

MINUTES OF DIRECTORS MEETING

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

SPECIAL MEETING

Wednesday, August 25, 1993

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on August 19, 1993, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, a special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District was held on Wednesday, August 25, 1993, at 7:30 p.m. in the LTD Board Room at 3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene.

Present: Janet Calvert
Tammy Fitch, Vice President
Patricia Hocken
Thomas Montgomery, Secretary
Keith Parks, President, presiding
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent: Peter Brandt, Treasurer
(one vacancy)

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

EMPLOYEE OF THE MONTH: Mr. Parks introduced the July Employee of the Month, Transportation Secretary Jill Howard. Ms. Howard was hired on April 27, 1992, after impressing staff with her abilities as a temporary worker. She was nominated by a co-worker, who said that in the year Jill had been with the transportation division, she had made an incredible impact. She was extremely committed, as demonstrated by how quickly she mastered the myriad complex details of her job, and was a consummate professional and a real pleasure to be around. No matter how much work she was given to complete, she was always ready to take on more, and the division functioned more efficiently, effectively, and happily because Jill was there. When asked what made Ms. Howard a good employee, Transportation Administrator Bob Hunt said that she was the quickest study with whom he had ever worked. She not only learned fast, she worked smart. He added that Ms. Howard was innovative and adaptable, and pleasantly indomitable as she assumed each task, and that she was an inspiration to her co-workers. After receiving her certificate check, Ms. Howard thanked the Board and said that working at LTD was a real pleasure.

Mr. Parks next introduced the August Employee of the Month, Bus Operator Marcie Pope. Ms. Pope was hired as a Farebox Data Clerk in July 1990, and became a part-time Bus Operator in July 1992. She was nominated by a rider, who commended Ms. Pope for being kind and helpful, as well as a good driver. When asked what made Ms. Pope a good employee, Transportation Administrator Bob Hunt said that Ms. Pope had fine attendance and safety records and recently received a commendation for correct schedule operation. She was

always cheerful and helpful with her customers and her peers; and, most importantly, she enjoyed her work, and it showed. After receiving her certificate and check, Ms. Pope thanked the Board and said that she was a people person and loved her job, including having a captive audience for her jokes, and that she would love to work at LTD until she retired.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: Mr. Parks opened the meeting for participation from the audience. (1) The first to speak was Steve Williamson of Springfield. He said that he was employed by Laurel Hill Center, which provides rehabilitation and training for people with psychiatric disabilities. He wanted to know what was happening with the changes in the Reduced Fare certification requirements, because it appeared that people with psychiatric disabilities might be cut, as a class, from the Reduced Fare Program. He stated that a psychiatric disability is a severe and persistent long-term mental illness, and that he had done extensive training with his clients each time the routes changed. He explained that a psychiatric disability tends to come and go, and that, depending on the severity of a client's illness, additional training is needed from time to time. Mr. Williamson said he was afraid that without the opportunity to pay the lower rate for a Reduced Fare pass, some of the people with psychiatric disabilities would not be able to go to their therapists, on family visits, etc., and that without those kinds of trips, people with psychiatric disabilities, like everyone else, do not do as well. He said that when people think of disabilities, they think of visible disabilities, but psychiatric disabilities are no less disabling and require no less support than more visible disabilities. The severity of the disability would come and go, but basically a person had to deal with a psychiatric disability over a long period of time.

(2) Trish Reed of Eugene spoke next, and submitted her comments in writing, as well. She said she was a mental health disabled person who moved to Eugene from Roseburg three months ago, and was speaking from a personal position. She said she thought the bus system was sent from heaven, because she had spent the last ten years without transportation. Not being able to do simple things for herself, such as going shopping, to doctor visits or treatment programs, or even going to a movie, made her feel as if she were totally disabled and that others treated her as a child. She told the Board members that they could not see her disability, but it was just as real as the disability of a person who couldn't see or walk. She said she sometimes had such emotional pain that she wanted to lock herself away from the outside, and that there was a lot of emotional pain involved in asking others to take her somewhere. She said that she couldn't go on strike to protest if she couldn't qualify for a Reduced Fare pass; she would have to pay the extra money to ride the bus. She thought that \$22 per month was a fair price for great bus service, so she would just have to do without one more thing, on her SSI disability money. She said she made a lot less money than the person with the other medical card. She also said that it had taken her a long time to admit out loud that she had a disability, and maybe for once someone finally recognized that she did not have to be maimed or crippled to get a helping hand. She said that the sad thing was that persons with mental disabilities were being pushed back to the dark ages, like they were not here and would go away. She stated that the bus was her life line, and that sometimes she felt very guilty using the disability pass because no one could see her scars. Even if she had money to buy a car, because of being dysfunctional at any given time, she couldn't drive, so bus service was her only resource. She said that even riding the same bus over and over again, she would get lost and need the bus driver's help. She added that people reach out to help those with visible disabilities, but were afraid of people with mental health disabilities, and that

