

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

**TIME:** 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., Thursday, August 13, 2015

**USUAL LOCATION:** *Town Hall (Room 1), 511 Colorado, Carbondale, CO*

*(This Agenda may change before the meeting.)*

	Agenda Item	Policy	Purpose	Est. Time
1	<b>Call to Order / Roll Call:</b>		<b>Quorum</b>	<b>8:30 a.m.</b>
2	<b>Executive Session:</b>			
	A. <b><u>Two Matters:</u></b> Paul Taddune, General Counsel:  1) Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(b) conferences with an attorney for the local public body for the purposes of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions concerning potential and pending litigation; and 2) Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402 4(e)(l) 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.	<b>3.5.2</b>	<b>Executive Session</b>	<b>8:31 a.m.</b>
3	<b>Approval of <u>Minutes:</u></b> RFTA Board Meeting, July 9, 2015, <b>pg. 3</b>		<b>Approve</b>	<b>9:00 a.m.</b>
4	<b>Public Comment:</b> 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)		<b>Public Input</b>	<b>9:05 a.m.</b>
5	<b>Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:</b>	<b>4.3.3.C</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>9:10 a.m.</b>
6	<b>Presentations/Action Items:</b>			
	A. Rail Corridor <u>License</u> Request for ACES Rock Bottom Ranch Soft Trail Connections to the Rio Grande Trail – Angela Kincade, Assistant director, Project Management and Facilities Operations, <b>page 11</b>	<b>1.1.</b>	<b>Discussion /Direction</b>	<b>9:15 a.m.</b>
	B. Update Regarding Proposed Rio Grande Railroad Corridor <u>Access</u> Control Plan – Angela Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management and Facilities Operations, <b>page 13</b>	<b>1.1.C</b>	<b>Discussion /Direction</b>	<b>9:35 a.m.</b>
	C. Planning Updates: <u>Integrated</u> Transit System Plan and 2016 Strategic Plan, <b>page 16</b>	<b>4.3.2.A</b>	<b>Discussion /Direction</b>	<b>9:50 a.m.</b>
	D. <u>Preliminary</u> Planning Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues for 2016 RFTA Budget – Mike Yang, Director of Finance, <b>page 17</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>Discussion /Direction</b>	<b>10:10 a.m.</b>
	E. <u>Alternative</u> Means of Engaging the Public in RFTA Board Meetings – Dan Blankenship, CEO and Edna Adeh, Executive Assistant, <b>page 21</b>	<b>4.8.1.C</b>	<b>Discussion /Direction</b>	<b>10:40 a.m.</b>
	F. RFTA <u>Parking</u> Management Plan Update - Mike Hermes, Director of Facilities, <b>page 22</b>	<b>4..2.</b>	<b>Discussion /Direction</b>	<b>11:10 a.m.</b>
7	<b>Information/Updates:</b>			
	A. <u>CEO</u> Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO, <b>page 23</b>	<b>2.8.6</b>	<b>FYI</b>	<b>11:40 a.m.</b>
8	<b>Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:</b>			
	To Be Determined at August 13, 2015 Meeting	<b>4.3</b>	<b>Meeting Planning</b>	<b>11:50 a.m.</b>
	<b>(This Agenda is Continued on Next Page)</b>			

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Est. Time</b>
9	<b>Next Meeting:</b> 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., August 13, 2015 at Carbondale Town Hall.	<b>4.3</b>	<b>Meeting Planning</b>	<b>11:55 a.m.</b>
10	<b>Adjournment:</b>		<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>12:00 p.m.</b>

**Mission/Vision Statement:**

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

**Values Statements:**

- ✓ **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.
- ✓ **Safe** – Safety is RFTA’s highest priority.
- ✓ **Sustainable** – RFTA will be environmentally responsible.

**ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
July 9, 2015**

**Board Members Present:**

Stacey Patch Bernot, Chair (Town of Carbondale); Kathy Chandler-Henry, Vice-Chair (Eagle County); Mike Gamba (City of Glenwood Springs); Bob Gordon (Town of New Castle); Jacque Whitsitt (Town of Basalt); Markey Butler (Town of Snowmass Village); Michael Owsley (Pitkin County).

**Voting Alternates Present:**

**Non-Voting Alternates Present:**

Patrick Stuckey (Town of New Castle); John Hoffmann (Town of Carbondale); George Newman (Pitkin County); Kathryn Trauger (City of Glenwood Springs).

**Staff Present:**

Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer (CEO); Paul Taddune, General Counsel; Edna Adeh, Board Secretary; Mike Hermes, Angela Henderson, Abbey Pasco, Amy Burdick, Facilities & Trails Department; Michael Yang, Paul Hamilton, Finance Department; David Johnson, Jason White, Planning Department.

**Visitors Present:**

John Kruger, City of Aspen; Paul Backes, McMahan And Associates, LLC.; Karl Hanlon, City of Glenwood Springs Attorney; Jeff Hecksel and Geoff Guthrie, City of Glenwood Springs.

**Agenda**

**1. Roll Call:**

Stacey Bernot, Chair, declared a quorum to be present (7 member jurisdictions present) and the meeting began at 8:30 a.m.

**2. Executive Session**

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

**A. One Matter: Paul Taddune, General Counsel:**

Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(b) conferences with an attorney for the local public body for the purposes of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions concerning potential and pending litigation; Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402 4(e)(l) 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.

**Mike Gamba made the motion for the RFTA Board to adjourn into Executive Session. Michael Owsley seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved. The Board adjourned into Executive Session at 8:32 a.m.**

RFTA staff present at the Executive Session included: Dan Blankenship, Edna Adeh, Paul Taddune, Mike Hermes, Angela Henderson, Jeff Hecksel, Glenwood Springs City Manager & Karl Hanlon, City of Glenwood Springs' Attorney.

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

**No action was taken during the Executive Session. The Executive Session adjourned at 9:38 a.m.**

**3. Approval of Minutes:**

**Jacque Whitsitt moved to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2015 Board Meeting and Kathy Chandler-Henry 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.

There were no comments from the public.

With the approval of the Board Chair, Jason White, RFTA Assistant Planner and RFTA's representative on the Garfield Clean Energy (GCE) Board, reported that the Ride Garfield County Bike Event, from Parachute to Carbondale, which took place June 19-26, was well attended and well received.

**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. No items were added to the meeting agenda.

Bernot next asked if any Board member had comments or questions regarding issues not on the meeting agenda. There were none.

**6. Consent Agenda:**

- A. First Amended and Restated Intergovernmental Agreement Between The City Of Aspen (City) And The Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) To Complete The Rubey Park Transit Center (Rubey Park) Development Project With One Construction Contract Managed By RFTA – Dan Blankenship, CEO
- B. Resolution 2015-12; DOLA Alternate Fuels for CNG Bus for Carbondale Circulator – Jason White, Assistant Planner.
- C. Resolution 2015-13; DOLA EMIA for GMF Renovation/Expansion Project – David Johnson, Director of Planning.
- D. Resolution 2015-14; GCFMLD for GMF Renovation/Expansion Project – David Johnson, Director of Planning.
- E. Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) – Brush Creek Park and Ride Management, Maintenance and Use Plan – Dan Blankenship, CEO

Bernot asked if the Board had any question(s) on the Consent Agenda Items.

Mike Gamba and Michael Owsley requested to remove sub-items D and E, respectively, for further discussion.

**Jacque Whitsitt made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda sub-items A, B, and C and Mike Gamba seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**Discussions on sub-items D & E:**

Regarding sub-item D, the GCFMLD grant for the renovation/expansion of Glenwood Maintenance Facility, Gamba wished to discuss RFTA's grant proposal with the City of Glenwood Springs to evaluate whether RFTA projects and Glenwood Springs' projects are competing.

Bernot suggested that RFTA coordinate with the other jurisdictions to make sure we are not competing against one another, starting with the next (Spring 2016) grant cycle. All jurisdictions should apply for FMLD to the best of their abilities, as the program offers a unique opportunity for funding local infrastructure.

Trauger, who attended a FMLD-hosted meeting for potential grantees on July 8, said that the GCFMLD Board is placing a significant emphasis on partnerships, so applicants should coordinate as much as possible.

Regarding sub-item E, the Brush Creek P&R IGA, Blankenship explained that the updated agreement was intended to give more authority to City staff to manage the parking area, including the ability to approve special events parking. The changes are shown in track changes mode on the attached document. The revised agreement does not have significant impact on RFTA. The item is on the EOTC's July 16<sup>th</sup> meeting Agenda. RFTA Board approval will allow the CEO to sign the IGA upon EOTC approval.

**Mike Gamba made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda sub-items D, and E and Jacque Whitsitt seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**7. Public Hearing:**

**A. Resolution 2015-15: 2015 RFTA Supplemental Budget Appropriation – Michael Yang, Director of Finance**

Blankenship reported that bids for the AMF Phase III expansion came in at \$8.25 million. The bids were higher than expected, but staff does not believe that RFTA will receive lower bids by going through another procurement process. In order to move forward with the project, RFTA needs to utilize approximate \$546,000 in 2013 bond funds and make a general fund appropriation totaling \$72,558.

