

1 **Regular Board Meeting Minutes**
2 **Cache Valley Transit District**
3 **Wednesday, May 24, 2023**
4 **5:30 pm**
5 **Logan City Hall**
6 **290 North 100 West, Logan, Utah**
7 **City Hall Conference Room**

8
9
10 *Present:* Patrick Jenkins, Cecelia Benson, Shaun Bushman, Terrie Wierenga, Bob
11 Christensen, Mary Barrus, Holly Broome-Hyer, Lieren Hansen, Ron Bushman, Mike
12 Arnold, Glen Schmidt, Paul James, David Geary, Jeff Turley, and Jeannie Simmonds

13
14 *Excused:* Sue Sorenson, 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 Patrick Jenkins
21
22 2. Pledge of Allegiance
23
24 3. Consent Agenda: Patrick Jenkins asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda.
25 Bob Christensen moved; Dave Geary seconded. Vote unanimous.
26 A. Approval of Agenda
27 B. Acceptance of Minutes – April 26, 2023
28 C. Next Board Meeting – June 28, 2023
29
30 4. Public comments: No comments or questions.

31
32 **Board Business**

33 **5. Board Business:**

- 34 A. Presentation of FY 2022 Audit – Glen Schmidt: Everything is in good shape with
35 the audit. The auditors issued an unmodified or clean opinion. There were no
36 problems and it was a very clean audit. The auditors expressed how good it was to
37 work with staff. The federal awards and audited controls looked good. Discussion
38 about the audit. Dave Geary stated that it was not just a clean audit, but a squeaky
39 clean audit because there were no findings.
40
41 B. Consideration of long range planning priorities – Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn:
42 Because of previous technical difficulties, an additional survey was sent to all

Approved 06/28/2023

43 board members; the goal of the survey was to get consensus and verify that
44 planning was on the right track. All board members responded. The results were
45 used to re-score. The priorities were ranked as follows: 1) get people to jobs in
46 Cache County; 2) provide access for person with disabilities, seniors, and low
47 income populations; 3) make existing service even better; 4) make transit more
48 competitive with driving; 5) make connections outside of Cache County; 6)
49 expand transit to new areas inside Cache County. There wasn't a large difference
50 between 1 and 2, so they were weighted the same in the project scoring.
51 Discussion about coverage versus existing service. One survey question addressed
52 what proportion of funds should go towards improving existing service or
53 expanding geographic service. An average of the results would mean 54 percent
54 of funds would go towards improving existing service and 46 percent towards
55 expanding service. A median of the results would mean 65 percent of funds would
56 go towards improving existing service and 35 percent towards expanding service.
57 With those as the results, the question becomes does that feels like the right
58 prioritization for the Board? The other priorities fit within those two big areas of
59 transit (coverage and existing service), which is why the question wasn't asked of
60 all six priorities. Discussion about the scoring methodology. Each priority is
61 weighted for project scoring with the additional criteria of "project cost" and
62 "new transportation mode." These two additions can prove to be a tie breaker, or
63 as a penalty for high cost projects. If the Board disagrees with the scoring
64 weights, they can be adjusted. Discussion about long range planning. Project
65 scoring informs decisions, but does not make them. Priorities can still evolve or
66 change, which can adjust how projects rank. From a management standpoint, it
67 gives staff a benchmark for when to bring things to the board. It also gives
68 guidance on the first 5 or 10 projects (it isn't limited to the number one project).
69 Additionally, identifying projects informs the state funding process because it
70 helps to demonstrate that we have projects that need funding. Discussion about
71 next steps. After the initial list of priority projects are identified, the next step is a
72 fiscally constrained priority project list.

73
74 **6. General Manager/Staff Reports:**

- 75 A. On bus advertising – Curtis Roberts, Administrations Director: The District just
76 went through a procurement process for an advertising brokerage for on bus
77 advertising. The District went with Houck. Nothing changed policy-wise, just
78 went with a different business (instead of Lamar). Houck focuses on small transit,
79 so they know how to market to smaller areas.
80
- 81 B. Title 6 outreach – Curtis Roberts, Administrations Director: Part of Title 6 is to
82 consider all sections of the population and to make sure not to discriminate (race,
83 national origin, and color). The largest population besides Caucasian is Spanish
84 speaking. Part of the District's plan was to have a booth at the Cinco de Mayo

85 celebration, which was staffed with at least one person who could speak Spanish
86 and signage that was in Spanish. Title 6 is about trying to get to where these
87 groups are at, which tend to be at these festivals.
88

89 **7. Board Chair Report:**

90 A. Review of Board apportionment – Patrick Jenkins, Board Chair: The current ideas
91 on the table are either a 7-member board or a 9-member board with a few
92 different suggestions about how to divide up the votes geographically (including
93 patterning it off of the cache county council, having more general geographic
94 regions, or dividing it similarly to the current board voting structure). In the spirit
95 of brainstorming, another suggestion is an at-large board to represent the
96 community at large; the focus would be on who would be the best board
97 members. Discussion about an at-large board. Don't know how members would
98 be appointed or what the logistics would be. The proposals so far have been
99 regionally based. Would cities feel represented in this model? Discussion about
100 steps forward. At the next board meeting, the Board will vote on the 9-member
101 structure that was proposed. After the structure is determined, the Board can go
102 through and work out the additional details.
103

104 B. Review of DC trip – Patrick Jenkins, Board Chair: The DC trip was an eventful,
105 fruitful, and great trip. They were able to see all six people from the Utah
106 delegation. They talked with them about what the District is trying to do and
107 about funding. This annual trip helps both in the long and the short term.
108

109 8. Public comments: No comments or questions.
110

111 9. **Adjourn:** Board Chair Patrick Jenkins adjourned the meeting.