

**Minutes of the Meeting  
of the  
Board of Trustees of the Utah Transit Authority (UTA)  
held remotely via phone or video conference  
and broadcast live for the public via YouTube  
December 16, 2020**

**Board Members Participating:**

Carlton Christensen, Chair  
Beth Holbrook  
Jeff Acerson

Also participating were members of UTA staff, community members, and media representatives.

---

**Call to Order and Opening Remarks.** Chair Christensen welcomed attendees and called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m. He then yielded the floor to Jana Ostler, UTA Board Manager, who read the electronic board meeting determination into the record as required by statute. The complete electronic board meeting determination is included as Appendix A to these minutes.

**Safety First Minute.** Sheldon Shaw, UTA Director of Safety & Security, provided a brief safety message.

**Public Comment.** Chair Christensen noted members of the public were invited to attend and comment during the live portion of the meeting; however, no live public comment was given. It was also noted that no online public comment was received for the meeting. (Note: Additional comment related to the tentative 2021 budget was received after the meeting packet was posted. A complete report of the public feedback received on the tentative budget is included as Appendix B to these minutes.)

**Consent Agenda.** The consent agenda was comprised of:

- a. Approval of December 9, 2020 Board Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the consent agenda was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously.

### **Agency Report.**

**Human Trafficking Campaign.** Carolyn Gonot, UTA Executive Director, mentioned January is National Human Trafficking Prevention Month and UTA is joining other transit agencies across the nation in efforts to prevent human trafficking activity.

**North Temple FrontRunner Seating.** Ms. Gonot indicated additional canopies with seating have been added at the North Temple FrontRunner platform.

**Mandatory Direct Expedient Release (MDES) Installation on FrontRunner North Alignment.** Ms. Gonot said a MDES has been installed at four crossings on the FrontRunner north alignment. The addition of this equipment is part of the positive train control system and increases efficiency by allowing trains to upgrade their speeds automatically. Ms. Gonot noted UTA is the first commuter railroad in the nation to have this functionality.

**Donation of Shelters to Intermountain Health Care.** Ms. Gonot shared that the agency recently donated six out-of-service bubble shelters to Intermountain Health Care for use by people working in COVID tents.

### **Discussion Item.**

**Clearfield Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Master Development Agreement.** Mary DeLoretto, UTA Chief Service Planning Officer, was joined by Paul Drake, UTA Director of Real Estate & TOD; Jordan Swain, UTA TOD Project Manager; Mark Shepherd, Clearfield City Mayor; and JJ Allen, Clearfield City Manager. Mr. Swain reviewed the station area plan, developer selection, and master plan working group history for the Clearfield TOD site. He then provided an overview of the master development plan (MDP), emphasizing the transportation plan, land use plan, and park-and-ride facilities contemplated in the MDP. Mr. Swain concluded by sharing information on the basic structure, development, sequencing plan, public improvement, and ownership and maintenance terms addressed in the master development agreement (MDA).

Mayor Shepherd and Mr. Allen expressed strong support for the project.

Discussion ensued during which the city representatives described their objectives for the site. Questions regarding affordable housing on the site were posed by the board and answered by staff and city representatives.

## Resolutions.

**R2020-12-08 Resolution Ratifying the Adoption of the Final 2021 Budget.** Bill Greene, UTA Chief Financial Officer, reviewed key items in the final operating and capital budgets and highlighted how the budget connects to the agency's strategic plan. It was noted that the board and public have had multiple opportunities to review and give input regarding the 2021 agency budget.

A motion to approve R2020-12-08 was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously with aye votes from Trustee Holbrook, Trustee Acerson, and Chair Christensen.

**R2020-12-09 Resolution Approving and Authorizing the Execution of the Authority's Amended Transit Agency Safety Plan (TASP).** Mr. Shaw touched on challenges experienced in 2020 and outlined updates to the TASP.

A motion to approve R2020-12-09 was made by Trustee Acerson and seconded by Trustee Holbrook. The motion carried unanimously with aye votes from Trustee Acerson, Trustee Holbrook, and Chair Christensen.

**R2020-12-10 Resolution Adopting the Third Amendment to the Utah Transit Authority Retirement Plan and Trust Agreement.** Kim Ulibarri, UTA Chief People Officer, described the resolution, which adopts two key updates to the Utah Transit Authority Retirement Plan and Trust Agreement. The first clarifies that employees participating in the 401A defined contribution plan may not participate in the defined benefit pension plan and the second updates the "applicable interest rate" for lump sum retirement payments and retirement credit purchases to 6.75% effective January 1, 2021.

Discussion ensued. A question on how frequently the long-range financial forecast is reviewed was posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve R2020-12-10 was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously with aye votes from Trustee Holbrook, Trustee Acerson, and Chair Christensen.

**R2020-12-11 Resolution Authorizing the Execution of Modification Number 2 to a Federal Aid Grant Agreement with the Utah Department of Transportation to Provide Funding for the Springville Sharp Tintic Railroad Connection Project.** Ms. DeLoretto

was joined by Heather Bening, UTA Project Manager II. Ms. Bening summarized the Federal Aid Grant Agreement history and the resolution, which adds \$300,000 in local funding from UTA to initiate the design phase of the Springville Sharp Tintic railroad connection project. The total project budget is \$6,638,299 and is divided as follows:

- Federal funds: \$5,594,344
- State funds: \$390,000
- Local matching funds: \$653,955
  - \$300,000 UTA local funds
  - \$117,985 UTA in-kind services
  - \$117,985 Springville
  - \$117,985 Spanish Fork

Discussion ensued. Questions on the project purpose were posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve R2020-12-11 was made by Trustee Acerson and seconded by Trustee Holbrook. The motion carried unanimously with aye votes from Trustee Acerson, Trustee Holbrook, and Chair Christensen.

**R2020-12-12 Resolution Authorizing the Execution of an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement (ILA) with the Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City for the Cooperative Construction of a TRAX Station at 650 South Main Street.** Ms. DeLoretto was joined by Andrea Pullos, UTA Project Manager III. Ms. Pullos delivered an update on the 650 South Main Street TRAX platform project and requested the board approve the resolution, which establishes an ILA with the Redevelopment Agency of Salt Lake City detailing partner contributions, including funding, for the platform construction, operation, and maintenance.

Discussion ensued. A question on the progress of developments near the site was posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve R2020-12-12 was made by Chair Christensen and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously with aye votes from Trustee Acerson, Trustee Holbrook, and Chair Christensen.

## **Contracts, Disbursement, and Grants.**

**Contract: Actuarial Services (Milliman).** Ms. Ulibarri requested the board approve a contract for actuarial services with Milliman. The contract term is for three years with two additional one-year options with a total value, including options, of \$228,500.

