

1 **Regular Board Meeting Minutes**  
2 **Cache Valley Transit District**  
3 **Wednesday, February 28, 2018**  
4 **5:45 pm**  
5 **Bridgerland Technical College**  
6 **1301 North 600 West, Logan, Utah**  
7 **Room 806/808**

8  
9  
10 *Present:* Roger Jones, Holly Broome-Hyer, Ron Natali, Rodger Pond, Dean Quayle, Jeff  
11 Turley, Norman Larsen, Cecelia Benson, Craig Wright, Sue Sorensen, Glen Schmidt,  
12 Shaun Bushman, Erik Ashcroft, and Amber Sleight

13  
14 *Excused:* Lloyd Berentzen, Heidi Harper, Patrick Jenkins, Lyle Lundberg, and Jeannie  
15 Simmonds

16  
17 *Others:* Todd Beutler, Curtis Roberts, and Charise VanDyke

18  
19 **Regular Meeting Agenda**

- 20  
21 1. *Call to order:* Board Chair Roger Jones  
22  
23 2. *Acceptance of Minutes:* Roger Jones asked for a motion to approve the minutes and  
24 agenda. Rodger Pond moved; Dean Quayle seconded. Vote was unanimous.  
25  
26 3. *Approval of Agenda:* Roger Jones moved the approval of the agenda with the  
27 minutes. Vote was unanimous.  
28  
29 4. Next Board Meeting: March 28, 2018 at 5:45 pm at Logan City Library  
30  
31 5. Questions and Comments for Management and Board (3 minutes or less): Roger  
32 Jones noted that Patrick Jenkins, Heidi Harper, and Lyle Lundberg had asked to be  
33 excused from board meeting. No questions.  
34

35 **Board Business**

- 36 6. Meet District employees: Leah Adkins Checketts introduced herself and her position  
37 at CVTD. Leah has been working for the District for 13 years. Dispatchers assign  
38 buses to drivers, make sure that shifts are filled, greet drivers, confirm that buses are  
39 on every route, schedule rides for paratransit passengers, take incoming calls, help  
40 with payroll processing, process comments, and drive a minimum of 10 hours a  
41 month. Gillian Crozier introduced herself and her position. Gillian has been working  
42 for the District for 11 years. She is the transportation services supervisor. Some of her

Approved 03/28/2018

43 duties include route planning, evaluating service, overseeing shift bids for drivers,  
44 training new hires, interacting with drivers and the public, and other projects that  
45 come her way.  
46

- 47 7. Presentation of District financial handout: Curtis Roberts, Finance Director, reviewed  
48 the financial handout with the board. Over the last five years, revenue has gone up  
49 roughly seven percent each year and expenditures have gone up about two percent  
50 each year. Excess funds have been set aside for upcoming needs. The district spent  
51 over 6.5 million dollars in capital expenditures during those five years. A snapshot of  
52 funding sources for CVTD: about two-thirds comes from the local option sales tax,  
53 almost one-third comes from the federal transit administration, and a small percentage  
54 comes from revenue sources such as advertising. Curtis outlined the replacement  
55 schedule for the buses for the next ten years; there is a plan in place for bus  
56 replacement through 2022 if everything goes through. CVTD has been fortunate to  
57 line up full funding for buses in the past; CVTD competes with other entities for grant  
58 funding. The goal is to get 80 percent funding for a bus; there have been times where  
59 CVTD has had to pay full price for a bus. There is a need for a new facility because  
60 of the confinements presented in the current facility, including limits to employee  
61 space and bus storage; getting additional buses to expand service goes hand in hand  
62 with a new facility.  
63
- 64 8. Presentation/Discussion of Board's Global Ends Policy: Ron Natali reviewed the  
65 results from the survey of the Global Ends General Manager's (GM) interpretations  
66 with the board. Seventeen out of nineteen board members participated in the survey.  
67 The PEP committee met to review the results and then sent them out to the board  
68 members a week ahead. The two board members who did not participate in the  
69 survey, Erik Ashcroft and Amber Sleight, were listed as "abstained" on the unofficial  
70 ballot from the survey results. The board used the Roberts Rules of Order to vote on  
71 whether or not to accept the GM's interpretation of the Global Ends policy and sub-  
72 policies. Sue Sorenson moved that the board accept the General Manager's  
73 interpretation of policy 1.0; Rodger Pond seconded. Board members discussed the  
74 interpretation. Ron Natali noticed after reviewing the survey comments for 1.0 that  
75 most of the comments were about the supporting documentation, which the board has  
76 not seen yet. Ron talked about the first monitoring report that the GM had submitted.  
77 Board members were overwhelmed by the report and the 150 pages of  
78 documentation, so it was concluded that the board would first review the GM's  
79 interpretations and approve them before the board receives the documentation to  
80 support the interpretations (which will not be until next year). Erik Ashcroft disagreed  
81 with the interpretation that zero fare is a part of safe, reliable, and convenient  
82 transportation. Sue Sorensen explained the structure of the report—the interpretation  
83 dealt with zero fare service being convenient; Erik disagreed with the interpretation  
84 that zero fare service is convenient. Erik also disagreed with the peer systems (which

