

1 **Regular Board Meeting Minutes**
2 **Cache Valley Transit District**
3 **Wednesday, October 27, 2021**
4 **5:45 pm**
5 **Logan City Hall**
6 **290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah**
7 **City Hall Conference Room**

8
9
10 *Present:* Craig Wright, Patrick Jenkins, Holly Broome-Hyer, Cecelia Benson, Lieren
11 Hansen, Shaun Bushman, Terrie Wierenga, Mary Barrus, Mike Arnold, Sue Sorenson,
12 David Geary, Ron Bushman, Paul James, Glen Schmidt, and Abraham Verdoes

13
14 *Excused:* Jeff Turley, Jeannie Simmonds, Gregory Shannon, and Lyle Lundberg

15
16 *Others:* Todd Beutler, Curtis Roberts, and Charise VanDyke

17
18 **Regular Meeting Agenda**

- 19
20 1. *Call to order:* Board Chair Craig Wright
21
22 2. Pledge of Allegiance
23
24 3. *Acceptance of Minutes:* Craig Wright asked for a motion to approve the September
25 minutes and a modified agenda (order of agenda items changed). Patrick Jenkins
26 moved; Dave Geary seconded. Vote was unanimous.
27
28 4. *Approval of Agenda:* Craig Wright moved the approval of the agenda with the
29 minutes. Vote was unanimous.
30
31 5. Next Board Meeting: November 17, 2021
32
33 6. Questions or comments from public: No questions or comments.

34
35 **Board Business**

36 **7. Board Business:**

- 37 A. Consideration of District health benefit renewal – Curtis Roberts, Administration
38 Director: Recently, the District went out to bid for health insurance. It was
39 anticipated that there would be about a 4 percent increase. The low bid provider
40 was the same provider that the District currently uses; the increase only ended up
41 being 2.5 percent at the same benefit package. The staff is proposing that the same
42 benefit package be kept because there wasn't much of a cost increase. Paul James

Approved 11/17/2021

43 moved to approve the benefit package; Cecelia Benson seconded. Vote
44 unanimous.

- 45
- 46 B. Consideration of new facility budget – Todd Beutler, CEO/General Manager: The
47 District has been working diligently to adapt to growing communities and be
48 viable into the future. A new facility would allow the District flexibility in service
49 delivery and adapt to growth. Staff, consultants, and a board committee (made up
50 of Dave Geary, Gregory Shannon, and Ron Bushman) have been working through
51 this facility project for four months. They have been guided by the goals that the
52 Board set early on. Lars Erickson and Al Tukuafu—Construction costs have gone
53 up since the project was first considered in 2018. In the last 24 months, costs have
54 gone up substantially with a 7.85 percent escalation in Utah construction costs
55 (comparable to places like Washington DC). Utah is pumping more into
56 construction than the national average. With a project like this, the estimating
57 process is more than just a square foot cost estimation. A team of estimators
58 works with the design team to do a detail estimate of building costs (civil work,
59 finishes, planning, electrical, etc.). There’s a network of vendors contacted, as
60 well as costs being forecasted out 8 to 10 months. There are multiple steps in the
61 estimating process before the owner budget is put together (conceptual sketch,
62 takeoffs, detail estimate, cost control, cost summary, owner budget). They went
63 through this process multiple times. The committee kept challenging them to look
64 at different cost saving options, while still putting together the best facility
65 possible. Through this process, they found a little over 5.1 million dollars in
66 savings. Costs have been put together for two designs; both options satisfy the
67 needs of the District for the next 25 years. Dave Geary – The consultants (builders
68 and design team) have provided satisfactory answers throughout this process.
69 Fifteen different concepts were examined before narrowing it down to two. Out of
70 all of the concepts, 8B is the most efficient and easiest to manage (cost 35.8
71 million for a metal building and 38.8 million for an insulated concrete tilt
72 building). Curtis Roberts – In 2010, the District bought property for a new
73 facility. Since that point, the District has been setting aside funds, as well as
74 working to get federal funds for the project. The District has 26 million dollars in
75 federal grant money with the required 6.5 million dollars from the District in
76 match (federal funding has an 80-20 match), which totals to 32.5 million.
77 Additionally, there are other grants that the District can pursue, some additional
78 funds in the fund balance, and the likelihood that the District can sell the current
79 facility. Altogether, the District can use 40 million dollars towards this project
80 without putting the District into financial difficulties. There is a deadline to use
81 federal funds; the District is expected to be committed in the upcoming year.
82 Discussion about the differences between the two concepts. The primary
83 difference between the two concepts is that 8B-1 encloses everything, while 8B
84 closes the minimum. Enclosing everything, including fuel, comes with lots of

