

**ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING AGENDA**

TIME: 8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m., Thursday, April 14, 2016

USUAL LOCATION: *Town Hall, 511 Colorado, Carbondale, CO*

(This Agenda may change before the meeting.)

	Agenda Item	Policy	Purpose	Est. Time
1	Call to Order / Roll Call:		Quorum	8:30 a.m.
2	Executive Session:			
	A. Three Matters: Paul Taddune, General Counsel: Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402 4(e)(I) Determining positions that may be subject to negotiations; developing strategy for negotiations and instruction negotiators; and 24-6-402(4)(a) The purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer, or sale of any real, personal, or other property interests: 1) Glenwood Springs Wye Area; and 2) Cole Subdivision; and, pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-602 (e) and (f): 3) CEO Performance Review		Executive Session	8:31 a.m.
3	Approval of <u>Minutes</u>: RFTA Board Meeting, March 10, 2016, pg. 3		Approve	9:15 a.m.
4	Public Comment: Regarding items not on the Agenda (up to one hour will be allotted if necessary, however, comments will be limited to three minutes per person)		Public Input	9:20 a.m.
5	Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:	4.3.3.C	Comments	9:25 a.m.
6	Consent Agenda:			9:30 a.m.
	A. Approval of <u>Myers</u> Easement Agreement– Paul Taddune, General Counsel, page 11	2.3.7	Approve	
	B. RFTA Emitter <u>Contribution</u> to City of Glenwood Springs Fire Department - Nick Senn, Senior Project Manager, page 12	4.2.5	Approve	
	C. <u>Memorandum</u> of Understanding Regarding Community Based Organization – Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 14	2.8.11	Approve	
	D. <u>Intergovernmental</u> Agreement for Garfield County Senior Programs – Traveler Services 2016 – Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 15	4.2.5	Approve	
	E. Nine-Party Memorandum of <u>Understanding</u> Regarding Garfield County Senior Programs for 2016 – Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 16	4.2.5	Approve	
7	Presentations/Action Items:			
	A. <u>Update</u> Regarding Integrated Transportation System Plan - David Johnson, Director of Planning, page 17	4.1	Discussion/ Direction	9:40 a.m.
	B. <u>Discussion</u> Regarding Potential Maroon Bells Fare Increase- Dan Blankenship, CEO, and Mike Yang, Director of Finance, page 19	4.2.5	Discussion/ Direction	10:15 a.m.
	C. Update Regarding <u>Rio</u> Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan – Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations, and Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 21	1.1	FYI/ Discussion	10:45 a.m.
(Agenda Continued on Next Page)				

	Agenda Item	Policy	Purpose	Est. Time
8	Board Governance Process:			
	A. 2015 RFTA Board of Directors Strategic Retreat Planning – David Johnson, Director of Planning, page 23	4.3.2.A	Agenda Planning	11:00 a.m.
9	Information/Updates:			
	A. CEO Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 24	2.8.6	FYI	11:15 a.m.
10	Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:			
	To Be Determined at April 14, 2016 Meeting	4.3	Meeting Planning	11:20 a.m.
11	Next Meeting: 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., May 12, 2016 at Carbondale Town Hall	4.3	Meeting Planning	11:25 a.m.
12	Adjournment:		Adjourn	11:30 a.m.

Mission/Vision Statement:

“RFTA pursues excellence and innovation in providing preferred transportation choices that connect and support vibrant communities.”

Values Statements:

- ✓ **Safe** – Safety is RFTA’s highest priority.
- ✓ **Accountable** – RFTA will be financially sustainable and accountable to the public, its users, and its employees.
- ✓ **Affordable** – RFTA will offer affordable and competitive transportation options.
- ✓ **Convenient** – RFTA’s programs and services will be convenient and easy to use.
- ✓ **Dependable** – RFTA will meet the public’s expectations for quality and reliability of services and facilities.
- ✓ **Efficient** – RFTA will be agile and efficient in management, operations and use of resources.
- ✓ **Sustainable** – RFTA will be environmentally responsible.

**ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
March 10, 2016**

Board Members Present:

Stacey Patch Bernot, Chair (Town of Carbondale); Jacque Whitsitt (Town of Basalt); Markey Butler (Town of Snowmass Village); Michael Owsley (Pitkin County); Patrick Stuckey (Town of New Castle).

Voting Alternates Present:

Kathryn Trauger (City of Glenwood Springs).

Non-Voting Alternates Present:

George Newman (Pitkin County); John Hoffmann (Town of Carbondale).

Staff Present:

Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer (CEO); Paul Taddune, General Counsel; Edna Adeh, Board Secretary; Mike Hermes, Angela Henderson, Dina Farnell, Brett Meredith, Facilities & Trails Department; David Johnson, Jason White, Planning Department; Mike Yang, Finance Department; John Hocker, Co-Director of Operations; Ed Cortez, President, ATU Local 1774.

Visitors Present:

Collin Szewczyk, Reporter (Aspen Daily News); Scott Condon, Reporter (The Aspen Times); John Kruger, Lynn Rumbaugh, (City of Aspen, Transportation Dept.); Ralph Trapani, and Jen Leifheit, Parsons Transportation Group; Mirte Mallory, WE-cycle; Emzy Veazy, III, Robert Burry, Citizens; Phylis Matice, Pitkin County; Elise Thatcher, Aspen Public Radio.

Agenda

1. Roll Call:

Stacey Bernot, Chair, declared a quorum to be present (6 member jurisdictions present) and the meeting began at 8:32 a.m.

2. Executive Session

Stacey Bernot read the topics and legal justifications of the scheduled Executive Session prior to the motion to adjourn into Executive Session:

A. **Three Matters:** Paul Taddune, General Counsel:

- 1) Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402 4(e)(I) Determining positions that may be subject to negotiations; developing strategy for negotiations and instruction negotiators; and 24-6-402(4)(a) The purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer, or sale of any real, personal, or other property interests: Glenwood Springs Wye Area; and
- 2) Cole Subdivision
- 3) Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-602 (e) and (f) CEO Performance Review

Michael Owsley moved to adjourn into Executive Session and Jacque Whitsitt seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. The Board adjourned into Executive Session at 8:32 a.m.

RFTA staff present at the first two sections of the Executive Session included: Dan Blankenship, Edna Adeh, Paul Taddune, Mike Hermes, Angela Henderson, and Dina Farnell.

Stacey Bernot proposed to postpone item #3 on the Executive Session until the April Board Meeting due to time constraints.

Markey Butler moved to adjourn from Executive Session into the regular Board Meeting and Michael Owsley seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

No action was taken during the Executive Session. The Executive Session adjourned at 9:19 a.m.

3. Approval of Minutes:

Michael Owsley moved to approve the minutes of the February 11, 2016 Board Meeting and Patrick Stuckey seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

4. Public Comment:

Stacey Bernot asked if any member of the public would like to address the Board or make a comment.

Emzy Veazy, III suggested that RFTA install television on its buses with programming and commercials as a way to raise revenue, similar to LA Transit. He reported that the BRT that leaves Aspen at 6:13 am is not synchronized with the Snowmass-bound bus at Brush Creek, and the Snowmass bus does not tend to wait for it. He suggested that RFTA reduce its regional fares, since the buses do not consume as much fuel traveling on the highway as they do operating in the city. People cannot afford bus passes at current pricing.

5. Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:

Stacey Bernot asked if there were any items that needed to be added to the meeting agenda. There were no items added to the meeting agenda.

Stacey Bernot next asked if any Board member had comments or questions regarding issues not on the meeting agenda.

Bernot noted that John Hoffmann, Patrick Stuckey, and Jacque Whitsitt will be running for re-election in their respective towns. New representatives on the Board, if any, will attend in May.

George Newman reported that Pitkin County would like to have a discussion with the RFTA Board to fund the Basalt Avenue crossing. Pitkin County will guarantee some or all of the projected shortfall but, perhaps, RFTA would consider allocating additional funding and reimbursing Pitkin County. Bernot supported adding this discussion to the April agenda. Whitsitt added that crossing Highway 82 after dark is terrifying, and she appreciates the support from the Pitkin County BOCC and Pitkin County Open Space and Trails on this project.

Bernot pointed out that Whitsitt will be leaving the meeting around mid-morning, which will eliminate the quorum. Blankenship suggested advancing the two supplemental budget resolutions and the Grand Avenue Bridge pedestrian shuttle partnership items, since they required a quorum.

