

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

TIME: 8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m., Thursday, June 11, 2015

USUAL LOCATION: *Town Hall (Room 2), 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	Approval of <u>Minutes</u>: RFTA Board Meeting, May14, 2015, page 3		Approve	8:31 a.m.
3	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	8:32 a.m.
4	Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:	4.3.3.C	Comments	8:35 a.m.
5	Consent Agenda:	2.8.9	Approve	8:36 a.m.
	A. CDOT-RFTA <u>Bustang</u> Access Agreement – Mike Hermes, Director of Facilities, page 10			
	B. <u>Resolution 2015-10</u> : Resolution Supporting the Commitment of \$1.5 Million as RFTA's Local Match for a Department of Local Affairs' (DOLA) Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance Program (EMIAP) Grant to Construct Phase 1 of the Glenwood Springs Maintenance Facility Renovation and Expansion Project ("GMF PROJECT") – Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 11			
	C. Proposed <u>Maroon</u> Bells Bus Service Increase – Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 15			
6	Information/Updates:			
	A. <u>CEO</u> Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO, page 16	2.8.6	FYI	8:55 a.m.
7	Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:			
	To Be Determined at June 11, 2015 Meeting	4.3	Meeting Planning	8:57 a.m.
8	Next Meeting: 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., July 9, 2015 at Carbondale Town Hall.	4.3	Meeting Planning	8:58 a.m.
9	Adjournment:		Adjourn	8:59 a.m.
10	RFTA Board of Directors Strategic Retreat: 9:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.			9:00 a.m.

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
May 14, 2015**

Board Members Present:

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

Voting Alternates Present:

Dwayne Romero, (City of Aspen);

Non-Voting Alternates Present:

George Newman (Pitkin County); Patrick Stuckey (Town of New Castle); John Hoffmann (Town of Carbondale).

Staff Present:

Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer (CEO); Paul Taddune, General Counsel; Edna Adeh, Board Secretary; Mike Hermes, Angela Kincade, Dina Farnell, Amy Burdick, Facilities & Trails Department; Barbara Hauptli, Procurement Department; Michael Yang Finance Department; Kenny Osier, Maintenance Department; David Johnson, Jason White, Planning Department.

Visitors Present:

Mike Malone and Amy Thompson, Clean Energy Collective (CEC); John Kruger, City of Aspen; Collin Szewczyk, Reporter (Aspen Daily News); Terry Partch, City of Glenwood Springs; Mark Chain, Dave Sturges, Jess Graber, Citizens; Dale Will, Pitkin County.

Agenda

1. Roll Call:

Stacey Bernot, Chair, declared a quorum to be present (6 member jurisdictions present) and the meeting began at 8:34 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. Two Matters: 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: (1) Pending litigation; and (2) pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402 4(a) The Purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer, or sale of any real personal, or other property interests.**

Jacque Whitsitt 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 8:36 a.m.

RFTA staff present at the Executive Session included: Dan Blankenship, Edna Adeh, Mike Hermes, and Paul Taddune.

Kathy Chandler Henry (Eagle County) arrived at 8:39 a.m. increasing the number of jurisdictions present to seven.

Jacque Whitsitt 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 9:10 a.m.

3. Approval of Minutes:

Dwayne Romero moved to approve the minutes of the March 12, 2015 Board Meeting and Kathy Chandler Henry seconded the motion. Jacque Whitsitt abstained from voting since she was not present at the previous Board Meeting. The Board maintained its quorum with 6 member jurisdictions present to vote. 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 comment(s) from the public.

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.

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

Bernot reminded the Board members of another COO potential candidate meet and greet sessions on May 15th in the RFTA offices on 1340 Main Street in Carbondale.

6. Consent Agenda:

A. Renewal of CDOT Lease of Brush Creek Park & Ride Facility – Dan Blankenship, CEO

Blankenship reported that RFTA has not received any specific communication from CDOT about whether the joint Aspen-RFTA lease on the Brush Creek transit station and park & ride would need to include RFTA. RFTA has a 30-year lease with CDOT for all BRT facilities, bus stops, and park & rides in the Highway 82 corridor, so it may not be necessary to include RFTA on the joint City-RFTA lease anymore. However, Blankenship recommended taking the extra step of Board authorization for the CEO's approval, even though it may not be necessary.