85 the GM would measure costs against in the monitoring report) selected in the last  
86 Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP). He believes that the comparison should be to other  
87 zero fare systems instead of the peer systems identified in the SRTP. Sue Sorensen  
88 and Rodger Pond clarified that the kind of costs for a zero fare system and a fare  
89 system are the same (buses, parts, fuel, etc.), so it doesn't matter if the systems in the  
90 comparison are fare or zero fare. Erik commented that the costs would still be  
91 different because of ridership numbers and the added admin costs in a fare system.  
92 Sue Sorensen and Shaun Bushman clarified that the comparison looks particularly at  
93 the cost per hour not the cost per rider. Sue asked if they looked at the parts that were  
94 relevant to compare if that would resolve his concern. Erik said that sure it would, but  
95 that if they threw in zero fare systems there would be no flexibility. Todd Beutler  
96 requested that the other peer systems added to the evaluation be of a similar size and  
97 serve a similar demographic, so that they are true peer systems. The reason why Todd  
98 chose to use the SRTP to identify the peer systems used in the comparisons is that the  
99 consultant chose the peer systems; this way he could be objective in the comparisons.  
100 Sue Sorensen asked if that cleared up the matter. Erik asked if there was a reason why  
101 Todd wouldn't want to include zero fare systems. Todd stated that this is a board  
102 matter and he is just trying to provide the board with information. Erik suggested that  
103 they look at other peer systems that consultants in the past have chosen. Roger Jones  
104 said that they could work on the wording and requested that the board move on if  
105 there was no further discussion. Roger asked for the vote on the 1.0 policy; all were in  
106 favor except for Erik Ashcroft, however the majority of the central region were in  
107 favor thus making the vote unanimous. Total votes: eight in favor, zero opposed—  
108 motion passed. Sue Sorenson moved that the board accept the General Manager's  
109 interpretation of policy 1.0.1; Rodger Pond seconded. Sue encouraged board  
110 members to look at the unofficial ballot and see that the majority of members had  
111 accepted this interpretation. No request for discussion. Roger Jones asked for a vote  
112 on 1.0.1; vote unanimous. Motion passed. Sue Sorenson moved that the board accept  
113 the General Manager's interpretation of policy 1.0.2; Shaun Bushman seconded. Sue  
114 requested that they bring in some discussion on this one. One of the questions brought  
115 up in PEP committee was whether or not policy 1.0.2 (optimized accessibility to  
116 transit services) deals particularly with ADA or if the policy is for accessibility in  
117 general. Discussion amongst board members about the pros and cons of changing it.  
118 Ron Natali said that if the board wants to change the policy in some way that the PEP  
119 committee could discuss what language to use, change to the policy manual, and then  
120 bring it back to the board. Craig Wright commented that he feels like accessibility in  
121 the general sense is covered by 1.0.3 and that 1.0.2 should be specific to ADA  
122 because it deserves its own attention. Policy 1.0.2 changed to read, "Accessibility to  
123 transit services for ADA is optimized." Shaun Bushman moved that the change be  
124 considered passed without having to be brought back to the board. Cecelia Benson  
125 seconded. Craig proposed that they amend Sue's motion to include this change to the  
126 1.0.2 policy (to make it ADA specific). Shaun Bushman seconded the amendment.