6. **Consent Agenda:**

- A. **Resolution 2016-05 Declaring RFTA's Official Intent to Reimburse Itself with the Proceeds of Future Taxable or Tax-exempt Bonds for Certain Capital Expenditures to be Undertaken by RFTA; Identifying Said Capital Expenditures and the Funds to be Used for Such Payment; and Providing Certain Other Matters in Connection Therewith - Dan Blankenship, CEO**

Jacque Whitsitt made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda in its entirety and Kathryn Trauger seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

7. **Presentation/Action Items:**

- C. **Grand Avenue Bridge Pedestrian Shuttle Partnership Recommendation – Dan Blankenship, CEO**

Blankenship reported that he attended a work session with City of Glenwood Springs City Council and Transportation Commission on March 3rd regarding the Grand Avenue Bridge's potential impacts on businesses. There is concern regarding the usability of the temporary pedestrian bridge. The bridge is 5-6 feet wide and crews have stacked plywood sheets along the side to prevent vehicles from splashing pedestrians. It is not an inviting way to get to and from the commercial core. The businesses have asked the City to operate a high frequency shuttle between the north and south side, starting as soon as possible, until the new bridge is completed. Blankenship asked the Board to allow RFTA to offer the shuttle service at a price that is below RFTA's fully allocated cost, or approximately \$107,500, until the end of the year. The reduced cost allocation will extend until March 2017, if approved. Glenwood Springs will experience significant impacts during the bridge project. This is an opportunity to support the community and demonstrate that RFTA values the City as a partner.

Newman asked if the reduced cost would be an additional contribution. Blankenship responded that by not charging the fully allocated cost, we would not be helping to defray fixed costs that have already been budgeted. RFTA also waived the fixed costs for the City in 1993, to help make it affordable for the City get the Glenwood Trolley up and running. The Trolley was the predecessor of the Ride Glenwood service.

Owsley asked if Garfield County and EOTC were approached to increase their contribution. Blankenship responded that RFTA staff will attempt to coordinate meetings with the EOTC and Garfield County. Bernot expressed support for Blankenship's proposal, because the City is a valuable part of RFTA and the project will impact the entire region. Glenwood Springs clearly has an imminent need. She has been attempting to patronize Glenwood Springs' businesses specifically to support them during this difficult time.

Whitsitt commented that funding for RFTA is frequently referred to as a subsidy, while RFTA should be considered essential infrastructure. Butler asked about the extent of Garfield County's participation. Blankenship responded that RFTA has not had a chance to speak to them, but Garfield County is committing \$3 million to the Grand Avenue Bridge project. There are no guarantees of additional contributions from the County. Butler and Trauger offered to participate in a meeting with the County.

Newman suggested making the shuttle fare-free, and making the entire Ride Glenwood service fare-free. Blankenship said that the shuttle would be free, and Trauger said that the City was looking into making Ride Glenwood free during the project.

Butler asked Blankenship to describe the proposed route and where the bus riders will park. Blankenship responded that, potentially, the route could start on 8th Street and loop around the Hotel Colorado, cross the bridge, go to the Hot Springs and/or the Tram, and then come back to 8th street. RFTA will have to work on the route, scheduling, frequency and vehicle types with City staff. In the future, the City may want to use different types of buses possibly with CNG engines. When the bridge closes, RFTA will ramp up the transit services between Glenwood Springs and Parachute, and will increase park and ride availability along the I-70 corridor.

Trauger thanked Blankenship for coming to the table and making the offer. Glenwood Springs is experiencing gridlock already, and businesses are impacted. Transit mitigation is critical to the City and to the region. Blankenship said he received an email at 5:45 am the morning of the Board meeting from Michel Gamba, expressing support for RFTA's proposal to operate the shuttle at a reduced cost.

8. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution 2016-03: RFTA 2015 Supplemental Budget Resolution – Mike Yang, Director of Finance

Yang referred to page 22 of the Board packet and explained that we close the budget on the previous year's capital projects and typically roll forward the unexpended budget items into the new year.

Referring to page 23 in the Board packet, Blankenship commented that staff included \$107,000 in the supplemental budget resolution for the City of Glenwood Springs' pedestrian shuttle service for Year 2016. The City will reimburse RFTA for the expense.

Bernot opened the Public Hearing at 9:57 a.m. and asked if there were any comments from public and Board members. There were none.

Markey Butler moved to approve Resolution 2016-03: RFTA 2015 Supplemental Budget Resolution and Michael Owsley Stuckey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Resolution 2016-04: RFTA 2016 Supplemental Budget Resolution – Mike Yang, Director of Finance

Michael Yang referred the Board to Agenda Item #8.B on page 31 of the Board Agenda packet, highlighting the follow adjustments:

1. Digital Trunk Radio System (DTRS): RFTA has budgeted \$100,000 for its share of an upgrade of Pitkin County's radio system towers. Blankenship commented that this will give us two more transmitting stations and will improve communications ability for the entire RFTA system, especially for Maroon Bells. Total cost for the system upgrade is \$7 million and many entities are contributing.
2. Bus Refurbishments: As we strategize bus replacement options, one idea is to refurbish buses, mainly by replacing engines and transmissions. This will extend the useful life by an estimated five years, maybe more. The refurbishment will also include the installation of new seats equipped with seatbelts. The resolution requests \$140,000 to conduct one test refurbishment of an MCI over-the-road coach.
3. Alternative Fuel Credit: As a result of the Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes (PATH) legislation, RFTA can claim a refund in 2016 for excise taxes on its usage of CNG.

Bernot expressed support for the refurbishment, if it extends the life of buses by five years. Regarding the \$97,000 increase in the new bids for waste management fees, Bernot noted that the consolidation of waste management companies has resulted in price increases. She requested that staff make certain that RFTA's receptacles are being used only by RFTA and look into other solutions to manage costs.

Bernot also inquired about Garfield County's cost allocation methodology for contributions to the Traveler program. Blankenship responded that the cost allocation methodology is based on ridership and appears equitable. Garfield County contributes approximately half of the cost for the program and RFTA covers the costs for Carbondale, Glenwood Springs, and New Castle.
Bernot closed the Public Hearing at 10:09 a.m.

Markey Butler made a motion to approve Resolution 2016-04: RFTA 2016 Supplemental Budget Resolution and Kathryn Trauger seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

7. Presentation/Action Items:

B. WE-cycle Plan for Glenwood Springs' Bike Sharing Program – Mirte Mallory, WE-cycle.

Blankenship stated that the purpose of this Agenda item was to discuss the plan for and RFTA's potential contribution to a WE-cycle bike sharing program in Glenwood Springs. WE-cycle will need decisions to be made quickly in order to launch the program in spring of 2017. RFTA has sponsored one station in Aspen and one in Basalt. Newman suggested that the Board consider funding at least one station in Glenwood Springs, consistent with RFTA's involvement in Aspen and Basalt.

Butler reported that the Town of Snowmass Village considered WE-cycle, but the steep grades precluded the program from being effective. She inquired if Snowmass's sales tax revenues will fund WE-cycle. Blankenship said yes, all sales taxes collected by RFTA are spent throughout the region in a manner that is equitable and beneficial. Snowmass Village's visitors and residents can take advantage of WE-cycle by using it wherever it is available. It is an amenity for the entire transit system. Blankenship also added that the WE-cycle system is designed and incentivized to promote very short trips. It is not meant for long, recreational rides, so it should not compete with businesses that rent bikes.

During Mirte Mallory's presentation to the Board, she said that RFTA leadership has been instrumental to the development and success of the WE-cycle program. RFTA was the first partner of the WE-cycle program in Aspen, helping WE-cycle to become the nation's first rural bike share program. In 2013, WE-cycle provided about 10,000 bike trips. By end of 2015, WE-cycle achieved double that number. Approximately 85% of WE-cycle users are also RFTA users.

Mallory explained the new and innovative CycleFinder App, which integrates WE-cycle and RFTA information. New for this year, anyone purchasing a RFTA zone pass will automatically be enrolled in WE-cycle. WE-cycle will launch a system in Basalt in May, with approximately 23 smaller, scalable stations and 80 bikes. The City of Glenwood Springs' City Council unanimously supported launching the WE-cycle program next spring. The ultimate goal, said Mallory, is to implement a valley-wide system, with RFTA serving as the hub and WE-cycle as the spokes. WE-cycle will provide first-mile and last-mile connections from the BRT stations. She needs to order the equipment by December 2016 in order to implement in Glenwood Springs in April 2017.

Bernot stated that she supports the WE-cycle program and its long-term goals, and would like to determine RFTA's financial commitment for the City of Glenwood Springs' WE-cycle program. Stuckey asked if Mallory could show WE-cycle use per jurisdiction, and where and when the trips are made. Mallory said she could provide that information for the City of Aspen and for other areas once the program is implemented.