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

7. Presentation/Action Items:

A. Draft Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan (ACP) Update Presentation – Angela Kincade, Assistant Director, Project Management and Facilities Operations.

Kincade reported that the 120-day extended comment period for the ACP officially closed on Saturday, May 9th. RFTA hosted 8 open houses in Aspen, Carbondale, and Glenwood Springs, which were advertised through local newspapers, the RFTA web-site, Twitter, Facebook, newsletters, and direct mail to residents. About 46 people attended the open houses. RFTA received approximately 80 comments. RFTA will address the comments and send them out to each of the Jurisdictions for review. RFTA will provide a brief update at the Board Meeting next month, if time is available.

On May 13th, one day prior to the Board meeting, RFTA scheduled an ACP work group session in Carbondale with staffs from the local jurisdictions, and RFTA intends to schedule more in the future. Blankenship's draft response to City of Glenwood Springs correspondence is included in the Board packet.

Bernot suggested extending the period between publishing public comments and adopting the plan. She felt that the May 13th work session was positive and productive, but wished to seek an alternate legal opinion on access control. Gamba suggested that the region can achieve the railbanking goals without adopting such as stringent plan, and requested another engineering opinion that may show more practicality in preserving rail-banking.

Owsley stated that the Board is asking RFTA to compete against itself and that the jurisdictions objecting to the current legal and engineering opinion might want to hire their own legal and engineering experts, if they wish.

Whitsitt said that the STB would decide whether or not RFTA had maintained railbanking, and she would like the STB's opinion, as opposed to another attorney's assessment.

Bernot commented that she will not sign off on Charles Montagne's opinion and that we need to seek another way to preserve the status of rail-banking, or maintain the access control policies set forth in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed ACP standards will impose great financial burdens on the Town of Carbondale.

Gamba stated that City of Glenwood Springs hired an STB expert who rendered a different opinion. Gamba felt that Montagne was very disrespectful to the Board at the last meeting. Bob Gordon expressed similar sentiments. Gamba said that the City of Glenwood does not concur with Mr. Montagne's opinion. He suggested that the Board obtain a legal opinion independent of RFTA's current Railbanking attorney and of any individual municipality's. He supports an updated ACP, and the preservation of the current bike and future rail corridor, but not a plan that will impose such financial burdens on the City of Glenwood Springs.

Taddune responded that, in his opinion, the access issues are discrete and can be solved on a case-by-case basis. RFTA attempted to arrange a meeting between Mr. Montagne, Mr. Eric Hockey (Counsel hired by Glenwood Springs), and staff from RFTA, Glenwood Springs and Carbondale to discuss the issue and come to a resolution. RFTA has not received a response as of yet regarding such a meeting. It may also require a declaratory opinion from the STB. Taddune emphasized that in his opinion public crossings should be distinguished from private crossings, and all entities should work collaboratively to find solutions. RFTA is committed to collaborating with Glenwood Springs.

Newman supported the suggestion of discussion and collaboration between the two attorneys, which may culminate in a proposed solution that they can offer to the STB for its opinion. Bernot concurred.

Gamba asked what the process would be if Glenwood Springs approaches the STB. Taddune said that RFTA would need to respond to the proposal put before the STB, and it could be an adversarial process. Taddune also noted that the STB Board is concerned about the national impact of its decisions on railbanking.

Blankenship stated that the issue is not so much about whether RFTA or the local jurisdictions will have to pay to preserve the ability to reactivate rail; it's about whether or not the corridor is deemed to be severed if crossings are constructed in a manner that won't preclude the ability to reactivate freight rail service. In the case of a private crossing, the owner can be required to either remove the crossing or upgrade it; although it is unlikely that RFTA would eliminate someone's private access. Public crossings are more complicated. It is not realistic to request jurisdictions to pay to upgrade crossings if rail is re-activated, or to create crossings where there is an agreement to upgrade the crossings in the future, since current Boards and Councils can't commit future Boards and Councils to honor such agreements. Lacking a binding commitment, however, to upgrade the crossings if freight rail is reactivated, adjacent land owners may assert to the STB that the corridor has been severed. The decisions we make regarding the approval of public crossings may be based on how much risk we are willing to take. There is complete willingness on RFTA's part to make public crossings workable for its constituent governments, but we need to define the risks and determine what level of risk everyone can live with. If we can get a declaratory judgement from the STB, then we'll need to work with the STB's decision, whatever it might be.

