

BOARD GOVERNANCE ASSESSMENT

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)



Project Status Report

Ad Hoc Board Enhancement Committee (BEC) Meeting

September 30, 2019

Agenda

Topic	Page
• Status and Accomplished Tasks	2
• Proposed Peer / Benchmark Agencies	3
• National Transit Research	6
• Timeline (Estimated)	10

Status and Accomplished Tasks

Key Work Steps

- Started adherence / compliance testing for governance areas:
 - Conflicts / ethics
 - Meeting quorums
 - Board and Committee attendance
 - Public notice
- Began peer / benchmark agencies research:
 - Board and committee structure
- Held initial conversations with VTA stakeholders

Communications

- Presented to Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) on 09-12-19 and Citizens Advisor Committee (CAC) on 09-11-19.
- New – added meetings with the Cities Association of Santa Clara County, City Managers Association and other individuals
- Developed Board Survey questionnaire. Target release this week.
- Added two more community engagement meetings / webcasts
- Continued development of VTA Governance Assessment website page and hotline for community feedback (date TBD)

Project and Resource Management

- Updated the Master Project Plan
- Developed Issues / Questions / Risks log
- Team worked together off-site
- Held weekly project calls
- Coordinated with VTA Project Manager

Key Dates Upcoming

- Week of 09/30 – Board Survey to be distributed
- Week of 10/07 – first round of VTA Board & management interviews
- 10/10 - BEC Phase I Deliverable meeting
- 10/9 and 10/10 - City Managers and Cities Association meetings
- TBD - Community meetings
- Week of 10/28 - second round of VTA and Agency interviews

Peer / Benchmark Agencies – Selection Criteria

Selection Criteria	Selection Summary
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Varying financial and ridership performance• Multi-modal (but not all modes)• Level of governance complexity / range of responsibility• Geographical distribution• Multi-jurisdictional entities• Varying Board structures• Varying operating size• Varying Board size	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not necessarily peers by operating measures• Mixture of bus, light rail, heavy rail, highways, funding and regional planning• Moderate to high complexity• CA, CO, IL, UT, TX and WA• Up to 87 participating jurisdictions or districts (combined jurisdictions)• Elected officials and appointed members. Full time and part time.• Larger and smaller than VTA.• Range from 3 to 15 members
<p>Note: We reviewed National Transit Database (NTD) performance metrics for over 2,500 national full reporters</p>	<p>Result: Six proposed agencies.</p>

Peer / Benchmark Agencies – Proposed

Transit Agency	Agency Information (From 2017 NTD reports)			Board Structure
	Operating Costs (\$ millions)	Service Area Population (million)	Modes	Member Representation
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro)	\$1,742.0	8.4	Bus, heavy rail, light rail, bikes, planning	14 members: LA County Supervisors (5); LA Mayor and appointees (4), elected officials from the 87 cities in LA County, through a Selection Committee (4), and Caltrans non-voting appointee (1).
Chicago Transit Authority (CTA)	\$1,415.0	3.2	Bus, light rail	7 members: Business, community and labor representatives. Appointed by Chicago Mayor (4) and Illinois Governor (3).
Portland Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District (TriMet)	\$688.5	1.6	Bus, light rail, heavy rail	7 members: Business and community representatives who live in geographical districts they represent. Appointed by Governor.
Denver Regional Transportation District (RTD)	\$534.8	2.9	Bus, light rail, heavy rail	15 members: Representing separate geographical districts. Directly elected.
Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART)	\$503.3	2.4	Bus, light rail, heavy rail, HOV	15 members. Appointed by local governments, proportionate to sales tax revenue received. Dallas (7) and other jurisdictions (8).
Utah Transit Authority (UTA)	\$257.7	1.9	Bus, light rail, heavy rail	3 full-time members (changed from 16 part-time members in 2018). Nominations from county districts; approved by Governor.
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)	\$381.8	1.9	Bus, light rail, bikes, CMA	12 members. Elected Officials.

Peer / Benchmark Agencies – Others Considered

Transit Agency	Agency Information (From 2017 NTD reports)			Board Structure
	Operating Costs (\$ millions)	Service Area Population (million)	Modes	Member Representation
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)	\$1,746.0	3.7	Bus, heavy rail	8 voting members and 8 alternates. Appointed by Fed Govt (2), states (4), DC (2).
San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni)	\$819.7	0.9	Bus, light rail, cable car	7 members. Appointed by EO (Mayor)
San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	\$626.0	0.8	Heavy rail, monorail	9 members. Directly elected.
Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County, TX (Houston Metro)	\$525.7	4.4	Bus, light rail	9 members. Appointed by EOs (Mayors, County)
Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority	\$432.9	2.0	Bus, heavy rail	13 members. Appointed by EOs.
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit)	\$417.0	1.4	Bus	7 members. Directly elected.
Minneapolis Metro Transit	\$376.9	1.8	Bus, light rail, heavy rail	17 members. Appointed by EO (Governor).
Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)	\$272.2	2.9	Bus, vanpool, CMA	18 members. Appointed by EOs.
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS)	\$268.7	2.5	Bus, light rail	15 members. Appointed by EOs.
Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT)	\$149.6	1.0	Bus, light rail	11 members. Appointed by EOs.
San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	\$133.1	0.7	Bus	9 members. Appointed by EOs (6) or other members (3).
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	\$131.6	3.7	Commuter rail	9 members. Appointed by three partner agencies.



