

43 of the elected leaders from Cache County, developers, and real estate people, as well
44 as those from the public. Envision Utah helped with the event. When asked what the
45 most important issue facing Cache Valley the top concern was transportation with air
46 quality as a close second. Cache Valley is projected to grow by almost 60,000 people
47 by 2040; it will take work and planning to manage this growth.

48
49 9. Discussion of the Long Range Transportation Plan – Jeff Gilbert, Cache Metropolitan
50 Planning Organization (CMPO): Jeff Gilbert spoke about CMPO’s involvement in
51 long range transportation planning; this includes multiple transportation aspects such
52 as road planning and public transportation, as well as considerations for bikes and
53 pedestrians. The Census Bureau considers Cache Valley an urbanized area. CMPO is
54 required to do plans that project out 20 years; plans are constricted by assumed
55 revenue. This plan is updated every four years; CMPO will do their next update in
56 two years. The Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP) that CVTD just conducted
57 will be used to inform their plan. Air quality issues are a big part of their plan. There
58 will potentially be a new budget to deal with emissions. CMPO has to prove that
59 emissions are within the standard; there are more stringent emissions tests coming.
60 The three primary issues that the valley is facing are air quality, growth (of which
61 transportation is key), and not being associated with the interstate freeway system.
62 Wasatch Front has realized that they need a comprehensive plan to tackle their
63 transportation issues. On I-15 for one, they’d have to build 15 lanes (or double decker
64 highways) just to keep up; they’ve realized that they need to get more creative and
65 look at policy—they can’t always build their way out of problems. One of the things
66 they’ve looked at is making public transit fare free in the corridor. While Cache
67 Valley does not face the same constraints as the Wasatch Front, policy is still key.
68 One of the things CMPO is considering is bus rapid transit, but that may be a long
69 way off. Some general questions and comments. There are several things to consider
70 for the future of Cache Valley, like future funding for things like road maintenance
71 and transportation; if Cache Valley doesn’t get ahead it could become a lot more
72 costly.

73
74 10. Presentation of 3rd quarter financials – Glen Schmidt: There were no surprises in the
75 third quarter and everything is on schedule. He highlighted a couple of things that
76 could be of interest to the board, such as the cash balances being higher than expected
77 because of the grant funds CVTD received for bus purchases. Norman Larsen asked
78 about the high cost for tires. Curtis Roberts replied that the purchase of tires used to
79 be spread out over the years, but that Michelin recently recalled all of the tires that the
80 buses had been using. Now all tire replacements occur almost at the same time. Tire
81 wear on the buses is similar (but not the same), so it will take time before purchasing
82 will spread out again. Roger Jones asked for a motion to accept the budget report.
83 Dean Quayle motioned, and Ron Natali seconded. Vote was unanimous.

85 11. Discussion of Fiscal Year 2018 budget - Glen Schmidt: The budget is very similar to
86 what was presented last month; however, it was updated to reflect the sales tax
87 increase and the gas price increase. Glen Schmidt opened it up to the board to discuss
88 the 2018 budget. Norman Larsen asked for time to speak and present to the board; he
89 takes sales tax personally and got onto the CVTD board for that reason. He outlined a
90 few of his concerns; he feels that the shop isn't as efficient as it should be and that the
91 food expenses are high. He also feels that CVTD should utilize the student population
92 for free help. Overall he feels like every company has a "valuable final product" and
93 that everything should revolve around ridership, but costs have gone up, ridership has
94 gone down, and that the cost per ride has gone up. Roger Jones pointed out that this is
95 a policy issue; if the board wanted to solely focus on ridership that would, for
96 example, mean cutting out Millville because it costs more per rider and then focusing
97 on increasing service in a one-mile radius around USU. It is ultimately the board's
98 decision if CVTD should pursue increasing ridership. Todd Beutler added that he
99 wants the board to make sure they are making good policy decisions. If the board
100 wants CVTD to increase ridership, a plan could be put together to do that, but it
101 would come at a cost of what the system was originally put together for the low
102 income, disabled, and elderly populations. Purely increasing ridership may change the
103 demographic of who the system is serving. Jeannie Simmonds added that she thinks
104 that Norman is making a good point: is CVTD about exposure or efficiency? The
105 board could in the future look at how much they are willing to spend per rider in
106 some areas. Ron Natali commented that the SRTP has given the board options to look
107 at; where the board chooses to put resources will affect both the budget and the
108 ridership. Should the board focus on ridership, coverage of the area, or a mix of the
109 two? Roger Jones commented that the SRTP, and what to do moving forward, will be
110 looked at in more depth next year giving the staff time to come back with their
111 recommendations. Todd Beutler commented that there is money set aside in the
112 budget for the coming year to conduct a voter survey, as well engage a marketing
113 firm, to understand the changes in society, engage the riders better, and develop
114 strategies to increase ridership. Norman Larsen said that he would argue that CVTD
115 is doing the same thing and getting less ridership. Roger Jones turned some time over
116 to Erik Ashcroft, who also expressed interest in presenting to the board. Erik Ashcroft
117 said that he looked into more detail on the food budget for this last year. He believes
118 that the expenses are excessive. Roger Jones said that it is the board prerogative to
119 reduce that part of the budget or to accept the recommendation of the staff. Todd
120 Beutler stated that the budget request is based on what the staff thinks is needed to
121 successfully execute and achieve budgetary goals, but that the board has the ultimate
122 decision on what that budget will be. Rodger Pond commented that if someone at
123 CVTD is conducting business during lunch it is appropriate to order lunch and that
124 employee morale is important in a service industry. Todd Beutler explained that
125 CVTD has a policy on food that requires documentation and a business purpose, as
126 well as approval; a record is kept on each expense, so if the board wants to review the