Whitsitt commented that citizens might be willing to support more public funding in order to construct public crossings according to the proposed ACP standards. The economic value of this trail is irreplaceable, so RFTA needs to address all of these issues, including funding.

Blankenship stated RFTA is willing to apply for grants or contribute project management services to help reduce the economic burden on public crossing sponsors.

Owsley suggested having a motion directing Mr. Montagne, Mr. Hockey and staff to seek guidance from the STB. Gamba supported the motion, adding that he wishes to make sure that the corridor is preserved for a trail now and possibly a light rail transit system in the future, but not for freight rail.

Owsley responded that freight rail created Aspen, and he did not wish to preclude anything.

Owsley made a motion to direct RFTA, City of Glenwood Springs and Town of Carbondale staff and Counsel to develop options to preserve the rail right-of-way and to seek Surface Transportation Board's (STB) input. Dwayne Romero seconded the motion.

Kathy Chandler Henry asked if there is a time limit on this motion. Dan Blankenship stated there is no time limit to it as long as we can make progress in resolving the issues and in adopting the ACP.

The motion passed unanimously.

The Board took a short break from 10:16 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

B. Final Board Approval of Solar Array Acquisition – Dan Blankenship, CEO

Blankenship introduced Amy Thompson and Mike Malone of CEC and Jason White of RFTA, to discuss RFTA's proposed purchase of solar panels in CEC's solar array. At the last meeting the Board adopted a resolution authorizing the CEO and General Counsel of RFTA to continue to negotiate and finalize the Lease/Purchase agreement for the acquisition of the solar array.

Although staff is recommending proceeding with this process, Blankenship wished to provide two updates. First, RFTA originally assumed that contract renewal with Holy Cross Energy (HCE) at the end of 20 years would reflect essentially the same terms in terms of the energy credits provided; however it is likely that HCE would renegotiate the power purchase terms to a lower rate. CEC maintains that in 25 years, it needs to make at least 6.5 cents per kWh from the electricity produced from the panels it owns in the array in order to defray the property lease and maintenance expenses connected with the array. According to CEC and RFTA forecasts, HCE energy credits in 25 years should (conservatively) exceed \$0.065/kWh. Language is being included in the agreement between RFTA and CEC that commits CEC to renewing the site lease after 25 years as long as the price it can sell its electricity for is \$0.065 per kWh or greater.

On a more positive note, HCE believes that the array will generate 10% more electricity than originally estimated, and therefore has recommended that RFTA reduce the capacity of its array by approximately 10%, from 575 kW to 507 kW, a savings on the purchase of approximately \$218,912, and a savings of \$291,341 on debt service over the 20-year term of the lease/purchase agreement. If the lease has to go taxable, RFTA will save an estimated \$56,000 on electricity compared to what RFTA would normally pay over 20 years. RFTA staff recommends moving forward with the purchase and seeks the Board's approval.

Bernot concurred with that decision.

Whitsitt made a motion to approve the Solar Array Acquisition and Chandler Henry seconded the motion.

Discussion: Romero supported the motion, citing the predominately conservative estimates.

The motion was unanimously approved.

C. Discussion Regarding Circulators versus Park & Ride Facilities – David Johnson, Director of Planning

Bernot commented she was not able to attend the April 2015 Carbondale Board of Trustees meeting, where the Carbondale Trustees and RFTA staff discussed transit and parking options in Carbondale. She was informed that RFTA staff (David Johnson and Jason White) may have been criticized too harshly by the Town Council, but she was pleased that the conversations are taking place and she apologized to RFTA staff for any hard feelings.

David Johnson said the purposed of today's discussion is to address accessibility to BRT stations (and general mobility) through local transit expansion and expansion of park and rides. He referred to the cost estimate chart in the Board packet on page 28.

Bernot stated that ridership has increased on the circulator in Carbondale, which should be considered an indicator of success. She suggested examining funding sources or options besides tax increases to enhance or expand services. In Carbondale, transit is an amenity for workers, visitors and seniors, and future options should address the needs of those groups, especially seniors. She hoped that the circulator could be adjusted to be more accessible to the seniors and to the schools. She is not in favor of creating more park & rides, or of expanding routes in a manner that would increase costs. Hoffmann commented that the circulator in Carbondale is not a circulator but a shuttle, and that bicycling to the station is faster than taking the shuttle. He also added that we should consider smaller vans for those routes.