made people with mental health disabilities rely on the bus even more than those with physical disabilities.

(3) Deanna Slipp of Eugene was the third speaker. She also worked at the Laurel Hill Center. She told the Board that she was there because people began coming to her scared because they didn't know where they could get another \$11 each month to pay for a regular fare bus pass. She said that there was a huge community of people with disabilities that didn't show who were receiving the same income as those with other types of disabilities. Ms. Slipp said she had been told that one of the reasons for the change in Reduced Fare certification qualifications was that some bus riders were upset when people without visible disabilities rode the bus with a Reduced Fare card. She stated that the budgeting change would be too much for many of people she worked with to manage, and when they stayed home, they had an increase in symptoms and could end up costing the taxpayers more in other services. Ms. Slipp said they did not understand the change from a disability focus to a focus on people who need special training or help to ride the bus. She said that the Laurel Hill Center staff worked with people for weeks and months at the agency and in their homes to help them increase their motivation and confidence and deal with the anxiety that kept them from any challenge. She said they worked with them in a way that she assumed they would not be able to prove on the new application form, but that the bus was a lifeline for them, and people with mental illness made progress very slowly and considered it a success when they could leave the house and go to a new place in the community.

(4) Mary Burgess said she had a mental illness plus arthritis, and that she had to carry heavy groceries on the bus and had hurt her rib cage. The doctor had filled out the new form and tried to explain that her weight aggravates this problem, but she was denied certification because it was viewed as a weight problem. She had to go to the doctor again to have new forms filled out. She said she had a great deal of stress and could have a stroke. She was taking thyroid medication, and the bus was her only transportation to the store, the pharmacy, etc.

(5) Connie Burnett, of Franklin Blvd., said that she used to have a phobia and be afraid to leave the house. Now the bus no longer comes past her house on Saturdays, and she would have to work a half-mile to catch the bus. She said she had a hard time getting around, and that she was speaking to stand up for those with mental health disabilities because she thought they did need help. She asked the Board members to try living on \$432 per month, and said she wanted them to understand that it was hard on everyone who had to. She said she could not drive, and could not live without her Reduced Fare bus service. She asked if there were any way to get the bus to 4750 Franklin on Saturdays. Planning Administrator Stefano Viggiano suggested that staff review this request during the Annual Route Review and consider it with the other requests the District receives each year. That process would begin within the next three or four months. Mr. Parks told Ms. Burnett that the District had 200 or more other requests for service this year that it was not able to fund, so her request was not alone.

(6) Todd Lewin, of Franklin Blvd., said he had a mental health disability, which couldn't be seen. The people he was around, his friends who were mentally ill, could not get around unless on the bus. He said it would be a menace to society if a lot of them were able to drive.

He said at one time he lived on \$422 a month and paid three-fourths of that in rent, and one-fourth for food, and could barely pay for a Reduced Fare bus pass. If the price of the pass increased, there would be a major decrease in the number of people with mental health disabilities riding because they would not be able to afford the pass. He said that sometimes when he was riding the bus, he helped other people with disabilities get on and off, because his father was disabled. He said it helped to have the low-cost bus pass because a lot of people with disabilities could not afford the regular bus pass, and even though the mental health disability couldn't be seen, it was there.

Item for Information--Revision of Reduced Fare Certification Process: Ms. Calvert suggested holding the discussion of this informational item while the speakers from the audience were still in attendance. Ms. Loobey said that there might be some connection between this item and the action item regarding the low-income discount fare program modifications.

