



**Working Meeting of the  
Stakeholder Relations Committee**

Wednesday, March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016

1:00 p.m. – 3:10 p.m.

**Report**

<b>Present:</b>	Bret Millburn, Committee Chair	Bob Biles	Chris Chesnut
	H. David Burton, Board Chair	Jayne Blakesley	Rebecca Cruz
	Robert McKinley, Vice Chair	Clair Fiet	Eddie Cumins
	Chris Sloan, Vice Chair	David Goeres	Pierre Eliezer
	Trustee Michael Romero	Steve Meyer	Cathie Griffiths
	Trustee Matt Bell	Andrea Packer	Michelle Larsen
	Trustee Jeff Hawker	Matt Sibul	Lynze Lenio
	Trustee Jeff Acerson	Isaac Clarke	Todd Provost
	Trustee Sherrie Hall Everett	Remi Baron	Erika Shubin
	Jerry Benson	Tustin Borg	EiLeen Billings
<b>Excused:</b>	Trustee Troy Walker	Trustee Necia Christensen	

---

**I. Please Note:** Committee Chair Bret Millburn designated Trustee Robert McKinley, Trustee Jeff Acerson and Trustee Jeff Hawker as voting members of today’s Stakeholder Relations Committee meeting. At 1:03 p.m. a quorum was present.

**II. Welcome to Trustee Everett:** Committee Chair Bret Milburn introduced Sherri Hall Everett as UTA newest Board member. All attendees introduced themselves to Trustee Everett and welcomed her to the Board.

**III. Safety First Messages: “March to the Beat of Safety”** (David Goeres) -

- With warm weather comes a desire to shine and polish your home. However, did you know that 90% of poisonings occur in the home? When warning labels are ignored or chemicals fall into the wrong hands, disaster can occur.
- Make informed decisions about the type of products you bring into your home. Before you buy, read the label to make sure you know exactly what you're purchasing. Also, understand terms and definitions found on product labels:
  1. “Caution” indicates the lowest level of potential harm.
  2. “Warning” indicates the lowest level of potential harm.
  3. “Danger” indicates the highest level of potential harm, i.e., tissue damage to skin, blindness, death or damage to the mouth, throat or stomach if swallowed.
- You should periodically clean out storage cabinets and carefully follow disposal instructions indicated on product labels. Living with chemicals is a reality. Understanding risk and limiting exposure are paramount to keeping your family safe.

**IV. Approve January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2016, Stakeholder Relations Committee Meeting Report** (Bret Millburn)-

- Trustee Matt Bell moved to approve the January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2016, Stakeholder Relations Committee report, as written. Trustee Michael Romero seconded the motion, motion passed unanimously.

## V. Review of January 2016 Performance Dashboard (Bret Millburn) -

- Responsible Executive is Andrea Packer, Vice-President of Communications and Customer Focus.
- Core Goal #1 – Public Trust and Accountability (**Rating Green**): Create and conduct a state-of-the-art survey process, combining qualitative and quantitative components designed to gauge sentiment regarding trust, accountability and confidence in UTA.
  1. Current Issue: The annual Benchmark Survey was completed, including a qualitative (two focus groups) component as well as a quantitative (telephone/online survey) component. The survey was modified to include additional questions pertaining to the goal. Staff is currently reviewing the results and preparing a report for the Board. Following this step, a companion effort will be developed to specifically target/survey stakeholder groups, including elected officials, business and community leaders.
- Strategic Goal #2 – Leverage Technology in Fares (**Rating Green**): Develop and implement a blueprint for a comprehensive fare policy and products focused on electronic fare collection.
  1. Recommendation on Distance-Based Fares: As a result of the Fare Policy analysis effort, UTA staff recommended a “no-go” decision on implementation of distance-based fare by mileage structure. This reflects (a) a lack of appeal/appetite for a distance-based fare structure due to concerns about complexity and unpredictability; (b) technology gaps requiring additional development exist, as revealed by the beta test; (c) preliminary modeling analysis shows no ridership benefit from a distance-based fare structure over other fare structures; and (d) additional costs would be incurred by the agency due to implications in paratransit and other support functions within the agency.
  2. Based on the information gathered through Fare Analysis Project completed last year from multiple audiences and stakeholders, staff is currently working on UTA’s future fare policy, developing a comprehensive multi-year proposal for the public fare structure. The fare proposal is scheduled to be presented in the second quarter of 2016, after which staff will conduct a prop-active public outreach and input effort.

