

**Monitoring Report:
Asset Protection (Policy 2.7)**

Finance Committee Meeting Review Date: Aug 6th, 2024

Board of Directors Meeting Review Date: Aug 15th, 2024

INFORMATION TYPE
Monitoring
RECOMMENDED ACTION(S)
<p>The Finance Committee recommends that the Board review this monitoring report and consider accepting it as:</p> <p>(A) a reasonable interpretation for all policy items and that the evidence demonstrates compliance with the interpretations.</p> <p>(B) a reasonable interpretation for all policy items and that the evidence demonstrates compliance with the interpretations, except for the CEO’s stated non-compliance with item(s) 2.7.2, which the Board acknowledges and accepts the proposed dates for compliance.</p> <p>(C) 1. For policy items x.x.x – there is evidence of compliance with a reasonable interpretation 2. For policy items x.x.x – the interpretation is not reasonable 3. For policy items x.x.x – the interpretation is reasonable, but the evidence does not demonstrate compliance 4. For policy items x.x.x – the Board acknowledges and accepts the CEO’s stated non-compliance and the proposed dates for compliance</p>
PRIOR RELEVANT BOARD ACTIONS & POLICIES
<p>Monitoring Reports are a key Policy Governance tool to assess organizational/CEO performance in achieving Ends (1.0) within Executive Limitations (2.0). A Policy-Governance-consistent Monitoring Process is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CEO sends Monitoring Report to all board members 2. At Board meeting, board accepts Monitoring Report through majority vote (or if not acceptable, determines next steps)
ISSUE SUMMARY
<p>TheRide’s Board of Directors establish policies that define what methods are unacceptable to use to achieve expected results, called Executive Limitations. This monitoring report provides the CEO’s interpretations of those policies, evidence of achievement, and an assertion on compliance with the Board’s written goals. As with other monitoring reports, the Board decides whether the interpretations are reasonable, and the evidence is convincing.</p>

Per Appendix A of the Board Policy Manual, this report was scheduled for monitoring in June and was submitted in August.

I certify that the information is true and complete, and I request that the Board accept this as indicating an acceptable level of compliance.

CEO's Signature
















Date

7/22/2024

ATTACHMENTS


1. Monitoring report for Asset Protection (Policy 2.7)

Table of Contents

POLICY TITLE: ASSET PROTECTION	Page#	Compliance
<p>2.7 The CEO shall not allow corporate assets to be unprotected, inadequately maintained, or unnecessarily risked.</p> <p>Further, without limiting the scope of the scope of the above by the following list, the CEO shall not:</p>	4	
<p>2.7.1. Allow Board members, staff, and the organization itself to be inadequately insured against theft, embezzlement, casualty, and liability losses.</p>	4	
<p>2.7.1.1 Unreasonably expose the organization, its Board or staff to claims of liability.</p>	5	
<p>2.7.2 Receive, process, or disburse the organization’s assets under internal controls insufficient to detect, deter and prevent fraud or insufficient to prevent and detect significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.</p>	6	
<p>2.7.3 Cause or allow buildings and equipment to be subjected to improper wear and tear or insufficient maintenance.</p>	10	
<p>2.7.4 Allow intellectual property, information, and files to be exposed to loss, significant damage or unauthorized access.</p>	12	
<p>2.7.5 Endanger the organization's public image, credibility, or its ability to accomplish Ends.</p>	13	
<p>2.7.5.1 Permit inconsistent, disrespectful or untimely response to stakeholder concerns.</p>	14	
<p>2.7.5.2 Allow third-party advertising that violates stated agency guidelines for community standards.</p>	15	
<p>2.7.5.3 Hire a former Board member as an agency employee or supplier within one year of that member’s departure from the Board.</p>	16	
<p>2.7.5.4 Hire a sitting elected official or former elected official from any jurisdiction that appoints members to the AAATA Board who has not been out of office for at least one year.</p>	16	
<p>2.7.5.5 Proceed with material changes to services, programs or transit facilities that could be foreseen to create significant resistance from the traveling public and external stakeholders because they had not had the opportunity for consultation, or their input had been ignored.</p>	17	
<p>2.7.6. Authorize the use of vehicles and their operators to transport persons detained by law enforcement for participating in public demonstrations.</p>	18	

 Fully Compliant

 Partially Compliant

 Non-Compliant

Preliminary CEO Interpretations and Evidence

POLICY 2.7

The CEO shall not allow corporate assets to be unprotected, inadequately maintained, or unnecessarily risked.