Customer Service Administrator Andy Vobora explained that the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 had mandated that transit provide half-fare service during off-peak times for the elderly and people with disabilities. The definition of disability had been taken from the federal regulations, and hinged upon the mobility nature of the disease. The old LTD certification requirements did not define that well, and caused a lot of confusion among certifiers and individuals. A large number of people who should not have been certified were certified over a long period of time. He said that LTD's Reduced Fare Program was a large program, with over 2,000 participants. There had been some problems with abuse and confusion; for instance, the school districts had been referring people with marginal learning disabilities or under stress because their parents were divorcing, etc., which did not meet the requirements for the program.

Since the CSC lacked good records on some participants, Mr. Vobora had wanted to update and computerize the Reduced Fare records. He had started notifying participants about some changes in the program, and some misinformation had spread. He said that, clearly, some of the examples the Board had heard about that evening would qualify for the program. The qualification regarding specialized training meant that someone who needed training when service changes were made would be qualified for the program. He had tried to make the mobility-based emphasis of the program more clear, and provide Reduced Fare certification for people who needed specialized training, services, and/or equipment.

Mr. Vobora said that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) allowed transit districts to take the broadest interpretation of the law. At this time, however, he had wanted to recertify everyone under the strictest definition to see where the program stood, and then see if changes should be made. He said that the District was not going to take Reduced Fare cards away from anyone. Staff were working their way through the files, which probably would take a year, and would wait until a person's card expired before requiring recertification.

Ms. Hocken asked if the federal definition was that elderly persons qualified in every case. Mr. Vobora replied that there were two automatic qualifiers. Those were for people aged 62 or older, and for anyone with a Medicare card. Ms. Calvert asked if that meant

anyone aged 62 or older no matter what physical condition. Mr. Vobora said that was correct.

A man in the audience said that people on SSI are either aged, blind, or disabled, so they should all qualify. Mr. Vobora said it was up to the FTA to outline the conditions that would automatically qualify.

In response to a question from the audience, Mr. Vobora said that there was not a year's waiting period to qualify; rather, the process of going through all the records would take about a year. If a person had a disability that affected his or her mobility, certification could be authorized as soon as the paperwork was completed. He said that the FTA definition steered somewhat away from what caused the mobility problem; if someone had a mobility problem, he or she should be certified.

Ms. Calvert said she understood the need to review the program, but since some 62-year-olds were running marathons, she thought the District should look at a generous definition for people with mental disabilities. Ms. Loobey said that the District currently was not certain of the population within the program, and who was eligible and not eligible. Staff had not been able to keep track if people left the community or their circumstances changed, etc. It was not unusual to have two or three people a week confused and "lost" on the buses, and it currently was difficult to track who some of them were. She said she was sorry if the recertification process was causing confusion in the community. Having better records would allow staff a quicker response when people did become confused while riding the bus and, as Mr. Vobora had said, following the FTA guidelines did not mean the Board couldn't broaden the District's definition. If the Board would like to look at that kind of broadening, staff would like to go back to the Board with some guidelines, because the District probably would not want to certify every psychiatric disorder that had been defined in the medical text.

Ms. Loobey said that staff were asking the Board to approve changes in the Low-Income Discount Fare Program. Laurel Hill Center was eligible for the program, and could purchase tokens or day passes for its clients.

Ms. Fitch asked if staff were doing some public relations work with the affected agencies. Mr. Vobora said that they were, but he thought some may have been missed, and the message was not getting out to all of them as clearly as staff would have liked. He added that staff were taking their time and re-examining applications that were denied by the doctors, because staff did not want to eliminate people who really should qualify.

Ms. Loobey said that the changes seemed to be causing uncertainty, and the phrase "independent mobility" was causing confusion, so staff would work with Laurel Hill Center and its clients to clarify the issues. Mr. Parks said that staff would bring this issue back to the Board at a later meeting.

The Board took a short break while the members of the audience left the room, and resumed the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

MOTION
VOTE

CONSENT CALENDAR: Ms. Fitch moved that the Consent Calendar for August 25, 1993, be approved as presented. The motion was seconded and passed by unanimous vote.

Consent Calendar items were: approval of the minutes of the June 16, 1993, regular Board meeting; approval of a resolution authorizing the General Manager to enter into a contract with the State of Oregon to receive capital matching funds from the Department of Energy stripper well litigation settlement; and approval of a Board Finance Committee recommendation to dissolve the Severance Pay Plan.

