Regular Board Meeting Minutes
Cache Valley Transit District
Wednesday, October 23, 2019
5:45 pm
Bridgerland Technical College
1301 North 600 West, Logan, Utah
Room 806/808

Present: Holly Broome-Hyer, Craig Wright, Glen Schmidt, Lieren Hansen, Jeannie Simmonds, Shaun Bushman, Gregory Shannon, Roger Jones, Dean Quayle, Patrick Jenkins, Sue Sorenson, Lloyd Berentzen, Cecelia Benson, Ron Natali, Jeff Turley, and Lyle Lundberg

Excused: Heidi Harper and Rodger Pond

Others: Todd Beutler, Charise VanDyke, and Curtis Roberts

Regular Meeting Agenda

1. Call to order: Board Chair Holly Broome-Hyer

2. Acceptance of Minutes: Holly Broome-Hyer asked for a motion to approve the minutes and agenda. Craig Wright moved; Cecelia Benson seconded. Vote was unanimous.

3. Approval of Agenda: Holly Broome-Hyer moved the approval of the agenda with the minutes. Vote was unanimous.

4. Next Board Meeting: November 20, 2019

5. Questions and Comments for Management and Board (3 minutes or less): No comments or questions.

Board Business

6. Legislative update – Tim Stewart, American Capital Group: There is a multi-billion dollar bill in highway funding (intended for the next six years), which is mainly for highways but does include transit. The traditionally bi-partisan bill moved quickly through the Senate (still waiting on the House). Funding for the bill still has to be worked out, which can be complicated as multiple committees are working together. Everyone is reticent on moving forward on a gas tax, but they’ve also been looking at user fees for cars. While the House is moving uncharacteristically slow, the fact that
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the senate moved first is encouraging. Impeachment politics and everything aside, they realize they need to move on it because of the upcoming election year. CVTD is well positioned at this point in the process; the project passed the red-faced test and is one of the most viable. Things could blow up with the impeachment, but mostly the question is how much time it will eat up. The House and Senate is most likely to deadlock as it did in ’98.

7. Presentation on how the connector route affects short and medium transit plans – Todd Beutler, CEO: Holly Broome-Hyer and Todd Beutler went and presented to the county on what the circulator does and how to pivot in the long term. Transportation challenges that are specific to transit are increased traffic (which increases the time to operate the route and the potential for accidents), sprawling community growth (which lengthens the route and areas aren’t always planned for transit), and residents and users want more convenience. Phase 1 will be to implement the Major Connector Route, which services 60 percent of destinations, is scalable in frequency and hours of operation, runs every 15 minutes at peak times and 30 minutes off, connects USU to downtown, and establishes a trunk line. Included in Phase 1 is also deploying technology. The app has been deployed, which allows the system to go to a frequency-based versus schedule-based service. Running service on main street would be a big challenge if the service were run on a set schedule because of traffic; people are more forgiving of service that is more frequent and not on a set schedule. The paratransit software is deploying in 2020. Phase 2 will comprise of working with the CMPO, county, and cities to rethink all of the existing routes with the connector in mind. The connector route allows for multiple connection points versus having to go back to the transit center to transfer. This cuts run time on certain routes, as they will not be forced to go back into Logan, so the trip becomes shorter. Working with the cities to identify transit needs allows for partnership and having a different conversation. Phase 3 would include working with the NPO (who have already done a transit corridor study) to identify corridors and land use planning that supports transit; long term commitments to these corridors by cities and CVTD can lead to transit supported development. This encourages development and economic growth. The connector route is a pivot to where the valley needs to go in the future.

8. Presentation of FY 2020 draft budget – Curtis Roberts, CFO: The District is anticipating using funds from savings of about 235,000 dollars. For revenues, sales tax has been about a 4 percent year over year increase; next year they’re expecting revenue from sales tax to be flat (or about the same as this year). The additional sales tax is expected to come in over 400,000 (estimated from what the county collected this year). Federal grants are going up fairly substantially. Salaries and benefits will increase because of the additional employees to run the new connector route (also anticipating one more supervisor position); staff is also asking the board to increase driver wages by 50 cents, as the District has been struggling to be competitive in a
tight labor market. Also budgeting for wage adjustments for merit based employees for cost of living and merit pay. No change is proposed to the current benefits. In professional fees about 50,000 dollars more is being budgeted for education about the new route. Curtis Roberts asked if there were any questions. Discussion about public outreach. The funds for Rumor are approved per year; they will be presenting on the marketing efforts and accountability in November. Staff will be discussing with Rumor about how to incorporate education on the new route into marketing; the increase in the budget is to make sure the public outreach is there. Discussion about staffing and the new route. Things like turnover are taken into account, so every year the District can anticipate there to be some savings. Next year will see a substantial increase to service, so staffing will be going up. Overall, the increase to service will cost over a million with everything included. With this transition, the District doesn’t want this understaffed because of the challenges that will be addressed, such as rider frustration with the change and making sure the drivers are being supported.

Discussion about the budgeting process. Staff builds the budget every year from scratch (from zero). The budgeting is pessimistic (overstating expenses and keeping revenues conservative). The new route qualifies the District for additional STIC funding in the future, which helps fund the route long term. The tentative budget is passed in November with the final budget to be passed in December after a public hearing.

9. Consider for adoption the District’s employee benefit package – Curtis Roberts, CFO:
No proposed changes to the benefit package. The District currently uses PEHP, which has two different networks; employees have a choice between a high deductible plan and a lower deductible plan (which the employee pays part of). If an employee chooses the high deductible plan, the District contributes to the HSA to equal out the two options. The benefit package is higher to retain employees even with a lower wage; it’s total compensation not an either or. Patrick Jenkins motioned to accept the employee package as presented; Roger Jones seconded. Vote unanimous.

10. Consider for adoption Board Policy Manual Update – Ron Natali, Public Engagement and Policy Chair: In the past year, the board has approved all of the interpretations by the general manager. Instead of going through each interpretation with the deliverables one at a time, the PEP committee, and any other board members who want to join, will be reviewing them in one go in January. The worksheet to do this has been finalized. The PEP committee will break up in teams to examine them then meet as a committee to come to a consensus before presenting the executive summary to the board. Because of the work done in PEP to prepare for monitoring, a new Appendix A was created as well as a few additional changes to the policy manual, which both need to be approved. The changes include a renumbering of the ends policy, the revised Appendix A and elimination of Appendixes B and C, and removing the supporting documents listed in the interpretations (which gives greater
freedom and flexibility to the deliverables). Some discussion about policy governance. Policy governance tells the general manager what he cannot do (outlines the playing field and gives freedom to operate within that field) and governs how the board behaves and interacts with the general manager. Lloyd Berentzen asked if policy governance was implemented because of an unruly board; Craig Wright answered that it was part of the reason. The general manager’s interpretations tell the board how he will operate under the policy; the board then examines evidence that shows that he’s doing what he says he’s doing, which can in turn act as part of his performance evaluation. Section 3 is about how to act as a board, speak with one voice, how to treat each other, etc. Cecelia Benson commented that it adds another layer of accountability. Patrick Jenkins moved to adopt changes to the board policy manual; Jeff Turley seconded. Vote unanimous.


13. Adjourn: Board Chair Holly Broome-Hyer adjourned the meeting.