Further, without limiting the scope of the above by the following list, the CEO shall not:

Degree of Compliance: Partially Compliant

Interpretation

I interpret this policy to address non-financial, non-liquid assets and property. This includes all physical equipment and structures as well as intellectual property. Liquid financial assets are covered under policy 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6.

Measures/ Standards of Achievement

Compliance will be demonstrated when compliance for policies 2.7.1 to 2.7.6 are achieved.

Rationale

This policy is fully defined in lower-level policies

Evidence

Lower-level policies are compliant except for policy 2.7.2. Hence this policy is partially compliant. A compliance timeline is provided in the respective policy.

POLICY 2.7.1

Allow Board members, staff, and the organization itself to be inadequately insured against theft, embezzlement, casualty, and liability losses.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

Measure/Standards & Achievement

Compliance with this policy will be demonstrated when

- A. AAATA carries property and liability insurance (private or self-insured) sufficient to replace assets and restore services quickly while remaining affordable for the agency.
- B. For all board members and staff, adequate insurance means that they will be indemnified and free of personal liability for decisions made when pursuing their duties in good faith.
- C. Lower-level policies are compliant

Rationale

- A. Replacement is a reasonable standard and level of achievement because the goal is the restoration of services, not just financial compensation for loss of use. If a natural disaster destroyed the bus garage and a large proportion of the fleet (i.e., fire, tornado, train derailment), insurance that only covered the current value of the assets would likely not be sufficient to rebuild those assets. AAATA’s Risk Management Team meets with the broker annually during the budget preparation period to review claims and the adequacy of coverage.
- B. Indemnifying staff and board members acting in good faith is a standard industry practice because inadvertent harm can occur, lawsuits can be filed for many reasons (regardless of validity), and without indemnification the agency may not be able to attract staff or board members.
- C. Compliance with lower-level policies constitutes compliance with this policy.

Evidence

Source of Data: Insurance records and Budget documents

Date of Data Review: 06/11/24 as verified by DCEO, Finance and Administration

Data:

- A. During the active monitoring period the agency carried sufficient insurance to replace assets as required; available assets were available to maintain service operations as planned, and all costs for insurance were managed within the Board approved budget.
- B. During the active monitoring period the agency carried sufficient insurance to protect staff and Board members from personal liability. There was no incidence leading to the need to indemnify a staff or board member.
- C. Policy 2.7.1.1 is compliant

POLICY 2.7.1.1

Unreasonably expose the organization, its Board or staff to claims of liability.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

In this circumstance (Asset Protection) I interpret liability to mean negligence in maintaining equipment that leads to unsafe conditions.

Standard/Measure

Compliance will be achieved when:

- A. All mechanical safety inspections of the bus fleet are done on time and as specified by the manufacturer and are passed prior to buses being released for use. More specifically, brakes, oil changes, steering columns, fire suppression systems, wheelchair ramps are reviewed for proper functionality.
- B. All buses are inspected at least once a day by a driver to ensure that their bus is in good working condition at the beginning of their shift.
- C. All facility safety inspections are passed.

Rationale

This is reasonable because “liability” implies negligence that leads to harm, and this policy is focused on physical assets. In the context of a transportation agency safety risks from equipment failures can be serious, and are highest on buses and in maintenance workspaces, and to a lesser degree terminals. Although we cannot foresee all equipment failures, maintaining equipment is entirely within the control of the agency.

A is reasonable because it focuses on the vehicle elements most important to public safety, and safety inspections are a mature, documented process developed by the manufacturers who built the vehicles.

B is reasonable because pre-trip inspections are effective at identifying defects that may have emerged since a mechanical inspection and are required by law. These inspections check for the proper functionality of handrails, ramps emergency exits, steering wheels, horns, windshield wiper, fluid and air leaks, lights, suspension systems, mirrors, exhaust systems, driver’s seat/belt and interior conditions (lighting, climate control etc.,) Drivers are also required to notify management about any possible mechanical problem that may emerge after the pre-trip inspection.