A motion to approve the contract was made by Trustee Acerson and seconded by Trustee Holbrook. The motion carried unanimously.

**Contract: Financial Advisor Services (Zions Public Finance).** Mr. Greene was joined by Emily Diaz, UTA Financial Services Administrator. Ms. Diaz asked the board to approve a five-year contract in the amount of \$1,118,891.50 with Zions Public Finance for financial advisor services.

Discussion ensued. Questions on the advisor selection process were posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve the contract was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously.

**Contract: Northern Utah County Double Track Project Long-Lead Items (Stacy-Witbeck).** Ms. DeLoretto requested approval of a contract with Stacy-Witbeck to procure long-lead items necessary for the FrontRunner double track construction in northern Utah County. The total contract value is \$774,938.

Discussion ensued. A question on when in the future a contract for construction contracting services will be in place was posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve the contract was made by Trustee Acerson and seconded by Trustee Holbrook. The motion carried unanimously.

**Contract: Utility Relocation Master Agreement for Ogden-WSU Bus Rapid Transit Project (Century Link).** Ms. DeLoretto was joined by Janelle Robertson, UTA Project Manager II. Ms. DeLoretto asked the board to approve a contract with Century Link for utility relocation required for the Ogden-WSU bus rapid transit project in an amount not to exceed \$300,000.

Discussion ensued. A question on how the utility lines to be moved are determined was posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve the contract was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously.

**Change Order: Ogden-WSU Bus Rapid Transit Project Early Utility Work (Stacy-Witbeck).** Ms. DeLoretto was joined by Ms. Robertson. Ms. DeLoretto requested approval of a change order with Stacy-Witbeck in the amount of \$162,222 for early utility work on the Ogden-WSU bus rapid transit project. The total contract, including the change order, is \$825,066.

Discussion ensued. A question on the timeline for starting this work was posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve the change order was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously.

**Change Order: On-Call Maintenance Change Order #1 to Task Order #130 – Provo FrontRunner Wayside Power Relocation (Stacy-Witbeck).** Ms. DeLoretto asked the board to approve a change order to Stacy-Witbeck Task Order #130 in the amount of \$38,466 for wayside power relocation at the Provo FrontRunner station. The change order brings the task order total to \$226,456 and the total contract value to \$41,120,191.

A motion to approve the change order was made by Trustee Acerson and seconded by Trustee Holbrook. The motion carried unanimously.

**Change Order: Program Management Services Contract Change Order (WSP).** Ms. DeLoretto requested approval of a change order in the amount of \$676,376 to the program management services contract with WSP for services rendered through March 3, 2021. The total contract, including the change order, is \$24,397,533.

A motion to approve the change order was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously.

**Change Order: Flex Route Deviation Transportation Services and On-Demand Accessible Shared Ride Contract Modification 4 (Tooele County Health and Aging Services).** Eddy Cumins, UTA Chief Operating Officer, was joined by Ben Adams, UTA Acting Special Services General Manager. Mr. Cumins asked the board to approve a one-year contract extension in the amount of \$734,358 with Tooele County Health and Aging Services for route deviation and on-demand service in the Tooele County area. The total contract, including the extension, is \$3,301,719. Mr. Cumins also noted the change order corrects some incorrect dates on the original contract.

Discussion ensued. Questions on ridership on the on-demand service and length of time the service has been in place were posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve the change order was made by Trustee Acerson and seconded by Trustee Holbrook. The motion carried unanimously.

**Change Order: Business Analytics Software Subscription Extension (Information Builders).** Dan Harmuth, UTA IT Director, was joined by Dave Snyder, UTA Enterprise Applications Manager. Mr. Harmuth requested approval of a change order in the amount of \$270,000 for a two-year extension of the contract with Information Builders for business analytics software. The total contract, including the change order, is \$770,150.

Discussion ensued. Questions on the term of the contract and impact should the agency opt to change vendors were posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve the change order was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Christensen call for a short break at 10:27 a.m.

The meeting resumed at 10:38 a.m.

**Pre-Procurement.** Todd Mills, UTA Senior Supply Chain Manager, was joined by Ms. Pullos; Bruce Cardon, UTA Commuter Rail General Manager; Thomas Gilmore, UTA Rail Service Project Administrator; and Jaron Robertson, UTA Director of Innovative Mobility Solutions. Mr. Mills said the agency intends to procure the following:

- i. FrontRunner Paint Booth

- ii. FrontRunner Bike Rack
- iii. On-Demand Technologies and Innovative Mobility Services
- iv. Meadowbrook Bay Expansion

Discussion ensued. Questions on expansion capacity at Meadowbrook, the number of bike racks needed on a full train, number of providers sought for on-demand technologies and innovative mobility services, and timeline related to the on-demand technologies request for proposals (RFP) were posed by the board and answered by staff.

**Grant Application: Ogden-WSU Bus Rapid Transit Depot Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (Rocky Mountain Power).** Ms. DeLoretto informed the board of the agency's intention to submit a grant application in the amount of \$750,000 to Rocky Mountain Power for electric vehicle charging infrastructure at the Ogden-WSU Bus Rapid Transit Depot. The grant would offset costs UTA would otherwise incur as part of the \$1,446,000 project total.

**Grant Application: CMAQ/STBG/TAP WFRC Concept Report Submittals for the Ogden/Layton Urbanized Area (Weber and Davis Counties).** Ms. DeLoretto was joined by Alma Haskell, UTA Grants Development Administrator. Mr. Haskell indicated UTA submitted grant applications to the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) for the following projects:

- Davis-SLC Community Connector – Design Funds – Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)
  - \$16,700,000 total design cost: \$1,500,000 federal STBG request in this urbanized area (UZA) + \$108,924 UTA match (additional funds for this project are also being requested in the Salt Lake City/West Valley UZA)
  - The request helps pay for design of the project, which is anticipated to seek Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Small Starts funding for additional design and project construction
- Box Elder Park-and-Ride Lot – Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ)
  - \$920,000 total project cost: \$850,000 federal CMAQ request in this UZA + \$64,000 UTA match
  - UTA is proposing a 100-stall park-and-ride lot and 2 bus bays on property between the rail corridor and the Wal-Mart on 1100 South (Highway 91) in Brigham City for vanpool and other users to have an official spot to



meet, where they can safely leave their vehicles and ride together to their destinations

- Bus Stop Improvements – STBG
  - \$571,000 total project cost: \$532,343 federal STBG request+ \$38,657 UTA match
  - UTA will construct almost 50 bus stops, including ADA/shelter pads, shelters, benches, and other amenities as warranted in the agency’s Bus Stop Master Plan

Discussion ensued. Questions on options for expending funds and frequency of updates to the Bus Stop Master Plan were posed by the board and answered by staff.