Whitsitt said that RFTA needs to come up with an equitable cost-share rationale. RFTA has cost allocation models for transit services, and perhaps the same thing could be developed for the WE-cycle program. Butler asked if Garfield County was providing financial support. Blankenship responded that RFTA could potentially apply for Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District (FMLD) grants.

Bernot stated that she believed there was Board consensus to move forward, but the Board needs to be more specific. Blankenship said that the precedent has been for RFTA to fund one station in each community, so funding one or two for Glenwood Springs might be appropriate. Newman concurred.

Mallory said that \$50,000 would fund one major kiosk, which could be placed at the 27th Street BRT station.

Michael Owsley made a motion for RFTA to move forward supporting WE-cycle station at 27th Street in Glenwood Springs. The motion was seconded by Jacque Whitsitt. Bernot offered an amendment to the motion encouraging the identification of other funding partners to help move the project along. The motion passed unanimously.

Jacque Whitsitt left the Board meeting at 10:48 a.m. The Board lost its quorum with only 5 jurisdiction members present.

The Board took a break from 10:48 to 10:56 a.m.

A. Update Regarding Integrated Transportation System Plan (ITSP) and 2016 RFTA 5-Year Strategic Plan – David Johnson, Director of Planning; Ralph Trapani, Parsons Transportation Group

David Johnson provided a summary of Phase I of the ITSP, which includes 4-stages. Stage 1, is estimated to cost \$260,000, exceeding the initial budget by \$60,000. If the Board approves that increase, staff will come back to the Board with a supplemental budget appropriation in April or May.

Blankenship said that the cost for the entire project will be similar to the BRT scoping study that was conducted in 2007-2008. The Corridor Investment Study (CIS), completed in 2003, was the guiding document for transportation until today. That study cost approximately \$2 million. Similar to the CIS, the ITSP will serve as a guide for how RFTA will grow over the next 20 years. RFTA will be seeking partnerships with other entities to fund and complete the entire study. Phase I should be completed by 2017.

Trauger stated that the connection with Eagle County is critical; in particular, the study should look at the potential for upgrading Cottonwood Pass access, because of the impacts to the region from the recent rock fall that closed I-70. Blankenship responded that Cottonwood Pass is somewhat out of the project scope and would probably need a different funding source. Newman concurred. Trauger said she was not suggesting that the scope be expanded to address Cottonwood Pass, but that we need to consider all these impacts on the transportation system. With Trapani's knowledge of the area, there is no need to re-create existing information.

Newman inquired whether a potential ballot initiative for additional property tax is still a component of the ITSP. Blankenship responded that the ballot initiative is no longer a priority for 2016. The original impetus for the ballot initiative was funding for long-term bus replacements. However, the Board had indicated it wanted to have a better understanding of RFTA's long-term operational and capital needs before pursuing additional funding. To help determine the future direction of RFTA, the ITSP process will seek input from jurisdictions throughout the region to help RFTA determine the transportation vision. One of the goals of the ITSP is to develop a compelling narrative in the event a taxing measure is pursued in 2017 or 2018.

Phase II of the ITSP would shift to detailed planning for and implementation of major projects that emerge from the visioning process, such as I-70 BRT and/or fixed-guideway alternatives in the upper valley.

Bernot commented that she felt very enthusiastic about undertaking this long-term planning process that will help guide the Board's decision-making. Owsley expressed surprise by the estimated \$1 million cost for Phase I. He suggested making an assessment of the study after the first \$200,000 has been expended, and then asking for a supplemental appropriation to continue. Hoffman agreed.

Blankenship responded that staff did not do the best job of communicating the potential cost of the study. The \$200,000 amount budgeted in 2016 served as a placeholder until a consulting team was retained that could develop the work plan and a better estimate. Blankenship said that RFTA will seek other partners and grants to help fund the study and the timeline for completion can be extended in order to lessen the impact on RFTA's budget during any given year. It will be important to guard against scope will creep and possibly establish a prioritized "parking lot" for tasks that might be undertaken if budget is available. Stage 1 (of Phase I) should be complete by the time of the Board retreat in June. The Board can examine the visioning information and decide how to move forward at that time.

Bernot concurred with Owsley, stating that staff needs to clearly define what this study is intended to do and not do, and the Board needs to be comfortable with the deliverables. Bernot said that RFTA staff should be used as much as possible, to conserve consultant time and costs.

Markey Butler said she was not against moving ahead with the study, but agreed that \$1 million is a lot of money. She inquired what the labor costs were. Trapani responded that they ranged from \$50-\$75 per hour up to \$250 per hour. Trapani said that Parsons had to make some assumptions about process and deliverables for the future phases, such as the number of meetings, and the number of alternatives to consider and model. In his experience, RFTA cannot do enough public outreach. Trapani observed that although RFTA is a transit agency, it is more of a regional mobility management organization, and this study will need to address an array of mobility needs.

Stuckey cautioned against underestimating the needs of western Garfield County and limiting the geographic scope to New Castle. Trapani concurred. The Regional Travel Patterns study, completed in 2014, showed that Glenwood Springs is importing 60% of its labor, and most of this labor is coming from Western Garfield County. Meetings have been set up with Parachute, Rifle, Silt, and New Castle.

D. Update Regarding Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan – Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations

Bernot asked Henderson to present this item at the May Board meeting for the first reading. Blankenship stated that an update will be included in the CEO Report of the April Board packet.

9. **Information/Updates:**

A. **CEO Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO**

Blankenship reported that the Property Tax Sunset Extension bill did not pass out of the House Transportation Committee. The vote was aligned strictly along party affiliation. Kelley Collier attended the hearing and testified. She received feedback that a ten-year extension was too long and a shorter extension of 5 years would be more feasible. Representatives Diane Mitsch Bush and Kerry Donovan have indicated a willingness to sponsor the bill again in 2017.

Referring to the ridership statistics on page 43, Butler questioned why regional ridership is 11% lower than the prior year, while it appears that ski visits and traffic congestion have increased. Blankenship responded that RFTA is re-evaluating the ridership numbers for January 2016.

(Patrick Stuckey left the Board meeting at 11:45 a.m.)

John Hocker briefed the Board on the X-Games ridership. The report he provided compared 4 days of system-wide ridership, since X-Games related transportation impacts all routes from Rifle to Aspen. Total ridership over the four days was 143,160 trips. The Saturday ridership is a new single-day record of 50,829; a doubling of ridership compared to Saturday the week before.

Blankenship commended the staff for the wonderful job that they did. Not only did they manage the X-Games transportation, but they did so in the midst of an epic snowstorm, including a multi-vehicle accident that closed SH82 for 45 minutes. Blankenship also noted that RFTA has potentially reached a limit in terms of its ability to manage the “quantum leaps” in ridership generated by X-Games transportation demands. At some point, it will no longer be a quality experience for users.

Bernot expressed gratitude for the staff’s effort and amazement at the ridership numbers. She asked what could be done to show appreciation to RFTA personnel. A few RFTA employees “really take a beating” from riders, Butler commented.

Hocker gave credit to many people in various departments who contributed to making the event go relatively smoothly. Bernot said that RFTA employees should know how appreciative the Board and management team are of their efforts. Hocker said that we are looking into a way to acknowledge the efforts of staff.

10. **Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:** To be determined at March 10, 2016 Meeting.

12. **Next Meeting/Retreat:** 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., April 14, 2016 at Carbondale Town Hall

13. **Adjournment:**

Stacey Bernot adjourned the Board meeting at 11:58 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:
Edna Adeh
Board Secretary

RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“CONSENT AGENDA” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 6. A.