CDOT has awarded RFTA approximately \$900,000 for the AMF Phase IV construction project (drive lanes, inspection canopy, building exterior cladding) that will occur in 2016. Use of bond funds for AMF Phase III will utilize approximately \$225,000 in revenue that was targeted for the CDOT grant. It will be necessary to identify these matching funds in the 2016 budget. In addition, \$160,000 of bond proceeds that staff had planned to use as match for CDOT grants being used to improve the West Glenwood Park and Ride facility are also being used for the AMF Phase III project. So, it will be necessary to draw upon the reserves in the Bus Stop and Park & Ride fund to provide the match for those grants. RFTA will not receive bids until January-February 2016 for the AMF Phase IV project. Unless something changes with economy, we do not expect construction costs to decrease.

RFTA received a \$600,000 CDOT grant and a \$200,000 GCFMLD grant for the New Castle Park and Ride project. We should have sufficient funding to begin the project next year if we receive an executed contract from CDOT early next year. The CDOT FASTER grant is for FY2017, but CDOT's 2017 fiscal year will begin in July of 2016. Staff is hoping CDOT will make the funding available in the winter of 2016, so that RFTA can obtain a competitive bid for the park and ride project.

Bernot inquired if Michael Yang plans to talk to the Finance Directors of each jurisdiction to check on revenue projections for the 2016 budget forecast.

Yang responded that we are starting the 2016 budget process one month earlier. The process includes communicating with budget directors from member jurisdictions multiple times to establish appropriate forecasts. The goal is to have two drafts presented to the Board, and to better correlate the Strategic Plan goals and projects with the budget. Staff is currently forecasting a 3% increase in sales taxes. Staff reviews sales tax forecast mid-year and in October, because there is a lag in sales tax collections and data. Staff has the information for the winter season and is waiting for similar information for the summer season.

Stacey Bernot asked if any Board members had questions or comments regarding the proposed 2015 Supplemental Budget Resolution. There were no questions or comments from the Board.

With no further questions from the Board, **Bernot opened the public hearing on Resolution No. 2015-15 at 10:01 a.m. There were no public comments, so Bernot closed the public hearing at 10:01 a.m.**

**Markey Butler moved to approve Resolution No. 2015-15 Supplemental Budget Appropriation and Jacque Whitsitt seconded the motion. Resolution No. 2015-15 was unanimously approved.**

## **8. Presentations/Action Items:**

### **A. RFTA 2014 Audited Financial Statements Presentation – Mike Yang, Director of Finance and Paul Backes, McMahan & Associates, LLC**

Mike Yang, Director of Finance, introduced Paul Backes of McMahan and Associates, LLC (RFTA's independent auditor) and explained that Backes was present to report on RFTA's 2014 audit.

Backes thanked the Board for the opportunity to present the 2014 Audit and directed the Board's attention to the 2014 RFTA Audited Financial Statements that were distributed prior to the meeting. Backes stated that the Board's Audit Subcommittee met on June 24, 2015 to review the 2014 Audit. Minutes of the Audit Subcommittee meeting were included in the July 2015 RFTA Board agenda packet on page 26. The 2015 Audit Subcommittee meeting was attended by Board members Jacque Whitsitt and Kathy Chandler-Henry; Eagle County Finance Director, John Lewis; Pitkin County Finance Director, John Redmond; Paul Backes and Nicholas Graham of McMahan and Associates; and RFTA staff Dan Blankenship, Paul Hamilton and Mike Yang.

Backes said that the 2014 RFTA Financial Statements are intended to be presented to bond holders and other stakeholders. RFTA received \$4.3 million in Federal grants in 2014, so the audit is a necessity for Federal oversight. Backes stated that RFTA had a clean audit for 2014, which means that RFTA's financial statements accurately reflect its financial condition. There were minimal changes to the financial statements and only one adjusting entry required.

McMahan's audit offered several recommendations for improvement of internal controls and day-to-day operations. These improvements related to inventory tracking, returned parts reconciliation, and data verification on Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs).

Blankenship reported that RFTA is already moving forward on adding layers of data verification to TVMs, such as billing address zip codes.

Stacey Bernot thanked Whitsitt and Chandler-Henry for their participation on the Audit Subcommittee and stated that their review helps to facilitate approval of the 2014 Audited Financial Statements.

Chandler-Henry reminded the Board that RFTA appears to be financially healthy for the short – term, but bus replacement needs will pose a long-term financial concern. Backes and Whitsitt concurred. We need to address the bus replacement issue, said Whitsitt, or we are just passing the problem along to future Boards.

**Jacque Whitsitt made a motion for the Board to accept the 2014 RFTA Audit Report and Financial Statements as presented. Michael Owsley seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.**

**B. Change of RFTA Board of Directors Meeting Time – Dan Blankenship, CEO**

Blankenship distributed a spreadsheet that reflected Board member choices regarding workable alternative times for the RFTA Board meeting.

Bernot explained that she would like RFTA Board meetings to become more available and accessible to the public. The Board makes many decisions regarding transportation, land use and other matters, she explained, and the public should have a greater opportunity to participate and become engaged. Hosting Board meetings later in the day would demonstrate the Board's commitment to the general public, Bernot said.

Some of the other Board members were not in favor of changing the meeting time and suggested other options to increase public awareness and participation. John Hoffman proposed a call-in period, similar to the practice of City of Rifle. Markey Butler questioned the impact on public attendance that would result from changing the meeting time, and said there were other opportunities for comments, such as calling or emailing the Board. Snowmass Village's meetings are televised, and people email her while the meeting is in session or while it is re-run on television.

Newman said he did not expect to see increasing numbers of people traveling to Board meetings personally, especially from far-flung places. If there is an important enough issue, people will be there, regardless of time and location, he said. Owsley stated that there are a variety of options for communications, making it less important today that people participate in person. Meeting times should hinge first on what works for the Board, and then the public; though he concurred with Bernot that increasing avenues for public involvement should be explored. Chandler Henry suggested hosting an annual meeting in the evening.

Bernot asked RFTA staff to examine different options for the Board to become more inclusive and transparent, and report back to the Board. If any changes to time or location are made, such changes would be effective January 2016.

**Michael Owsley made a motion to keep the meetings as they are presently scheduled, and to direct staff to explore alternate outreach methods to improve public participation in RFTA Board meetings. Markey Butler seconded the motion.**

Comments from the Board were as follows:

- Jacque Whitsitt said that there is a difference between letters and face-to-face comments from the public in attendance.
- Bernot concurred with the need for consistency, suggesting quarterly evening meetings with a consistent venue.
- Markey Butler said that she agrees with the quarterly evening meetings; she also added that we should direct staff to research other days in the month for quarterly evening meetings that will work with everyone's schedule.

Bernot asked for a roll call on the motion. **The motion failed with yes votes by Gordon, Owsley, Butler and nay votes by Whitsitt, Bernot, Gamba and Chandler-Henry.** RFTA requires at least 6 votes from members present to pass a motion.

**Gamba made a motion to direct staff to look into other options to be accessible and transparent to the public, including time change of the meeting days and times. Whitsitt seconded the motion.**

Gordon and Stuckey expressed concern about overloading councilors and commissioners with evening meetings, to the point of losing attendance. Bernot responded that she did not envision a vast overhaul in the meeting schedule, but something in the direction of evening meetings. She suggested having semi-annual evening meetings in a different jurisdiction starting in calendar year 2016.

**The motion failed with 5 ayes and two nays.**

**Owsley made a motion to direct staff to explore alternative means to involve the public. Chandler-Henry seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

Blankenship suggested open houses for the Board members to interact with the public.

**C. Draft Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan Update Presentation – Angela Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management and Facilities Operations**

Angela Henderson reviewed progress and process to date, as outlined in the Agenda Summary. RFTA intends to work through end of August to address comments received, and to send those comments to Counsel for review. The goal is to bring the ACP to the Board for acceptance in October.

Bernot asked the Board if they had any questions. The Board had no further questions.

**D. RFTA Board of Directors Strategic Planning Retreat Follow-up – Dan Blankenship, CEO & David Johnson, Director of Planning**

Dan Blankenship referred the Board to the Retreat Summary in the July 2015 Board Meeting Portfolio, prepared by Retreat Facilitator, Gary Suiter. One of the key directives following the Strategic Plan was to develop an Integrated Transportation System Plan, Blankenship said. Referring to the draft outline developed by staff, Blankenship said that the Plan can be a vehicle for developing short-term transit projects and filling in essential gaps in the transportation system, and it can also help to address long-term needs and issues. Key elements could include a financial plan; an update of the organizational structure assessment; a financing plan; an inventory of current and future land use developments and an assessment of how they could impact transportation services and infrastructure. The plan could also establish thresholds that would trigger planning for future service enhancements and expansion. Blankenship said that the thresholds should be set low enough to allow time for planning and implementation of public transportation improvements before



problems related to traffic congestions or impacts from increasing numbers of buses reach the crisis stage. Given the long lead times associated with major capital projects, Blankenship said that we wouldn't want to be the "frog in boiling water" and suddenly realize we are way behind the curve in terms of planning and implementing solutions to growing traffic congestion and mobility problems.