## VI. 2015 UTA Customer Satisfaction Research/Net Promoter Score Analysis (Pierre Eliezer, Andrea Packer and Clair Fiet) –

- Net Promoter Score (NPS) is:
  1. One key measure that explains how well UTA is doing with our customers. NPS is an index ranging from -100 to 100 that measures the willingness of UTA customers to recommend our services to others.
  2. It is used as a proxy for gauging the customer’s overall satisfaction with UTA services and the customer’s loyalty to our brands.
- Objective of Study:
  1. Determine custom net promoter score for fixed route bus, TRAX and FrontRunner.
  2. Determine service design and delivery improvements that are likely to increase net promoter score, hence increase customer satisfaction and ridership.
- Methodology:
  1. Sample all fixed bus routes
  2. Sample all TRAX routes
  3. Sample FrontRunner
  4. Numbers of completed questionnaires required based on daily ridership and length of each route.
  5. Participants selected randomly, so that all riders had equal opportunity to participate in the survey.

6. Questions were adjusted to reflect the mode on which each respondent was traveling.
7. There were 6,300 riders who participated in the study.

<b>Sampling Information System-Wide and By Mode</b>			
	FrontRunner	TRAX	BUS
Confidence Level	99%	99%	99%
Sample Size	1,573	1,662	2,956
Error Margin	3.2%	3.2%	2.4%

### **Net Promoter Score Results:**

- Customer Satisfaction Measured by Net Promoter Score:
  1. Question: How likely would you be to recommend (MODE) to family and friends?
  2. Formula: NPS = % **promoters** and -% **detractors**. Possible Range: -100 to 100
    - a. FrontRunner Net Promoter Score was 51, compared to 59 during 2013
    - b. TRAX Net Promoter Score was 45, compared to 40 during 2013.
    - c. Fixed Route Bus Net Promoter Score was 27, compared to 24 during 2013.

### **Gauging Customer Experience Actual vs. Expected Experience:**

- Do you know the arrival time?
  1. FrontRunner Proportion was 95%, compared to 93% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 95%, compared to 93% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 88%, compared to 92% during 2013.
- On-time Arrival: Does it meet rider's expectation?
  1. FrontRunner Proportion was 91%, compared to 96% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 88%, compared to 92% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 83.5%, compared to 83% during 2013.
- Station Stop Cleanliness: Does it meet rider's expectation?
  1. FrontRunner Proportion was 96%, compared to 97% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 90%, compared to 91% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 90%, compared to 89% during 2013.
- Ease of Information: Did the rider easily obtain the schedule information?
  1. FrontRunner Proportion was 94%, compared to 90% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 93%, compared to 91% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 90%, compared to 89% during 2013.
- Transfer Rate: Did rider have a transfer in?
  1. FrontRunner Proportion was 38%, compared to 44% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 37%, compared to 46% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 34%, compared to 37% during 2013.
  4. Conclusion: Fewer riders are making transfers.
- Timeliness of Transfer: Did this meet rider's expectation?
  1. Frontrunner Proportion was 91%, compared to 85% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 88%, compared to 84% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 83%, compared to 81% during 2013.
- Courtesy/helpfulness of UTA Employees: Did this meet rider's expectation?
  1. FrontRunner Proportion was 96%, compared to 95% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 92%, compared to 92% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 92%, compared to 91% during 2013.
- Level of Safety: Did safety level meet rider's expectation?

1. FrontRunner Proportion was 97%, compared to 96% during 2013.
  2. TRAX Proportion was 91.7%, compared to 93% during 2013.
  3. Buses' Proportion was 94%, compared to 93% during 2013.
- Electronic Displays on Platform/Vehicle: Were these displays helpful to riders?
    1. FrontRunner Proportion was 89%, compared to 88% during 2013.
    2. TRAX Proportion was 90%, compared to 94% during 2013.
    3. Buses' Proportion was 88.2%, compared to 89% during 2013.
  - Travel Time: Did travel time meet rider's expectation?
    1. FrontRunner Proportion was 90%, compared to 92% during 2013.
    2. TRAX Proportion was 89%, compared to 93% during 2013.
    3. Buses' proportion was 88%, compared to 90% during 2013.
  - Conclusion #1:
    1. UTA fixed route bus, TRAX and FrontRunner customers have a positive perspective of those services.
    2. This positive perspective has increased system-wide on aggregate.
    3. Opportunities for improvement exist for all modes.