85 costs for dealing with fumes in the building. The operating costs are higher in 8B-
86 1 versus 8B (more square footage to heat and cool). Utility costs will go up
87 between the current facility and a new facility because of size, but there will also
88 be savings because of the efficiencies with newer systems. The 8B concept hits a
89 sweet spot between size and operating costs (smaller concepts than 8B had
90 increased operating costs and larger concepts, such as 8B-1, had increased
91 operating costs). The 40 million dollar budget includes contingencies, as well as
92 anticipated escalation, to stay within the budget. Some building items would need
93 to be purchased earlier to reduce construction time. Discussion about the
94 difference between a metal building and a tilt up concrete building. The life cycle
95 on a metal building is 25 years before the roof and panels would need to be
96 replaced (about 3 to 4 million dollars); the life cycle on a tilt up concrete building
97 is roughly 50 years. At year 25, the metal building becomes the more expensive
98 building. Discussion about the steps forward. After approval, the design team can
99 move forward with conceptual designs. The facility would be designed to
100 necessary specifications, including seismic requirements. The estimation is 18
101 months from start to finish. The hope is to start building in the spring. Discussion
102 about solar. Solar would not be included in this phase of building, but the facility
103 can be designed to be solar ready. It could be added back in if the project is within
104 budget. Discussion about the current facility. The current facility was built in
105 1998 and designed to be a 20-year facility. Discussion about the facility budget.
106 There are indications that transit will receive funding in the infrastructure plan,
107 but the timeline is unpredictable. The federal grants that the District has received
108 have been managed well, which has helped in receiving additional funding. The
109 lobbyist that the District works with is working on getting some additional
110 funding. There would be no sales tax increase or bonding needed to build this
111 facility. Craig Wright asked for a motion. Dave Geary moved to authorize
112 management to spend up to 40 million dollars for this project (funding beyond
113 this would require board authorization). Glen Schmidt seconded. Vote unanimous.

- 114
115 C. Southeast service alternatives update – Chelsey Hendrickson, Kimley-Horn:
116 Kimley-Horn was engaged to identify alternative service options for the southeast
117 service area of the District. This process starts by reviewing relevant existing
118 plans and studies to figure out what is happening in these communities. After this,
119 service alternatives were developed and the public was engaged for feedback. If
120 approved, a new service could be launched as early as fall or winter of 2022.
121 Overall, transit planning is all about finding the right level of service for an area.
122 Densely populated areas with more ridership need one type of service, while areas
123 of low demand need another. The service options that were examined: fixed route,
124 deviated fixed route (goes off route when requested), microtransit, 3rd party
125 transportation (subsidizing uber/lyft), and demand response transportation. Of the
126 different service options, the best for Cache Valley are fixed route and