127 records the staff will provide that information to the board. Roger Jones said that the
128 board could either accept the staff's recommendation or move to reduce the food
129 budget. He asked that the board members who felt strongly about reducing the food
130 budget to make a motion to do so; Erik Ashcroft made a motion to reduce the food
131 budget by \$10,000 and Norman Larsen seconded. Amber Sleight asked for examples
132 of when money is spent on food. Todd Beutler gave a few examples of when meals
133 have been bought: after a snow crew has spent 14 hours removing snow, a meeting
134 with someone from the legislature subcommittee to discuss transportation issues, and
135 a transportation planning session; all occasions have to meet the criteria of the current
136 food policy and the proper paperwork filled out. He added that if it would be helpful
137 the policy can be brought before the board; the staff is willing to do whatever the
138 board wants to do. Ron Natali proposed another option: instead of reducing the
139 budget by \$10,000, the policy is brought before the board and restructured to meet the
140 needs of the board and then approved for use. If expenditures go down for the 2018
141 budget, based on the policy, the board can leave it at that. Sallie Petersen agreed with
142 Ron and said that she feels that employee morale is important and that blindly cutting
143 an amount is not good; the board should focus on the policy. Roger Jones said that
144 they have a motion on the floor, but stated that there is another suggestion and if
145 those who motioned agreed a substitute motion could be made. Norman Larsen asked
146 if the food budget needed to be approved this month; Curtis Roberts replied that a
147 tentative budget needed to be passed for the month of November so that the budget
148 could be released to the public for comment. The final budget is not passed until
149 December and then goes into effect January 1; the budget can be amended up or
150 down in January, but requires that the board holds another public hearing. Jeannie
151 Simmonds commented that she agrees that the policy review and adjustment will take
152 care of these challenges without requiring the budget to be changed right now. She
153 also stated that just because it is in the budget doesn't mean that it will be spent, if it's
154 not spent, it simply goes back into that cash reserves. The motion to reduce the food
155 budget by \$10,000 was withdrawn. The food policy will be examined in January.
156 Jeannie Simmonds moved to adopt the tentative budget and Dean Quayle seconded.
157 Roger Jones asked if they would add approving two additional full-time driver
158 positions and final approval of the employee benefits package to their motion because
159 those needed to be finalized in November; they agreed. Norman Larsen asked if there
160 would be further discussion on professional fees; Jeannie Simmonds and Glen
161 Schmidt stated that this is a tentative approval and things can be discussed further in
162 the December meeting. Norman Larsen also stated that he feels like CVTD
163 employees should partially pay for their benefits because of the increase in cost; Todd
164 Beutler replied that the benefits package is essential for employee retention and that
165 whether the benefits package continues is carefully considered every year. Roger
166 Jones stated that he wants to act on the motion on the floor to approve a tentative
167 budget, two new full-time driver positions, and the benefits package; he asked for a
168 vote by the raise of hand. Norman Larsen and Erik Ashcroft opposed. Motion passed.

169

170

12. Board Chair's report: No report.

171

172

13. General Manager's report: No report.

173

174

14. **Adjourn:** Board Chair Roger Jones adjourned the meeting.