### Importance/Performance Gap Analysis:

- Customers' Expectation Gap / Satisfaction Ranking:
  1. **Green:** Customer is satisfied with the corresponding service characteristic.
  2. **Red:** Corresponding service characteristic needs improvement.
- FrontRunner 2015:
  1. **Green:** Customer is satisfied with the corresponding service characteristic
 

a. Cleanliness of station	d. Friendly, courteous, quick service
b. Smoothness of ride	e. Cleanliness of Interior
c. Ease of paying fare	
  2. **Red:** Corresponding service characteristic needs improvement:
 

a. Short wait transfer time	e. Travel time
b. Availability of seats	f. Cost-effective, affordability
c. Convenient transfers	g. Frequent Service
d. Arriving on time	
- TRAX 2015:
  3. **Green:** Customer is satisfied with the corresponding service characteristic
 

a. Ease of paying fare	d. Friendly, courteous, quick service
b. Cleanliness of station	
c. Smoothness of ride	
  4. **Red:** Corresponding service characteristic needs improvement:
 

a. Availability of seats	e. Cost-effective, affordability
b. Cleanliness of interior	f. Short wait transfer time
c. Convenient transfers	g. Frequent service
d. Arriving on time	h. Travel time
- Buses 2015:
  1. **Green:** Customer is satisfied with the corresponding service characteristic:
 

a. Ease of paying fare	d. Availability of seats
b. Cleanliness of station	e. Cleanliness of interior
c. Smoothness of ride	
  2. **Red:** Corresponding service characteristic needs improvement:

- |                                       |                                  |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| a. Friendly, courteous, quick service | d. Cost-effective, affordability |
| b. Short wait transfer time           | e. Arriving on time              |
| c. Convenient transfers               | f. Travel time                   |
|                                       | g. Frequent service              |

**Top Five Ranking of Desire Improvements FY 2015-2016:**

- FrontRunner:
 

1. Arriving on time	4. Cost-effective, affordability
2. Frequent Service	5. Availability of seats
3. Travel Time	
- TRAX:
 

1. Arriving on time	4. Frequent service
2. Travel Time	5. Cost effective, affordability
3. Short wait transfer time	
- Buses:
 

1. Arriving on time	4. Short-wait transfer time
2. Frequent Service	5. Cost-effective, affordability
3. Travel Time	
- Conclusion #2: The top four (4) improvements identified by UTA customers through the importance/performance gap analysis and ranking of desired improvement for all 3 modes are:
 

1. Arriving on time	3. Travel time
2. Frequency of service	4. Cost-effective, affordability

**Price versus Value / Conclusion #3:**

- The improvement of quality service implemented by UTA from 2013 to 2015 has resulted in a 4% increase in customer satisfaction system-wide.
- The Net Promoter Score has increase by two (points) from 2013 to 2015. Net Promoter Score measures the willingness of customers to recommend UTA services to others as an index ranging from -100 to 100.
- UTA services are improving in quality and customer satisfaction, although opportunities for improvement exist for all modes.
- **Action Item:** Andrea Packer stated that, in addition to the customer satisfaction survey, UTA also conducts an annual survey regarding Public Opinion and Perception of the organization, as part of the Compliance report. Once completed, Andrea will present the results to the Stakeholder Relations Committee.

**VII. Proposition 1 Weber and Davis County Service Enhancements (Eddie Cumins) –**

- Purpose of Presentation: Provide overview and receive constructive feedback.
- Community Involvement:
  1. Community Based Outreach has been conducted:
    - a. Rider surveys, both online and onboard.
    - b. Open Houses have been held
    - c. Meetings with elected officials have taken place. Eddie reported that he has met with all 30 mayors in Davis and Weber. Each of these meetings were on a one-on-one basis.
    - d. Market segmentation.
  2. Develop Service Strategies:
 

a. Immediate	b. Short Term	c. Long Term
--------------	---------------	--------------