Markey Butler asked if RFTA is fully prepared to handle the impact of Base Village development, scheduled for completion in 2017. Blankenship responded that RFTA is examining options and costs to address the impacts, recognizing that RFTA will have constraints regardless of funding availability, such as fleet and personnel. George Newman asked Blankenship if he planned to discuss the potential impact of the Base Village development on the No Fare Aspen/Snowmass bus service with the EOTC and Blankenship indicated that he was.

Jacque Whitsitt left the Board meeting at 11:00 a.m. The Board maintained its quorum with 6 member jurisdictions present.

Bernot said that RFTA will likely need to go to voters to help fund future needs. We can point to this Plan as our homework.

Blankenship said that RFTA often makes significant accomplishments in a piecemeal fashion or in the absence of a plan. Imagine what can be achieved with a comprehensive plan, he said.

Bernot stated that she fully supports moving forward with the Integrated Transportation Plan. She asked the Board members if they were comfortable moving forward with the plan and there were no objections.

Blankenship stated that David Johnson will prepare the scope of work, schedule and budget for consideration at a future Board meeting.

## **9. Information/Updates:**

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

Blankenship noted that Michael Yang received the Distinguished Budget Presentation Award for 2015 from Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA). Blankenship also mentioned that RFTA's new COO Kelley Collier will begin work on July 28<sup>th</sup>.

Blankenship referred to the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program Policy Statement on page 32-33 of the Board packet. RFTA DBE Liaison Officer Edna Akeh explained the assumptions and calculations for the proposed 3% DBE participation for Federal Fiscal years 2016-2018.

Regarding ridership, system-wide boardings have increased 1% year-to-date, said Blankenship. Although regional commuter ridership was up by approximately 6% through May 2015, the tremendous growth RFTA experienced in 2014 due to VelociRFTA BRT implementation is tapering. In addition, fuel prices have been lower and the winter was milder.

Gamba asked why transit ridership had decreased on Ride Glenwood. Blankenship speculated that the warm weather may be a factor, allowing people to walk and bicycle more.

Blankenship invited the Board's attention to the fare revenue comparison report found on page 35 of the Board agenda packet. Through May 2015, fare revenue was below the amount collected in 2014 by approximately \$153,000. However, the 2015 budget forecasted a 4% increase in farebox revenue over 2014, so the variance compared to budget is actually greater. Blankenship surmised that the negative variance could be due to a decline in pass sales at RFTA's consignment outlets, such as grocery stores throughout the region, since the ticket vending machines have been installed at the

VelociRFTA stations. In 2014, the outlets purchased passes from RFTA for resale, but may still be holding onto their inventory this year because people are purchasing their passes at the TVM's. So, RFTA may have received a bump in fare revenue in 2014 that it won't receive in 2015. Also, the timing of pass purchases by businesses for their employees in 2014 could be impacting fare revenue in 2015. Staff hopes that fare revenue and ridership will begin to bounce back during the summer months.

Finally, Blankenship referred to a graph of AMF energy consumption. RFTA has experienced a 44% decrease in utility consumption as a result of the various efficiency improvements implemented during the AMF Phase I-II re-commissioning. This is consistent with engineering estimates of a 45% savings and particularly noteworthy because heating, air conditioning, and air quality within the facility were greatly improved, while utility costs declined as a result of the upgrades that were made during the first two phases of the AMF re-commissioning project.

8. **Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:** To be determined at August 13, 2015 Meeting.

Gamba asked for an update on the Cole Subdivision.

9. **Next Meeting:** 8:30 – 12:00 p.m., August 13, 2015 at Carbondale Town Hall

10. **Adjournment:**

**Bernot moved to adjourn the Board meeting at 11:22 a.m.**

The Board Meeting adjourned at 11:22 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Edna Adeh  
Board Secretary

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**  
**“PRESENTATIONS/ACTION” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 6. A.**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 13, 2015
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Rail Corridor License for ACES Rock Bottom Ranch Soft Trail Connections to the Rio Grande Trail
<b>Policy #:</b>	<b>1.1: The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	Complete three Rio Grande Railroad Corridor/Trail documents: Rio Grande Corridor Land Management Plan, Rio Grande Corridor Trail Management/Maintenance Plan, and Rio Grande Trail Access Plan
<b>Presented By:</b>	Angela Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management & Facilities Operations  Tom Newland representing the Aspen Center for Environmental Studies (ACES)
<b>Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve License as requested;</li> <li>• Approve License with conditions; or</li> <li>• Deny the License.</li> </ul>
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Aspen Center for Environmental Studies (ACES) is requesting a license to connect a looped 9’ wide soft surface trail through its ranch and connect to the Rio Grande Trail in two locations</li> <li>2. This 9-foot wide, ADA compliant, decomposed asphalt pedestrian/bikeway (~1,941 linear feet) will provide safe and easy access to Rock Bottom Ranch’s educational, recreational, and natural features from the pedestrian/bike Rio Grande Trail.</li> </ol>
<b>Background Info:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The Aspen Center for Environmental Studies (ACES) is requesting a license to connect a looped trail through the ranch to the Rio Grande Trail.</li> <li>B. The Rock Bottom Ranch Eco-Ed Trail System, as it is known, will be an interdisciplinary outdoor learning environment combining elements of environmental science, recreation, sustainable agriculture, conservation, and wild lands preservation. Rock Bottom Ranch already provides existing amenities including educational farmyards, a covered open-aired barn, gardens, pasturelands and year-around educational programming for kids and adults.</li> <li>C. The Eco-Ed Trail System will provide a trail system for visitors to access the ranch on their own from the Rio Grande Trail, allowing for unstructured play and access to educational areas of the ranch that are currently not reachable for the general public. It would also provide outdoor teaching space (Eco-Ed Stations) for school groups, a gathering area for adults and children, a youth natural play-scape, and restoration of a ditch wetland area to an ecologically sound riparian habitat attractive to wildlife.</li> <li>D. This is a soft trail system and can be easily removed in the event rail is returned to the corridor; therefore, it should not have an impact on the “rail-banked” status of the Railroad Corridor.</li> <li>E. The proposed connections meet the intent of the RFTA Recreational Trails Plan and the Pitkin County May 2015 Rio Grande Trail Management Plan.</li> </ol>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	<p>RFTA’s draft 2014 Access Control Policy (ACP) for management of Railroad Corridor :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enables RFTA to uphold and preserve the Railroad Corridor’s “railbanked” and “designated trail” status pursuant to a Notice of Interim Trail Use (“NITU”)</li> </ol>

	<p>under 16 U.S.C. 1247(d), which was issued to RFTA by the Surface Transportation Board (“STB”). The ACP is intended to ensure that RFTA complies not only with STB’s construction of 16 U.S.C. 1247(d), but also maintains the Railroad Corridor intact consistent with freight rail reactivation, possible future commuter rail use, interim trail use, open space uses, and other lawful public purposes; and</p> <p>2. Enables RFTA to continue to adhere to the planning and stewardship requirements of the Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) Conservation Covenants</p> <p>RFTA’s <i>current</i> policy regarding Rio Grande Trail access is outlined in the 2005 Recreational Trails Plan and reads as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Provide for convenient, direct access and use by residents and visitors. Identify trail access points considering proximity to residential, educational and employment centers. The trail will provide off-street connections between communities, towns, commercial employment centers and to other resources throughout the valley.</li> <li>II. Identify connections to existing and proposed trails, recreation areas, population and activity centers, roads, the river and public lands. Specifically, provide direct links to the Glenwood Springs River Trail, the Basalt-Old Snowmass Trail, the Rio Grande Trail and local trails in Carbondale and Basalt. Trail connections provide indirect access to the Glenwood Canyon Trail, the Christine State Wildlife Area, Pitkin County trails, BLM and USFS lands.</li> <li>III. Trail system shall emphasize regional recreational concept and commuter functions.</li> <li>IV. Identify or develop off-street access to schools for student commuting and environmental education.</li> </ol> <p>3. This suggested use also adheres to the Pitkin County definition for trails use as called out in the “Rio Grande Trail Management Plan” recently updated in May of 2015 by Pitkin County Open Space and Trails and vetted with the RFTA Board of Directors at the March 2015 RFTA Board of Director’s meeting:</p> <p>4. The <i>Pitkin County Home Rule Charter</i> provision authorizing the Open Space and Trails Program defines trails as follows:</p> <p>“Trails” shall be defined as non-motorized access ways meeting one or more of the following criteria: preserving historic routes of ingress and egress to public lands and waterways; providing access to and from recreational or urban destinations; providing transportation or recreational opportunities throughout the Roaring Fork Watershed.”</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Implications:</b></p>	<p>There are no fiscal implications for RFTA. All of the improvements for the trail system will be funded through ACES and a GOCO grant received for the project.</p>
<p><b>Attachments:</b></p>	<p>Attachment 1: Site Plan of improvements to be placed as a part of the Eco-Trail project.</p> <p>Attachment 2: Specific site plan for the West RFTA trail connection</p> <p>Attachment 3: Specific site plan for the East RFTA trail connection</p> <p>Attachment 4: Specifications for the Eco-Trail.</p> <p>These attachments can be found in the August 2015 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the Board agenda packet.</p>