Johnson said that the chart on page 28 indicates the estimated operating cost for the transit options, assuming RFTA operates the services. Costs would be different if the towns chose to

operate on their own or through a contractor. Blankenship added that it would still be costly if the towns want to operate on their own, and that most communities prefer to contract with RFTA. Romero concurred, and added that it will cost the jurisdictions more to operate themselves. Bernot supported the idea of comparing the cost of Snowmass Village service with RFTA.

Blankenship stated that circulator systems are intended to connect to the regional system and to provide mobility within the community. The Town of Basalt is more challenging than Town of Carbondale because it is a larger area, extending to El Jebel. Blankenship advocated a very basic system, and expanding if feasible. The circulator could streamline the travel time of the regional buses, which could reduce RFTA's operating costs slightly. City of Aspen's transit service is fairly expensive because of the extent and frequency of the system. The current circulator system in Carbondale, he added, is one of the most productive local routes in the region.

Bernot supported the idea of a pilot program in Basalt. Whitsitt commented that this is more a concern for Carbondale than Basalt and would rather see resources spent in Carbondale.

Chandler Henry suggested that policy makers and land use planners consider transit impact fees, and be mindful of future impacts on transportation, such as housing.

Bernot and Romero agreed that we should assess existing transit impact fee models. Gamba expressed support for modifying routes in Carbondale while keeping operating costs constant. Glenwood Springs, he said, has to work with RFTA in modifying and coordinating local and regional routes to minimize duplication.

Public comment:

Sundee Reef of Carbondale requested that the circulator bus access the senior housing, and suggested using smaller buses or vans. Gamba said that he has been discussing with Glenwood Springs' staff the possibility of switching to smaller vehicles, and would be interested in the cost implications.

Blankenship said RFTA could work with Town of Carbondale staff to consider modifications to the existing routes that provide more access without increasing operating costs. He added that public is asking for increased frequency to the BRT station. Blankenship also said that RFTA had received a grant in 2015 for the purchase of a smaller van-type vehicle for the Carbondale Circulator.

Bernot appreciated RFTA's offer to examine route modifications for the Carbondale Circulator, and said she would discuss We-Cycle bike sharing with the Town Council.

8. Public Hearing:

A. Resolution 2015-09: 2015 Supplemental Budget Resolution – Mike Yang, Director of Finance

Mike Yang referred the Board to Agenda Item #8 on page 30 of the Board Agenda packet. The \$195,000 refundable deposit that RFTA provided to CEC was not considered an expense. Now that RFTA is moving forward with the CEC purchase, we have to appropriate the funds as a purchase.

With no further questions from the Board, **Bernot opened the public hearing on Resolution No. 2015-09 at 11:47 a.m. There were no public comments, so Bernot closed the public hearing at 11:47 a.m.**

Dwayne Romero moved to approve Resolution No. 2015-09 Supplemental Budget Appropriation and Michael Owsley seconded the motion. Resolution No. 2015-09 was unanimously approved.

9. Board Governance Process

A. 2015 RFTA Board of Directors Strategic Retreat Planning – David Johnson, Director of Planning

Bernot recommended that the Board focus on matters other than the ACP at the Retreat. We will start with regular Board meeting at 8:30 a.m. on June 11th and then proceed with the retreat at 9:00 a.m.

10. Information/Updates:

A. CEO Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO

Dan Blankenship referred Board members to the CEO Report on page 35 of the Board packet.

Stacey Bernot acknowledged John Putnam's retirement from RFTA after his many years of service.

John Kruger, City of Aspen Transportation Director, briefly commented on the challenges of constructing Rubey Park and maintaining transit operations. Romero commented that the funding was provided by regional cooperation of 5 entities helping to bring this project to fruition.

This was the last meeting that Dwayne Romero was serving as an alternate of City of Aspen. Everyone thanked him for his services.

Blankenship referred to page 38 of the Board Packet under the sub-title of Audit Subcommittee Members of 2014 and asked for volunteers to participate in the 2015 subcommittee. Kathy Chandler Henry and Jacque Whitsitt volunteered to participate.

11. Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting: To be determined at May 14, 2015 Meeting.

12. Next Meeting/Retreat: 8:30 – 2:30 p.m., June 11, 2015 at Carbondale Town Hall

13. Adjournment:

Bernot moved to adjourn the Board meeting at 11:57 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Edna Adeh
Board Secretary

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“CONSENT” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 5. A.**

Meeting Date:	June 11, 2015
Agenda Item:	CDOT-RFTA Bustang Access Agreement
POLICY #	N/A
Strategic Goal:	None
Recommendation:	Authorize the CEO to execute the CDOT-RFTA Bustang Access Agreement subject to its approval as to form by the RFTA General Counsel
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, CEO
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CDOT will be implementing the Bustang I-70 interregional bus service on July 13, 2015. 2. The I-70 corridor Bustang service will operate between Glenwood Springs and Denver on weekdays. It will originate and terminate in Glenwood Springs and make one round-trip per day. 3. It will begin service each weekday at RFTA's 27th Street BRT station in Glenwood Springs at 7:05 a.m. It will make a stop at RFTA West Glenwood Springs park & ride on Wulfsohn Road at 7:15 a.m., prior to departing Glenwood Springs for Denver. Bustang will arrive back in Glenwood Springs at approximately 9:30 p.m. each weekday. 4. The CDOT-RFTA Bustang Access Agreement sets forth the responsibilities of RFTA, CDOT's Bustang contractor, Horizon Coach Lines, and CDOT. 5. RFTA should not incur any appreciable costs as a result of this agreement and staff recommends that the RFTA Board authorize the CEO to execute it subject to its approval as to form by the RFTA General Counsel.
Background Info:	See Core Issues.
Policy Implications:	N/A
Fiscal Implications:	None anticipated
Attachment?	Yes, please see “draft” CDOT-RFTA Bustang Access Agreement.pdf that is included in the June 2015 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf that is attached to the e-mail transmitting the Board agenda packet.

RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“CONSENT AGENDA” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 5. B.

Meeting Date:	June 11, 2015
Agenda Item:	Resolution 2015-10: Resolution Supporting the Commitment of \$1.5 Million as RFTA’s Local Match for a Department of Local Affairs’ (DOLA) Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance Program (EMIAP) Grant to Construct Phase 1 of the Glenwood Springs Maintenance Facility Renovation and Expansion Project (“GMF PROJECT”)
Policy #:	2.8: Board Awareness and Support
Strategic Goal:	Design and construct temporary parking for approximately 20 buses at the Glenwood Springs Maintenance Facility (by 11/26/15 contingent upon resources)
Recommendation:	Adopt Resolution 2015-10.
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, CEO
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Staff has applied for a \$1.5 million EMIAP grant to assist with construction of Phase I of the Glenwood Springs Maintenance Facility (GMF) Renovation and Expansion Project. 2. Higher service levels associated with the operation of VelociRFTA BRT have necessitated the staging of more buses at the GMF than it was originally designed to comfortably accommodate. 3. To provide more capacity for existing service levels and in order to provide additional capacity for bus staging during the Grand Avenue Bridge construction project in the summer/fall of 2017, so that RFTA can help to mitigate traffic congestion during the anticipated 3-month bridge closure, RFTA needs to create more parking spaces for buses at the GMF. Ideally, the GMF Phase 1 construction project can be completed before the bridge closure. 4. Staff has been developing a plan to create additional bus storage, maintenance space, and office capacity on a 2-acre parcel adjacent to the GMF that RFTA purchased in 2009. Preliminary estimates of the total cost for all phases of the GMF expansion project exceed \$30 million, whereas the GMF Phase 1 construction costs are estimated to be approximately \$3.5 million. 5. To support Phase 1 of the GMF expansion, staff is applying for grant funding from every potential source, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The EMIAP grant program (\$1.5 million); B. TIGER grant funding (\$1 million/application will be submitted by 6/5/15); C. Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District (GCFMLD) (\$450,000/will apply in Fall grant cycle); D. CDOT FTA/Section 5311 capital assistance grant (\$500,000/funds have been awarded); and E. Originally, staff committed RFTA to \$50,000 of the local match required for the \$3.5 million project.

