ban asked what role Mr. Pangborn would like the Committee to play in supporting him. He replied that he would like to agree on strategies and goals, with clear expectations and then periodic feedback. Ms. Ban and Mr. Gaydos appreciated his between-meetings message from Mark to the Board, and his “no surprises” goal.

Mr. Pangborn said he had been talking with the Leadership Council about how to get information back to the Board, whether by performance reports or another method. He would be working with the Board to find out what information they would like to have and how they would like it to be presented.

**NEXT MEETING:** Suggestions for the next meeting were: a report of progress on the HR plan, *Looking to the Future*; continued discussion of performance objectives for the interim period; and the timeline for Board HR Committee activities.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

---

Recording Secretary