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
PRESENTATION/ACTION” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 6. B.**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 13, 2015
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	FYI – Update Regarding Proposed Corridor Access Control Plan (ACP)
<b>Policy #:</b>	<b>1.1: The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	Complete Corridor Access Control Policy
<b>Presented By:</b>	Angela Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management & Facilities Operations.
<b>Recommendation:</b>	This is a status report regarding the proposed Access Control Plan Update and the <b><i>newly developed</i></b> 2014 RFTA Railroad Corridor Design Guidelines & Standards
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Staff is in the process of updating the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. The first document to be updated is the Access Control Plan (ACP). In addition to updating the ACP, staff has also worked with Rail Engineers to develop Design Guidelines and Standards (DG) to assist the local jurisdictions, CDOT and adjacent private property owners with understanding RFTA’s processes for managing all existing and/or proposed uses of the RFTA Railroad Corridor.</li> <li>2. The ACP &amp; DG were scheduled for a 120-day public comment period. The public comment period closed on May 9, 2015 and staff has been working with the attorneys and engineers to develop responses to comments received from RFTA’s member jurisdictions, Garfield County, CDOT, and the public. RFTA provided responses to Glenwood Springs, Garfield County and CDOT on Monday, August 3rd. Staff is now working through the last of the public comments and, once reviewed by the attorneys and engineers, will post a copy of all of the responses on the RFTA website at <a href="http://www.rfta.com/traildocs.html">http://www.rfta.com/traildocs.html</a> .</li> <li>3. Staff was directed to create an ACP Work Group, made up of staff members from RFTA’s member jurisdictions, Garfield County and CDOT to work through the comments received during the public comment period and to develop an updated version of the ACP &amp; DG. To date staff has held several joint jurisdictional meetings, May 13<sup>th</sup> June 30<sup>th</sup>. July 14<sup>th</sup> and July 29<sup>th</sup>. It was determined at the July 14<sup>th</sup> meeting that it might be easier to focus on the ACP document itself. Staff has been sending out small sections of the ACP document in a word format to allow the ACP Work Group to review and provide suggested revisions to the document, and then meet to work through the suggested revisions together. This has proven to be an effective use of everyone’s time together as a group. To date we have reviewed two separate sections of the ACP and staff will be sending out the final section of the ACP to the ACP Work Group for review in preparation for our next meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 19<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>4. Staff has been working with the attorneys and rail engineers on a strategy for cleaning up some of the title issues in the federal grant right of way areas along the Railroad Corridor (fgrow). Staff has a tentative strategy developed and will begin working with Congressional Delegation to formalize the process. The anticipated process will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacting each potentially impacted adjacent property owner to exchange deed information for the various parcels to figure out how their ownership title was acquired.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the encroachment was allowed by the federal government then RFTA will correct the survey and the GIS system with the information provided by the property owner. If the RFTA survey is correct and the adjacent property boundaries is encroaching into the Railroad Corridor by mistake, then staff will work with the railroad engineers to establish the minimum width necessary for a railroad system to function in the future.</li> <li>• Farnsworth Group will then create a legal description for each parcel, i.e. the adjacent property owner’s parcel and the Railroad Corridor parcel.</li> <li>• If both parties are in agreement with the legal descriptions, then there will be an exchange of Quit Claim deeds.</li> <li>• Once all of the deeds are exchanged in all of the impacted fgrow areas along the Railroad Corridor, staff will present the Quit Claim deeds to our Congressional representatives and ask for Congressional ratification of the Federal Grant areas. This would essentially be a patent area clean-up, which will allow the property owner the ability to secure a clear title to their parcel.</li> <li>• This process is not a speedy process; however, the attorneys and staff believe it is workable.</li> <li>• The attorneys are researching the timeframes required for this process and the engineers are putting together a cost estimate for the work involved in establishing a minimum width and a legal description for each of the parcels impacted. Staff hopes to have some more definitive information available at the Board meeting.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Background Info:</b></p>	<p>The ACP update, along with the DG, is one of the first sections that will be addressed as part of the Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Comprehensive Plan update. RFTA’s staff and team of Railroad attorneys and engineers have completed a thorough review and <b>update</b> to the <b>current</b> ACP and developed the DG to assist our local jurisdictions and adjacent property owners with any third party requested use of the Railroad Corridor. In summary the ACP and DG are intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable RFTA to uphold and preserve the Railroad Corridor’s “railbanked” and “designated trail” status pursuant to a Notice of Interim Trail Use (“NITU”) under 16 U.S.C. 1247(d), which was issued to RFTA by the Surface Transportation Board (“STB”). The ACP is intended to ensure that RFTA complies not only with STB’s construction of 16 U.S.C. 1247(d), but also maintains the Railroad Corridor intact consistent with freight rail reactivation, possible future commuter rail use, interim trail use, open space uses, and other lawful public purposes.</li> <li>• Enable RFTA to continue to adhere to the planning and stewardship requirements of the Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) Conservation Covenants</li> <li>• Enable RFTA to meet the terms of the CDOT funding requirements for acquisition of the Railroad Corridor “A multi-modal transportation system utilizing the Railroad Corridor shall be implemented by the year 2020”</li> <li>• Provide minimum Design Guidelines &amp; Standards and a review process for any third party requested uses of the Railroad Corridor to limit the financial exposure to RFTA and the taxpayers for any third party requested uses</li> <li>• Copies of the 2000 and the 2005 Comprehensive Plans which contain, the <b>current</b> Policy for Managing Railroad Crossings, The <b>current</b> Access Control Plan and the Recreational Trails Plan. The “Draft” update of the <b>current</b> Access</li> </ul>

	<p>Control Plan, a copy of the <b>“Newly developed”</b> Design Guidelines and Standards (a several hundred page document) and a copy of the Land Schedule (the Railroad Corridor Survey superimposed over a Bing Map) are posted on the RFTA website at <a href="http://www.rfta.com/traildocs.html">http://www.rfta.com/traildocs.html</a> .</p> <p>With the 120-day public comment period closed, staff will work with the attorneys, engineers and the ACP Work Group to review and update the ACP and DG documents. Staff will continue to update the Board monthly throughout this process.</p>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	Board End Statement 1.1 says, “The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	RFTA’s team of legal and railroad engineering consultants is under contract and has been working on the Corridor Access Control Plan and an overall update to the Comprehensive Plan. Approximately \$150,000 has been budgeted in 2015 for the Comprehensive Plan Update and other corridor management-related tasks. It is likely that additional funds will need to be appropriated for this project in 2015.
<b>Attachments:</b>	The ACP Review and Adoption Timeline (Updated) is attached below. RFTA staff responses to comments received from the City of Glenwood Springs, Garfield County (2015-08-03 RFTA Final Staff Responses to ACP Comments.pdf) can be found in the August 2015 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the Board agenda packet.

### RIO GRANDE RAILROAD CORRIDOR ACCESS CONTROL PLAN UPDATE SCHEDULE

Draft Access Control Plan (ACP) & Draft Design Guidelines (DG) TIMELINE	Start Date	End Date
Draft Access Control Plan & Design Guidelines (ACP & DG) to RFTA Board and Jurisdictions	1/2/2015	1/2/2015
Update to the RFTA Board - Engineers will be in Attendance at this Meeting	1/8/2015	1/8/2015
ACP & DG Available for Public Comments on <a href="http://www.rfta.com">www.rfta.com</a>	1/9/2015	5/9/2015
Compilation of ALL Comments, Public, Board and Jurisdictional comments	5/11/2015	5/15/2015
ALL comments, Public, Board and Jurisdictional to RFTA Attorneys and Engineers	6/8/2015	6/12/2015
RFTA Staff, Attorneys and Engineers review ALL comments, Public, Board and Jurisdictional and develop initial responses	6/15/2015	8/31/2015
ACP Work Group Meeting to review and discuss initial responses to public comments and incorporation into the Draft ACP - Will attempt to schedule a few meetings to work through all of the initial responses	5/11/2015	8/31/2015
TOC Staff, COGS Staff and RFTA staff to convene a meeting to discuss options for managing/maintaining the Railroad Corridor that will protect the Corridor in perpetuity. Some of the ideas are to review existing policies for other 'Railbanked' Corridors, to discuss the draft ACP and seek direction from the STB and/or taking proposed projects (8th St., Southbridge, 14th St., Industry Way, etc. to the STB for a "declaratory Order"	7/1/2015	as needed
Incorporation of ALL comments, Public, Board and Jurisdictional (this will be an ongoing process as the ACP Team works together to find consensus on the responses) into the ACP & DG as needed.	7/3/2015	8/31/2015
Final Review of ACP & DG by Attorneys and Engineers	7/27/2015	9/7/2015
ACP & DG Update to RFTA Board for review	9/10/2015	9/10/2015
RFTA Board of Director final comments to staff incorporated into the DRAFT ACP & DG	9/11/2015	9/30/2015
Presentation of ACP & DG to RFTA Board	10/8/2015	10/8/2015