**Grant Application: CMAQ/STBG/TAP WFRC Concept Report Submittals for the Salt Lake City/West Valley Urbanized Area (Salt Lake County).** Ms. DeLoretto was joined by Mr. Haskell. Mr. Haskell noted the agency submitted grant applications to the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) for the following projects:

- Davis-SLC Community Connector – Design Funds – STBG
  - \$16,700,000 total design cost: \$1,500,000 federal STBG request in this UZA + \$108,924 UTA match (additional funds for this project are also being requested in the Ogden-Layton UZA)
  - The request will help pay for design of the project, which is anticipated to seek FTA Small Starts funding for additional design and project construction
- Point of the Mountain Transit Environmental Study – STBG
  - \$4,000,000 total study cost: \$3,000,000 federal STBG request + \$181,540 UTA match + other UTA and partner funds
  - The request will help pay for environmental study and preliminary engineering of the project, which is anticipated to seek FTA Small Starts funding for construction
- On-Route Electric Bus Charging Infrastructure: Round 2 – CMAQ
  - \$2,681,540 total project cost: \$2,500,000 federal CMAQ request + \$181,540 UTA match
  - Two on-route chargers at key locations in UTA’s Salt Lake County system
- Bus Stop Improvements – STBG
  - \$647,000 total project cost: \$603,198 federal STBG request + \$43,802 UTA match

- This would construct almost 30 bus stops, including ADA/shelter pads, and shelters, benches, and other amenities as warranted
- Future of FrontRunner Double Tracking – South Jordan to Draper Stations – CMAQ/STBG
  - \$40,400,000 total project cost: \$3,000,000 federal CMAQ or STBG request + \$217,848 UTA match + other UTA/partner funds
  - Double tracking 2.5 miles of FrontRunner track from the Draper to the South Jordan Station
- Alternatives and Environmental Study of the 400 West TRAX Rail Connection – STBG
  - \$1,300,000 total project cost: \$1,211,990 federal STBG request + \$88,010 UTA match or other local match
  - This funding would begin the environmental study of this corridor, which was identified in both the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan and the 2019-2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan

### **Service and Fare Approvals.**

**Fare Agreement: Eco Trip Rewards Custom Fare Agreement Extension (Intermountain Health Care).** Mr. Greene was joined by Monica Morton, UTA Fares Director. Ms. Morton asked the board to approve a one-year extension of the Eco Trip Rewards agreement with Intermountain Health Care. The new contract has an estimated value between \$195,000 and \$277,000.

Discussion ensued. A question clarifying the pandemic accommodation was posed by the board and answered by staff.

A motion to approve the fare agreement was made by Trustee Holbrook and seconded by Trustee Acerson. The motion carried unanimously.

**Fare Agreement: Eco Trip Rewards Custom Fare Agreement Extension (Select Health).** Mr. Greene requested the board approve a one-year extension of the Eco Trip Rewards agreement with Select Health. The new contract has a value of \$5,900.

A motion to approve the fare agreement was made by Trustee Acerson and seconded by Trustee Holbrook. The motion carried unanimously.

## Discussion Items.

**Customer Service Department 2020 Report.** Nichol Bourdeaux, UTA Chief Planning & Engagement Officer, was joined by Cindy Medford, UTA Manager of Customer Service. Ms. Medford provided an overview of the agency's customer service function and cited statistics on comments by source, top five comments, and service alerts.

Discussion ensued. A question on remote work was posed by the board and answered by Ms. Medford.

**Fraud Risk Assessment.** Ron Ellis, UTA Director of Internal Audit, reviewed the requirements and scoring of the agency's fraud risk. He then highlighted opportunities for improving scores in the future.

Chair Christensen turned control of the meeting to Trustee Holbrook at 11:27 a.m. and then left the meeting to attend another commitment.

## Other Business.

**Next Meeting.** The next meeting of the board will take place on January 13, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.


**Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. by motion.

Transcribed by Cathie Griffiths  
Executive Assistant to the Board Chair  
Utah Transit Authority  
[cgriffiths@rideuta.com](mailto:cgriffiths@rideuta.com)  
801.237.1945

*This document is not intended to serve as a full transcript as additional discussion may have taken place; please refer to the meeting materials, audio, or video located at <https://www.utah.gov/pm/sitemap/notice/646085.html> for entire content.*

*This document along with the digital recording constitute the official minutes of this meeting.*

Approved Date: January 13, 2021

DocuSigned by:  
  
9F729E1F2C184AC...

---

Carlton J. Christensen  
Chair, Board of Trustees

## Appendix A

### UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY ELECTRONIC BOARD MEETING DETERMINATION

Consistent with provisions of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act, (UTAH CODE § 52-4-207 [4]), as the Chair of the Board of Trustees ("Board") of the Utah Transit Authority ("UTA"), I hereby make the following written determinations in support of my decision to hold electronic meetings of the UTA Board without a physical anchor location:

1. Due to the ongoing threat of the COVID -19 pandemic and the persistence of community person-to-person virus transmission, conducting Board and Board Committee meetings with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location.
2. Federal, state, and local health authorities have adopted guidelines which encourage institutions and individuals to limit in-person interactions and recommend increased virtual interactions.

This written determination takes effect on December 16, 2020, and is effective until midnight on January 15, 2021 and may be re-issued by future written determinations as deemed appropriate.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of December 2020.

DocuSigned by:



UTAH TRANSIT AUTHORITY

---

Carlton Christensen, Chair of the Board of Trustees

## **Appendix B**

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



*Amended 12/15/2020*

The Utah Transit Authority held a public comment period and public hearing to receive input on the 2021 Tentative Budget. The public hearing was held on Wednesday, November 11 at 6pm at UTA's downtown Salt Lake City office at 669 West 200 South. COVID-19 precautions were in place – individuals attending in person were required to wear masks and practice safe social distancing. A remote attendance option was also made available via WebEx.

A 30-day public comment period on the Tentative Budget was held from November 11 through December 11. During the 30-day comment period, members of the public were invited to submit comments via email, online, mail, or over the phone. Information on the Tentative Budget was made available online at [www.rideuta.com/budget](http://www.rideuta.com/budget), as well as onsite at UTA Headquarters. Appendix 1 details the promotion and outreach methods used to inform the community about this opportunity.

As part of the statutory requirements governing UTA's budget process (Section 17B-1-702, Utah Code Annotated), notice of the 2021 Tentative Budget was sent directly to the Utah Governor, state legislature, and local city and county constituent entities. A total of five responses were received.

A total of 25 public comments were received between November 11 and December 11.

---

## **Public Hearing, November 11, 2020 (3 comments):**

1. *Brooke Green:* I just wanted to say you guys did a great job, I think everything looks great. Good job to all of you, you have a great team.