COMPENSATION SURVEY-BOARD SALARY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR CONSULTANT SELECTION: Bill Nevell, Human Resources Administrator, explained that staff had mailed Requests for Proposals to a number of firms and the Board Salary Committee and staff had interviewed three respondents. The interview committee's recommendation was that the Board contract with Ralph Andersen and Associates. Mr. Nevell said that the Board had budgeted \$10,000 for this study, and the estimated cost was \$7,500.

Ms. Fitch, Salary Committee Chair, said that the committee was very impressed with the firm, and appreciated the fact that the vice president of the company referred to the District's policy as the crux of the issue, no matter what was happening in the market place. She said it was a unanimous decision, and that she appreciated Mr. Parks standing in for Mr. Montgomery.

Ms. Calvert said she thought the Board would have to review the salary administration policy and make it more specific. Ms. Loobey said the consultant had recommended that this policy be less ambiguous.

Mr. Nevell said the consultant estimated that it would take 10 to 12 weeks to complete the study. Staff would keep the Board updated during that time, and the Board would receive a report at the end of the study. Ms. Loobey said that the consultant anticipated three visits to the property, and promised to follow up without charge if the District had any questions, which she said was very unusual.

Ms. Hocken commented that, not having seen the RFP and the work plan, she would hope that when the comparisons of jobs were done, the consultant would look at both governmental and private sector businesses, because governmental agencies were often accused of being high in terms of benefits. Ms. Fitch said the committee had discussed this with the consultant, and also discussed including the cost of living specific to certain areas. Ms. Loobey said the consultant had a process to factor that in during the study.

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved that the Board adopt the Board Salary Committee recommendation to retain Ralph Andersen and Associates to conduct a compensation study. Mr. Montgomery
VOTE seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

LOW-INCOME DISCOUNT FARE PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS: Ms. Loobey explained that, essentially, the agencies that were involved in the program had liked the way it was set up and found it useful, but did not have the money to use the program as fully as the Board had allowed. The agencies made two requests. First, they asked if the discount on tokens could be set at 50 percent of the cash value, rather than 33 percent. Second, they asked if day passes could be included in the discount program, because many of their clients need to

take multiple trips in a day, looking for employment, housing, etc. Staff thought the recommendations were valuable, and recommended that the Board approve them.

Ms. Calvert said she realized, in working with low-income people as she did, that transportation was always a key factor in doing anything, and very important in trying to help people to be more self-sufficient. She moved that the Board approve the recommended changes to the Low-Income Discount Fare Program, as follows: an increase in the token price discount from 33 percent to 50 percent; and the inclusion of day passes as eligible purchases. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion. Ms. Hocken asked for an estimate of the administrative costs for this program. Mr. Vobora said that the sales were handled by the CSC employees who handled the regular token and pass distribution, and the agencies were required to pick up their orders, rather than LTD delivering to them. Therefore, this program did not take much extra staff time.

MOTION

VOTE There was no further discussion, and the motion to approved the recommended changes passed by unanimous vote.

APPOINTMENT OF MPC REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Parks said he had appointed Ms. Hocken to replace Jack Billings as one of LTD's two representatives to the Metropolitan Policy Committee, but he needed Board approval to finalize the appointment. Mr. Montgomery moved that Pat Hocken be appointed to fill the vacant LTD position on the Metropolitan Policy Committee. Ms. Fitch seconded, and the motion carried by unanimous vote.

MOTION
VOTE

APPOINTMENT OF TRANSPAN SYMPOSIA REPRESENTATIVES: LTD had been asked to name two representatives to attend the Lane Council of Governments symposia on the TransPlan Update and subsequent task force meetings during the next two years. Mr. Parks said he had asked Ms. Fitch and she had said she would be willing to participate. He also thought it would make sense for Ms. Hocken to participate, since she would be a continuing Board member and would be working with the MPC.

MOTION Ms. Calvert moved that Pat Hocken and Tammy Fitch be appointed as LTD's representatives in the TransPlan Update process. Mr. Montgomery seconded the motion, and VOTE Ms. Hocken and Ms. Fitch were appointed by unanimous vote.