6. The EMIAP grant assumes that total GMF Phase 1 construction costs will be \$3.5 million and, in addition to \$1.5 million in EMIAP and \$500,000 in CDOT grant funds, that RFTA will supply an additional \$1.5 million from a combination of TIGER, GCFMLD and/or RFTA funds.
7. The EMIAP grant should be awarded in July 2015; however, the status of RFTA's TIGER and GCFMLD grant applications won't be known until the Fall of 2015. DOLA staff has indicated that RFTA's EMIAP grant application will not compete well unless it contains a firmer commitment of the grant's proposed \$1.5 million local match.
8. Consequently, staff recommends that the RFTA Board adopt Resolution 2015-10, which commits RFTA to providing up to \$1.5 million in local match for the EMIAP grant. This amount could be lower depending upon how successful RFTA is at garnering TIGER and GCFMLD funding for the GMF Phase 1 project.
9. The RFTA General Fund year-end fund balance was approximately \$16.47 million, of which \$7.57 million is unassigned (see chart below). Staff believes that the GMF Phase 1 expansion project is important enough to justify using reserve funds to cover the \$1.5 million local match, if necessary. However, staff will continue to look for as many grant opportunities as possible to minimize the amount of local match RFTA is required to provide.

		Audited
General Fund		12/31/2014
Non-spendable		\$ 920,754
Restricted		\$ 826,040
Committed for Transit Capital	\$ 335,000	
Committed for Trails Capital	\$ 525,000	
Committed for Facilities Capital	\$ 575,000	
Committed for Operating Reserves	<u>\$ 5,716,681</u>	
Total Committed		\$ 7,151,681
Unassigned		<u>\$ 7,571,940</u>
Total Fund Balance		<u>\$ 16,470,415</u>

10. Staff recommends that the Board adopt Resolution 2015-10 attached below.

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:

If RFTA is not awarded TIGER or GCFMLD grant funding for this project, RFTA would be required to commit approximately \$1.5 million in unrestricted reserve funds for the GMF Phase 1 project in order to provide the required local match for the \$1.5 million EMIAP grant.

Attachments:

Yes, please see Resolution 2015-10, below.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION NO. 2015-10

Resolution Supporting the Commitment of \$1.5 Million as RFTA's Local Match for a Department of Local Affairs' (DOLA) Energy and Mineral Impact Assistance Program (EMIAP) Grant to Construct Phase 1 of the Glenwood Springs Maintenance Facility Renovation and Expansion Project ("GMF PROJECT")

WHEREAS, the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) is a political subdivision of the State of Colorado and, therefore, an eligible applicant for a grant awarded by DOLA; and

WHEREAS, RFTA has submitted an EMIAP Grant Application to DOLA for Phase 1 of the GMF Project requesting a total award of \$1.5 million; and

WHEREAS, RFTA has already been awarded \$500,000 in Federal Transit Administration Section 5311 Capital Assistance for the GMF Project; and

WHEREAS, RFTA will also be applying for an \$18 million 2015 TIGER grant for the renovation and expansion of the GMF, \$1 million of which is intended for Phase 1 of the GMF Project and to provide match for the EMIAP grant; and

WHEREAS, RFTA plans to apply for \$450,000 in Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District grant funds for Phase 1 of the GMF Project and to provide match for the EMIAP grant; and

WHEREAS, DOLA has indicated that a firm commitment of matching funds will make RFTA's EMIAP grant application more competitive; and

WHEREAS, DOLA will need a commitment from RFTA regarding the availability of its \$1.5 million local match before it can award EMIAP grant funding in the current grant cycle; and

WHEREAS, it will not be known whether RFTA will be awarded either 2015 TIGER or GCFMLD grant funds until the fall of 2015, several months after the current EMIAP grant cycle ends; and

WHEREAS, RFTA has sufficient unassigned General Fund reserves to be able to supply up to \$1.5 million in local match for the EMIAP grant as a contingency in the event that 2015 TIGER and/or GCFMLD grant funds are not awarded for the Phase 1 GMF project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

That the RFTA Board of Directors strongly supports the EMIAP grant application submitted by RFTA and will appropriate up to \$1.5 million in matching funds if 2015 TIGER and GCFMLD grant funds are not received.

That the CEO is authorized to execute the EMIAP grant if it is awarded and to submit all other documents and take whatever other actions that may be required by the grant agreement.