C is reasonable because facility inspections are rigorous and well documented.

Evidence

Source of Data: Fleet maintenance records and facility inspection records

Date of Data Review: 7/22/24 as verified by Manager of Facilities, Manager of Operations, and Manager of Fleet

Data:

During the monitoring period,

- A. A review of fleet maintenance records confirms that all fleet safety inspections were done in line with the manufacturer's requirements. These inspections included brakes, oil changes, steering column, wheelchair ramps and fire suppression systems. Inspections were done within acceptable time periods and no bus was put in service until it was inspected.
- B. A review of pre-trip inspection reports found that bus drivers inspected all the buses that were sent out for service at least once a day and sometimes during shift changes. All safety defects reported were addressed prior to the bus being put back in service.
- C. A review of facility safety inspections indicates that all three facilities were assessed for potential hazards and passed all inspections. Additionally, as a safety precaution, all spills that occurred were cleaned as soon as possible to prevent falls.

POLICY 2.7.2

Receive, process, or disburse the organization's assets under internal controls insufficient to detect, deter and prevent fraud or insufficient to prevent and detect significant deficiencies or material weaknesses.

Degree of Compliance: Not Compliant

Interpretation

In the context of the asset protection policy, I interpret this policy to pertain to preventing theft of non-financial assets including physical equipment, electronic records, and intellectual property (i.e., trademarks).

Measure/Standard of Achievement

Compliance will be demonstrated when the agency

1. *Physical assets (non-electronic):*
 - A. Has processes in place that track and account for maintenance parts and fuel, electronic devices and data and intellectual property from procurement to disposal.
 - B. Access to valuable assets is limited to staff with an operational need and without unduly impacting operational efficiency or morale
 - C. Have no incident of recordable theft incidences that were as a result of negligence or the lack of proper controls in place.
2. *Electronic equipment and data*
 - A. All electronic equipment is used in accordance with the Electronic Usage Policy which provides staff with what to do and what not to do when using agency electronic property.
 - B. Access to computer servers, network assets and other electronic equipment is limited to staff with an operational need, for example via passwords and administrative access.
 - C. There are no instances of theft of computer equipment theft or electronic data as a result of lack of proper controls in place.
3. *Cyber/Online Data and Information*
 - A. All electronic data and online activities using agency gadgets are conducted in line with the Electronic Usage Policy.
 - B. The agency uses multi-factor authentication prior to allowing access of online/electronic information.
 - C. Have no incidence of data being stolen by staff or external parties (breach).
4. *Intellectual property*
 - A. The agency's name and logos are trademarked.
 - B. Have no incidence of intellectual assets being stolen

Rationale

This is reasonable because

- A. Liquid financial assets are covered under policy 2.5.3 and 2.5.4.
- B. Tracking of assets ensures a positive account of what the agency has, discourages theft, and identifies and accounts for discrepancies. The agency has limited its interpretation of physical assets to maintenance parts, fuel and electronic assets because tracking other administrative parts e.g., note pads, pens may be time consuming and the impact of their loss negligible.
- C. Limiting staff access to important assets reduces the risk of theft, maintains morale, aids in accountability and supports loss investigations should they need to occur. Access controls can be increased as evolving circumstances warrant.
- D. The only significant piece of intellectual property at the agency is our name and logos. The misuse or theft of these could cause confusion and problems for our passengers or damage our reputation.
- E. Successful theft-prevention processes and controls can be gauged by the number of actual theft cases that happen. A target of 0 is reasonable as this is the highest possible outcome.

Evidence

Source of Data: Operational and Administrative Policies and Processes.

Date of Data Review: 7/1/2024 as verified by Manager of IT, Manager of Public Affairs and Community Engagement, Manager of Fleet

Data:

During the monitoring period, there were

	A. Internal Controls in place?	B. Limited Access?	C. Actual incidences of theft
1.Non electronic physical assets	Yes	Yes	0
2.Electronic assets	Yes	Yes	0
3.Cyber/Online Data & Information	Yes	Yes	0
4.Intellectual Property	Yes	No, Name and logos are not trademarked.	0

The agency was compliant on all four categories except having its name and logo trademarked. Because of this, the CEO reports non-compliance with the policy. The agency is currently working with legal counsel to address this issue. Compliance is anticipated in the next monitoring period.