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	Approval of Myers Road Easement Agreement
Policy #:	2.3.7: Financial Condition and Activities
Strategic Goal:	CEO: Closeout the BRT project
Presented By:	Michael Hermes, Director of Property, Trails, and Facilities.
Recommendation:	Staff recommends that the Board authorize the CEO to execute the Myers Road Easement Agreement subject approval as to form by the RFTA General Counsel.
Core Issues:	In order to construct the access driveway that will provide Mr. Myers with vehicular access from his property to Cody Lane, RFTA will need to convey an easement over approximately 300 sq. feet of the property RFTA acquired from Mr. Myers that was used for the construction of the expansion of the Basalt Park and Ride.
Background Info:	<p>In 2012, RFTA acquired a parcel of land as part of the BRT project from Mr. Myers for the construction of the Basalt Park and Ride expansion. This property was acquired through an eminent domain proceeding and, as part of the court ordered settlement, RFTA was required to construct a driveway access for Mr. Myers from his property to Cody Lane. The settlement agreement required Mr. Myers to design the driveway and obtain all the required permits before RFTA was required to construct the driveway. This process has been completed with the exception of the easement agreement between RFTA and Mr. Myers.</p> <p>During the design process it was discovered that the driveway would need to encroach on approximately 300 sq. ft. of RFTA property in order to meet the CDOT design standards.. This discovery triggered the need to grant Mr. Myers the attached easement so that RFTA can fulfill its obligation to construct the driveway.</p>
Policy Implications:	RFTA Board Financial Condition and Activities Policy 2.3.7 states, “The CEO shall not acquire, encumber or dispose of real property.”
Fiscal Implications:	There are no fiscal implications to RFTA for the easement itself. However the driveway will cost approximately \$75,000 and these funds will come from the BRT project budget.
Attachments:	<p>Yes, please see the following documents included in the April 2016 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf, attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Easement for Driveway and Pipeline (02569378-7xB3C52).pdf 2. Meyers Easement Exhibit A CDOT Access Permit.pdf 3. Meyers Easement Exhibit B Easement Discription.pdf.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
 “CONSENT AGENDA” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 6. B.**

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	Emitter Contribution to City of Glenwood Springs Fire Department
Policy #:	4.2.5: Board Job Products
Strategic Goal:	Refine Grand Avenue Bridge Replacement project transit mitigation plan
Presented By:	Nicholas Senn, Senior Project Manager and Dan Blankenship, CEO
Recommendation:	Approve Emitter Donation to Glenwood Springs Fire Department (GSFD)
Core Issues:	To aid in the mitigation of the impacts caused by CDOT’s Grand Avenue Bridge Construction, RFTA could contribute surplus Opticom LED Emitters to GSFD to provide emergency signal prioritization.
Background Info:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2011, during the development of the Automatic Vehicle Location, Computer Aided Dispatch (AVL/CAD) components of the BRT system, an erroneous consultant recommendation was given to the design team pertaining to the type of Opticom Emitter to be installed in the new BRT buses. 2. Emitters notify a traffic signal of an approaching BRT bus and either extend the green time for the bus to pass through the signal or preempt the side street green time to allow for a shortened stop for the BRT bus. Transit Signal Prioritization (TSP) enables the BRT buses to more consistently maintain their schedules and to be more competitive with private automobiles traveling in the corridor. TSP travel time improvements are a key component to the success of the BRT system. 3. As was subsequently discovered, the AVL/CAD vendor mistakenly purchased 19 Emergency Vehicle Preemption emitters (Model 794H) instead of Transit Vehicle Preemption emitters (Model 794T). The incorrect emitters were placed in storage until the delivery of the BRT buses in 2013, and until completion of the Traffic Signal receiver installations as part of the BRT construction contract. 4. Late in 2014, RFTA staff installed the stored emitters on the BRT buses following the installation of the Opticom receivers at the TSP locations on SH 82 and SH 133. After CDOT installed the operating software in the TSP signals and the new BRT buses traveled through the intersections, it was discovered that the emitters preempted these signals just as a fire truck or police car would. With the frequency of BRT buses operating in the Highway 82 corridor, this caused signal problems from Carbondale to Aspen. 5. Working with CDOT Region 3 Traffic, RFTA ordered and replaced the emitters and has had the Emergency Vehicle Preemption emitters in storage ever since their replacement. The cost for this replacement was \$21,740. RFTA staff explored returning the components to the manufacturer, however, they had been used and were past the warranty

	<p>period for the original purchase and could not be returned. Also, because of the secure nature of these devices, they are not excess equipment that could be sold on open markets, like gov.bids, by RFTA either.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. The City of Glenwood Springs currently does not have Opticom emitters on its emergency vehicles and there aren't any receivers on the SH 82 signals on Grand Avenue. These signal improvements typically are a joint effort by the community and CDOT, when it improves traffic signals. 7. A majority of the impacts related to the construction of the Grand Avenue Bridge (GAB) will concentrate traffic demand on the downtown signals. 8. Glenwood Springs and CDOT have been working closely with the Glenwood Springs Fire Department (GSFD) to install Opticom receivers on the affected signals as part of the GAB traffic mitigation plan. The central Fire Station for GSFD is located at 8th and Cooper, only one block away from the most affected intersections for the next two years during the construction. 9. To facilitate this project, staff recommends that RFTA donate 11 (value of \$11,587) of the 19 excess emitters to the Glenwood Springs Fire Department for its vehicles. This will help GSFD navigate the GAB construction impacts more efficiently and provide faster and safer emergency service to the community beyond the GAB project. 10. If other first responders in the region need emitters, RFTA can consider donating to them as well. Staff believes that donating the excess emitters for the benefit of public safety throughout the region is preferable to allowing them to go unused.
Policy Implications:	Board Job Products Policy 4.2.5 states, "The Board will approve RFTA's annual operating budget (subject to its meeting the criteria set forth in the Financial Planning/Budget policy)."
Fiscal Implications:	RFTA has already paid for the emitters and its ability to sell them is limited. The value of the emitters is approximately \$11,587.
Attachments:	None.

RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“CONSENT AGENDA” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 6. C.

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	Memorandum of Understanding Between Rocky Mountain Health Plans and Roaring Fork Transportation Authority
Policy #:	4.2.4 Board Job Products
Strategic Goal:	Traveler: Additional community awareness of/involvement in the Traveler and how to utilize service most efficiently
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, CEO
Recommendation:	Authorize the CEO to execute the MOU.
Core Issues:	The West Mountain Region Health Alliance, which addresses access to affordable care in Eagle, Pitkin, and Garfield Counties, is applying for a 5-year grant opportunity to connect clients using medical services to community based organizations that address housing, food insecurity, transportation, utility needs, and interpersonal violence. The grant opportunity will allow for testing and addressing these social needs through a referral and community navigation program. Community based organization participation is a requirement of the proposal.
Background Info:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RFTA has been identified by the Alliance as a community based organization partner. 2. RFTA will provide paratransit services through a referral program to passengers served by the Traveler in Garfield County and by RFTA in Pitkin County, although most trips are currently booked directly by individual passengers. 3. The potential Accountable Health Communities Model will allow RFTA staff to collaborate with medical providers in an advisory group setting to communicate challenges and opportunities of current systems. 4. RFTA may be asked to track data such as trip purpose and other information on participating clients. 5. If the grant is awarded, the Alliance will undertake planning for 1 year prior to project kick-off, to determine input required from community partners as well as to develop a management process for the 5-year life of the grant project.
Policy Implications:	Board Job Products Policy 4.2.5 states, “The Board may take positions on transportation matters, including local, state, or federal issues that affect the organization’s regional goals and the organization’s ability to achieve its Ends.”
Fiscal Implications:	N/A
Attachments:	Yes, please see

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“CONSENT” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 6. D.**

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	Intergovernmental Agreement for Garfield County Senior Programs Traveler Services - 2016
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer
Policy #:	4.2.5 – Board Job Products
Strategic Goal:	Build Partnerships with Garfield County and Western Garfield County Communities
Staff Recommends:	Please approve the Intergovernmental Agreement for Garfield County Senior Programs Traveler Services – 2016 and authorize the RFTA Chair to execute it.
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2008, RFTA was designated the provider of the Traveler Senior Transportation Program services, which it has provided from 2009 through 2015 pursuant to the Intergovernmental Agreement for Garfield County Senior Programs - Traveler Program. 2. Garfield County has updated the IGA for 2016. 3. Staff is requesting the Board to approve the IGA and authorize the Board Chair to execute it. The Agreement has been reviewed by RFTA’s Counsel.
Background Information:	See Core Issues
Policy Implications:	Board Job Products Policy 4.2.5 states, “The Board will approve RFTA’s annual operating budget (subject to its meeting the criteria set forth in the Financial Planning/Budget policy).”
Fiscal Implications:	The total estimated budget for the Traveler in 2016 is \$709,400. RFTA will be reimbursed by Garfield County for its documented expenses connected with providing the Traveler transportation service in 2016, up to \$513,303. The City of Glenwood Springs will also contribute \$30,000 to RFTA to defray costs related to the ADA Complementary Paratransit Service that it receives from the Traveler. In addition to these amounts, RFTA is contributing \$166,097 towards the Traveler’s expenses in 2016 to defray the prorated cost allocated to its members (Glenwood Springs, Carbondale, and New Castle) by the County’s cost allocation methodology. However, RFTA anticipates receiving a \$40,000 administrative fee payment for providing the service that will reduce its net contribution to the Traveler to approximately \$126,097.
Additional Info:	Yes, see “IGA for Garco Senior Prog.pdf” included in the April 2016 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“CONSENT” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 6. E.**