INTRODUCED, READ AND PASSED by the Board of Directors of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority at its regular meeting held the 11th day of June, 2015.

ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
By and through its BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

By: _____
Stacey Patch-Bernot, Chair

I, the Secretary of the Board of Directors (the "Board") of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (the "Authority") do hereby certify that (a) the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Board at a meeting held on June 11, 2015 (b) the meeting was open to the public; (c) the Authority provided at least 48 hours' written notice of such meeting to each Director and Alternate Director of the Authority and to the Governing Body of each Member of the Authority; (d) the Resolution was duly moved, seconded and adopted at such meeting by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the Directors then in office who were eligible to vote thereon voting; and (e) the meeting was noticed, and all proceedings relating to the adoption of the Resolution were conducted, in accordance with the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority Intergovernmental Agreement, as amended, all applicable bylaws, rules, regulations and resolutions of the Authority, the normal procedures of the Authority relating to such matters, all applicable constitutional provisions and statutes of the State of Colorado and all other applicable laws.

WITNESS my hand this ____ day of _____, 2015.

Edna Adeh, Secretary to the Board of Directors

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“CONSENT” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 5. C.**

Meeting Date:	June 11, 2015
Agenda Item:	Proposed Maroon Bells Bus Service Increase
POLICY #	4.2.5: Board Job Products
Strategic Goal:	Create Transit Service Optimization Plan
Recommendation:	Approve proposed Maroon Bells Service Increase
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, CEO
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RFTA has been providing bus service between Aspen and the Maroon Bells since the late 1970's, first by Pitkin County, then by the Roaring Fork Transit Agency, and now by RFTA. 2. In the 2000 RFTA formation IGA, the Maroon Bells bus service was grandfathered, along with the Pitkin County Senior Van and the Woody Creek Van in recognition of the contribution of Pitkin County's full 1-penny mass transit sales tax (collected in unincorporated Pitkin County), which was dedicated to RFTA by voters when the Transportation Authority was created. Pitkin County's contribution of its 1-penny mass transit sales tax is greater than RFTA's cost of providing these services. In 2014, the Maroon Bells service covered approximately 76% of its fully-allocated operating cost (\$381,114) with fares (\$288,344). 3. Staff is currently proposing to add service to the Maroon Bells on weekdays during the month of September. 4. Traditionally, during the month of September, RFTA has only operated service to the Maroon Bells on weekends. 5. This year, the Forest Service has asked RFTA to consider adding service to the Maroon Bells on weekdays during September because the visitor demand is growing every year and the Forest Service is experiencing some parking problems up at the Maroon Lake. 6. I already approved having the Maroon Bells service operate 1 hour earlier this coming season to take some of the pressure off parking. The estimated additional public investment, net of fares for this increase is approximately \$12,000. RFTA should be able to fund that amount out of anticipated budget savings in 2015. 7. In order for RFTA to operate bus service to the Maroon Bells on weekdays during September, there would be an estimated additional public investment, net of fares, of approximately \$16,000. Again, this amount most likely can be covered through budgetary savings in 2015. 8. Staff recommends that the Board approve this additional service because it will help to reduce automobile impacts on the Maroon Bells and provide work for 4 more drivers per week during September, which will help to reduce turnover during the fall off-season. 9. The decision is time-sensitive, because of the need to advertise and plan the change. If the Board doesn't want us to approve the service increase, the discussion can be brought back at a later date for implementation in 2016.
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 public investment required for starting the services at 8:00 a.m. instead of 9:00 a.m. is approximately \$12,000. The additional public investment for operating weekday service in September is approximately \$16,000.
Attachment?	No.

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

CEO REPORT

TO: RFTA Board of Directors
FROM: Dan Blankenship, CEO
DATE: June 11, 2015

American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Transit Board and Board support Seminar in Denver, July 18 – 21: Denver Regional Transportation District will be hosting an APTA seminar for Transit Board members and support staff July 18-21. There is a \$745 registration fee for Board members. If the reservation is made after June 18th, the fee goes up to \$795 per person. Hotel accommodations at the Grand Hyatt Denver will cost \$179 per night, or \$537 for three nights. If the RFTA Board wishes to designate any Board members to attend this seminar, please let staff know, so that we can make reservations. Staff assumes the Board members’ expenses (registration fee, lodging, travel, and meals) would be paid by for by RFTA. Information about the seminar can be found at: ATPA Transit Board Seminar.pdf included in the June 2015 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board meeting agenda packet.