- Community Priorities:
  1. Service Improvements:
    - a. Increase Span of Service (9:00 p.m. or later)
    - b. Improve frequency (30 minute service or better)
    - c. Provide more weekend service
    - d. Add additional coverage to serve new markets
    - e. Improve system connectivity
    - f. Provide faster more direct service
    - g. Implement demand response programs (coordinated mobility, vanpool, rideshare, etc.)
  2. Service Oriented Investments:
    - a. Purchase new buses:
    - b. Install new bus stop shelters and amenities:
    - c. Implement bike share and create new bike trails/lanes
    - d. Wayfinding Improvements (Enhanced signage and information)
- Proposition 1 Service Improvements:
  1. Thirty-eight percent (38%) increase in annual bus service:
    - a. 72,620 additional service hours annually
    - b. Two (2) new bus routes
    - c. Six (6) routes with increased weekday span of service (13,760 earlier/later annual hours)
    - d. Two (2) routes with added peak hour service
    - e. 18% increase in annual weekend bus service:
      - ✓ Four (4) routes with new Sunday service
      - ✓ Four (4) routes with improved Saturday frequency
      - ✓ Three (3) routes with improved Sunday frequency
    - f. Two (2) new mobility management programs.
- Proposition 1 Service Oriented Investments:
  1. Purchase eighteen (18) new buses:
 

a. Five (5) ski buses	c. Nine (9) regular buses
b. Four (4) Trolleys	
  2. \$3 million in Shelters, Sidewalks, Trails, etc. (FY 2016-2018):
 

a. 100+ bus stops improved	d. Improved bike amenities at bus stops
b. Multiple sidewalk projects	e. Bike Share Program
c. Multiple bike trail/lane projects	
- UTA Proposition 1 Implementation Timeline:
  1. FY 2015: Proposition 1 passes in Weber, Davis and Tooele Counties.
  2. FY2016: Focus on service enhancements that UTA can control.
 

a. Improved bus stops	d. First/Last Mile improvements
b. Improved span of service for weekday routes	e. Introduce new routes
c. Improved weekend service	f. Demand Responsive Service
  3. FY 2017:
    - a. Expansion buses added
    - b. Expand frequency on key routes as new buses arrive
    - c. Improved bus stops
    - d. First/Last mile improvements
  4. FY 2018:
    - a. Expand frequency on key routes as new buses arrive
    - b. Realize routes with improved destinations

- c. Improved bus stops
  - d. Improved span of service for weekday and weekend routes
  - e. 100% realization of Prop 1 Money for Service.
- FY 2016 Proposition 1 Budget: Sources = \$4,770,826 and Uses = \$4,770,826.
  - 1. FY 2016 Service Improvements cost = \$2,389,896
  - 2. Weber County FY 2016 Service-Oriented Investment Project Costs = \$745,535
  - 3. Davis County FY 2016 Service-Oriented Investment Project Costs: = \$803,037
- Proposition 1 Funds Distribution:
  - 1. FY 2016:
    - a. Service = 50%
    - b. Shelters and Amenities = 32%
    - c. Reserves = 14%
    - d. Capital Facility = 4%
  - 2. FY 2017:
    - a. Service = 71%
    - b. Shelters and Amenities = 15%
    - c. Reserves = 6%
    - d. Capital Buses = 6%
    - e. Capital Facility = 2%
  - 3. FY 2018:
    - a. Service = 84%
    - b. Capital Buses = 12%
    - c. Capital Facility = 2%
    - d. Reserves = 1%
    - e. Shelters and Amenities = 1%
- Next Steps – Communication Strategy:
  - 1. Elected Officials: Get message out, listen to all feedback and then make any necessary adjustments.
    - a. Davis COG on March 16<sup>th</sup>
    - b. Weber COG on April 4<sup>th</sup>
  - 2. Public Open Houses: With this proposal, public input is as important as ever, and a series of open houses to solicit comments from riders in Davis and Weber Counties has been scheduled throughout March and April.
    - a. North Salt Lake City Hall on March 24<sup>th</sup> from 4:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.
    - b. Ogden Transit Center on March 31<sup>st</sup> from 4:30 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.
    - c. North Temple Station on April 7<sup>th</sup> from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
    - d. Clearfield Station on April 19<sup>th</sup> from 3:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m.
    - e. Layton Library on April 21<sup>st</sup> from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
  - 3. Service Implementation during August 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016 (August Change Day).
- Trustee Matt Bell moved to temporarily move forward with the implementation of four (4) route changes on April Change Day in Davis and Weber Counties, as part of the Proposition 1 program. Trustee Matt Bell included in his motion, that ridership and other expense data should be provided regarding the four routes being implemented.
- Trustee Michael Romero seconded the motion, motion passed.
- **Action Item:** This Service Enhancement Plan is in line with the pledge made last fall by UTA’s Board of Trustees that any funds received from increased sales taxes raised through Proposition 1 would be used to enhance service in counties/cities that passed the resolution.
- **Action Item:** Chair H. David Burton suggested that the Stakeholder Relations Committee review the Board Policy regarding the Reserve Account percentage. They would like to verify where the current amount of 14% originated and if that amount is currently the most appropriate.