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	9-Party Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Regarding Garfield County Senior Programs for 2016
POLICY #:	4.2.5: Board Job Products
Strategic Goal	Build Partnerships with Garfield County and Western Garfield County Communities
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer
Recommendation:	Please approve the 9-Party MOU and authorize the RFTA Chair to execute it.
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provision of Garfield County Senior Programs, including congregate meal/nutrition services and Traveler transportation services is a cooperative effort involving 9 governmental entities as follows: Garfield County, City of Rifle, Town of Carbondale, City of Glenwood Springs, Town of New Castle, Town of Silt, Town of Parachute, Colorado Mountain College, and RFTA. 2. The parties set forth the terms and conditions of their cooperative provision, administration, and funding of the Senior Programs for senior citizens in Garfield County pursuant to a 9-Party MOU, which explains who is responsible for various aspects of Senior Programs. RFTA was designated the provider of the Traveler transportation services, which it provides pursuant to a separate IGA with Garfield County (see Agenda Item 6. A., above). 3. Each year, the actual financial contributions of the 9-Party IGA participants, which help to support the Senior Programs, are established by the terms of the 9-Party MOU. The MOU sets forth the level of services to be provided in each community and the methodology for determining the financial contributions of the 9-Party MOU’s participants. 4. Staff recommends that the RFTA Board approve the Garfield County Senior Programs 9-Party MOU and authorize the RFTA Chair to execute it. The 9-Party MOU is included as an attachment in the Intergovernmental Agreement for Garfield County Senior Programs Traveler Services – 2016 (Agenda Item 6. D., above), and has been reviewed by RFTA’s Counsel.
Background Info:	See Core Issues
Policy Implications:	Board Job Products Policy 4.2.5 states, “The Board will approve RFTA’s annual operating budget (subject to its meeting the criteria set forth in the Financial Planning/Budget policy).”
Fiscal Implications:	The total estimated budget for the Traveler in 2016 is \$709,400. RFTA will be reimbursed by Garfield County for its documented expenses connected with providing the Traveler transportation service in 2016, up to \$513,303. The City of Glenwood Springs will also contribute \$30,000 to RFTA to defray costs related to the ADA Complementary Paratransit Service that it receives from the Traveler. In addition to these amounts, RFTA is contributing \$166,097 towards the Traveler’s expenses in 2016 to defray the prorated cost allocated to its members (Glenwood Springs, Carbondale, and New Castle) by the County’s cost allocation methodology. However, RFTA anticipates receiving a \$40,000 administrative fee payment for providing the service that will reduce its net contribution to the Traveler to approximately \$126,097.
Additional Info:	Yes, see “9-Party MOU.pdf” included in the April 2016 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to e-mail transmitting RFTA Board Agenda packet.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
 “PRESENTATION/ACTION” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 7. A.**

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016																						
Agenda Item:	Update Regarding Integrated Transportation System Plan and 2016 RFTA 5-Year Strategic Plan																						
Policy #:	4.1: Governing Style and Values																						
Strategic Goal:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake Phase I of the Regional Integrated Transportation Service Plan (ITSP) Update RFTA 5-Year Strategic Plan 																						
Presented By:	David Johnson, Director of Planning Ralph Trapani, Parsons Transportation Group (PTG)																						
Recommendation:	Provide comments and direction on development of the ITSP and the 2016 5-Year Strategic Plan																						
Core Issues:	<p>ITSP In response to the ITSP purpose and goals established by the RFTA Board and staff, and the proposed scope of work, PTG has created a work plan, schedule, and budget. The Work Plan and budget for Stage 1 of Phase 1 have been developed by PTG and reviewed by the RFTA Board and staff. Components include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assemble Background Information Complete Organizational Capacity and Efficiency Review Conduct workshops interviews and planning sessions Develop Vision Statements <p>The scope of work includes approximately 25-30 meetings with Town and County staff, elected officials, major employers and other stakeholders. By the April Board meeting, the Parsons Team and RFTA staff will have met with the following stakeholders to assemble background information and discuss transportation visions and priorities:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Stakeholder</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Town of Snowmass Village</td> <td>April 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town of Basalt</td> <td>April 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pitkin County</td> <td>April 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>City of Aspen</td> <td>April 5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town of Parachute</td> <td>April 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aspen Ski Company</td> <td>April 8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town of Carbondale</td> <td>April 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>City of Glenwood Springs</td> <td>April 11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town of New Castle</td> <td>April 12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Garfield County</td> <td>April 13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Parsons recommended that meetings with elected officials be scheduled after the municipal elections so that input newly elected representatives can be included in the ITSP process. One significant take-away from meetings with jurisdictions so far came from the Town of Parachute. Community Development staffer Derek Wingfield, who expressed great enthusiasm for the temporary transit service extension to Parachute, noting that many resident hitch-hike regularly to Rifle and destinations to the east for work.</p>	Stakeholder	Date	Town of Snowmass Village	April 4	Town of Basalt	April 4	Pitkin County	April 5	City of Aspen	April 5	Town of Parachute	April 6	Aspen Ski Company	April 8	Town of Carbondale	April 11	City of Glenwood Springs	April 11	Town of New Castle	April 12	Garfield County	April 13
Stakeholder	Date																						
Town of Snowmass Village	April 4																						
Town of Basalt	April 4																						
Pitkin County	April 5																						
City of Aspen	April 5																						
Town of Parachute	April 6																						
Aspen Ski Company	April 8																						
Town of Carbondale	April 11																						
City of Glenwood Springs	April 11																						
Town of New Castle	April 12																						
Garfield County	April 13																						

	<p>The Parsons Group team also met with met RFTA staff for two days this month to assemble the information needed for the efficiency review.</p> <p>Staff will provide the Board with a brief presentation regarding feedback and input obtained from regional staff, so far.</p> <p>At the March meeting, staff was asked to create a brief overview of the ITSP to assist RFTA Board members in explaining the plan's objectives to their Board's and Council's, as well as constituents. An ITSP overview has been included in the April 2016 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf, attached to the e-mail transmitting the Board Agenda packet.</p>
Background Info:	The ITSP is intended to establish a long-term vision and an integrated plan for transportation in RFTA's region. The ITSP will also identify gaps, needs, and opportunities in RFTA structure and services, now and in the future.
Policy Implications:	Board Governing Style and Values Policy 4.1 states, "The Board will govern lawfully and in accordance with the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority Intergovernmental Agreement, observing the principles of "Policy Governance," with an emphasis on (a) outward vision rather than internal preoccupation, (b) encouragement of diversity in viewpoints, (c) strategic leadership rather than administrative detail, (d) clear distinction of Board and chief executive roles, (e) collective rather than individual decisions, (f) future rather than past or present, and (g) proactivity rather than reactivity."
Fiscal Implications:	Stage I of the ITSP is estimated to cost \$260,000.
Attachments:	Yes, please see "RFTA ITSP Overview_v2 3-29-2016.pdf," included in the April 2016 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf, attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
 “DISCUSSION/ACTION” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 7. B.**

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	Discussion Regarding Potential Maroon Bells Fare Increase
POLICY #:	4.2.5: Board Job Products
Strategic Goal:	Update RFTA’s 15-Year Financial Sustainability Plan
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer Mike Yang, Director of Finance
Recommendation:	Discuss potential fare increase and if one is desired, schedule a Public Hearing for May 12 th , prior to approval.
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Currently, the fare for the Maroon Bells Bus tour is \$6 for adults and \$4 for children and Senior Citizens. RFTA shares \$0.50 of the fare on every ticket sold with the Forest Service, which uses the proceeds to defray expenses related to the Maroon Bells. 2. It has been approximately 8 years since the last fare increase. 3. RFTA has increased service levels for the Maroon Bells service and, as a result, fully-allocated costs have risen significantly. However ridership has also increased significantly so, in 2015, the level of public investment for the service was lower than the previous year, when operating costs were actually lower than they were in 2015 (see line 13, on chart on next page). 4. This year there will be a new \$5 fee for parking at Highlands for the Maroon Bells Bus Tour. 5. When considering a potential fare increase, the additional cost for parking should also be taken into consideration which, due to fare elasticity, could reduce ridership and fare revenue as well. 6. For 2016, the RFTA budget assumes that the service will incur an operating loss of \$116,800 (see line 17, on chart on next page). 7. The scenarios reflected below reflect the estimated impact that fare increases of varying amounts, combined with a \$5 parking fee, would have on the budgeted operating loss (see line 19, on chart on next page). A negative number indicates that the proposed fare increase and parking fee would increase the operating loss compared to the 2016 budget. A positive number means that the proposed fare increase would reduce the operating loss compared to the 2016 budget. 8. The fare increase scenarios/assumptions below include a \$0.25 increase in the Forest Service share on every ticket sold. 9. Staff believes that either the fare should be increased by \$3-\$4 per ticket or not at all. 10. A presentation of the proposed fare increase will be made at the Board meeting.