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
 “PRESENTATIONS/ACTION” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 6. C.**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 13, 2015
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Planning Updates: Integrated Transit System Plan and 2016 Strategic Plan
<b>Policy #</b>	<b>4.3.2.A: Agenda Planning</b>
<b>Strategic Goal</b>	Update RFTA 5-Year Strategic Plan; and Develop Integrated Transportation System Plan (ITSP)
<b>Presented By:</b>	David Johnson, Director of Planning
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Review and comment on the Updated 2016 Strategic Plan</li> <li>2) Provide comments and direction on development of the Integrated Transportation Plan Request for Qualifications (RFQ)</li> </ol>
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) At the annual Board Retreat, Staff received comments and direction from the Board that have resulted in updates to the 2016 Strategic Plan. The updated Plan is attached for Board review.</li> <li>2) At the Board Retreat, RFTA staff also received direction from the Board to begin working on an Integrated Transportation System Plan (ITSP). As a first step in the process, Staff developed an outline of an ITSP for Board review and comments at the July 2015 Board Meeting. This is the basis for the ITSP’s scope of work.           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Since the July 2015 Board meeting, RFTA staff has developed a draft RFQ for on-call Planning Services. This RFQ is intended to procure a team of planning professionals to conduct the ITSP. The consultant team acquired through this process may also assist with other related projects, such as Pitkin County’s proposed Parking Master Plan.</li> <li>✓ Within the next month, the City of Glenwood Springs will begin procurement of consulting services to update the City’s 5-year Transit Operating Plan. RFTA will be involved in the study process, and results of this study are likely to be incorporated into the ITSP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3) Staff anticipates bringing back a schedule and budget for the first phases of the ITSP, the cost of which will most likely be incorporated into the 2016 budget.</li> </ol>
<b>Background Info:</b>	The proposed On-Call Planning RFQ is modeled after the RFQ for on-call Architectural and Engineering services, which RFTA issued and awarded in 2012, and has proved beneficial for RFTA.
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	See Core Issues.
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Planning studies and projects will be contracted by task order to the Planning Consultant Team selected through the RFQ process. Costs will be determined during the scoping of each task order.
<b>Attachments:</b>	The following documents are included in the August 2015 Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the Board agenda packet: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Draft 2016 5-Year Plan Working.pdf</li> <li>2) RFQ for On-Call Planning.pdf</li> </ol>



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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 13, 2015
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Preliminary Planning Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues for 2016 RFTA Budget
<b>POLICY #:</b>	<b>2.5 Financial Planning/Budgeting</b>
<b>Action Requested:</b>	Discuss the 2016 budget initiatives, assumptions and issues and give staff direction.
<b>Presented By:</b>	Michael Yang, Director of Finance
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On a fund basis, staff will highlight issues associated with the 2016 budget and seek direction from the Board.</li> <li>○ The 1<sup>st</sup> draft budget will be presented for the Board’s consideration at the September 10, 2015 meeting.</li> <li>○ The 2<sup>nd</sup> draft budget will be presented for the Board’s consideration at the October 8, 2015 meeting.</li> <li>○ The final budget will be presented for the Board’s review and adoption at the November 12, 2015 meeting.</li> <li>○ A list of budget assumptions, issues and highlights is provided on the following pages.</li> </ul>
<b>Background Info:</b>	See Core Issues
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	Board Financial Planning/Budgeting policy 2.5.1 states, “The CEO shall not allow budgeting that omits credible projection of revenues and expenses, separation of capital (including replacement and depreciation) and operation items, cash flow projects, and disclosure of planning assumptions.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Inaccurate forecasts of revenues and expenditures could result in the unanticipated use of fund balance in order to achieve the Authority’s goals and objectives.
<b>Options:</b>	Discuss 2016 budget overview information and provide staff with direction.
<b>Staff Recommend:</b>	See budget overview information.
<b>Attachments:</b>	Yes, see the list of 2016 budget initiatives, assumptions, and issues provided on the following pages.



## 2016 Budget: Preliminary Planning Initiatives, Assumptions, and Issues

### General Fund (including Service Contract Special Revenue Fund)

#### **Budget Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues:**

- The initial budget should add to fund balance, if possible.
- There should be a reduction in transit services, if necessary, to avoid the use of fund balance.
- The budget should adhere to the financial reserve thresholds in accordance with Policy 2.5.5.
- Align budget with goals identified in the Strategic Plan.
- Consult with RFTA member jurisdictions' Finance Directors to obtain their sales tax revenue estimates for the budget year. RFTA's sales tax revenue estimates will be calculated based on the information provided by each jurisdiction.
- Develop revenue estimates for Service Contracts, State and Federal grants, and other governmental contributions.
  - Garfield County budgeted \$650,000 in 2015 to support the Grand Hogback bus service and staff must confirm whether their contribution will continue in 2016.
  - The Elected Officials Transportation Committee (EOTC) budgeted \$621,658 in 2015 to support the no-fare Aspen/Snowmass regional transit services and staff must confirm their contribution amount for 2016.
- There is no upward fare adjustment planned for 2016.
- Develop Transit Service budget, initially, based upon status quo service levels with updates for seasonal date changes. Staff will cost out potential adjustments to services that may be requested by RFTA and its contracting partners:
  - Highway 82 Corridor/BRT Service
  - Grand Hogback I-70
  - Aspen Skiing Company service contract
  - City of Aspen municipal service contract
  - City of Glenwood Springs municipal service contract
- Adjustments to service hours and miles may result in adjustments to Bus Operator shifts, Mechanic positions, parts and fuel.

- Departments will submit their draft budget requests, which can include new positions. Management will evaluate each new position request and prioritize them based on need and available resources. Any new positions identified by management as a priority will be incorporated into the budget.
- Departments will also submit their capital item and project requests. Any unexpended items budgeted in 2015 may need to be carried forward and adjusted in 2016 to complete the project. Management will evaluate and prioritize them based on need, available resources and how they fit with strategic goals. Priority items will be presented along with the draft budget. Capital grants will be strategically pursued to help fund these items and only those that are awarded will be included in the budget or presented in a supplemental budget appropriation resolution over the course of the budget year. Financing options will also be considered, as needed. Timing of New Castle P&R funding is a consideration also.
- Any additional Board priorities should also be incorporated into the budget's planning assumptions.

Continuing Budget issues and considerations:

- In 2015, sales tax revenues through April (or June collections) and have exceeded budget estimates by approximately 11%. Transit fares have trailed budget estimates by 10%. Staff will continue to maintain a conservative approach regarding these rates.
- In 2015, management obtained fixed price transit fuel contracts to manage the volatility normally associated with fuel prices. This approach continues in 2016 where staff has currently locked approximately 70% of its diesel fuel needs for the 2016 budget which reflects a 14% decrease from the current year's weighted average cost per diesel gallon. Staff is currently monitoring fuel prices and may lock the remaining needs for 2016. Our current CNG pricing will be assumed in our budget preparations.
- In 2015, healthcare costs increased 10% from the prior year. Costs continue to rise and are estimated to increase another 10% next year. More information regarding the increase will become available in the coming weeks. Staff continues to review the current plan design to identify possible changes for consideration, if any.
- Historically, the high cost of living in the Roaring Fork Valley has challenged the Authority's ability to hire and retain qualified transit personnel. During the recession in 2009, the pool of workers available in the region increased for RFTA as a result of limited job opportunities. However, with a stronger economy and job growth, management continues to review and refine RFTA's compensation package with respect to wages, incentive programs, and benefit enhancements, including employee housing, in order to remain competitive in the local job market. As part of the compensation review, a market survey will be conducted in September for all job descriptions and any potential adjustments will be identified and considered as needed.
- As of August 2015, the overall occupancy rate for RFTA employee housing had increased to 95% compared to 83% at the start of the year. Year-to-date rental income has increased by approximately 24% from the prior year. Staff will continue to monitor the local rental housing market, current rental leases, and anticipated seasonal hires during the budget preparations.
- Request for Funding Application Forms are required to be completed by organizations seeking financial support. The deadline for requests pertaining to the 2016 budget year will be around the end of August or early September. Staff will review funding applications and present them in the draft budget submitted to the Board.
- Other issues and priorities as identified by the Board.

New Budget issues:

- Contract negotiations with Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 1774 are anticipated to begin around October and appear likely to be completed after the 2016 budget has been adopted in November. If the negotiations result in budgetary impacts, staff will prepare a 2016 supplemental budget appropriation resolution at a future Board meeting for approval.
- Appropriate \$250,000 representing the remaining half of RFTA's contribution to the Town of Basalt to help fund the Basalt Avenue Pedestrian Underpass Project. RFTA's total planned contribution to this project is \$500,000. In 2015, the first half was made through a combination of \$30,300 in cash and \$219,700 of debt relieved that was owed to RFTA for the Willits Underpass Project.
- Approximately \$225,000 in local match will need to be identified for a \$900,000 CDOT/FTA Section 5311 grant designated for Phase IV of the Aspen Maintenance Facility recommissioning project.