2. *Donald Geverts:* I am an engineering student at UVU and I just recently found out about this meeting. Where can I find more information about the data about future trends and more information about this?

3. *George Chapman:* I'm sorry to hear that it's only 2 minutes, because you don't get many comments, you should do 3 minutes. I'm disappointed there are no previous comments, I think that's a big issue. A lot my comments should be adopted for the budget because I give you comments every week and a lot of them are applying to the budget. So my most

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



important comment is that you have \$187 Million from the CARES act and nothing for riders, come on? Implement the \$1 bus fare – it's really important that you understand the difference between rail and bus fare elasticities- I hope someone there at UTA understands that. You should be spending money now to increase ridership or accept low ridership for the next 10 years and without ridership increase there will be no justification for any projects including any BRT. UTA cannot justify spending \$100 million for the BRTs for 1-2 thousand passengers a day. You promised 5 thousand riders on the S-line to justify \$40 million and it never got above 1600 – it's now 650. And every day I see reasons not to ride buses, cars parked so close to stops that they force buses to stay into the street. And I sent you a sign, a picture of a sign from UTA that told bus drivers to stay away from the curb. How dumb is that. So you also need a better server and software system, load balancing is a warning system, you shouldn't need to load balance. And your WebEx audio is wrongly set in the audio software setting.

Again stop covering up windows, clean windows, encourage ridership, it's the next best reason to ride a bus. That's my two minutes. I still think you should allow 3 minutes.

*George granted one extra minute*

Thank you very much. Just you cut me off at 2 minutes, and at 2 min 20 sec I was going to thank UTA. The previous commenter asked for more information and UTA has actually been pretty good over the last couple of years since the new system went into effect. You put into effect an easy way to find all the reports, including daily ridership reports. And that's impressive, but you also put in FrontRunner future possibilities and other future plans and I want to congratulate you on that. I still think you should be doing more, you know me, I want more always. I'm very very concerned about lack of ridership increase. You're down 50% still even though traffic on freeways is back to 90% of normal. And that's a warning sing. So right now for the next couple of months, I'm asking you, implement a \$1 fare, publicize it and get more riders back on mass transit. If you don't see the ridership increase in the next few months, I am thinking you will have low ridership for the next 10 years. Those are my comments. Thanks for the extra minute.

---

## Online through OpenUTA, November 11 – December 11, 2020 (21 comments):

*The OpenUTA page has had 99 visitors and 21 complete responses as of 12/11/20.*

1. *Shawn Capenos*: I am new to Utah and have little prior experience reviewing budgets, but what I saw made sense to a novice and seems reasonable. Maybe this isn't the



# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



<p>place, but I'd like to see a little more detail or links of where to find more info about what some of the Capital projects are, namely the (Fronrunner) Ogden Business Depot and double track initiatives. I have personal interest in the Pleasant View station going back into service, hence my general interest in the Fronrunner goings-on. Nonetheless, interesting to see the transparency in the UTA operation and I appreciate the presentation materials, very informative. Thanks!</p>
<p>2. <i>Unknown</i>: Please have front runner run on Sunday so I can see my family</p>
<p>3. <i>Mandy</i>: I rode UTA for years until May when the service levels dropped. The current service takes me 1 hour and 45 minutes each way, preciously it was only 1 hour. For me to ride again, the service would need to improve. I miss the 35 Max, the regular 35 bus is just too slow &amp; the connections have long wait times.</p>
<p>4. <i>Mark Coolidge</i>: Not so much a question about the budget but a question or timeline on when service of TRAX might return to the airport. Thank you! Love using TRAX to the airport!</p>
<p>5. <i>Unknown</i>: I stopped commuting to work in March 2020 and do not plan to use public transportation in the future for regular commuting.</p>
<p>6. <i>William Carlson</i>: there are other projects that you can save some money by be better connector for the busses and the rail system</p>
<p>7. <i>Van Reese</i>: I used to ride almost every day, but with pandemic I have stopped. I was going to try riding again, but then the cases spiked. I would like to go back, and perhaps the new cleaning measures and better community mask wearing will help.</p>
<p>8. <i>Philip Sauvageau</i>: I appreciate the planning and proposed items. I could not find the anticipated long range cost needs for FrontRunner Double Tracking and how much the 2021 allocated would cover. Does the budgeted amount cover needs for long range project schedules? How much flexibility is there to purchase real estate along the FrontRunner corridor that becomes available before needed? Are bus stop signage replacements budgeted and scheduled for Weber, Davis, and Box Elder (I just see Salt Lake County in the summary)?</p>
<p>9. <i>Julie Nester</i>: PLEASE have the drivers "front door" the riders. I am so tired of seeing people take advantage by not paying. Revenue is down because drivers refuse to allow people to pay. I pay when I ride. I buy a pass and I expect others to as well. If drivers and passengers wear a mask and the barrier is in use, there is NO reason not to make people pay. I feel like I am being punished because I am honest</p>
<p>10. <i>Angie Couey</i>: One thing that I have noted as a passenger is that with the COVID-19 Pandemic many of the bus drivers are not collecting fare from passengers while other drivers are collecting fare. Since I use my [FAREPAY] card and can tap on and off from either the back or the front of the bus I have still been charged to ride but those with cash or claiming to have cash frequently are riding for free because the drivers are to paranoid to collect money since it means having passengers less than 6 feet away from them in order to put the money in the collection slot. This means I am contributing to</p>

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



UTA's budget while many other passengers are only sometimes or not never contributing by paying their fare. I am concerned that if either taxes are raised to make up the difference in revenue loss or fares are increased to make up for loss of revenue during the pandemic this would raise my portion of costs for maintaining UTA. As it is because of changes to fares, using my [FAREPAY] card I will need to pay an additional \$1.00 a day ride UTA, as up to now I have avoided using Trax when ever possible to save that extra fifty cents it costs to use Trax, but now I will have to pay the same amount regardless if I take the bus or Trax to a destination.

11. *Karl Quist*: I think the 2021 budget seems reasonable, especially considering the current circumstances and restrictions. Realizing you may not be able to respond, but is there consideration in the future budget for a possible rail project connecting SL County and Tooele County? Thank you for your hard work!

12. *Steven C Blue*: Were would you buy a monthly UTA-Bus Pass ?  
Were would find the schedule for UTA ? Seniors do not have a computer access.  
Were are these tings posted at ? On the walls of the Bus Stop, I work a Graveyard Shift does UTA have a schedule for that, but I do not live in Salt Lake City but on the outside.