POLICY 2.7.3

Cause or allow buildings and equipment to be subjected to improper wear and tear or insufficient maintenance.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

I interpret this policy to be focused on avoiding excessive costs or inconvenience to customers due to inadequate maintenance.

Measure/Standards & Achievement

Compliance will be achieved when

- A. **Fleet:** Preventative maintenance of 90% (or more) of fixed route buses is conducted in accordance with the manufacturer's standards.
- B. **Facility:** An architect conducts assessment of each of the three facilities (Ypsilanti Transit Center, Blake Transit Center and Dawn Gabay Operations Center) every three years and finds that they are adequately maintained.
- C. All inspections by the agency, city and state on **major equipment** are passed.
- D. Computer hardware is inventory controlled and maintained in accordance with Equipment Management Procedures

Rationale

This is reasonable because

- A. Aside from public safety (addressed in 2.7.1.1) the chief risks from inadequate maintenance are higher costs and breakdowns that inconvenience passengers. Preventative maintenance of the bus fleet happens every 6,000 miles and addresses various components to include transmission, farebox functionality, air conditioning, electronics system etc. FTA target for such maintenance is 80%. The agency aims to be better custodians of its resources and has its target of 90%.
- B. If preventative maintenance is not done properly and timely, it could result in unnecessary costs or loss of service. Building structures deteriorate slowly and hence they are inspected every three years per FTA requirements. Inspection by an architect provides an independent third-party perspective by a subject matter expert. Given that some of the buildings are older, for example, the DGOC was built in 1984, a target of adequately maintained (3, on a scale of 1 to 5) is reasonable. This facility assessment is scored based on extensive assessment of all rooms and major equipment therein. Older buildings score lower than newer buildings.
- C. Passing inspections indicates that major equipment has been maintained in accordance with agency, city and/or state requirements (Agency standards are only considered where city and state standards are not required). Since the agency has a lot of equipment, assets addressed here are only that which affects safety, accessibility and functionality of fleet and facilities. Such equipment includes boilers, elevators, underground storage tanks, and fire alarm systems.
- D. The Equipment Management Procedures addresses inventory control, loss prevention and disposition. This process ensures that wear and tear is assessed and addressed accordingly, and maintenance is conducted timely.

Evidence

Source of Data: Preventative maintenance and Inspection reports

Date of Data Review: 6/27/24 as verified by Manager of Fleet, Manager of Facilities, and Manager of IT

Data:

- A. 92% of fleet maintenance was conducted on time and in accordance with the manufacturer’s recommendations during the monitoring period.
- B. The agency achieved 100% pull out during the monitoring period
- C. No deficiencies were found during the facility condition assessment which was last conducted in 2022

Below were the scores of the three facilities

	Score (on a scale of a 1-5) 1=Poor, 3=Adequate, 5=Excellent	Target achieved? Y/N
Ypsilanti Transit Center	3	Y
Blake Transit Center	5 (Newer building)	Y
Dawn Gabay Operations Center	3	Y

The following inspections were conducted during the monitoring period.

	Frequency of inspection	Inspection Passed/Failed?
Backflow Systems (plumbing)	Annually	Passed
Boilers Semi-Annual, (Spring-Fall)	Annually	Inspected semi-annually passed, Certified annually
Elevator	Annually	Passed
Fire Alarm System	Annually	Passed
Fire Extinguishers	Annually	Passed
Fire Suppression System	Annually	Passed
Overhead cranes	Annual	OSHA inspection passed
Underground Storage Tanks	Quarterly/Annual	Passed
Storm Water Prevention Plan	Quarterly	Passed

- D. All IT hardware was inventory controlled as stipulated in the Equipment Management Procedures.

POLICY 2.7.4

Allow intellectual property, information and files to be exposed to loss, significant damage or unauthorized access.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

Measure/Standards & Achievement

- Compliance with this policy will be demonstrated when
- A. The agency is able to acquire Cyber insurance, and pass any required Information Technology Controls Audit
 - B. All physical files of employee and client records are stored, collected, and managed based on set standard operating procedures that appropriately secure documents and limit access.

