

1 **Regular Board Meeting Minutes**
2 **Cache Valley Transit District**
3 **DBA Connect Transit**
4 **Wednesday, April 22, 2026**
5 **5:30 pm**
6 **Connect Administration**
7 **3021 North 300 West, North Logan, Utah**
8 **Connect Transit Boardroom**
9

10
11 *Present:* Lieren Hansen, Glen Schmidt, Emily Fletcher, Flor Estrada, John Zsiray, Paul
12 Mortenson, Ron Bushman, and Shaun Bushman

13
14 *Excused:* Mike Arnold

15
16 *Others:* Todd Beutler, Curtis Roberts, Jody Kimball, Mindy Spackman, Kaylee
17 Fannesbeck, Spencer Green, Gillian Crozier, Colton Fullmer, and Charise VanDyke

18
19 **Regular Meeting Agenda**

- 20
21 1. *Call to order:* Board Vice Chair Glen Schmidt
22
23 2. Pledge of Allegiance
24
25 3. Consent Agenda: Glen Schmidt asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda.
26 Shaun Bushman moved; John Zsiray seconded. Vote unanimous.
27 A. Approval of Agenda
28 B. Acceptance of Minutes – March 25, 2026
29 C. Next Board Meeting – May 27, 2026
30
31 4. Public comments: No comments or questions.
32
33 5. **Board Business:**
34 A. Review of planning effort – Peter Soderberg, Nelson/Nygaard: This presentation
35 builds on last month’s, but digs a little more into the detail; specifically, how the
36 pieces come together for an integrated study and a little more context. First, a
37 Transit Route Study is a comprehensive review of all transit services, asking the
38 questions of what is working well and what isn’t? It’s also a market assessment to
39 identify key locations and ask the question of how well are the services aligned
40 with these markets? These locations can change and evolve as populations and
41 work densities shift. The study also incorporates rider and community priorities
42 by getting feedback from current riders and from those who aren’t riding. That

Approved 05/27/2026

43 information is compiled and used to make recommendations for how to better
44 meet service needs with current resources. It is also used to make
45 recommendations of what changes to implement when new funding and resources
46 become available. There are multiple reasons to do Transit Route Studies. The
47 market for transit is constantly changing, especially in growing areas like Cache
48 Valley. It's best practice to review service every few years to keep up with
49 changes and to evaluate service performance, as well as if the service is still
50 meeting the needs of the community. It also helps to adjust those service levels
51 within current budget constraints and provide recommendations for future service,
52 both in the near term and the long term. Multiple data sources are examined when
53 doing a Transit Route Study. Data is provided from the transit agency and it is
54 examined to see how they're already operating and how current routes are
55 performing; this data includes things like on-time performance, rider transfer
56 locations, and automatic rider data to see where activity is. Other data sources are
57 population and growth projections, demographics and employment census data,
58 travel patterns, and other regional planning documents. This data helps planners
59 understand transit performance, such as which routes are late or have high or low
60 ridership and productivity. It also helps them understand the market for transit,
61 such as which are key job center and population areas (and if those areas are
62 connected effectively). The data helps planners understand regional context to
63 guide the study. To get data from the community and stakeholders, they are
64 engaged via surveys and stakeholder input meetings. So far, we have a strong
65 response of almost 400 surveys; previous experience in Cache Valley suggest that
66 there are high levels of local engagement, so we're aiming for more. There are
67 multiple meetings planned to ask for input at key project times (i.e. existing
68 conditions, prioritization model, scenario development). Board members can be
69 involved in multiple ways. They can give input on the approach (like the input on
70 the survey by the board committee) and help spread the word about the study.
71 Board members can also give input so that it makes their and their constituents'
72 priorities known. The Board will also work together with the planners and staff on
73 the prioritization model for service concepts (i.e. frequency, coverage, evening
74 service, etc.). We'll work through things like potential tradeoffs and budget
75 constraints. We want Board approval, so board involvement and understanding
76 are key; the goal is to have strong support from the Board by the end of the study.
77 There will continue to be updates on the study in board meetings. The study
78 integration takes all the data, engagement, and stakeholder input – what is
79 working well, where there needs to be improvement, the highest priority concerns
80 – and feeds it into the prioritization model, which then helps to develop a transit
81 network scenario in a holistic approach. The planned completion for the study is
82 early 2027. Preliminary recommendations will be made in time for the budget
83 process in Fall 2026. Discussion about the study. There will be a stakeholder
84 meeting in May. The board member one-on-ones with the planners are being

85 scheduled. The one-on-ones are an opportunity for each board member to ask
86 questions or voice concerns privately; we want to understand what board
87 members are hearing from constituents and what their top priorities are.
88