13. *Paul O'Brien*: One of the 2021 Agency Goals under the category of "Service" is--- Innovate service with a focus on customer experience. The current customer experience on a bus with the windows covered with advertising is not good. The view out the window is distorted making it difficult to read street addresses and business names. On page 12 of the 2021 Tentative Budget projected advertising revenue is \$1,363,000 and on page 16 of the budget document it is noted that advertising revenue is 0.2% of total operating revenue. A small budget reduction in this projected revenue by removing and prohibiting advertising on bus windows will enhance the customer experience and support the agency goals for 2021. If the current contract with Lamar does not allow this, before granting another extension to the contract or going out for bid again this minor adjustment to the advertising protocols should be implemented. The impact on the budget will be minimal and the positive impact for the bus rider will be significant.

14. *Judy Lord*: I appreciate the enhanced vehicle cleaning plans.  
What is the TIGER program?  
Why is the Administration Budget increasing by 2 million dollars?

15. *Paul Hughes*: If u actually listened to riders u would not have done away with monthly passes from the ticket vending machines but u don't u have ur minds already made up and don't give a damn what the public wants.

16. *Monika Kuba*: The train should go to Logan and pass through pleasant view. There should be more trains on key days so the wait is not an hour. Should be a trax from Ogden station to Weber state (it takes an hour by bus which is ridiculous)

17. *Sarah Cassell*: I think we should invest more money into SLCounty and Salt Lake transit from UTA. We invest a ton into the budget for Ogden, which has a much lower

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



population density than salt lake. We should work to expand transit to more dense parts of salt lake. Along with that, we need to invest more in safety on public transit (aka covid safety) the virus will still be here next year and we need more invested there.

18. *Ben:* I love the Ogden/WSU BRT line. As the Wasatch Front continues to grow rapidly, I am happy to see that our public transportation systems are innovating to make sure inter-county commutes will be easier and faster than ever before.

19. *Braden Armstrong:* We should focus more of our money on places with higher population density (Salt Lake and Utah Valley) and not as much in lower-density areas (Ogden).  
More money should be dedicated to safety; COVID will still be around next year!

20. *Jake Carter:* We need UTA to keep our air clean here! Whatever it takes!

21. *Grant Amann:* I am a professional planner in the UT. We Desperately NEED to increase RIDERSHIP on what we have already built.  
Car ownership rates are not decreasing. Please spend more money on busses and even less on rail to help get people out of their cars. Please spend that money on SALT LAKE / WEST VALLEY and less than the 53 million proposed on less densely populated Ogden. Rail is awesome in NYC, but it makes less sense in Utah. I was disheartened to hear about the FrontRunner double-track news, because although I cannot complain about how cool that would be, I earnestly believe the money is better off spent on buses (until Car Ownership decreases in UT), and I know because I have done extensive research on UT and other similar state's transit networks. We do not need to spend \$53 million on BRT in Ogden, this number could be reduced and better spent in areas with higher population densities. I love BRT but I would love for BRT to work better in SLC / West Valley where more people use transit. Buses should be a priority in Ogden, but not at that price tag. BRT might have some extra costs that would could afford to use by using standard bus transit.  
This current budget is a great step in the right direction, but please do not ignore this plea. We could have an incredible bus network that people loved using, at a fraction of the cost of rail, if we were not as distracted by rail or building expensive new BRT lines in places where everyone already owns a car. PLEASE FOCUS ON INCREASING RIDERSHIP ON WHAT WE HAVE ALREADY DESPITE COVID IN 2021. Have you seen our air quality lately? With population increases (that are happening in West Valley primarily), the air will only get worse.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section will cover some proposed recommendations to address each of the issues mentioned in the former section (which I have listed below, for ease of access). These

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



suggestions include both temporary and long-term solutions, and because sprawl is such an expansive issue, some recommendations might only be on a small, town or city-wide scale, while others will be on a national or global scale. The first three solutions need to happen on a city-wide scale.

## Solution 1: Prioritize Density

City planning commissions and elected officials need to prioritize density at every level of government. There are many techniques that governments can do to prioritize density, and solutions might be different depending on the size and location of a city. However, general solutions such as eliminating parking minimums, having flexible zoning definitions, and encouraging multi/mixed use developments can go a long way. Other solutions include determining city centers and eliminating height restrictions and minimizing street width in those city centers. As mentioned previously, it is advantageous for cities to have multiple city centers.

## Solution 2: Bus innovation

New bus related technology has eliminated some of the huge barriers of inconvenience that have historically existed on buses. One of the largest barriers is that trains are often electric, which is much cheaper than buses. However, electric buses are a reality. Los Angeles' NextGen Bus Study will pioneer electric buses for the United States. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) makes bus riding faster and more convenient. Lots of new policies are considering making buses free.

Other new future improvements of buses include: low to ground entry, separate bus only lanes, bus bulbs (a separate waiting space for people to wait for the bus, often a raised platform in the street), wireless communication with traffic lights to ensure buses get right-of-way, and better safety and security. Another improvement to buses that should not be ignored is physical outside appearance to look more like trains or trolleys so that riding a bus is an experience.

While cars are updated every year to include the latest features, oftentimes buses feel the same as they always have. Many of these features are standardized in Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) systems, with an especially important feature of being able to pay with your smartphone device. Finally, it is important for public transportation systems to be creative in how they generate income. For example, by placing better advertisements in buses, or at stops, or by having special transportation deals. All of these bus innovations can help people get excited about riding public transportation.

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



There is also discussion about making separate buses for people who are willing to spend more money on their ride if it is nicer. These buses would offer cleaner, protected, less dense rides with amenities such as food, WIFI, and sleeping pods. More expensive buses would subsidize cheaper ones. The fact is that planes have first class. Trains have a first class. Buses have lacked a first-class equivalent, but it would be easy enough to create a fleet of buses that are more expensive.

### Solution 3: Congestion Pricing

Raising taxes for car ownership and streamlining that money directly back into public transportation networks is one of the best ways to mitigate negative externalities created by private vehicle transportation. Congestion pricing is a method that considers the times during the day and week that certain streets and freeways are most heavily used, and then charging people to use those roads during peak hours. Congestion pricing has the two-fold benefit of getting people out of their cars and onto public transportation networks and generating revenue for those exact networks.

### Solution 5: Safety and Cleanliness

Safety and cleanliness are often difficult goals for a transportation system to reach if they are not generating money. However, these two goals should be prioritized because the reality is that people will be unlikely to ride buses if they are not clean. Simple things, like providing trash receptacles on the bus, can go a long way. Other solutions include covering frequently touched surfaces with removable plastic and providing dedicated people in each bus or at regular stops who are dedicated to safety and cleaning.