- **Action Item:** Trustee Matt Bell stated that he would like to talk to the mayors before he gives his final approval to the Service Enhancement plan that was presented at today's Stakeholder Relations Committee meeting.

#### VIII. Proposition 1 Tooele County Service Improvements (Chris Chesnut) -

- Proposition 1 Outreach:
  1. Community Based Outreach:
    - a. Rider Surveys (Online and Onboard)
    - b. Open Houses
    - c. Meetings with elected officials
    - d. Market segmentation
  2. Develop Service Strategies/Plans:
    - a. Immediate
    - b. Short Term
    - c. Long Term
- Tooele County Priorities:
  1. Connection with Salt Lake during the middle of the day
  2. Increase span of service on local routes
  3. Pedestrian and bicycle connections to transit
  4. Transit 101: Basic education on transit and how it works in Tooele.
- UTA Proposition 1 Implementation Timeline:
  1. FY 2015: Proposition 1 passes in Weber, Davis and Tooele Counties.
  2. FY2016:
    - a. Improved bus stops
    - b. Improved span of service for weekday routes
    - c. Demand Responsive Service
    - d. First/Last Mile improvements
    - e. Transit 101 Community Education
  3. FY 2017:
    - a. Expansion vehicles added
    - b. Improved bus stops
    - c. First/Last mile improvements
  4. FY 2018:
    - a. Introduce new routes and services
    - b. Improved bus stops
    - c. Improved span of service for weekday and weekend routes
    - d. 100% realization of Prop 1 Money for Service.
- Proposition 1 Funds Distribution:
  1. FY 2016: The focus on 2016 is to improve amenities of bus stops and bicycle lanes.
    - a. 28% Amenities
    - b. 27% Seniors/Disabled/Low Income Service
    - c. 14% Reserve Requirement
    - d. 13% Fixed Service
  2. FY 2017: The focus of 2017 is to deliver service on the street.
    - a. 38% Senior/Disabled/Low Income Service
    - b. 29% Fixed Service
    - c. 9% Amenities
    - d. 9% Reserve Requirement
  3. FY 2018: The focus of 2018 is also to deliver service on the street.
    - a. 63% Seniors/Disabled/Low Income Service



- b. 27% Fixed Service
- c. 5% Amenities
- d. 1% Reserve Requirement
- Proposition 1 Service Enhancement Benefits:
  1. 83% increase in overall service
  2. 100% increase in weekend service
  3. 2 routes with improved frequency
  4. 20+ bus stops improved
  5. Improve bike lanes, sidewalks and other connections to transit
- FY 2016 Implementation Timeline: During May, Shuffle services will implement expanded hours. This service will be provided by a MV1 smaller vehicle that can accommodate two wheelchairs and up to 4 seated passengers. The vehicle will be UTA branded. The shuffle service will be on local route 402 and the hours will be expanded to 7:00 a.m. through 7:00 p.m.

**IX. January/February 2016 Social Media Report** (Lynze Lenio and Andrea Packer) –

- A copy of January and February’s Social Media report was provided in the packet for each Stakeholder Relations Committee member.
- Due to time constraints at today’s meeting, the Social Medial report will be postponed until the next Stakeholder Relations Committee meeting.