**Bus Stops/PNR Special Revenue Fund**

Budget Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues:

- Develop Vehicle Registration Fee estimate based on historical data and trends.
- Budget bus stops and park and ride operating expenditures based on historical data, trends and needs.
- Similar to the current year, additional resources needed to fund the operating and maintenance costs associated with BRT stations and park and rides will be transferred from the General Fund using available sales tax revenues.
- While the 2015 budget reflects the use of fund balance to pay for the local share of the West Glenwood PNR, any unexpended budget remaining will need to be carried forward in 2016 to fund the completion of the project.

**VSS BRT Capital Projects Fund**

Budget Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues:

- While the 2015 budget reflects that the remaining funds are to be expended, any unexpended budget remaining will need to be carried forward in 2016 to close out the Very Small Starts Capital Grant.

**AMF Capital Projects Fund**

Budget Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues:

- While the 2015 budget reflects that the remaining funds are to be expended for the completion of Phases III of the Aspen Maintenance Facility (AMF) Recommissioning Project, any unexpended budget will need to be carried forward in 2016 to fund assets and infrastructure related to the project.

**Series 2013A Capital Projects Funds**

Budget Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues:

- While the 2015 budget reflects that the remaining funds are to be expended, any unexpended budget remaining will need to be carried forward in 2016 to fund assets and infrastructure for several capital projects which includes Phase III of the AMF Recommissioning Project, Carbondale Park and Ride Expansion Project, and Rubey Park Transit Center Renovation.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**  
**“PRESENTATION/ACTION ITEM” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 6. E.**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 13, 2015
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Alternative Means of Engaging the Public in RFTA Board Meetings
<b>Presented By:</b>	Dan Blankenship, CEO
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Discuss and provide direction to staff.
<b>POLICY #:</b>	<b>4.5: Board Members’ Code of Conduct</b>
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At the July 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, the RFTA Board voted to direct staff to explore alternative means of involving the public in RFTA Board meetings.</li> <li>2. Staff issued a Request for Information (RFI) to vendors that supply audio/video systems that can provide live website streaming and/or recordings of Board meetings.</li> <li>3. Staff received 4 responses to the RFI with Granicus-type systems that range in cost from \$200 - \$1,000 per month for software and support services, and from \$7,000 - \$15,000 for hardware. Staff continues to evaluate the merits of the proposals received and likely will make a recommendation during the 2016 budget development process. Staff believes that live website streaming of Board meetings would be one of the best ways to make Board meetings accessible to the public. Also, this approach would significantly reduce the amount of time spent by staff to produce Minutes of the Board meetings.</li> <li>4. Other ideas for engaging the public are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Quarterly or semi-annual evening Board meetings beginning in 2016.</li> <li>b. Periodic Mobile Town Hall-style meetings on buses to gather input directly from passengers.</li> <li>c. Solicit passenger feedback through on-board Survey Monkey polling.</li> <li>d. Board members participate in Passenger Appreciation Day events at BRT stations in their communities.</li> <li>e. Conduct annual or semi-annual meet and greet events and invite the public to attend.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Staff would like to hear the Board’s ideas about methods to enhance public participation and engagement in RFTA Board meetings and RFTA issues.</li> </ol>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	Board Members’ Code of Conduct Policy 4.5.6 states, “Board members and/or alternates are expected to attend Board meetings. If a jurisdiction has no representation (regular or alternate) for more than two (2) of the Board’s regularly scheduled meetings in any fiscal year, this will constitute notification to the appointing authority of RFTA’s request for more active participation.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Audio/Video and live-streaming hardware could have an initial cost of \$7,000 - \$15,000 depending upon the system, and monthly fees could range from \$200 to \$1,000 per month. If website live-streaming of RFTA Board meetings is desired, staff will incorporate the costs into the 2016 budget.
<b>Attachments:</b>	No.

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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 13, 2015
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	RFTA Parking Management Plan Update
<b>Presented By:</b>	Mike Hermes, Director of Facilities
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Staff recommends Option A, below.
<b>Policy #:</b>	<b>2.4.10: Asset Protection</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	Develop/Complete Long-Term Capital Replacement Plan
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Effective management of parking at RFTA park &amp; ride facilities could help to reduce demand for parking.</li> <li>2. People who use the RFTA park &amp; ride facilities for ride-sharing and overnight parking, or the customers of adjacent businesses, who use RFTA parking spaces, reduce the availability of parking spaces for RFTA transit users.</li> <li>3. People who park in restricted areas create safety and other issues that are a cause for concern to RFTA and other users of park and ride facilities.</li> <li>4. The RFTA Board has directed staff to develop a Parking Management Plan.</li> <li>5. Staff has continued to perform due diligence regarding the Parking Management Plan.</li> <li>6. Staff has developed parking rules and signage.</li> <li>7. The cost of signs for all RFTA park &amp; ride facilities is approximately \$22,000, if installed by RFTA or about \$75,000 if installed by a contractor</li> <li>8. 3<sup>rd</sup>-party parking enforcement could cost \$75,000 to \$100,000 per year or more depending upon the level of enforcement desired/required.</li> <li>9. Given the initial and ongoing costs of this program, staff would like Board input before moving forward.</li> <li>10. Options are as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Install signs at all park &amp; ride lots using Facilities staff and use selective enforcement (i.e. when staff observes someone violating rules, call for the tow service).</li> <li>B. Move forward with full implementation if adequate funding exists in the 2016 budget.</li> <li>C. Postpone implementation of the program indefinitely.</li> </ol> </li> <li>11. Staff recommends Option A.</li> </ol>
<b>Background Info:</b>	See Core Issues, above.
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	Board Asset Protection Policy 2.4.10 states, “The CEO shall not endanger RFTA’s public image or credibility or its ability to accomplish its Ends.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Yes, There could be a fiscal impact on the 2015 and 2016 budgets and potentially future RFTA budgets depending on how robust a parking enforcement program the Board wishes to implement.
<b>Attachments:</b>	No

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

**CEO REPORT**

**TO:** RFTA Board of Directors  
**FROM:** Dan Blankenship, CEO  
**DATE:** August 13, 2015

**CDOT/Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Site Visit:** CDOT administers and awards FTA grant funds for rural transit systems. Every three years, the FTA performs a Triennial Review of CDOT compliance with FTA regulations and the degree to which CDOT’s grantees, such as RFTA, are also complying with Federal regulations. To this end, RFTA was one of two rural transit agencies selected for a Site Visit, which was conducted on August 6<sup>th</sup>. RFTA was requested to supply a variety of documentation to verify its compliance with FTA regulations and to answer questions posed by FTA contractors and representatives of Region VIII FTA and CDOT during the Site Visit. Overall, staff believes the Site Visit went well and expects that it will be notified in the not too distant future if FTA, CDOT, or the contractors have any additional questions or recommended remedial action.

**RFTA Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance Program (EMIAP) Grant for Phase I of the GMF Expansion Project:** On August 6<sup>th</sup>, RFTA received disappointing news from the Department of Local Affairs (DOLA) that its application for \$1.5 million in EMIAP grant funding had not been approved. Staff is attempting to follow up with DOLA to determine why its application was not deemed sufficiently competitive for this funding, so that it can potentially modify its applications in the future. Staff was hoping that the EMIAP grant would help fund the construction expanded parking for 20 buses, and enable RFTA to stage more vehicles for the Grand Avenue Bridge closure transit mitigation that is planned for the summer/fall of 2017. This setback will require staff to identify other revenue sources for this critically needed project. In addition, staff has resubmitted its \$1.5 million EMIAP grant request for DOLA’s fall funding cycle.

**June 2015 Year-to-Date Ridership Report**

Roaring Fork Transportation Authority System-Wide Ridership Comparison Report				
Service	Jun-14 YTD	Jun-15 YTD	# Variance	% Variance
City of Aspen	595,709	552,936	(42,773)	-7.18%
RF Valley Commuter	1,375,924	1,464,675	88,751	6.45%
Grand Hogback	41,585	43,719	2,134	5.13%
Aspen Skiing Company	449,187	441,194	(7,993)	-1.78%
Ride Glenwood Springs	106,669	99,844	(6,825)	-6.40%
X-games/Charter	15,745	23,165	7,420	47.13%
Senior Van	2,099	1,987	(112)	-5.34%
MAA Burlingame	10,089	5,235	(4,854)	-48.11%
Maroon Bells	14,570	20,945	6,375	43.75%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,611,577</b>	<b>2,653,700</b>	<b>42,123</b>	<b>1.61%</b>
Subset of Roaring Fork Valley Commuter Service with BRT in 2015				
Service	YTD June 2014	YTD June 2015	Dif +/-	% Dif +/-
Highway 82 Corridor Local/Express	542,255	605,899	63,644	12%
BRT	401,984	420,485	18,501	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>944,239</b>	<b>1,026,384</b>	<b>82,145</b>	<b>9%</b>

**Planning Department Update – David Johnson, Director of Planning**

The “8-13-2015 Planning Department Update.pdf” can be found in the August 2015 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the Board Agenda packet.