89 B. Consideration of feasibility study on bus simulator – Todd Beutler, CEO/General
90 Manager: During the budget process a few months ago, we talked about the
91 design of a training course on the south property and how we were also looking at
92 bus simulators. Questions were raised about phasing and if we needed bus
93 simulators. The need for bus simulators arises from not always having a bus
94 available for training new drivers, which can hold up training. A while back, we
95 did a feasibility study on electric buses and want to do something similar for bus
96 simulators. We want to better understand how other transit agencies are using bus
97 simulators, including operational benefits, challenges, facility requirements, and
98 vendor options. The proposed feasibility study would include outreach to
99 approximately ten transit agencies and provide information to management to
100 help determine whether bus simulators would be a good investment. The
101 estimated cost of the study is approximately \$45,000; although it wasn't included
102 in the budget, staff want to see if there are other areas to save in the budget and
103 only add a budget amendment if needed. We want an unbiased evaluation of bus
104 simulator use and to understand the overall effectiveness of simulator-based
105 training. Management saw a need to gather more information, so they'd like
106 authorization from the Board to do the study. Discussion about bus simulators.
107 The preliminary conversations with other transit agencies produced mixed
108 feedback; some saw a benefit, while others indicated they provided limited value.
109 Some of these agencies were not using them in the ways we anticipate we'd use
110 them. But staff haven't spent a ton of time or resources on this, as focuses have
111 been elsewhere. Connect has a 5-year contract with Nelson/Nygaard who has the
112 expertise for this; they developed the scope for this study and provided the quote
113 (the contract helped with the rate). Management evaluated doing it in-house and
114 determined that we don't have the bandwidth for something like this as we do not
115 have a planning department (why we use consultants for things like this). The
116 budget for the Transit Route Study was discussed during the budget process last
117 year; the budget was \$200,000, which is typical for a planning study. Discussion
118 about the budget. Staff anticipate, but cannot guarantee, that this study could be
119 funded with budget savings; if a budget amendment is needed it would be towards
120 the end of the year. Most years Connect has been pretty under budget. Discussion
121 about the bus simulator feasibility study. The Board generally indicated that
122 additional internal research should be conducted to provide additional information
123 for future consideration.
124

125 6. Management Report:

126 A. Review of rider comment process – Spencer Green, Operations Supervisor:
127 Passenger comments (complaints, suggestions, etc.) come in from multiple places,
128 but the most common comments come through our website or are called in;
129 comments also come in from interactions at the transit center or through other
130 informal interactions like with an employee. Website submissions are emailed
131 directly to supervisors and dispatchers; dispatchers assist in filtering and assigning
132 comments for follow-up. Supervisors then review and respond to the comments
133 on a case-by-case basis; they follow up with the individual if they've requested to
134 be contacted again. The bulk of comments are about quality control (feedback
135 about drivers, service improvement suggestions, etc.). If it's a complaint about a
136 driver (conduct or driving performance), supervisors will pull video to watch and
137 see if it validates the comment or if they see something else; they then determine
138 the appropriate response before following up with the driver and complainant (if
139 follow-up requested). The favorite comments received are compliments about
140 drivers, which are passed onto the driver as positive reinforcement. Suggestions
141 about service improvements (changes to bus stops, service changes, etc.) are
142 evaluated based on feasibility and if the proposed change would improve overall
143 service. If the individual wants to be contacted, the goal is to contact them by the
144 next business day. The timeline for resolution depends on the comment and can
145 vary greatly, from a couple of days for things like driver behavior to a year plus
146 for things like service adjustments. Most issues are resolved at the supervisor
147 level, though comments may occasionally be escalated to management when
148 necessary. Discussion about comments. We receive roughly 20 comments a
149 month, though volumes fluctuate. Some are anonymous, most are not; most want
150 a follow-up, but about a quarter of them are a do not reply. If they want follow-
151 up, they can be contacted for more information if needed. Only about a fifth of
152 comments are unfounded; a lot of comments are in the middle where they might
153 be blown out of proportion or there needs to be some education (like the driver
154 didn't do anything wrong because of this reason). Typically, after a conversation
155 with the commentor, they end up in a good spot and it's usually a great experience
156 in customer relations. Some comments are too vague to do anything about like
157 "the driver missed me," but no details and a do not reply. Multiple stop
158 adjustments or improvements have come from comments; lots of comments about
159 a location increases the likelihood of an adjustment. There are occasional
160 complaints from passengers about other passengers. These usually come up at the
161 transit center and if it's concerning, they get law enforcement involved; it's
162 usually just school kids swearing at each other. The complaint process is the same
163 no matter where it comes from, so if board members get a complaint the best
164 thing to do is send the comment or commentor through the website because it gets
165 put directly into the process. Putting it through the website also helps us to track
166 trends and do better analysis. The most common areas or routes that get
167 complaints are main street and Route 11. Route 11 is the most unreliable route

168 currently; last year there were a lot of complaints about it because after traffic
169 picked up it'd be late every single run. There have been some band aid solutions
170 put in place, so complaints have dropped, but larger changes won't be
171 implemented until after the study with Nelson/Nygaard is finished. After the study
172 is finished, it'll still take time to implement with some changes needing to take a
173 year or more.

174
175 B. Questions for management: No questions.

176
177 7. **Board Chair Report:**

178 A. Recognition of Employee Anniversaries: Employee anniversaries include 19 years
179 for Gillian Crozier (Operations Manager), 15 years for Tina Miller (Driver), 14
180 years for Spencer Green (Operations Supervisor), 12 years for Steven Earley
181 (Driver), 12 years for Tom Sullivan (Driver), 5 years for Stephanie Tatro
182 (Training Supervisor).

183
184 B. Report on City Council Reports: No reports.

185
186 8. Public comments: No questions or comments.

187
188 9. **Adjourn:** Board Vice Chair Glen Schmidt adjourned the meeting.