### Solution 6: Culture

Finally, American “car culture” does detract from public transportation usage. Major transportation networks in cities with media creators should consider offering filming opportunities to encourage the usage of public transportation in everything from short online videos to professional films. Cars are sometimes tied to the identity of being “American” with movies about cars, and single-family homes having garages that are bigger than bedrooms, giving more priority to cars than the residents. Car ownership and usage is also subsidized by the government. That means the overall social costs associated with driving are being ignored. The point of this research report is not to discourage rail usage. The point of this research report is to promote the necessity of a cultural shift that needs to happen in the United States. We need to stop subsidizing cars and start promoting public transit.

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



## VII. CONCLUSION

Overall, it is possible for cities to control growth and establish dense, walkable cities. These cities will help diminish negative externalities that come from private vehicle usage. The most effective way for most cities on the American continent to establish transportation networks is by incorporating and focusing primarily on bus transportation. By prioritizing buses over rail and car transportation, in most circumstances, US city governments will be able to focus on building a public transportation network that generates enough revenue to hit a farebox recovery ratio of 1:1. These networks will be safer and better for the environment, and even better for the overall economy of each city, and the country as a whole.

### BUS VS. RAIL REPORT:

One of a city's greatest challenges is moving its population from destination to destination within and outside of the city. Connecting people to their places of work and places of commerce is a difficult task, and because it is so difficult to solve, many cities forego planning effective systems because growth is fast and uncontrolled. Instead of being able to plan effective transportation networks, cities run them at a loss, subsidizing them with taxpayer money. There are few bus and rail networks in the United States which generate more money than they cost to run (Stromberg, 2015).

Not only do current systems of transportation cost cities and individuals a lot of money, but they also generate a lot of negative externalities, such as air pollution and human injuries and deaths, which are extremely costly to society with the burden being shared by society as a whole. However, with accurate planning, established priorities, and the use of modern technology, cities are able to effectively provide equal and equitable transportation access to every individual, while also generating income for the system itself to be improved. Since widespread ownership of private automobiles, American city planners have focused on building cities and towns for people to get around in with their cars. This became the standard and oftentimes other modes of transportation were neglected because of the emphasis on private vehicle ownership. Nowadays, however, the negative externalities that private automobile ownership causes are well documented. Public transportation systems have never been more important but building infrastructure for public transportation is costly and time consuming.

In many circumstances, rail transportation networks are the most cost effective and best options for public transportation in cities around the world. However, there are environments where rail transit has limited effectiveness. Rail transportation is most cost

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



effective over long distances, with a high density of people, and for freight and goods. In places where these circumstances don't exist, rail transportation is ineffective at getting people out of their cars, it is inflexible, can cause sprawl, and is difficult to update. Many low-density cities' rail farebox recovery ratio is extremely low, and rail infrastructure isn't helping decline automobile usage, and the negative externalities that personal automobiles bring. In these circumstances, it seems buses are more flexible, don't cause sprawl, and are easier to update. According to the study, buses are better poised to fix American issues of low public transit ridership and high single occupancy vehicle usage than systems of light rail. Cities of low density, like most non-coastal cities of the American continent and other developing countries, should strongly consider bus transportation for most public transportation needs, and should only implement rail transportation for freight and goods, in population corridors of high density, or over long 100+ mile distances.

## II. Measures of Successful Public Transportation

There are two main measures of effective transportation systems: ridership and revenue generation. It can be argued that either one of these issues is the cause of the other issue. For example, if more people rode public transit, revenue would increase. If revenue generated better amenities, such as technology and security, buses or trains could be constantly improving, which would also increase ridership.

### 1) Revenue Generation

In many cases, transit networks cost cities more money than they generate. This is proven by looking at the farebox recovery ratio. This is often ignored, because the value of moving people to their jobs, jobs which give people money to spend in local economies and on taxes, is not readily quantifiable and is likely worth more than the money lost to supporting a bus or rail system.

#### Farebox Recovery Ratio

One metric used to determine the cost effectiveness of a transportation network is called the "farebox recovery ratio." It is the "fraction of operating expenses which are met by the fares paid by passengers. It is computed by dividing the system's total fare revenue by its total operating expenses" (Rodrigue CITE). Very few global rail transportation networks have a farebox recovery ratio at or above 1:1, as seen in the chart below, and in most cases, the network is costing the government a lot more than it is generating. For most American transit networks, the ratio is shockingly low, and costs a lot more than the system is generating.

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



Continent Country System Ratio Fare System

Asia Japan Osaka Municipal Transportation Bureau 137% Distance Based

Europe UK London Underground 134% Zone Based

Asia Hong Kong MTR Hong Kong 124% Distance Based

Asia Japan Hankyu Railway 123% Distance Based

Asia Japan Tokyo Metro 119% Distance Based

Asia Singapore SMRT Corporation 101% Distance Based

Asia Taiwan Taipei Rapid Transit System 100% Distance Based

Europe Netherlands Rotterdamse Elektrische Tram 99% Distance Based

Source: Jean-Paul Rodrigue, The Geography of Transport Systems

## 2) Ridership

Ridership is the amount of people utilizing public transportation. American ridership and farebox recovery ratios are extremely low compared to international levels. Cars are king in the United States, and when public transportation networks are built, they usually are run at a loss to the city and have to be subsidized because they do not generate enough revenue on their own from ridership to be self-sustaining. Lack of ridership is a very important issue because if rail systems are built, but no one uses them, they will take up space and go unused. Los Angeles is dealing with this issue currently because more and more money is being spent on public transportation, including new rail lines, with ridership decreasing every year (LA Metro, 2019), which may necessitate future removal if ridership rates do not improve.

## III. Environments Where Rail is Most Effective

Rail transit is undeniably more attractive than bus transportation. Rail transit is sexier, sleeker, and something about it is just fun. Movies such as Harry Potter and Some Like It Hot have romanticized the form of transportation, whereas bus transportation is associated with negative experiences, everything from going to grade school to racist acts against Rosa Parks. There are three environments where rail transit is extremely effective in town transportation infrastructure. They are: over long distances, in corridors of mass human population, and when transporting freight and goods.

### 1) Mass Human Population

Initially, rail is difficult and expensive to build due to infrastructure costs (rail infrastructure must have its own dedicated land use, where buses can use the same roads as cars). However, with more and more people, this cost is better offset. Because rail transit can have multiple cars, it can move more people at the same time than buses can. Buses have a typical max capacity of 35 passengers, although double decker and articulated buses can



# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



carry up to 80 passengers (CODOT). However, trains can be twice as long (or even longer) to fit twice as many people and more. Buses simply will not be able to efficiently accommodate population centers that exceed the 60-80 passenger limit on larger buses. Rail transit systems of New York, Tokyo, Singapore, and Hong Kong are incredible in what they accomplish. However, the common thread between these cities is that they are extraordinarily dense. Rail transportation is effective in densely populated areas, but, with the exception of New York City and a few others, cities in the United States (and on most of the American continent) are not densely populated.