**Finance Department Update – Michael Yang, Director of Finance**

2015 Budget Year				
General Fund				
	June YTD			
	Actual	Budget	% Var.	Annual Budget
<b>Revenues</b>				
Sales tax (1)	\$ 7,916,639	\$ 7,163,584	10.5%	\$ 18,934,000
Grants	\$ 723,435	\$ 699,953	3.4%	\$ 5,937,550
Fares (2)	\$ 2,027,560	\$ 2,258,863	-10.2%	\$ 4,642,000
Other govt contributions	\$ 654,158	\$ 654,158	0.0%	\$ 5,877,388
Other income	\$ 251,654	\$ 247,399	1.7%	\$ 413,000
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 11,573,446</b>	<b>\$ 11,023,956</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>\$ 35,803,938</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Fuel (3)	\$ 979,508	\$ 1,096,658	-10.7%	\$ 1,949,623
Transit	\$ 9,481,138	\$ 9,517,943	-0.4%	\$ 18,219,320
Trails & Corridor Mgmt	\$ 130,085	\$ 116,622	11.5%	\$ 398,960
Capital	\$ 2,682,155	\$ 2,672,650	0.4%	\$ 12,396,412
Debt service	\$ 824,967	\$ 824,966	0.0%	\$ 2,383,459
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 14,097,854</b>	<b>\$ 14,228,839</b>	<b>-0.9%</b>	<b>\$ 35,347,774</b>
<b>Other Financing Sources/Uses</b>				
Other financing sources	\$ 1,417,651	\$ 1,417,651	0.0%	\$ 1,670,374
Other financing uses	\$ (1,183,211)	\$ (1,183,211)	0.0%	\$ (2,640,032)
<b>Total Other Financing Sources/Uses</b>	<b>\$ 234,440</b>	<b>\$ 234,440</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>\$ (969,658)</b>
<b>Change in Fund Balance (4)</b>	<b>\$ (2,289,968)</b>	<b>\$ (2,970,443)</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>\$ (513,494)</b>

(1) Sales tax is budgeted and received two months in arrears (i.e. April revenues are received in June). Through April, all member jurisdictions are tracking at or above budget.

(2) Through June, fare revenue is down approx. 11% compared to the prior year. This decrease is being monitored and appears to be attributable to the timing of bulk pass orders by outlets and businesses, timing of Maroon Bells bus tickets, and the increased popularity of the \$5 stored value card transit pass. The chart below provides a June YTD 2014/2015 comparison of actual fare revenues and ridership on RFTA fare services:

Fare Revenue:	June 14 YTD	June 15 YTD	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Regional Fares	\$ 2,108,612	\$ 1,963,460	\$ (145,152)	-7%
Other Service/Maroon Bells	\$ 143,857	\$ 50,016	\$ (93,841)	-65%
Advertising	\$ 18,731	\$ 14,084	\$ (4,647)	-25%
<b>Total Fare Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 2,271,200</b>	<b>\$ 2,027,560</b>	<b>\$ (243,640)</b>	<b>-11%</b>
Ridership on RFTA Fare Services:	June 14 YTD	June 15 YTD	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Highway 82 (Local & Express)	542,255	605,899	63,644	12%
BRT	401,984	420,485	18,501	5%
SM-DV	51,053	44,255	(6,798)	-13%
Maroon Bells	14,570	20,945	6,375	44%
Grand Hogback	41,585	43,719	2,134	5%
<b>Total Ridership on RFTA Fare Services</b>	<b>1,051,447</b>	<b>1,135,303</b>	<b>83,856</b>	<b>8%</b>
Avg. Fare/Ride	\$ 2.03	\$ 1.76	\$ (0.27)	-13%
Avg. Fare/Ride MB	\$ 9.87	\$ 2.39	\$ (7.49)	-76%



(3) Fuel appears to be under budget thus far and staff will continue to monitor this situation.

(4) Over the course of the year, there are times when RFTA operates in a deficit; however at this time, we are projecting that we will end the year within the budgeted deficit. Please note that the Board's approval of Resolution 2015-03 included a bus replacement purchase which will use approx. \$227,000 of insurance recoveries currently residing in fund balance to fund a portion of the purchase and Resolution 2015-09 includes a one-time cash purchase portion of the CEC solar array investment for approx. \$196,000

RFTA System-Wide Transit Service Mileage and Hours Report								
Transit Service	Mileage June 2015 YTD				Hours June 2015 YTD			
	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.
RF Valley Commuter	1,986,076	1,948,915	37,161	1.9%	88,682	88,845	(163)	-0.2%
City of Aspen	251,655	259,217	(7,562)	-2.9%	27,934	28,091	(157)	-0.6%
Aspen Skiing Company	204,679	211,094	(6,415)	-3.0%	14,297	14,154	143	1.0%
Ride Glenwood Springs	62,318	59,690	2,628	4.4%	4,835	4,825	10	0.2%
Grand Hogback	107,833	108,343	(510)	-0.5%	4,133	4,172	(39)	-0.9%
MAA/Burlingame	2,292	6,037	(3,745)	-62.0%	197	396	(199)	-50.3%
Maroon Bells	8,022	7,850	172	2.2%	648	699	(51)	-7.3%
Specials/Charter	3,825	4,594	(769)	-16.7%	600	505	95	18.8%
Senior Van	9,368	10,338	(970)	-9.4%	914	922	(8)	-0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,636,068</b>	<b>2,616,078</b>	<b>19,990</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>142,240</b>	<b>142,609</b>	<b>(369)</b>	<b>-0.3%</b>

### 2016 RFTA Annual Budget – Preliminary Schedule

2016 Annual Budget Preliminary Schedule		
Date	Activity	Status
8/13/2015	Discussion/Direction/Action: Preliminary planning initiatives, assumptions and issues.	On schedule
9/10/2015	Presentation/Direction/Action: 1 <sup>st</sup> draft budget presentation	On schedule
10/8/2015	Presentation/Direction/Action: 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft budget presentation	On schedule
11/12/2015	Public Hearing: Final budget presentation and adoption	On schedule

### Facilities & Trails Update – Mike Hermes, Director of Facilities & Trails

Facilities and Bus Stop Maintenance August 13, 2015

#### Capital Projects Update

**Rubey Park Renovation Project:** After several months of preparation, demolition and civil work, the new Rubey Park Transit Center is beginning to rise above the foundations and the progress is becoming much more visible. During the week of July 27<sup>th</sup>, the new drive lanes behind the station were poured and the steel for the bathroom building was delivered and was erected. In the coming weeks, bus traffic will begin using the new drive lanes and the steel for the customer waiting area and the administrative office will be delivered and erected. Work at the site will be more concentrated in the building area and the construction impacts on traffic in the vicinity and on the public will begin to lessen. As of this report the project is generally on time and on budget.

**AMF Phase 3- Indoor Bus Storage:** The AMF indoor bus expansion project is moving forward and the contract with FCI has been signed and the Notice to Proceed has been issued. A preconstruction meeting with the contractor and all the project's stakeholders was held on July 29<sup>th</sup>. FCI will begin staging at the AMF for the project the first week of August. This fall, the work will mainly consist of relocating deep utilities, constructing the drive lanes from Highway 82 into the AMF and preparing for the balance of the construction next spring.

**West Glenwood Park and Ride Project:** The plan set for the West Glenwood Spring Park and Ride project continues to move forward and staff expects the FOR (30%) plans to be issued by the end of August.

**GMF Expansion Project:** Staff continues to submit grant applications to any grant program that could potentially fund any phase of this project. As of this report, there have not been any grant announcements for the submittals. The RFQ for a design build team for the project is being developed and staff expects the RFQ to go to ad by the end of August.

**Carbondale Park and Ride:** Staff has received all of the required approvals for the park and ride expansion project and is now awaiting the final concurrence and approval letter from CDOT. Staff cannot issue a Notice to Proceed to the contractor until this letter has been received from CDOT. There is a problem with the financial software CDOT uses to track grants and, until this glitch can be overcome and the project entered into the CDOT system, CDOT staff cannot send RFTA the final concurrence letter. The project is also waiting on a building permit from the Town of Carbondale. RFTA staff has submitted the building permit application to the Town and is awaiting the Town staff's comments. Securing the building permit is generally the responsibility of the contractor, but because of the delays with CDOT approvals, RFTA staff has moved this process forward to save time once RFTA issues a Notice to Proceed to the contractor.