127 Roger Jones asked for a vote on 1.0.2 (with the aforementioned change); vote  
128 unanimous. Motion passed. Sue Sorenson moved that the board accept the General  
129 Manager’s interpretation of policy 1.0.3; Cecelia Benson seconded. Roger Jones  
130 asked if there was any discussion. Norman Larsen, Amber Sleight, Shaun Bushman,  
131 Cecelia Benson, Sue Sorenson, Rodger Pond talked about the inclusion of specifics of  
132 the hours and cities included in the interpretation. It was concluded that the  
133 interpretation language should be generalized to “operating hours” and “approved  
134 service area” instead of getting into specifics. General agreement about those  
135 changes. Erik Ashcroft asked about the transit planning with Box Elder; Todd Beutler  
136 clarified that the policy specifically states “region” and that he’s defining the region  
137 according to BRAG standards, which includes Box Elder and Rich counties. Roger  
138 Jones said that there would be more discussion about this when he gives his report.  
139 Roger Jones asked for a vote on 1.0.3 (with those two changes to the wording  
140 included): vote unanimous. Motion passed. Sue Sorenson moved that the board  
141 accept the General Manager’s interpretation of policy 1.0.4; Shaun Bushman  
142 seconded. Norman Larsen thinks that the interpretation is broad and should be limited  
143 to what can be controlled, like how full the buses are. Shaun Bushman suggested that  
144 the quarterly service report could be added as a supporting document because it  
145 outlines riders per route. Norm thinks that empty buses do more harm than good. Ron  
146 Natali asked how the District could predict when there’d be an empty bus and a full  
147 bus; he also added that the quarterly service report would be a good addition to the  
148 supporting documents. Jeff Turley asked if there’s a difference in emissions between  
149 a small and a large bus. Todd Beutler replied that there is not a lot. Roger Jones  
150 pointed out that in the last study of CVTD buses it was found that a big bus only  
151 emits as much as one car. Cecelia Benson asked what the mpg is for a big bus versus  
152 a small bus. A large bus gets four mpg and a small gets six mpg; the large buses run  
153 on diesel and the small buses run on gas. Todd Beutler commented that people don’t  
154 like being crammed onto a bus like sardines and that there would be people who  
155 stopped riding because of that. He also talked about how buses are not built to run at  
156 capacity constantly. Jody Kimball, Operations Manager, commented that they’ve  
157 found that from a maintenance perspective it is more cost effective to run a big bus;  
158 the smaller buses are not built for those conditions and would often break down. Jody  
159 also added that the District already caters vehicles to the loads to an extent (a 35 foot  
160 bus vs a 40 foot bus) and that the CAR small buses only have a twelve-seat capacity.  
161 Roger Jones said that to answer Norman’s question they should assume that the staff,  
162 with all of their experience, know what they’re doing as far as capacity goes, so he  
163 would certainly trust the staff. Sue Sorensen wanted to clarify that what the board is  
164 addressing here is traffic congestion and emission levels. Roger Jones moved for a  
165 vote. Erik Ashcroft asked for more discussion. Roger asked that Erik hurry. Erik  
166 replied that we want to treat this with importance. Roger commented that he’s  
167 thinking more importance than the rest of us. Erik commented that he guesses he  
168 takes it more seriously. Roger commented well maybe, maybe not. Erik asked if there

169 is a way to determine statistically if CVTD has reduced congestion and improved air  
170 quality. Todd Beutler said that there is a way—the SRTP has an area where people  
171 identify whether or not they have access to a car. From this, the District knows that 40  
172 – 45% of riders have access to a car. Todd added that he could also include the most  
173 recent travel survey done by an outside consultant. Roger Jones asked that if the  
174 addition of the travel survey to the interpretation (as well as the quarterly service  
175 report) would satisfy the board. Roger asked for a vote on 1.0.4 (with aforementioned  
176 changes made): vote unanimous. Motion passed. Sue Sorenson moved that the board  
177 accept the General Manager’s interpretation of policy 1.0.5; Holly Broome-Hyer  
178 seconded. Shaun Bushman asked that the quarterly service report be added to the  
179 supporting documents to this interpretation as well. No disagreements. Roger Jones  
180 asked for a vote on 1.0.5 (with the aforementioned change made): vote unanimous.  
181 Motion passed. Jeff Turley commented that he believes the surveys are a valuable tool  
182 as it gives board members the opportunity to go through the materials ahead of time  
183 and saves time at the board meetings. Jeff commented that someone had mentioned  
184 transparency—he said that it is good to say who said what for transparency issues and  
185 that everyone speaks out loud at the board meeting so he doesn’t see the difference in  
186 putting a name to the survey. Rodger Pond asked if board members could go back  
187 through the survey to refresh their memory on their answers; Ron Natali responded  
188 that if a board member wants their answers they can contact him and he will get it  
189 sent to them after they finish their survey. Ron also added that with the passing of the  
190 interpretations of 1.0 that the board will be moving on to the GM interpretations for  
191 2.1.

192  
193 9. Board Chair report: Roger Jones and Todd Beutler attended another transit-planning  
194 meeting in regards to service for Box Elder County. They’re talking about doing a  
195 request proposal; Box Elder County would be paying for the service if they move  
196 forward. UTA recently cut the limited FrontRunner service from Ogden to Pleasant  
197 View. Roger will keep the board updated on this matter over the next nine months.

198  
199 10. General Manager Report: Todd Beutler told the Logan board representatives that they  
200 might be contacted by a CAR passenger, Stephen Daines, who has some complaints  
201 about the service. Todd briefly talked about the CAR and ADA rules in regards to no  
202 shows. Todd briefly outlined Stephen’s complaints, the ways that CVTD employees  
203 have been working with him, and his continuing dissatisfaction. Next board meeting,  
204 Todd will be presenting on the Short Range Transit Plan to get the board’s  
205 recommendations on areas to focus on from a policy perspective as changes are made  
206 to the service.

207  
208 11. **Adjourn:** Board Chair Roger Jones asked for a motion to adjourn, Rodger Pond  
209 moved; Roger Jones adjourned the meeting.