## 2) Goods and Freight Transportation

Freight transportation is also cost effective over rail over long distances. Rail transportation can move very heavy objects, or large amounts of people at a low cost over extended distance. This is where rail transit is undeniably advantageous. America's goods and freight transportation rail "is more than 10 times more energy efficient than trucks per mile" (Zipline Logistics).

### IV. Environments Where Bus Infrastructure May be More Effective Than Rail

#### 1) Corridors of Low Human Population

Areas that have low density simply aren't able to fill trains to capacity. Due to rail transportation's ability to carry more passengers than buses, they are literally designed to work in cities of high density. Buses can be smaller depending on the size of demand and can run more frequently if demand increases. In cities with low populations, rail construction will be excessive and unnecessary.

#### 2) Areas that Require More Miles of Infrastructure

In locations that suffer from sprawl, public transportation networks require more lines and more miles of track to be able to reach individual neighborhoods. If two neighborhoods are too far apart from each other, they might both require a separate rail line. Sprawled cities require more miles of infrastructure. When more miles of infrastructure are needed, bus networks are cheaper per mile than rail networks. This is because bus networks can utilize the same infrastructure that automobiles are already using, whereas rail needs completely new development. The head of a transportation center at the University of South Florida claims "you can build up to 10 Bus Rapid Transit lines for the cost of one light rail line" (Dennis Hinebaugh). It should be noted that some improvements to bus networks, such as Bus Rapid Transit are comparable in some cases to construction costs of Light Rail in some cities. Boston, however, claims that 25 miles of BRT infrastructure would be the same cost of less than 4 miles of light rail.

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



### 3) Areas Where Buses Have Already Been Given the Priority

In areas where buses have already been given the priority, it will be difficult for cities to build successful rail transportation networks that integrate well with their bus systems. Usually cities will have one mode of transportation that has the majority share of public transportation infrastructure. If this mode of transportation is bus, then many argue that money spent on new rail infrastructure could go to improving existing bus infrastructure. As a part of this study, I interviewed an organizer of the LA Bus Union named Kikanza Ramsey-Rey. She says that rail is currently receiving more attention than buses in LA, but that LA already has an extensive bus network. Kikanza represents the Bus Union that supports prioritizing bus improvements over light rail improvements in Los Angeles. According to her research, she says “in history, out of all MTA's passengers, 90% use the buses, yet buses only receive 30% of MTA's money, while the other 70% is going to the rail system. The rail system that only 10% of passengers use” (Kikanza Ramsey-Ray, LA Bus Union Organizer). Kikanza represents the vast majority of minority and disadvantaged communities that do not otherwise have a voice in Los Angeles policy making. It is frustrating to her and her union when expensive rail projects do not serve her community and are too slow to be built due to infrastructure barriers. While it is true that rail could serve her and her community, she argues that buses are already serving her community, but that the buses need improvements. These improvements would be feasible if rail projects did not get priority over bus improvements. Because the majority of rail networks aren't connected to every residential location, if a city chooses to invest in rail, then it will have to also continue to spend to improve bus lines.

### 4) Changing Cities

Once built, rail networks rarely change. Old stops stick around, and if any changes occur, they often are adding additional stops further away from city centers. Cities change and job centers can change, but rail networks do not allow for flexibility. In a personal interview with Jody Litvak, who is a director of Community Relations at LA Metro, Jody discussed the flexibility that buses offer public transportation networks. She said, “The bus system is very flexible given the available street network suitable for the operation of transit buses remains extensive, available with only occasional disruptions for maintenance or auto accidents, and funded by other agencies (so no recurring costs to the transit agency). However, the bus network operates in a shared environment, so speed and reliability are reduced compared to rail (but are generally stable).” It is important to note that bus transportation is negatively impacted by utilizing the same transportation network that automobiles use. Rail benefits from being in a separate lane, however, most rail networks in LA are still slowed down by having to stop at stop light intersections. Jody also mentioned the future of the NextGen bus

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



study in Los Angeles and discussed how “bus services can and are changed on a regular basis.” She went on, “In the case of Metro, service changes occur twice per year (June and December) but additional changes can be made at any time when a need arises, with a relatively short time to adjust. Buses even bridge for the rail system at times of disruption and construction.

## 5) Areas Where Public Transportation Ridership is Low

According to a survey by Global Consumer Survey, only 11% of United States citizens use public transportation to get to school or work (GLS, 2020). While it is true that rail can encourage people to ride public transportation, the data shows that rail alone (without cities implementing other methods) does not get people out of their cars. When small cities build rail networks, car ridership and ownership do not decline significantly (William Mallet, 2018). American ridership is low, and rail infrastructure alone is not helping decrease a significant amount of automobile usage. The negative externalities that come from personal automobiles cannot be ignored, and public transit needs to be a priority to reduce negative externalities that cars create.

## V. Profile of American Cities

American cities are characterized by sprawled out locations, suburbs, large distances between economic and residential centers, and small population sizes. This is important because transportation systems need to be adapted to the populations they represent. Because of this, cars have been prioritized in nearly every city in the United States.

### 1) Car Subsidization

Although it is often cheaper for individuals to drive than it is for them to take public transportation, this is often because negative externalities that automobiles create are completely ignored by the government covering them up. The average automobile owner considers her costs of owning a car such as the price of the car, the price of gas and the price of repairs/maintenance. However, the reality is that each person’s automobile is costing the United States money needed to create and maintain roads, resources to address poor air quality, health care costs associated with vehicle collision related deaths and injuries, and money being lost to parking spaces that could have money generating commercial developments on top of them. Considered and Overlooked Costs per Passenger-Mile of Automobiles Source: Todd Litman, 2018

In 2019, Gössling and Choi, researchers from Europe and South Korea, analyzed the cost-benefit ratio of European Union transportation projects. The research showed that projects would fail to include negative externalities of automobiles. Gössling and Choi were

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



interested in factors such as climate change, noise, soil and water quality, land use, travel time, health, safety, and quality of life to reflect a more accurate cost-benefit analysis. Gössling and Choi estimated that “automobility costs the European Union about \$566 billion (€500 billion) per year, while cycling and walking produce respective benefits of \$27 billion (€24 billion) and \$75 billion (€66 billion)” (Gössling, Choi 2019). Externalities are being ignored, and governments are willing to support this trend without realizing the benefits and savings that denser cities can have. Car use causes a decline in the use of public transportation. By subsidizing car ridership, the United States has been encouraging its declining transit ridership. As shown by the graph below, US transit ridership has been declining by about a quarter million every year. Source: American Public Transportation Association

## 2) Sprawl

Sprawl is simply defined as the natural outward growth of physical developments, such as homes and businesses, from city centers. Cities in the United States have experienced sprawl from many planning decisions and technology impacts over time. A key factor of cities with effective rail transportation is high density. The greater density, the higher the ridership. However, in cities with low population density, people rely on cars a lot more. The use of cars further promotes urban sprawl, and other undesirable outputs such as carbon waste, unwalkable towns, and dangerous communities. Sprawl has many negative effects such as “higher water/air pollution, increased traffic fatalities and jams, loss of agricultural capacity, increased car dependency, higher taxes, increased runoff into rivers and lakes, harmful effects on human health, including higher rates of obesity, high blood pressure, hypertension and chronic diseases, increased flooding, decrease in social capital and loss of natural habitats, wildlife and open space” (Everything Connects).