**New Castle Park and Ride:** Background on this project from the July board report:  
*RFTA staff was successful in obtaining a one year extension of the \$200,000 dollars grant from the GCFLMD Board and now RFTA has until October 15 of 2016 to expend those funds. Staff is in the process of submitting a request to CDOT to advance \$600,000 in FASTER funding they have committed to the project from FY 2017 to FY 2016. If staff is successful in this request, it will begin to work with CDOT to obtain a grant agreement and advance the project approval process concurrently, with the goal of having the project approved and ready to bid by the 2016 February/March time frame. There is a reasonable chance that CDOT will either not be able to reprogram the FASTER grant funds or that staff will not be able to obtain and execute a grant agreement and receive the necessary approvals from CDOT in time for RFTA to bid and construct the park and ride in 2016. Should either of these events occur then project will either need to be postponed until 2017 or an alternative source of funds must be identified to construct the project. If the project cannot be completed by mid-October 2016, the GCFMLD grant funds will expire.*

**August Update:** On July 24th RFTA staff submitted to request to CDOT to move the funds that have been tentatively awarded to RFTA for the New Castle Park and Ride from CDOT FY2017 to CDOT FY2016. The reply from CDOT was less than encouraging. Since the grant awards for FY2017 will not be officially announced until February of 2016, CDOT will be unable to even begin to consider RFTA's requests until after that date. That only leaves 8 months before the GCFLMD grant expires on October 15, 2016 for the following tasks to occur:

- CDOT must determine if there are unused 2016 FASTER funds that could be released for the New Castle PNR project and make this adjustment in their 2016 budget.
- CDOT and RFTA must execute a grant agreement.
- RFTA must submit the required information to CDOT for all the required clearances. CDOT staff must review this documentation, concur that the project has met all of the requirements, and write the final letter of authorization to go to ad.

- RFTA must issue a RFP for the project, receive bids, and award the contract. By the time RFTA receives concurrence to go to bid it will be late spring and outside of the prime bidding window for bidding projects. This means the risk of receiving bids that are outside of the acceptable budgetary range will be greater.
- The contractor must complete the project before October 15, 2016 in order to satisfy the requirements of the GCFMLD grant that will expire on that date.

Staff will continue to work with CDOT to try and push the project through the CDOT process faster and if necessary ask the GCFMLD for another extension of the grant funds to 2017. At the same time staff will be discussing contingency plans for the project and explore other avenues to fund and complete the project.

### **Facilities Updates**

#### **Glenwood Maintenance Facility:**

Glenwood Maintenance Facility (GMF):

- There are no significant items to report.

#### **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 & Ride Lots:**

- There are no significant items to report.

#### **Park and Ride Rules Signage:**

Please refer to the August agenda summary for an update on this topic.

## FACILITIES, RAIL CORRIDOR & TRAIL UPDATE – Angela Henderson

### **RFTA Employee Housing**

- The Main Street apartment complex in Carbondale, a 5 unit complex with 7 beds, is currently at **100%** occupancy.
- The Parker House apartment complex in Carbondale, a 15 unit complex with 24 beds unit, is currently at **93%** occupancy.
- RFTA's allotment of long-term housing at Burlingame in Aspen, consisting of four one-bedroom units, is currently at **100%** occupancy.
- RFTA Permanent employee housing is currently at **95%**.
- RFTA will begin renting 10 seasonal 2 bedroom units at the Burlingame apartment complex on September 1, 2015.
- RFTA has also secured 10 additional 2 bedroom seasonal units at the Burlingame apartment complex, 5 beginning November 1<sup>st</sup> and 5 beginning December 1<sup>st</sup>. RFTA will be able to release the units back to Burlingame for a nominal fee in the event that the units aren't needed for the winter season as long as they are released prior to each of the lease start dates.

### **RFTA Railroad Corridor**

**Right-of-Way Land Management Project:** Along with its legal and engineering consultants, RFTA staff is working on completing the following tasks in 2015:

- An update to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. The first document to be updated is the Access Control Plan. This is in process and an update on this process will be provided to the Board monthly (see separate agenda item)
- Once the draft versions of ACP and DG guidelines are finalized and approved by the RFTA Board then staff will send out both documents to GOCO, with an updated list of crossings any potential crossings to secure GOCO's approval of the ACP, DG and list of crossings
- With the final version of the ACP accepted by the RFTA Board of Directors, staff will work with the attorneys to Review and update the existing templates & formats that RFTA is using for licensing in the Rail Corridor
- The final version of the ACP and DG will also allow staff to finalize a process and fee structure for RFTA that will enable it to have railroad and legal experts review, assess and report on proposed development impacts along the corridor along with recommendations regarding potential mitigation of the impacts that RFTA can provide to permitting jurisdictions
- Once the process for the ACP is complete and the forms and review process has been finalized, staff will begin updating the rest of the Comprehensive Plan, the Recreational Trails Plan and the Executive Summary documents to bring back to the RFTA Board for review and direction
- Staff continues working on issues related to the Federal Grant Right-of-Way areas identified up and down the Railroad Corridor and will provide updates as necessary (*Ongoing*);
- Staff has received an appraisal for the UPRR easement in the WYE area. Staff will be meeting with the City to discuss the appraisal, next steps and to seek reimbursement from the City of Glenwood Springs for a portion of the appraisal costs, up to a maximum of \$10,000 (*Complete*);
- **River Edge Colorado** (*Sanders Ranch/Bair Chase/River Bend/Cattle Creek development*) Crossing Review and Coordination. The developer is proposing new road crossing locations as part of their application to Garfield County and the County is in the process of reviewing the developer's latest submittal. The County has been seeking clarification on some of the developer's assumptions and staff has been responding accordingly. The developer has requested that RFTA review an updated traffic study and provide a response for an at-grade pedestrian crossing at the same location as the at-grade road crossing. Staff has advised the developers' representative that we will review the traffic study as soon as they sign an engineering agreement that outlines the terms for reimbursement to RFTA for the costs associated with the review. To date the developer hasn't provided this agreement. To refresh the RFTA Boards memory, the current agreements for this parcel call for a grade-separated trail crossing, not an at-grade pedestrian crossing (*Ongoing*);
- **South Bridge** Crossing Review and Coordination – The City and CDOT continue to work through all elements related to the South Bridge updated design. The City provided a brief update at the last ACP work Group meeting on July 29<sup>th</sup> and staff will be meeting with the City staff sometime in the next few weeks to get a detailed update and determine next steps for this very important project (*Ongoing*);
- **8<sup>th</sup> Street Crossing Project by CDOT and the City of Glenwood Springs**– This project is critical to CDOT for use as a detour during the Grand Avenue bridge replacement project and is important to the City as a permanent crossing. CDOT has submitted an application to the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). RFTA's response to the application is due to the CPUC by August 21, 2015. We are reviewing the application and will be reaching out to CDOT for clarification on a couple of issues regarding the application (*Ongoing*);

- **Industry Way, Carbondale** – This project is on hold while the ACP Work Group works through updates to the ACP and DG (*On Hold*);
- **2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Carbondale** – This is a fairly new project and this is just an FYI. This is close to the Carbondale Town Hall and the current crossing serves a few private homes. There is a senior housing facility proposed in this vicinity which means that the use at this crossing will be changing. The Town of Carbondale is in the process of setting up a meeting with RFTA staff to discuss the project and the current crossing. We will keep the Board updated (*Ongoing*);
- **TCI Lane Bridge Project** – The TCI Lane Ranch subdivision (across from the wildlife section of the Rio Grande corridor), proposed to build a bridge across the Roaring Fork River to tie to the Rio Grande Trail back in April 2008. The RFTA Board gave preliminary approval for this bridge to be constructed and asked the developer to bring the bridge design back for a final approval. The design was completed in 2011 and the bridge was brought back to the February 10, 2011 meeting board meeting for final approval. The RFTA Board asked for some additional information and the developer brought the additional information back to the March 10, 2011 meeting. The bridge projected was voted down by the RFTA Board but the developer asked for the opportunity to come back to the Board for reconsideration at a later date. The RFTA Board did not object to this request. The developer would like to revisit this project sometime in the near future. Staff will provide an update on this project once an update is available (*Ongoing*).

### **Rio Grande Trail Update**

- Staff is in the middle of the weed season. Staff has been mechanically removing weeds. This is consuming most of staff's time.
- Staff is re-working the Rio Grande Trail Map with the Marketing Dept.
- Staff is coordinating with CCAH to discuss art in the corridor and overall beautification through Carbondale.
- Staff is actively working to beautify the corridor through Carbondale:
  - Staff will begin to install a single track/dirt trail adjacent to the paved surface in Carbondale, where space allows. Impact will be very minimal to regular trail use.
    - A professional trail builder is providing input and will assist with construction
    - Staff is seeking advice from the Town of Eagle it is somewhat the pioneer of this idea. Eagle's project is called Singletrack Sidewalks and aims to provide youth (and adults) an alternative way to get around town and to and from school.  
<http://www.outsideonline.com/1930586/connecting-town-singletrack-sidewalks>
    - The local biking community is excited about this addition to the RGT corridor. No jumps will be built and it will rideable for all skill levels.
    - Local youth will be asked to participate.
  - Staff recently purchased 156 truckloads of dirt for the corridor through Carbondale.
    - Staff would like to undergo a fundraising campaign to continue the project.
      - We need money for picnic areas, art installations, native landscapes, and creating a play area for youth
- Staff has been participating in the RFTA Regional Bike, Pedestrian, and Transit Access Plan.
- Staff has been clearing sight lines along the trail by removing tree limbs and brush.