Rationale

- A. The Cyber insurance company conducts a risk assessment of the agency prior to providing insurance. Part of the assessment includes reviewing internal risk controls. This assessment is done annually prior to the renewal of the insurance coverage. It is not possible to acquire Cyber insurance without having proper processes and procedures in place. This includes practices such multi-factor authentication. IT controls audits are conducted by external third parties and includes reviewing regulatory compliance
- B. Internal controls ensure the agency keeps personal information safe from unauthorized access and unreasonable exposure to damage or loss.

Evidence

Source of Data: Insurance documents, Audit reports, and Operational records.
Date of Data Review: 6/11/2024 as verified by DCEO, Finance and Administration, Manager of Mobility Services and Interim Manager of Human Resources

Data:

- A. The agency had cyber insurance throughout the monitoring period and passed the IT control audit.
- B. Employee and Paratransit service customer data is the only information stored in paper form. A review shows that this information was stored and managed within existing standard operating procedures.

POLICY 2.7.5

Endanger the organization's public image, credibility, or its ability to accomplish Ends.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

I interpret this policy as meaning the community trust in the management of the institution.

Measure/Standard

Compliance with this policy will be demonstrated when

- A. Agency ballot measures pass
- B. Agency Survey data (when available) suggests a high degree of confidence in the agency.
- C. A majority (50%+1 or more) of survey respondents in Community surveys (when available) conducted by local municipalities indicate that public transportation is favorable.
- D. On time performance (fixed route) is above 70%
- E. Anecdotal review of local media and social media find no pattern of serious agency criticism.
- F. There are no *legitimate* public accusations suggesting significant mismanagement of the AAATA due to a factor over which the CEO has control and there are no *legitimate* public accusations suggesting the agency has broken a significant promise or failed to deliver on an important commitment.
- G. Compliance with policies 2.7.5.1 - 2.7.5.4 is achieved.

Rationale

These are reasonable because:

- A. Passing a millage indicates a broad degree of trust in agency management.
- B. Use of polling data provides public perception of the agency collected by an independent third party. It can provide direct measures of public perceptions in between ballot measures.
- C. Community surveys collected by local municipalities provide public perception data from residents. A majority of residents finding transit to be favorable may be indicative of a positive public image.
- D. On-time performance measures reliability of service and has an outsized impact on shaping the perception of passengers, who can influence the general public. It can influence public perception as a whole. 70% percent is reasonable because that level is the lowest in recent local history and may shape local perceptions of what is acceptable.
- E. Anecdotal tracking of local media and social media is appropriate as professional tracking is very expensive, less formal tracking can suffice, and it is unclear how much either source can actually shape public opinion about transit.
- F. As a public body, there will always be some criticism of the agency. Limiting AAATA to decisions that contain no risk of raising objections would severely limit our ability to pursue Ends outcomes. The CEO can only be accountable for what they control, not what others may believe. Unfounded allegations of mismanagement can be weaponized in disagreements over decisions made by the agency. The CEO cannot stop someone from blowing a small issue out of proportion. Mismanagement implies a violation of Board policy, widespread concern, and/or negligence rather than an individual complaint or controversial decision. A legitimate case of mismanagement would likely involve decisions that were unlawful, imprudent, or in violation of commonly accepted business practices or professional ethics (policy 2.0).
- G. Lower-level policies details issues of specific concern to the Board.

Evidence
<p>Source of Data: External input by members of the public, Operational records, Date of data review: 07/03/24 as verified by the CEO, DCEO of Operations, and the Manager of Public Affairs and Community Engagement.</p> <p>Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. In 2022, TheRide passed a millage (61%), winning majorities in all three municipalities (Ann Arbor, Ypsi, Ypsi Twp won). B. The telephone survey conducted in December 2021 indicates that 81% of the public had a favorable opinion of the TheRide. C. In 2022, Ann Arbor conducted a community survey and 68% of respondents noted that the public transit was of high quality, 54% noted that public transportation was accessible. No similar surveys were found from other municipalities. D. During the monitoring period, on time performance was at 81% E. A staff review of local newspaper articles and samples of social media posts found nothing that suggested agency actions or decisions led to the agency damaging its own credibility. F. There was no record of legitimate public accusations in the monitoring period. G. Lower-level policies are compliant