MOTION **APPOINTMENT TO BOARD FINANCE COMMITTEE:** Ms. Fitch moved that VOTE Mr. Montgomery be appointed to the Board Finance Committee, to replace Mr. Billings. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC EDUCATION CAMPAIGN: Ms. Loobey said that there had been a great deal of discussion regarding an LTD public education campaign during that budget process, and the Board had expressed some concerns. Staff believed that a public education campaign was important to LTD, in order to engage the community in a dialogue concerning the future of transportation systems within the context of federal and state policies and mandates. On page 38 of the agenda packet, staff had outlined themes that had been proposed; the Board's concerns, as understood by staff; and staff's reasons for proposing a public education campaign.

Ms. Loobey said that one of the major concerns the Board emphasized was that LTD was a special service government, not a local purpose government. She said staff did not hear that a public education campaign was a bad idea; they heard concerns about how that might be done, including funding and under what umbrella it might be undertaken. Some of the concerns that were raised would become moot if staff followed the Board's strong lead to develop a campaign in an alliance with other local agencies and local units of government. Staff would not know some of the answers to the Board's concerns until they advanced the idea of a consortium and discovered the level of interest of the other units of government. Staff were first asking the Board if there was agreement that a public education campaign made sense, and if it should be done in alliance with other agencies and units of government. If so, staff would approach their counterparts in the other units of government and report back to the Board. The Board would review any proposal that was developed by the consortium, and staff recommended that the proposal then go through the MPC because of the concurrent TransPlan Update process. Ms. Loobey said that a lot of people were not familiar with the TransPlan Update, the federal Clean Air Act, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), etc. She believed that the process of the TransPlan Update would go far more smoothly with an informed citizenry. The last TransPlan update process took almost two years, and the most controversial issue was the goal for modal split for alternative transportation, because Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield couldn't agree.

Ms. Loobey said that staff's recommendation was to propose the formation of a consortium, and staff would report back to the Board periodically about their outreach efforts to other local units of government. Mr. Montgomery said he assumed this meant that the first step would be to do fact finding; to talk with other agencies to see what everyone thought about what direction should be taken by everyone. Ms. Loobey replied that it first would be just staff outreach; and no campaign had yet been designed.

Ms. Calvert said that someone had to step up and take the lead to help others think in more global terms as far as what was going to happen in transportation design in the whole community. The pitfalls were what was happening in Eugene and Springfield, and getting caught in a dog fight. She suggested that LTD could help lead the way, and said that there might be an opportunity to get something going and provide some leadership in the community, but she also thought this needed to be done carefully. She said she was living in the most rapidly growing area of Eugene, and it would be more affected by what Springfield did across the freeway than by anything Eugene might do, and Springfield probably felt the same about Eugene in certain areas.

MOTION Ms. Hocken moved that the Board authorize staff to work with other local agency staff to develop a proposal for MPC's consideration that a public education campaign be conducted in coordination with the TransPlan Update. Ms. Calvert seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

VOTE

ANNUAL BOARD STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT: Ms. Fitch brought up the fact that three Board members would be going off the Board in December. She said she understood the timing and the need to get things going for the budget process and other issues before the District, but if the Governor and the Senate Committee acted in a timely manner, the Board could have up to three new members by January 1. It had occurred to Ms.

Fitch that maybe the Board should consider a day-long strategic planning retreat locally, and cover the issue important for the budget process. She thought a retreat later, with the new members would be critical to get the Board working together, and she thought it would be hard to justify the cost of having weekend retreats in both November and January.

Ms. Calvert asked if current Board members would continue to serve if the Governor did not act before their terms ended. Ms. Loobey said that the law provided that Board members would continue serving until their replacements were named, unless they moved out of their subdistricts or resigned, as Mr. Billings had done.

Ms. Loobey said that Ms. Fitch had raised a good point, and Ms. Calvert had asked the same question earlier. Staff had considered the importance to the District of going ahead with projects and the budget process, but had not considered a mini-retreat to cover the most essential issues. She said her concern was that even though the District had a potentially clumsy situation with no control over the Board replacement schedule, the District still had to function. One important part of the retreat had been to help set the agenda to build the budget, including providing direction on service and long-term financial planning. She wasn't sure the Board could handle everything at a one-day retreat, and she was also concerned that with three new Board members, many of the District's issues would not have the collective wisdom of the current Board. She said it would take the new Board a while to get up to speed with the lingo and the consequences and ramifications of issues. Staff were a little anxious because so many issues were upon the District. They valued the expertise of the senior Board members, which was invaluable in answering some of the questions and helping the District move forward. The value of the retreat, she said, had been to get away informally with fuller discussion and more debate, as well as a greater opportunity to explore issues. One of the aspects of the Board working together as a team was a function that had been helped in other cases by consultants, such as training on the functions and responsibilities of Board members.