127 microtransit. Microtransit is flexible and effective in serving hard to meet transit
128 needs, such as in lower density locations. Three alternatives were put out for
129 public feedback and was done in coordination with the first mile/last mile study.
130 Of the surveys received, 158 respondents lived within the study area (77 percent
131 of these individuals were interested in taking transit). The options given came
132 down to a tradeoff between resources and wait time (a larger service area, means
133 a longer wait time). It was close to a 50-50 split between those who liked the
134 fixed route as is and a new microtransit service (they were slightly in favor of
135 microtransit); this means that marketing and communication will be important
136 moving forward. Microtransit is shared transportation that uses technology to
137 operate effectively and efficiently in areas where it is hard to meet transit needs
138 with fixed-route services. It provides more flexibility and that first mile
139 connection. The recommendation that Kimley-Horn is making is to implement
140 Alternative 1. This option keeps route 11 the same and the microtransit area
141 smaller. The reasons behind this recommendation: it focuses changes on routes
142 that currently have the lowest performance and provides flexibility and greater
143 coverage as these communities grow. Starting with a smaller microtransit zone
144 also gives the District the chance to gain some experience to get it working well
145 in a smaller area before expanding. The service would be close to cost neutral at a
146 comparable quality. The microtransit service would stay within the marked
147 service area during service hours; the exception would be to connect out to other
148 service, like at the transit center. The service will be kept zero fare and can be
149 viewed as another service delivery method that the District can provide. If the
150 District moves forward with this service, microtransit software would need to be
151 procured and tested, vehicles purchased, drivers trained, and marketing and
152 communications done on the new service type. Discussion about microtransit
153 service. Technology helps to predict the most efficient route and takes into
154 account factors such as wheelchairs. There are multiple types of vehicles that can
155 be used to provide this service. The staff are still examining vehicles (one will be
156 going to a national expo to look at different type of vehicles). The palatable wait
157 time is usually about 20 minutes; above that, people will look at other
158 transportation options. The perception of smaller, full vehicles is better. Most of
159 the time, ridership goes up because of the flexibility and good experience. The
160 service is flexible; as more data is gathered, adjustments can be made to provide
161 better service or scale to a fixed route as needed. With technology, virtual stops
162 versus physical bus stops can be placed. A public hearing would be held before
163 any major changes were made.

164
165 D. Presentation of FY 2022 draft budget – Curtis Roberts, Administration Director:
166 The estimated increase for health insurance benefit costs was 4 percent over the
167 current premium; it actually came in at 2.5 percent. The District will see the full
168 effect of the increase in base wages that was approved in June 2021. Staff is

169 proposing to add one full-time position to help with scheduling; to give some
170 context, adding this position would free up supervisor time to train drivers, as
171 well as focus on other areas that improve service delivery. There is also some
172 anticipated overtime; it's not enough to need another full time person yet. The
173 District bid out insurance (liability, workers compensation, and bus insurance);
174 the cost came back lower this year than the previous year (the District stayed with
175 the current insurance provider). We anticipate that there will be a continued mask
176 mandate in 2022; this entails an increased cost in supplies for masks on the bus.
177 Fuel price has gone up. It is being monitored; the budgeted amount might have to
178 be adjusted. This last year's supply shortages have affected staff's ability to
179 replace computers, so a lot of them will be replaced in FY2022 (most of the
180 computers are 6 or 7 years old). It's anticipated that the amount spent on parts will
181 go down, as there were four large bus replacements this last year and eight large
182 buses being replaced next year. The parking lot is scheduled to be resealed and
183 repainted in accordance with our transit asset management plan. Staff is proposing
184 to allocate 10,000 in seed money to support first mile/last mile projects identified
185 by the study currently underway. Currently, the sales tax is higher because of
186 stimulus funds in the economy; this will likely slow the last part of this year. A 3
187 percent increase is anticipated for next year, this is consistent with the Governor
188 office's projections. For federal and state operating grants, FY2021 included one-
189 time stimulus grants (CARES) that were required to be used quickly. In FY2022,
190 the use of federal funds is more consistent with prior years. Other revenue will
191 come from selling the old buses that are being replaced (8 large and 2 small). The
192 planned capital projects: starting construction of the new facility (number is
193 currently a placeholder), concrete replacement that is a tripping hazard (at current
194 facility), a bike shelters project, bus replacements, ITS system (auto passenger
195 counter, stop announcements, etc.), and a couple of contingent amounts for
196 equipment that could break down. Discussion about the budget. The sales tax is
197 split into two different categories—there is the original sales tax that was adopted
198 by the community and the additional sales tax that the county passed. The
199 microtransit numbers haven't been included in the budget, as this service has not
200 been approved by the board.

201
202 **8. Board Chair Report:**

203 A. Nothing to report.

204
205 **9. Adjourn:** Board Chair Craig Wright adjourned the meeting.