Background Info:	See Core Issues
Policy Implications:	Board Job Products Policy 4.2.5 states, “The Board will approve RFTA’s annual operating budget (subject to its meeting the criteria set forth in the Financial Planning/Budget policy).”
Fiscal Implications:	Based on the RFTA’s fare elasticity model, which assumes that for every 10% increase in fare, ridership declines by 4%, a \$5 cost for parking, and a \$0.25 increase per ticket in the Forest Service share (i.e. an increase from \$0.50 and \$0.75), staff believes that a \$3 or \$4 fare increase would reduce the 2016 budgeted operating loss of \$116,800 by \$18,453 and \$26,540 respectively, and these two scenarios are the best in that respect. Higher fare increases would increase the budgeted operating loss unless corresponding service reductions were implemented.
Additional Info:	Yes, see Maroon Bells Bus Tour fare estimation chart below.

Maroon Bells Bus Tour				Revised 3-22-16 Status Quo									
	Audited	Unaudited	Budget	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	Scenario 6	Scenario 7	Scenario 8	Scenario 9	Scenario 10
	2014	2015	2016	\$1 increase	\$2 increase	\$3 increase	\$4 increase	\$5 increase	\$6 increase	\$7 increase	\$8 increase	\$9 increase	\$10 increase
Description	2014	2015	2016	2016	2016	2016	2016	2016	2016	2016	2016	2016	2016
1 Adult	36,400	64,003	64,000	52,625	48,358	44,091	39,824	35,557	31,290	27,023	22,757	18,490	14,223
2 Youth/Senior	11,300	16,839	16,800	13,845	12,723	11,600	10,478	9,355	8,232	7,110	5,987	4,865	3,742
3 Package	5,500	9,552	9,550	9,552	9,552	9,552	9,552	9,552	9,552	9,552	9,552	9,552	9,552
4 Wednesday Special	5,800	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 Total Pass Sales	59,000	90,394	90,350	76,022	70,633	65,243	59,854	54,464	49,074	43,685	38,296	32,907	27,517
6 Passengers	123,128	174,202	174,000	152,044	141,266	130,486	119,708	108,928	98,148	87,370	76,592	65,814	55,034
7 Miles	46,687	66,253	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296	65,296
8 Hours	3,917	5,432	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371	5,371
9 Total Marginal Cost	\$197,788	\$286,120	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941	\$292,941
10 Total Fixed Cost	\$140,826	\$195,284	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297	\$220,297
11 Subtotal Operating Cost	\$338,614	\$481,404	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238	\$513,238
12 Allocated Training & Other Costs	\$23,068	\$34,424	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020	\$31,020
13 Total Operating Cost	\$361,682	\$515,828	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258	\$544,258
14 Fare Revenue	\$285,670	\$454,319	\$454,000	\$ 423,950	\$ 453,593	\$ 472,453	\$ 480,540	\$ 477,840	\$ 464,361	\$ 440,111	\$ 405,086	\$ 359,281	\$ 302,684
15 Net Operating Cost	\$76,012	\$61,509	\$90,258	\$120,308	\$90,665	\$71,805	\$63,718	\$66,418	\$79,897	\$104,147	\$139,172	\$184,977	\$241,574
16 Allocated Capital Cost	\$19,804	\$26,695	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542	\$26,542
17 Total Net Operating & Capital Cost	\$95,816	\$88,204	\$116,800	\$146,850	\$117,207	\$98,347	\$90,260	\$92,960	\$106,439	\$130,689	\$165,714	\$211,519	\$268,116
18 Fare Recovery Ratio	79%	88%	83%	78%	83%	87%	88%	88%	85%	81%	74%	66%	56%
19 Potential RFTA Savings				(\$30,050)	(\$407)	\$18,453	\$26,540	\$23,840	\$10,361	(\$13,889)	(\$48,914)	(\$94,719)	(\$151,316)

RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“PRESENTATION/ACTION” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 7. C.

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	Update Regarding Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan (ACP)
Policy #:	1.1: The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized
Strategic Goal:	Complete Corridor Access Control Plan
Presented By:	Angela Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management and Facilities Operations Dan Blankenship, CEO
Recommendation:	FYI – Update in preparation for first reading May 12, 2015
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the March 10th meeting, the RFTA Board agreed with staff’s request to delay the first reading of the ACP until the May 12, 2016 RFTA Board of Directors meeting. 2. Given that the RFTA Board Retreat is scheduled for June, the second reading and final adoption of the ACP is tentatively scheduled for July 2016. This will provide approximately 60 days for further public review prior to final adoption. 3. Staff is finalizing its responses to comments on the last draft of the ACP submitted by Glenwood Springs, Carbondale, and Garfield County. It is anticipated that the staff responses to the comments should be forward to the jurisdictions during the week April 11th. 4. In response to the comments, staff is proposing some additional revisions to the ACP, which it plans to review with the Staff ACP Work Group. 5. One of the most significant remaining concerns of commenters has to do with the permanence of crossing agreements. Given the costs that might be incurred by local governments to construct public crossing projects that conform to RFTA’s guidelines, the commenters believe that RFTA should convey easements for their crossings. Also, commenters fear that they might not be able to obtain state, federal, or local grants for their projects if they cannot demonstrate they will have continuing control over the assets. 6. Instead of easements, there may be other ways to assure grantors that their investments will not be removed before they have been fully depreciated. Staff is proposing that the following additional language be included in Section 17.0 of the ACP to address this concern: <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Until freight or commuter rail is imminent or active in the corridor, RFTA will generally approve new public and private at-grade crossings that meet its Design Guidelines, insofar as such crossings would not preclude or impair RFTA’s ability to reactivate freight rail service. For a public crossing that is being proposed, in addition to the requirements listed above for a private crossing, the applicant shall also obtain any permits required by CDOT, and to the extent the CPUC has jurisdiction over railbanked property, require approval and an allocation of costs by the CPUC. If a public crossing is</p>

	<p>constructed in conformance with RFTA’s DG, RFTA may be willing to enter into a long-term agreement with the project sponsor, subject to the unanimous approval of the RFTA Board of Directors. An approved agreement of this type can only be revoked with a unanimous vote of the RFTA Board of Directors, unless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RFTA agrees to relocate, reconstruct, or upgrade the crossing at its own expense; or 2. The crossing sponsor fails to adequately maintain the crossing and fails to cure safety-related deficiencies following reasonable written notice provided by RFTA. <p style="text-align: center;">Other specific terms and conditions of the license, lease, or contract, will be negotiated at the time of issuance.</p> <p>7. Staff would appreciate Board feedback regarding the acceptability of the above proposed revision of the ACP before it meets with the ACP Staff Work Group. Although there may be alternative, mutually agreeable approaches that could address the concerns of commenters, staff believes that all public crossing agreements, as well as agreements for major private crossing should require RFTA Board approval.</p> <p>8. The above provision would only apply to at-grade crossing which, if constructed in conformance to RFTA’s Design Guidelines, should not jeopardize the corridor’s railbanked status or impair RFTA’s ability to reactivate freight rail service. Although some crossings might potentially need to be grade-separated in the event of a commuter rail system using the corridor, staff believes that costs associated with grade-separated crossings would likely need to be paid for by the rail project, which will require a public vote prior to approval in any event.</p> <p>9. Following the meeting with the ACP Staff Work Group, the proposed draft of the ACP will be finalized and presented to the RFTA Board for the first reading at the May 12th Board meeting.</p>
Policy Implications:	Board End Statement 1.1 says, “The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized.
Fiscal Implications:	RFTA’s team of legal and railroad engineering consultants is under contract and has been working on the ACP and an overall update to the Comprehensive Plan. Approximately \$150,000 was budgeted in 2016 for the Comprehensive Plan Update and other corridor management-related tasks. The need to resolve Federal Land Grant issues involving adjacent property owners, and other corridor-related efforts, may require some additional funding for legal, engineering, and other consulting services, than currently budgeted. Staff will keep the Board apprised of budgetary issues as the year progresses.
Attachments:	No.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“GOVERNANCE PROCESS” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 8. A.**

