

Stakeholder/Government Relations Committee

June 14, 2017

Trustees Present:

Bret Millburn, SRC Chair

Jeff Acerson

Necia Christensen

Karen Cronin

Sherrie Hall Everett (phone)

Dannie McConkie

Robert McKinley

Brent Taylor

Excused: Trustee Greg Bell and Trustee Troy Walker

Meeting commenced at 10:20 a.m. with committee chair, Trustee Bret Millburn welcoming everyone.

- 1. Safety First Minute:** Dave Goeres provided the Safety Message
- 2. Review of February 8, 2017 Meeting Report:** Motion was made by Karen Cronin to approve the meeting minutes with a second by Dannie McConkie. The motion passed unanimously.

3a. Benchmark Survey

Nichol Bourdeaux introduced the Benchmark report (and referred to it as it related to the comments in the previous meeting which were presented by Trustee Taylor). It was noted that concern was expressed by Trustee McConkie regarding the accuracy of the report by such a small sampling. Nichol responded that the survey was conducted by Dan Jones & Associates and is a valid sample size, providing a margin of error of +/- 4% (down from +/-5% rate in previous reports).

Erika Shubin reviewed the slides with the group. On the slide referring to the “Overall, do you have a favorable or unfavorable impression of the Utah Transit Authority?” Nichol explained the specifics of this slide. Chair McKinley emphasized that only 16% of the people surveyed had a “somewhat to very unfavorable” opinion of UTA (meaning that 84% had a favorable opinion).

Opinions expressed included the feeling that expanding and providing more routes are considered positive changes. Nichol mentioned ski service and how it is improving public trust and opinions. She noted that, “Executive wages/salaries, scandal/corruption, financial management, poor use of tax dollars and bad publicity” public opinion had improved.

It was noted that the question “UTA is held accountable to the public” was just added in 2016.

Jerry Benson explained that the Onboard Survey (not included with this presentation) explains in more detail what specific mode riders feel about the services. It was also noted that this type of survey is conducted in person among the riders.

A slide which generated conversation was the “What are the reasons you do not use UTA?” The largest increase was seen in “Doesn’t go where needed” went from 13% to 24% in 2016.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Trustee Acerson asked if our reports are cross-referenced with other transit agencies to see if there are trends in the industry. He also asked if Dan Jones & Associates had provided any recommendations on how we can improve the survey. He asked if UDOT or the Legislature also has a public opinion survey which could be used collaboratively. Trustee McConkie noted that Joe Walker at UDOT could provide the UDOT public opinion survey. Trustee Acerson also mentioned that he would like to see the areas we can improve on. Trustee McConkie then commented that comparing systems from state-to-state is not really “apples to apples” because our system is still so “young” compared to others (like back east). Trustee Acerson acknowledged that, but also mentioned that we should be looking ahead and learning from other transit authorities and what their trends are.

Jerry Benson recommended that the staff bring back any suggestions from the experts on survey improvements. He mentioned that Nichol Bourdeaux is working on a Community Relations Plan with the Langdon Group. There are also other data gathering projects going on. He would like us to look at all of the feedback “tools” which we have and to perhaps look at additional means and ways of how to get accurate feedback and to determine what our “true priorities” are.

Trustee Taylor asked for a copy of the full survey results. He referred to a survey by Utah Politics.com which was conducted in the prior year and how the results vastly differ. Trustee Millburn also requested that the copies be sent out to the full board.

Nichol responded that the survey was conducted at the beginning of 2017.

(Trustee Hall Everett left the phone conference call at 11:15 a.m.)

3b. Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Update by Matt Sibul

Matt Sibul introduced the item and explained SB174 which explains in fuller detail the requirements of establishing the CAB (Citizens’ Advisory Board) and subsequent meetings. He read from the full SB174 bill the specific requirements, but also provided a summarized version. He also provided context as to the Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), which was established years ago. Although this committee has been in existence for another purpose, Matt explained that the original group had since been disbanded and that some of the criteria for selection could be used in the new committee. The CAB will be formed with the specific role of communication and collaboration with UTA management.

Trustee Millburn emphasized that moving forward with the new committee, we make the meetings ‘meaningful.’

- **Creating the Nomination process**
 - Create the form to be used
 - Establish selection criteria
 - Reach out to Appointing Authorities
 - Utilize all forms of media to announce
 - Create interest within own cities/areas for recruits
 - Define reimbursement/compensation/incentive guidelines
 - Conflict of Interest form policy

- **Clear guidelines/goals on moving forward**
 - Hold a meeting in July for the SGRC committee
 - Have Committee members selected by September
 - Hold first meeting in Fall 2017

- **Set aggressive goals for accomplishing this task**

Trustee Millburn will engage with the Legislative task force to find out their guidelines on staying in compliance (specifically as it relates to incentives for the committee.)

3b. Policy Review & Process Outline

General Counsel, Jayme Blakesley, passed out two documents: 1) Summary of UTA Powers, Duties and policies, 2) List of Board Policies as of February 28, 2017.

Handout #1 reviewed the following:

1. Utah Public Transit District Act (Utah Code Ann. 17B-2a-801)
 - a. General and Specific Powers
 - b. Board of Trustees
 - c. Executives

2. Limitations
 - a. Federal Law
 - b. State Law

3. Current Structure of UTA Board Policies (refers to the list in handout #2)

Jayme explained in brief detail the Carver Model and how it worked to establish our current policy structure. He reviewed each line of the “Summary of UTA Powers, Duties and Policies” document.

Jerry Benson referred to PolicyGovernance.com website for any questions trustees might have regarding the establishment of the current policies. He went on to explain some of the guidelines of the Carver Model. The CEO Performance Plan was also referred to as another document which supports the direction that the Trustees are currently on.

Trustee Millburn also reviewed some of the history of using the Carver Model and expressed an interest of taking a renewed look at our existing policies and the best model for governing the agency today.

Chair McKinley also mentioned that the UTA Corporate policies should align with the board policies. He suggested that we adopt a “hybrid” Carver model which would better meet our needs and obligations to the stakeholders. He also reiterated the role of the Board of Trustees as a governing body and not to be involved in the day-to-day decisions being made at the agency.

The conversation included ideas to develop a single set of policies which are specific to topics (vs. “Ends, Board Processes, Executive Limitations, etc.). Jayme Blakesley took a minute to orient the Trustees to Handout #2.

Jayme would like to engage his team in the Legal Department to look at peer transit agencies to see what their policy structures are. Chair McKinley also asked that we look at customizing our policy management/creation procedure to meet OUR needs (vs. a specific program).

Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Meeting transcribed by: Rebecca Ochsenhirt Cruz