Ms. Fitch said that another alternative might be to invite two or three possible Board members to the retreat, if no one had been appointed but there was a good indication of who might be appointed, to provide background information for them. She was concerned about losing the expertise and history of the three departing Board members. Ms. Calvert asked if there were any possibility that the Board could have a full retreat now and staff plan dinner meetings and longer work sessions in the evening to deal with individual topics, that might accomplish some of the training and discussion. Mr. Parks asked how long the appointment of Mr. Billings' replacement would be. Ms. Loobey said that Mr. Billings's term also would expire on December 31, but the Governor possibly could make appoint someone to a full four-year term. Ms. Loobey said she didn't think it would be out of place for someone to attend Board meetings before he or she was an official member. If the Board settled the date for the retreat, it would give her a good reason to call the Governor's office to say that the Board would like to get materials to the Governor's nominee even before his or her confirmation by the Senate. Ms. Fitch said if some of the new Board members could be at the retreat, she would say to go ahead with it. Ms. Loobey said that if the Board were going to have a one-day retreat, it didn't make sense to leave the community.

Mr. Parks asked when staff needed direction for the budget. Ms. Loobey said that staff began internal work the latter part of November.

Ms. Loobey said she would call the Governor's office to see if it appeared that one or two members could be named before the retreat. If so, plans would be made for a two-day retreat. If not, a one-day retreat would be planned, as well as dinner meetings and work sessions. Ms. Hocken said that one other option would be to have dinner meetings one night a week, and take care of the retreat material in pieces.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AT THIS MEETING:

Eugene Station Update: Mr. Parks asked if the public hearing on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be conducted by the Board or by a consultant. Ms. Loobey said it would be done by the Board, at a location larger than LTD's Board Room. Ms. Calvert asked if the EIS process was taking longer than had been anticipated. Mr. Viggiano replied that it was; staff originally had hoped to receive the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) in June, but the review by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) had taken a lot longer than expected, and some changes were being made to the in-house draft. The consultant was having to do some additional work, so the public hearing probably would be two to three months later than staff had hoped it would be.

Mr. Parks said it concerned him a great deal because there would be Board turnover, and the new members might be reluctant to move ahead with the Eugene Station process. Ms. Fitch asked when the Board would vote on the site. Mr. Viggiano said that if all went well, the Board vote could occur at the November Board meeting. He explained that the Board could make a decision 45 days after the draft EIS was released, providing they held a public hearing 30 days after release. The key to the process would be the release date. Ms. Hocken asked if the District would still have to obtain the Conditional Use Permit after site selection. Ms. Loobey said that staff expected that to occur after the first of the year. Ms. Calvert said that maybe it would be better if the Governor made her appointments later, so the current Board members could finish the process of selecting the site.

Ms. Hocken asked if the Board members needed to do anything to help with Lane Community College and parking issues. Ms. Loobey said she would be meeting with LCC President Jerry Moskus at the end of August, to discuss downtown parking, the group pass, and other issues important to LCC and LTD.

Ms. Loobey said that Mr. Viggiano and Tim Dallas, Director of Operations, had met the previous week with the administrator and some board members of Olive Plaza. It seemed that a small vocal minority was very emotionally concerned about the station, and others thought it would be okay, so there were mixed feelings among the residents.

Mr. Montgomery said the District would have to select a site; that was the reality, and the sooner the better. Mr. Parks thought that staff should hurry the process as much as possible.

Fiscal Year 1992-93 Ridership: Ms. Calvert asked why productivity had been going down the last two years. Ms. Loobey said that was a result of added service; costs went up, and it took a while to build ridership on new service.

MOTION EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO ORS 192.660(1)(d): Ms. Calvert moved that the Board move into Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(d), to conduct deliberations with persons designated by the governing body to carry on labor negotiations.

VOTE The motion was seconded, and the Board moved into Executive Session at 9:15 p.m. by unanimous vote. Mr. Dallas and Bill Nevell, Human Resources Administrator, were present for the discussion.

RETURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION: The Board returned to regular session at 10:15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT: The Board unanimously adjourned the meeting at 10:15 p.m.


Board Secretary