**X. April Change Day Hearing Report** (Erika Shubin and Andrea Packer) -

- Proposed Changes:
  1. Discontinuation of Routes 836 and 842 in Utah County due to underperformance and low ridership.
  2. Redirect resources to increase frequency and service on Routes 833, 834, 821 and 850.
    - a. Increase frequency from 60 minutes 30 minutes on Routes 833 and 834.
    - b. Add trips to Routes 821 and 850 during peak periods.
  3. Consider use of Flex routes in areas that would be better served by the on-demand service..
  4. Minor adjustment to timing and routes to increase operational efficiency.
- Public Outreach and Comment:
  1. Public comment period held December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015 to February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016.
  2. Multiple activities conducted to inform riders and solicit comments, including:
    - a. Public hearing notice was published in the *Provo Daily Herald*, on the state website and on UTA’s website.
    - b. A formal public open house was held on January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016 at the Provo City Library.
    - c. Comments were accepted via UTA’s website, via email at [hearingofficer@rideuta.com](mailto:hearingofficer@rideuta.com), through the email and by phone through UTA’s Customer Service Department.
  3. Notices placed on affected bus routes to inform riders of the proposed changes and for opportunities to provide comment.
  4. Personal contact made with the customers on the affected routes; alternative transportation solutions for affected riders are being discussed.
  5. Proposed changes presented to Utah County local elected officials at the February meeting of the Utah County Regional Planning Committee.
- Summary of Comments:
  1. Total of four (4) comments received:
    - a. Two comments received at the open house.
    - b. Two comments received via email.
  2. One commenter was in favor of the changes due to the increased service on other routes.

3. One commenter was disappointed, but understood the reasons for the changes after discussion with staff.
  4. One commenter opposed the change due to personal hardship; staff is work on alternative solution.
  5. One comment was unrelated to the proposal.
- Results of Changes:
    1. Increased operational efficiency by redirecting resources to more productive routes.
    2. Projected ridership increase of 30,000 boardings annually.
    3. Improved access for approximately 15400 more low income and minority residents.

**XI. FY 2016 Utah State Legislative Update** (Matt Sibul and Jayme Blakesley) –

- Overall Legislative Strategy and Engagement Guidelines:
  1. Build and rebuild trust with legislators. Reinforce changes and reforms that have been made and are in process at the agency.
  2. Educate, inform and listen. UTA is not sponsoring or leading out on any legislative items this session. Staff will be there to support the Authority’s partners, answer questions and to be helpful.
  3. Be present: Board of Trustees and executive staff presence at the sessions will be key to the agency’s success.
  4. Be Communicative: Coordination and messaging are important. After noteworthy interactions, meet back with Jerry Benson, Jayme Blakesley, Michelle Larsen or Matt Sibul.
  5. Convey the message that Proposition I Implementation Plans are Moving Forward. Staff is meeting with elected officials of Davis, Weber and Tooele Counties to get input. Final technical plans are being drafted and UTA will be going back out for more input as the agency plans on rollout out Phase One in the third quarter of 2016.
- UTA has been watching various bills that would decrease funding resources or otherwise affect the agency. Some of these bill include:
  1. H.B. 209 – Public Transit District Board County Appointment Amendments: This bill amends the membership of a public transit district board of trustees for a public transit district with more than 200,000 people residing within the boundaries of the public transit district, and makes conforming changes. This bill would add 2 additional UTA Board members. This bill is put forward by Salt Lake County. Both of the 2 new Board members would go toward Salt Lake County. Also, Senator Harper is attempting to tag onto this bill and has the potential to do greater restructure UTA’s governance. There is an understanding that a compromise has been reached by Representative Anderson and Senator Harper. There is a possibility that the Senate will propose an amendment that would only add one additional voting member to UTA’s Board of Trustees.
  2. H.B. 122 – Sales Tax Exemption for Public Buildings Contractors. This bill amends the sales and use tax exemption for construction materials purchased by or on behalf of the state, its institutions, or its political subdivisions. Matt Sibul has requested additional accounting information from Bob Biles in regards to this bill.
  3. H.B. 243 – Public Transit District Officers Amendments: This bill modifies the Public Transit District Act by amending provisions relating to public transit district officers. This bill provides that the requirement that a public transit district have an internal auditor as an officer of the district only applies to certain public transit districts.
  4. S.B. 94 – Law Enforcement us of Body Cameras. This bill modifies the Utah Code of Criminal Procedure to address the use of body cameras by law enforcement officers.