Because there are so many negative externalities of sprawl, the factors that cause sprawl in cities should be examined. In United States cities, rail is often built to sprawl out from city centers, so by nature of common practices of construction, they will cause sprawl. An example of sprawl occurring because of rail transportation can be examined in Chicago. Chicago’s rail networks spread out from the city center like a spiderweb with no connectivity between lines. As the city grew, it was easy to build rail stops further and further out, and it was a simple solution to population growth. Now, years later, the negative externalities of sprawl are known, and although it was simple to build rail networks spreading out from the city center, it was certainly not without negative impacts.

Although rail networks are good and reliable forms of public transportation in areas of high density, it is tempting for cities to allow rail networks to grow outward like vines instead

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



of focusing on dense centers. The idea is simple; that rail networks will connect residential households to economic job centers. However, the reality is that new rail stops will be built further and further out from the city, because of rail's tendency to spread out, instead of circle and loop around densely populated areas.

These new rail stops often are built where there is little development, and soon, because of the new ease of access, the area around the stop will start to develop more. This can be shown in Figure 1 (above), which comes from Newman and Kenworthy's theory of sustainable Urban Growth. Newman and Kenworthy outline several steps that cities can take to overcome automobile dependency. They argue that the automobile allows people to fill in spaces between rail stops, thus no longer relying on rail, but becoming entirely dependent on their automobiles (Newman, Kenworthy, 1999).

When people live farther and farther away from their places of work, they tend to opt for private vehicle use, because it allows them to travel from door to door without taking multiple different lines of transportation. By having more residential locations closer to job centers, people will consider other modes of transportation besides private automobiles.

### 3) Small Populations

While the United States is becoming more and more urbanized, the reality is that city population sizes are still low. As seen in the graph below, the majority of US cities and towns have less than 10,000 people, and only 10 have greater than one million people. These 10 cities, unsurprisingly, are the cities with the highest farebox recovery ratios in the United States. There are roughly 41 cities with rail, and cities such as Little Rock, Arkansas have a light rail system while having less than 250,000 people in the city. Even when cities in the United States have a population above one million people does not indicate high ridership. For example, Dallas, Texas has an annual ridership of only 158,000 on its rail system (Dallas Morning Star, 2018).

Compared to cities with positive farebox recovery ratios, such as Hong Kong which has a population of roughly 7.5 million, most cities in the United States simply are not dense enough to create positive farebox recovery ratios.

Also, it is ridiculous that Ogden BRT should cost over 50,000,000.

---

**Public Hearing Officer Email, November 11 – December 11, 2020:**

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



*Reznick Pharcyde:* I was told years ago when UTA had their last major changes and took away my bus stop for the 603 at 25th and Madison that there would be enclosed seating areas with a heater installed for the winter. The person in charge of these changes specifically told me this on the phone and I have not seen it come to fruition. It would be nice to have something like that as we wait for some buses, especially in the winter time. I also do not like that I have to walk three blocks to catch the 603 because of the removal of the bus stop on Madison ave. I have an elderly mom and we do not use the 603 as much because of the walking ensued.

I also like to see a fare pay card for youth riders. I understand there was a change with the fares recently and saw that youth fares are the same as seniors, but this fare is not available to youth on a fare pay card as it is with seniors. So I'm confused as to how they take advantage of that discount. Any way you can implement these changes would be awesome for me and my family. Thanks.

---

## Customer Service Phone Number, November 11 – December 11, 2020:

*No additional comments received*

---

## Stakeholder Responses, November 4 – December 10, 2020:

Five responses were received from the following stakeholders:

- Davis County
- Emigration Township
- Herriman City
- South Jordan City
- Bountiful



# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report

## Appendix 1 Promotion and Outreach

### Email via GovDelivery

*Sent to Rider Insider subscribers & FAREPAY registered users*

- 15,331 total sent
- 15,072 total delivered
- 2,937 total opened
- 246 clicked to learn more/provide feedback

### Facebook Posts

*Engagements are number of unique people who engaged with post, including liking, sharing, and clicking.*

- 11/09/20 (paid) – 20 likes; 4 shares; 8 comments about fare enforcement, masks, and cleaning; 253 total engagements
  - Total Reach: 8540 (Paid reach: 7,644)
- 11/10/20 (virtual public open house) – 6 likes; 153 total engagements
  - Reach: 620
  - Unique Views: 263
- 11/11/20 – 5 likes; 12 total engagements
  - Reach: 1,010
- 12/01/20 – 7 likes; 1 comment about Tooele and trains; 29 total engagements
  - Reach: 995
- 12/03/20 – 5 likes; 14 total engagements
  - Reach: 1,043
- 12/08/20 – 2 likes; 7 total engagements
  - Reach: 196
- 12/11/20 – 1 reaction, 11 total engagements
  - Reach: 642

### Instagram Posts

- 12/03/20 – 22 likes
- 11/06/20 – 22 likes, 2 comments about mask enforcement

### Twitter Posts

- 11/06/20 – 3 likes, 1 retweet
- 11/09/20 – 7 likes, 3 retweets
- 11/10/20 – 2 likes, 2 retweets
- 11/10/20 – 7 likes, 3 retweets, 2 comments (nothing notable)

# UTA 2021 Tentative Budget Public Comment Report



- 11/11/20 - 3 likes, 2 retweets
- 11/12/20 – 2 likes, 2 retweets
- 12/01/20 – 4 likes, 1 retweet
- 12/03/20 – 2 likes, 1 retweet
- 12/08/20 – 4 likes, 3 retweets

## RideUTA Blog Post

- Link: <https://rideuta.com/news/2020/11/Budget-2021>
- 36 views

## YouTube Channel

- Virtual Public Open House, 11/10: 71 views, 2 likes
- Public Hearing, 11/11: 50 views

## Partners

*The following internal and external partners were asked to share this information with their networks.*

- Planning
- Civil Rights
- Business Development & Fares
- WFRC
- MAG

UNAPPROVED