<p>POLICY 2.7.5.1</p> <p>Permit inconsistent, disrespectful or untimely response to stakeholder concerns.</p>
<p>Degree of Compliance: Compliant</p>
<p>Interpretation</p>
<p>I interpret this policy to apply to agency responses to concerns/inquiries from outside the AAATA, primarily from other groups, institutions, or officials, but are not passenger concerns. I define inconsistent to mean that the response was treated differently than how most are treated and out of line with existing policies, where applicable. I define disrespectful to mean rude, discourteous, or unprofessional. I define untimely to mean unreasonably late or delayed. All of these factors are dependent on context.</p> <p><u>Measure/Standards & Achievement</u> Compliance with this policy will be demonstrated when the CEO, in their professional judgment, finds no evidence of any <i>legitimate</i> criticism of the agency’s communications from any outside group on grounds other than desiring a different conclusion.</p> <p><u>Rationale</u> This interpretation is reasonable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Customer concerns are addressed under policy 2.1.3.1. 2. It applies to the type of concern, not the individual raising the issue. Owners, customers, and others can all raise “stakeholder concerns” covered by this policy. 3. No instances of unprofessional responses are an appropriate target in line with the policy language

4. Criticisms that amount to wanting a different answer, rather than a criticism of the quality of the response, are common and are not inconsistent, disrespectful, or untimely. Limiting AAATA to only innocuously safe decisions, or choices that were popular with outspoken special interests, would severely limit our ability to pursue Ends outcomes.
5. The agency cannot control how responses are perceived, only the degree of professionalism with which they are crafted. People can feel disrespected even if the agency does nothing disrespectful. Trying to avoid all such criticisms would severely limit pursuit of the Ends.
6. Legitimate criticism is determined by the CEO's professional judgment because there is too much nuance to prescribe rules for all staff communications, and honest misunderstandings are common and often easily resolved.

Evidence

Source of Data: Emails, meeting notes, and legal records.

Date of Data Review: 7/3/2024 as verified by CEO

Data:

During the monitoring period the CEO found no evidence of legitimate criticism of the agency's communications.

POLICY 2.7.5.2

Allow third-party advertising that violates stated agency guidelines for community standards.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

Measure/Standards & Achievement

Compliance with this policy will be demonstrated when the agency consistently operates based on Advertising Policy, 2014 or an updated version. Updates to the policy should include clear expectations on content to safeguard TheRide's image.

Rationale

The current Advertising Policy, 2014 provides for management of expectations and restricts inappropriate third-party advertising in order to protect AAATA's image and reputation. It is also reasonable to allow for policy updates to improve clarity of expectations, comply with new regulations, be in line with industry best practices, address potential loopholes in order to safeguard TheRide's image and reputation.

Evidence

Source of Data: Marketing and Operational records

Date of Data Review: 06/17/24 as verified by Manager of Public Affairs and Community Engagement

Data:

During the monitoring period AAATA operated and enforced the AAATA's Advertising Policy, 2014. There were no violations to the policy.

POLICY 2.7.5.3 Hire a former Board member as an agency employee or supplier within one year of that member’s departure from the Board.

&

POLICY 2.7.5.4 Hire a sitting elected official or former elected official from any jurisdiction that appoints members to the AAATA Board who has not been out of office for at least one year.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

Measure/Standard

Compliance with this policy will be demonstrated when

- A. The agency confirms that during the monitoring period, AAATA did not hire a current or former Board member as an agency employee or supplier within one year of that member’s departure from the Board.
- B. Additionally, AAATA did not hire a sitting elected official or former elected official that has not been out of office for at least one year from any jurisdiction that appoints members of the AAATA Board.
- C. 100% of bid submissions confirm that potential suppliers have no conflict of interest, and that they are specifically not current sitting elected officials or board members, or within one year since departure from such positions.

Rationale

- A.-B. This is reasonable as that is what the policy calls for.
- C. Bids occur prior to contracting and the agency ensures that all potential contractors/suppliers are aware of this expectation.

Evidence

Source of Data: Employment and procurement records

Date of data review: 6/24/24 /as verified by Interim Manager of Human Resources and the Manager of Procurement

Data:

- A. One former board member was hired by the agency during the monitoring period, but they had been off the board for over 18 months. None of the employees hired during the monitoring period were current or previous suppliers.
- B. No sitting elected official or former elected official was hired as an agency employee or supplier during the monitoring period.
- C. A review of bids and supplier contracts confirm that there was no elected official or board member currently serving or within one year of service that was hired as a supplier.