National Transit Research

“Public Transit System Boards: Organization and Characteristics”

- There have been limited studies on transit / transportation governance
- “There is no universal formula for what transit Boards should look like or how they should function.”
- There are some common topics.

The following is intended as an example to stimulate thought. These are not conclusions for VTA’s circumstances.

“Public Transit System Boards: Organization and Characteristics”: Transportation Research Board Study

- **Scope:** National survey of Board Chairs and CEOs/GMs. 254 responses.
- **Objectives:** Identify Board powers, role, responsibilities, size, structure, composition, and perceptions of effectiveness
- **Survey Topics:**
 - Board Selection Methods (elected officials, appointed, hybrid)
 - Average Board Size
 - Length of Board Term
 - Board Chair Employment Status (corporate, elected official, retired)

National Transit Research (continued)

“Public Transit System Boards: Organization and Characteristics” (continued)

- **Survey Results (continued):**

- New Member Orientation (workshop, materials, informal orientation)
- Meeting Frequency (monthly or as-needed)
- Committee Structure (Executive, Finance/Budget, Planning, Legislative/Government Relations, Marketing)
- Transit Board Responsibilities (policy setting vs management)
- Board Effectiveness Self Ratings Areas (political support, funding, planning, transit image, governance, ridership)
- Improving Effectiveness (committed members, transit knowledge, committee structure, external agency communication)
- Measures to Assess Board Effectiveness (achieves strategic goals, appearance of equipment, balanced budget, increased ridership, labor relations, employee morale, public opinion, service quality, reputation with media)

These are examples to stimulate thought. We will seek your feedback.

National Transit Research (continued)

“Transforming Public Transportation Institutional and Business Models”

The following is intended as an example to stimulate thought. These are not conclusions for VTA’s circumstances.

“Transforming Public Transportation Institutional and Business Models” :Transportation Research Board Study

- **Objectives:** Describe how transit agencies are making transformative changes, to equip them to for long term efficiency, effectiveness, reliability, safety, and security. Prepare 14 case studies.
- **Drivers of Change:**
 - Funding and finance — funding shortfalls, grant availability
 - New technology – ride sharing, autonomous driving, fare acceptance and ticketing
 - Demographics and society – population shifts, aging and diverse population, housing prices and homelessness
 - Sustainability, energy, and environmental concerns – carbon emissions, electrification
 - Travel, land use, and development patterns – Transit oriented development, millennial driving habits, growth of single-person households, increase in trip “chaining”
 - Infrastructure condition – state of good repair, deferred maintenance

National Transit Research (concluded)

“Transforming Public Transportation Institutional and Business Models” (continued)

- **Themes of Successful Change:**

- Collaboration and partnerships - external partner relationships
- Clear vision – With regional planning organization, the business community, elected officials, community stakeholders
- Stable and supportive leadership – building support, experienced leadership, engaging stakeholders
- Effective governance structure – changes in the composition or role of the Board, and impact on staff
- Sufficient internal and external agency resources - modifications to organizational structure, outside expertise, reallocation of tasks.
- Targeted workforce development – training, key hires.
- Realignment of agency authority with other regional agencies - re: multimodal planning, project delivery, finance match
- Risk of failing to change – motivation supports success.

These are examples to stimulate thought. We will seek your feedback.

Timeline and Key Milestones (estimated)

Overall Status: Green

Tasks	Week Starting																				
	August		Sept					Oct				Nov				Dec				Jan	
	19	26	2	9	16	23	30	7	14	21	28	4	11	18	25	2	9	16	23	30	
BEC Meetings (S = status; D = deliverable)							S	D						S				D			
Community Meetings / Webcasts (to be scheduled)																					
- City Managers & Cities Association meetings																					
Phase I - Project Kickoff; Document Review																					
- Evaluate Governance; Test Adherence																					
Phase II – VTA & Member Agency Interviews																					
- Peer Comparisons; Best Practices																					
Final Reporting and Board Meeting																					

Note: Some tasks may overlap.

RSM US LLP

+1 800 274 3978

rsmus.com

This document contains general information, may be based on authorities that are subject to change, and is not a substitute for professional advice or services. This document does not constitute audit, tax, consulting, business, financial, investment, legal or other professional advice, and you should consult a qualified professional advisor before taking any action based on the information herein. RSM US LLP, its affiliates and related entities are not responsible for any loss resulting from or relating to reliance on this document by any person. Internal Revenue Service rules require us to inform you that this communication may be deemed a solicitation to provide tax services. This communication is being sent to individuals who have subscribed to receive it or who we believe would have an interest in the topics discussed.

RSM US LLP is a limited liability partnership and the U.S. member firm of RSM International, a global network of independent audit, tax and consulting firms. The member firms of RSM International collaborate to provide services to global clients, but are separate and distinct legal entities that cannot obligate each other. Each member firm is responsible only for its own acts and omissions, and not those of any other party. Visit rsmus.com/aboutus for more information regarding RSM US LLP and RSM International.

RSM, the RSM logo and *the power of being understood* are registered trademarks of RSM International Association.

© 2019 RSM US LLP. All Rights Reserved.