Meeting Date:	April 14, 2016
Agenda Item:	RFTA Board Strategic Planning Retreat
Policy #:	4.3.2.A: Agenda Planning
Strategic Goal:	Update RFTA 5-Year Strategic Plan
Presented By:	David Johnson, Director of Planning
Recommendation:	<p>Please provide direction regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential Agenda topics • Retreat Agenda Board Subcommittee members • Input on facilitator selection and other issues and preferences
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. According to the Board’s Agenda Planning Policy 4.3.1, “The Board’s annual planning cycle concludes on the last day of July, so that administrative planning and budgeting can be based on accomplishing a one year segment of long-term Ends,” however, the Board has generally opted to conduct its retreat earlier. 2. Policy 4.3.2.A. states, “The annual (planning) cycle will start with the Board’s development of its agenda plan for the next year. The Board will identify its priorities for Ends and other issues to be resolved in the coming year, and will identify information gathering necessary to fulfill its role. This may include methods of gaining ownership input, governance education, and other education related to Ends issues, (e.g. presentations by futurists, advocacy groups, demographers, other providers, staff, etc.). 3. Each year, the RFTA Board typically conducts a 7-hour Strategic Planning Retreat in lieu of the regularly scheduled June Board meeting. The conference room at the Carbondale Library has been reserved for this year’s Board Retreat. 4. Staff is seeking RFTA Board members to serve on the Board Retreat Subcommittee. Subcommittee members will work with the Board Chair to establish the topics and the agenda. Board input on the Retreat can be provided either at the April and May Board meetings or through the Board Subcommittee. Potential topics for the retreat agenda include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ITSP Review: Current status and deliverables; scope and budget for future phases • Long-term workforce recruitment and retention • Long Term Capital and Fleet Replacement and Expansion • 2017 5-year Strategic Plan with connection to financial forecasts and capital plans • Summary of progress on 2016 goals • Other short and long-term strategic projects/priorities of the Board 5. Staff also seeks input on selection of a facilitator.
Background Info:	See Core Issues.
Policy Implications:	See Core Issues.
Fiscal Implications:	Budget for facilitation is approximately \$3,000
Attachments:	No.

**“INFORMATION/UPDATES” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 9. A.
CEO REPORT**

TO: RFTA Board of Directors
FROM: Dan Blankenship, CEO
DATE: April 14, 2016

Department of Local Affairs’ and CDOT Grants: DOLA recently awarded RFTA \$1.005 million Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance Program grant to defray the incremental cost of CNG engine technology for six over-the-road coaches RFTA plans to acquire this year. CDOT will be awarding RFTA \$1.45 million in grants for buses as well.

Grand Avenue Bridge North-South Connector: RFTA staff is continuing to work with City of Glenwood Springs’ staff to finalize details of the planned pedestrian shuttle, which currently has a start date of May 16th.

February 2016 Year-to-Date Ridership Report

Roaring Fork Transportation Authority System-Wide Ridership Comparison Report				
Service	Feb-15 YTD	Feb-16 YTD	# Variance	% Variance
City of Aspen	263,564	341,770	78,206	29.67%
RF Valley Commuter	542,632	535,475	(7,157)	-1.32%
Grand Hogback	14,774	16,583	1,809	12.24%
Aspen Skiing Company	272,338	300,183	27,845	10.22%
Ride Glenwood Springs	31,777	32,221	444	1.40%
X-games/Charter	23,165	28,978	5,813	25.09%
Senior Van	681	659	(22)	-3.23%
MAA Burlingame			-	
Maroon Bells			-	
Total	1,148,931	1,255,869	106,938	9.31%
Subset of Roaring Fork Valley Commuter Service with BRT in 2016				
Service	YTD Feb. 2015	YTD Feb. 2016	Dif +/-	% Dif +/-
Highway 82 Corridor Local/Express	158,203	141,697	(16,506)	-10%
BRT	172,418	175,033	2,615	2%
Total	330,621	316,730	(13,891)	-4%

Finance Department Update – Mike Yang, Director of Finance

2016 Budget Year				
General Fund				
	February YTD			
	Actual	Budget	% Var.	Adopted Budget
Revenues				
Sales tax (1)	\$ 25,063	\$ 26,545	-5.6%	\$ 20,678,000
Grants (2)	\$ 25,536	\$ 25,536	0.0%	\$ 2,073,550
Fares (3)	\$ 717,087	\$ 626,716	14.4%	\$ 4,594,000
Other govt contributions	\$ 709,167	\$ 709,167	0.0%	\$ 1,364,158
Other income	\$ 113,339	\$ 111,509	1.6%	\$ 449,140
Total Revenues	\$ 1,590,192	\$ 1,499,473	6.1%	\$ 29,158,848
Expenditures				
Fuel	\$ 454,959	\$ 577,332	-21.2%	\$ 1,698,415
Transit	\$ 4,352,314	\$ 4,505,752	-3.4%	\$ 19,715,589
Trails & Corridor Mgmt	\$ 22,339	\$ 22,534	-0.9%	\$ 437,460
Capital	\$ 359,295	\$ 315,690	13.8%	\$ 7,050,000
Debt service	\$ 200,446	\$ 200,446	0.0%	\$ 2,318,980
Total Expenditures	\$ 5,389,353	\$ 5,621,753	-4.1%	\$ 31,220,444
Other Financing Sources/Uses				
Other financing sources	\$ -	\$ -	#DIV/0!	\$ 5,172,000
Other financing uses	\$ (379,189)	\$ (379,189)	0.0%	\$ (3,215,177)
Total Other Financing Sources/Uses	\$ (379,189)	\$ (379,189)	0.0%	\$ 1,956,823
Change in Fund Balance (4)	\$ (4,178,351)	\$ (4,501,470)	7.2%	\$ (104,773)

- (1) Timing issue as January and February sales tax revenue will be deposited in March and April.
- (2) Grant revenues will be recorded when available for reimbursement.
- (3) Through February, fare revenue is up approx. 11% over the prior year. This increase is primarily attributable to the timing of bulk pass orders by outlets and businesses. The chart below provides a February 2015/2016 comparison of actual fare revenues and ridership on RFTA fare services:

Fare Revenue:	Feb-15	Feb-16	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Regional Fares	\$ 642,861	\$ 715,287	\$ 72,426	11%
Advertising	\$ 8,552	\$ 1,800	\$ (6,752)	-79%
Total Fare Revenue	\$ 651,413	\$ 717,087	\$ 65,674	10%
Ridership on RFTA Fare Services:	Feb-15	Feb-16	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Highway 82 (Local & Express)	173,656	141,697	(31,959)	-18%
BRT	172,418	175,033	2,615	2%
SM-DV	24,779	26,354	1,575	6%
Grand Hogback	14,774	16,583	1,809	12%
Total Ridership on RFTA Fare Services	385,627	359,667	(25,960)	-7%
Avg. Fare/Ride	\$ 1.67	\$ 1.99	\$ 0.32	19%

- (4) Over the course of the year, there are times when RFTA operates in a deficit; however, we are projecting that we will end the year within budget.

RFTA System-Wide Transit Service Mileage and Hours Report								
Transit Service	Mileage February 2016 YTD				Hours February 2016 YTD			
	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.
RF Valley Commuter	767,987	779,587	(11,600)	-1.5%	36,708	34,981	1,727	4.9%
City of Aspen	107,598	105,271	2,327	2.2%	11,830	11,730	100	0.9%
Aspen Skiing Company	121,487	125,154	(3,667)	-2.9%	7,341	8,400	(1,059)	-12.6%
Ride Glenwood Springs	19,940	20,279	(339)	-1.7%	1,604	1,603	1	0.1%
Grand Hogback	36,736	39,577	(2,841)	-7.2%	1,468	1,434	34	2.4%
X-games/Charter	4,147	3,745	402	10.7%	423	546	(123)	-22.5%
Senior Van	2,846	2,966	(120)	-4.0%	316	279	37	13.3%
Total	1,060,741	1,076,579	(15,838)	-1.5%	59,690	58,973	717	1.2%

2015 Financial Statement Audit – Schedule

2015 Financial Statement Audit Schedule		
Date	Activity	Status
5/2/2016 – 5/6/2016	Start of Audit – auditors conducting onsite fieldwork	<i>On schedule</i>
6/20/2016 - 6/30/2016	During this period, staff anticipates that the Audit Report will be reviewed by the RFTA Board Audit Subcommittee . A meeting will be held at a RFTA office in Carbondale between the Audit Subcommittee, the auditor and staff to discuss the audit in detail.	<i>Email will be sent to Audit Subcommittee to establish date & location of meeting.</i>
7/8/2016	Final Audit Report to be distributed to RFTA Board with July Board Packet	<i>On schedule</i>
7/14/2016	Presentation of Final Audit Report at RFTA Board Meeting by Auditor	<i>On schedule</i>

Current Audit Subcommittee Members:

1. **Steve Skadron**, RFTA board member and Mayor of the City of Aspen,
2. **Markey Butler**, RFTA board member and Mayor of the Town of Snowmass Village,
3. **John Lewis**, independent financial expert and Eagle County Director of Finance, and
4. **John Redmond**, independent financial expert and Pitkin County Director of Finance

Other anticipated meeting participants include:

1. **Paul Backes**, CPA and Partner at McMahan & Associates, LLC (external auditor)
2. **Dan Blankenship**, RFTA CEO
3. **Kelley Collier**, RFTA COO
4. **Michael Yang**, RFTA Director of Finance
5. **Paul Hamilton**, RFTA Assistant Director of Finance

Audit Subcommittee Meeting Expectations: The draft version of the audit report will be made available to the subcommittee prior to the meeting. The external auditor will present the audit report to the subcommittee and answer questions related to the report and audit process. RFTA staff will also be available answer questions. In addition, the meeting will allow time for the subcommittee to discuss the audit report without RFTA staff present.