POLICY 2.7.5.5

Proceed with material changes to services, programs or transit facilities that could be foreseen to create significant resistance from the traveling public and external stakeholders because they had not had the opportunity for consultation, or their input had been ignored.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

Measure/Standards & Achievement

The CEO ensure that all final decisions regarding services, programs, or transit facilities (fares are addressed in Policy 2.5.12) provide opportunities for public involvement in line with the AAATA’s Public Input Policy (PIP) for Service and Fare Changes (Board Resolution 5/2012).

Rationale

This is reasonable because the PIP is compliant with federal regulation regarding public involvement and describes levels, types and timing of engagement needed in relation to the degree of change being considered i.e., major, minor, or adjustment. It also emphasizes not only receiving comments but responding to all input and more so, having two-way conversations to better understand comments or suggestions. Hence preventing or reducing chances where a stakeholder(s) may feel ignored.

Evidence

Source of Data: Planning and operational records

Date of Data Review: 06/27/24 as verified by DCEO, Planning

Data:

All service changes were conducted in accordance with the Public Input Policy. There were public input sessions in November 2023 that collected public feedback before the Washtenaw Express was launched in May 2024. There were other minor service changes, and all occurred in line with the PIP.

POLICY 2.7.6

Authorize the use of vehicles and their operators to transport persons detained by law enforcement for participating in public demonstrations.

Degree of Compliance: Compliant

Interpretation

Measure/Standards & Achievement

Compliance with this policy will be demonstrated when no AAATA vehicles (owned or contracted) nor any AAATA staff (directly employed or contracted) are used to transport persons detained by law enforcement for participating in public demonstrations.

Rationale

This is reasonable because the policy is self-evidence in its intent.

Evidence

Source of Data: Operational records

Date of Data Review: 6/27/24 as verified by the CEO

During the monitoring period, the CEO did not authorize the use of vehicles or operators to transport persons detained by law enforcement for participating in public demonstrations. No such requests were made to the agency.

Policy Trendlines

Policy	FY 20	FY 22	FY 23	FY 24
2.7				
2.7.1 (Created FY22)				
2.7.1.1 (Created FY23)				
2.7.2 (Deleted in FY 24)				
2.7.2.1 (Became 2.7.2 in FY 24)				
2.7.3				
2.7.4				
2.7.5				
2.7.5.1				
2.7.5.2				
2.7.5.3				
2.7.5.4				
2.7.5.5				
2.7.6				

LEGEND	
	Policy is not compliant
	Policy is partially compliant
	Policy is compliant
	To be determined

Guidance on Determining “Reasonableness” of CEO Interpretations

Are the interpretations reasonable?

An interpretation is reasonable if the following are provided,

1. a measure or standard,
2. a defensible rationale for the measure or standard,
3. a level of achievement necessary to achieve compliance and
4. a rationale for the level of achievement.

Is evidence verifiable?

Evidence is verifiable if there is

1. actual measurement/data,
2. the source of data and
3. the date when data was collected is provided.

Board’s Conclusion on Monitoring Report

Board’s conclusion after monitoring the report.

Following the Board’s review and discussion with the CEO, the Board finds that the CEO:

- (A) a reasonable interpretation for **all** policy items and that the evidence demonstrates compliance with the interpretations.
- (B) **a reasonable interpretation for all policy items and that the evidence demonstrates compliance with the interpretations, except for the CEO’s stated non-compliance with item(s) 2.7.2 which the Board acknowledges and accepts the proposed dates for compliance.is making reasonable progress towards compliance.**
- (C)
 1. For policy items x.x.x – there is evidence of compliance with a reasonable interpretation
 2. For policy items x.x.x – the interpretation is not reasonable
 3. For policy items x.x.x – the interpretation is reasonable, but the evidence does not demonstrate compliance
 4. For policy items x.x.x – the Board acknowledges and accepts the CEO’s stated non-compliance and the proposed dates for compliance

Board Notes: (If Applicable)

2.7.1.1 was not a sub policy of 2.7.1 in the original Carver policy template. It was its own independent policy. The Board may wish to consider elevating this policy.