5. H.B. 300 S1 – Body Cameras for Law Enforcement Officers: This bill provides that a law enforcement agency that uses cameras worn by law enforcement officers shall have a written policy governing the use of cameras that meets or exceeds the minimum guidelines provided.
6. H.B. 64 – Fees for Government Records Requests: This bill modifies provisions of the Government Records Access and Management Act relating to fees charged for records.
7. H.B. 67 – Weapons on Public Transportation: This bill eliminates the prohibition of carrying a firearm on a bus with no criminal intent.
8. H.B. 215 S1 – Local Option Sales and Use Tax Amendments (sponsored by Representative Brian M. Greene): This bill enacts a local sales and use tax for highways and public transit. This bill authorizes a county to impose a local option sales and use tax for highways and public transit; address the use of revenue collected from the local option sales and use tax for highways and public transit; requires a political subdivision that receives certain sales and use tax revenue to make technical corrections. Utah Lawmakers defeated this bill in Committee.
9. H.B. 168 – Transportation Funding Modifications: This bill modifies the Transportation Code by amending provisions relating to the County of the First Class Highway Projects Fund.
10. H.B. 183 – County Option Sales and Use Tax for Highways and Public Transit Amendments. This bill modifies the Sales and Use Tax Act by amending provisions relating to the county option sales and use tax for highways and public transit and makes technical and conforming changes.
11. H.B. 215 S1 – Local Option Sales and Use Tax Amendments: This bill enacts a local option sales and use tax for highways and public transit; addresses the use of revenue collected from the local option sales and use tax for highways and public transit; requires a political subdivision that receives certain sales and use tax revenue to submit certain information in audits, reviews compilations, or fiscal reports; and makes technical corrections.
12. H.B. 282 – State Contractor Employee Health Coverage Amendments: This bill addresses employee health insurance requirements for state contractors. This bill amends the types of contracts that trigger a state contractor’s employee health insurance requirements; amends provisions for a state contractor to demonstrate compliance; amends employee health insurance requirements; and makes technical changes.
13. H.B. 347 – Local and Special Service District Amendments: This bill amends provisions related to local and special service districts.
14. S.B. 80 – Infrastructure Funding Amendments: The Senate gave its final approval to a bill that could transfer nearly a half-billion dollars from transportation to water projects over the next eleven years.
15. S.B. 184 - Procurement Code Modifications: This bill modifies provisions relating to the Utah Procurement Code; adds definitions; rearranges some procurement provisions; modifies provisions relating to the head of a procurement unit with independent procurement authority; modifies exemptions from the procurement code; rewrites provisions relating to requests for statement of qualifications and approved vendor lists; authorizes a procurement unit to establish price based on specified established terms; modifies provisions relating to correcting immaterial errors in a solicitation and clarifying information in a solicitation response; modifies duties and responsibilities of the chief procurement officer.
16. Depot District: UTA is working to preserve the \$2 million dollars appropriated during 2015 to help fund the Depot District. UTA is working to get intent language in Appropriations to preserve that funding.
17. Criminal Background Investigation: Staff is watching a bill that would prohibit UTA from conducting criminal background investigations and asking job applicants if they have a

criminal history before interviews are conducted. That would create troubling issues for the Authority.

- UTA staff and Board members have had a voice and been successful in changing language for approximately 15 or more bills. UTA has had great support and cooperation for the League of Cities and Towns and from the Utah Association of Special Districts.

**XII. Input for May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2016 Stakeholder Relations Committee Meeting Agenda** (Bret Milburn) –

- Safety First Minute (David Goeres)
- Approval of the March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2016 Stakeholder Relations Meeting Report (Bret Millburn)
- Policy Review (Andrea Packer)
- Social Media Report (Lynze Lenio and Andrea Packer)
- Review of February 2016 Performance Dashboard (Bret Milburn)
- Liaison, Conference and External Committee Reports (Bret Millburn)
- Input for August 2016 Stakeholder Relations Committee Meeting Agenda (Bret Millburn)

**XIII. Meeting Adjourned -**

- At 3.10 p.m. Trustee Matt Bell moved to adjourn the Stakeholder Relations Committee meeting.
- Trustee Michael Romero seconded the motion, meeting adjourned.

**XIV. Next Meeting Date -**

- The next meeting of the Stakeholders Relations Committee will be held in the Golden Spike Board Room on Wednesday, May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2016, at FrontLines Headquarters located at 669 West 200 South, starting at 1:00 p.m.

Report Transcribed by: EiLeen Billings, Executive Assistant  
VP/Corporate Communications and Customer Focus Department  
E-mail: [ebillings@rideuta.com](mailto:ebillings@rideuta.com)  
Tele: (801) 287-3209  
Cell: (801) 230-3428