Facilities and Bus Stop Maintenance April 14, 2016

Capital Projects Update

P3 Conference: March 6th-8th, Mike Hermes attend the Public Private Partnership (P3) conference in Dallas to learn more about the P3 model for the funding, constructing, managing and maintaining of public infrastructure projects. The conference was very informative and staff focused on learning more about on the entities and businesses using the P3 model to build public transportation infrastructure projects and resolving complex housing issues.

P3 projects tend to be very complicated and require a great deal of very technical effort over several years to develop and bring to fruition, but they are a very creative solution to complex problems and attract the most skilled and technically capable firms and creative people. They tend to produce very unique and buildable projects by introducing the profit motive into public infrastructure projects while maintaining public control and ownership over these projects.

The Colorado Department of Transportation is becoming a leader in using the P3 model to build improvements to the state highway system. In the future the public will see many new projects funded by private equity and paid for by the revenue generated by tolls collected by users of the CDOT improvements and supported by availability payments from CDOT. Public and private colleges are beginning to use the P3 model to construct, renovate and manage their student housing portfolios and relieve themselves of the risks and effort required to manage their student housing. The issues that colleges face with their student housing programs are very similar to the short term housing issues many jurisdictions and businesses face in the Roaring Fork Valley and the P3 model may be a creative way for public entities to begin to address these issues.

The P3 model has been used for many years in Europe and Canada and is becoming the standard way to build large public infrastructure projects. The model is beginning to become more accepted in the United States and the list of P3 projects that have come to financial close or that are in the development stage is growing each year. Each P3 project follows the same general steps of finance, design/build, operate and maintain and the terms of each project and the issues they resolve are limited only by the creativity of the entities entering into a P3 partnership. P3 projects are generally over \$100 million dollars and have contract terms from 30 to 50 years in order to create the economies of scale required to generate the cash flow necessary to make the projects profitable. The RFPs and contracts can be very complicated and take several years to develop and negotiate. As the P3 concept has become more accepted and the process more developed, the model is being adapted to accommodate smaller scale projects.

Staff had the opportunity to discuss some of the housing and transportation issues that RFTA and other jurisdictions in the Roaring Fork Valley are facing with some of the experts at firms developing transportation and housing P3s around the country. These were very high level, big picture discussions but it was generally agreed that it was possible that the P3 model can be used to resolve some of these issues and that it could be a worthwhile exercise to develop either a high level RFI or a more detailed and comprehensive RFP document to release to the industry and see what kind of solutions industry could recommend.

If the board is interested in learning more about the P3 model and how it works staff could present a short PowerPoint presentation at a future board meeting with more information about the model and some examples of how it has been used. Industry experts would also be willing to come and make an educational presentation to the board and answer questions.

AMF Phase 3- Indoor bus storage: FCI is mobilizing back on site by April 15 to begin work on the remainder of the building expansion project. This phase of the AMF renovation project will add approximately 17,000 sq. ft. of indoor bus parking to the facility.

AMF Phase 4- Inspection canopy, drive lanes and building cladding: On March 31st RFTA received a Notice to Proceed from CDOT for the FTA 5311 grant that will fund the 4th phase of the renovation of the AMF facilities. This phase will include the construction of a bus inspection canopy, the removal and replacement of the drive lanes from the new employee parking lot to the entrance of the fueling entrance. Staff has received pricing from the contractor for the removal and replacement of the facilities cladding and staff is still evaluation the feasibility of the estimate. Once that evaluation is complete, staff will be able to determine how much of the cladding replacement can be competed with the grant funds.

West Glenwood Springs Park and Ride/ GMF Phase 1A expansion project:

- Staff has completed the environmental review of the project with CDOT and the FTA.
- On Tuesday, March 29th, staff met with the GWS PNZ board and the project received unanimous approval. Staff also received comments from GWS staff and those comments are being reviewed and answered.
- Staff anticipates receiving a Notice to Proceed for the project from CDOT the week of April 4th.
- The project will go out to bid as quickly as possible after the receipt of the NTP from CDOT.
- See the attached PDF for a visual representation of the project.

GMF expansion project:

- Staff is continuing to work with the Shrewsbury/Iron Horse team to develop the design build package for the GMF expansion Phase 1 wall and road work that staff anticipates will begin next spring to provide better access to the facility and create the flat space necessary for the construction of the next phases of the GMF facility.
- On Monday, April 4th, RFTA staff and the Shrewsbury/Iron Horse team met to begin work on the remainder of the GMF expansion project and the development of the design/build package for the project. The first step is to reaffirm the concepts and needs that staff has developed for the facility and familiarize the Shrewsbury/Iron Horse team with the concepts for the facility.

New Castle Park and Ride: Bids were received for the New Castle Park and Ride construction project. RFTA budgeted \$800,000 for the project and the low bid was \$619,000. Staff anticipates work should begin by the end of April.

Facilities Updates

Glenwood Maintenance Facility: Staff received the SGM quarterly report on the maintenance and operation of the CNG station and the report was very positive. The staff at the GMF is keeping the system well maintained and following all of the safety procedures when fueling and servicing GNG vehicles. To review the report, please see "RFTA_CNGsupport_MemoApr2016 (3).pdf," included in the April 2016 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf, attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board agenda.

Carbondale Maintenance facility: There are no significant items to report

Aspen Maintenance Facility: There are no significant items to report

RFTA Bus Stops and Park and Ride Lots: There are no significant items to report

Facilities, Rail Corridor & Trail Update

Following are new updates regarding corridor-related projects and tasks:

- **South Bridge** – Members of CDOT, City of Glenwood Springs City Council and Staff, Garfield County commissioners and staff, RFTA and the South Bridge design team reconvened on March 29th to get everyone up to speed on the project and to set a strategy for moving this project forward. It was determined that the updated and most current version of the preferred alternative 10B still appeared to be the most viable option. However it was recommended that the design team look to a location further south to avoid the costs of having to tunnel under the existing Glenwood Springs airport. The engineering team is going to revisit some of the costs of the current project alignment and the viability of relocating the South Bridge further into the Jackson Ranch conservation easement in an effort to reduce some of the overall construction costs of this project. The South Bridge group will reconvene in late April and/or early May. (*Ongoing*);
- **8th Street Crossing Project by CDOT and the City of Glenwood Springs**–Staff is still working through the logistics of the 8th Street temporary process with CDOT and will be bringing back the agreements between RFTA and CDOT to the May 12th RFTA Board meeting. RFTA and the City are also working through the design concepts for a permanent grade separated crossing of 8th Street. Both of these projects, the temporary and the permanent 8th Street crossings are moving fairly smoothly through the process.; (*Ongoing*);

Rio Grande Trail Update

- Staff is actively working to beautify the corridor through Carbondale
- **ACRE Narrative Design has created the master plan for the Rio Grande ArtWay! It is on RFTA's website to get public feedback.** <http://www.rfta.com/trail-documentation/>
 - **Please review the Master Plan and contact Brett with comments.**
- **We are looking to schedule a public meeting, partnering with CCAH, to inform neighbors and community members on April 14thWe would love it if you would come and join us!**



- **Staff secured a \$183,653 Colorado Parks and Wildlife grant to fund a soft-surface trail through Carbondale!**
 - **Staff will be reopening the wildlife section for the summer on Saturday, April 30th at 5pm. Staff will have pizza and drinks to celebrate with trail users.....Please come and celebrate the reopening!!**