Chief Operating Officer (COO) Recruitment: The recruitment process for the RFTA COO has been concluded. Nearly 70 applications were received and 30 of the applicants had transit experience. Staff conducted telephone interviews with 7 of the candidates and has invited three current finalists to visit RFTA for in-person interviews. The name of the new RFTA COO will be made public within the next few days.

Final Closing on Solar Array: On May 27, 2015, RFTA closed on the acquisition of a 504kW solar array. The total cost of the array, plus costs of issuance was \$1,648,490.52. This was approximately \$42,000 more than was estimated in the May 14, 2015 Board agenda summary, primarily because of the costs of closing, which included Bank fees and legal review costs. RFTA paid \$195,205 in cash and financed \$1,453,285 through Alpine Bank for 20 years by means of a lease/purchase agreement. As soon as staff begins receiving data regarding the performance of the solar array, it will begin providing the Board with periodic reports.

April 2015 Year-to-Date Ridership Report

	Apr-14	Apr-15	#	%
Service	YTD	YTD	Variance	Variance
City of Aspen	481,175	452,744	(28,431)	-5.91%
RF Valley Commuter	969,872	1,042,966	73,094	7.54%
Grand Hogback	29,968	29,553	(415)	-1.38%
Aspen Skiing Company	449,187	441,194	(7,993)	-1.78%
Ride Glenwood Springs	70,880	65,720	(5,160)	-7.28%
X-games/Charter	15,588	23,165	7,577	48.61%
Senior Van	1,483	1,362	(121)	-8.16%
MAA Burlingame	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
Maroon Bells	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
Total	2,018,153	2,056,704	38,551	1.91%
Subset of Roaring Fork Valley Commuter Service with BRT in 2015				
Service	YTD April 2014	YTD April 2015	Dif +/-	% Dif +/-
Highway 82 Corridor Local/Express	331,040	363,793	32,753	10%
BRT	296,294	309,568	13,274	4%
Total	627,334	673,361	46,027	7%

Planning Department Update – David Johnson, Director of Planning

The 6-11-15 Planning Department Update.pdf can be found in the June 2015 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the Board Agenda packet.

RFTA Board Action Item List

<u>No.</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Update</u>	<u>Request by</u>	<u>Status</u>
1.	Discuss legislative strategy to address RFTA's Eminent Domain authority	Future meeting	Whitsitt	Staff is coordinating with CASTA. CASTA recommends education of Legislature in 2015 and working on amendment in 2016
2.	Report on Feasibility and Revenue Potential of Concept Advertising on exterior of RFTA buses	Future meeting	Board	Research has been conducted, but this is a lower priority
3.	Report on Electric Vehicle Charging Station management questions	Future meeting	Board	Started; research underway, funds not currently identified for installation
4.	Add bicycle capacity to Next Bus Signs	Future meeting	Bernot	Have not figured this out yet.
5.	Natural Gas RFP: Include Water Management Plan as criteria and identify Environmental Watchdog	Report at future meeting	Breslin	Delayed; Source Gas currently providing gas
6.	Committee comprised of people with physical disabilities to advise on transit and trail issues	Future meeting	Owsley	Planning Dept. will begin working on this in 2015
7.	Replace Up/Down Valley designations on station signage, or supplement with a list of destinations served from each station	Report at future meeting	Owsley	Facilities Department to review
8.	Evaluation of RFTA's Fare Rates and Structure, including Free Rides for Seniors and Children	Report at a future meeting	Bernot	Finance/CEO to review and bring before the Board
9.	Establishment of Farebox Recovery Goal	Board policy discussion at future meeting	Whitsitt	Finance/CEO to review and bring before the Board
10.	Free complementary passes for Board members to give to first time riders	Report at future meeting	Boineau	Finance/CEO to review and bring before the Board
11.	List of Corridor Policy and discussion items for Board consideration	Future meetings	Whitsitt	Will provide at subsequent Board meetings
12.	Tree Farm discussion	Future meeting	Bernot	Staff will bring back
13.	Discussion of Board meeting time	Board Retreat	Bernot	Determined at Retreat
14.	Provide Opportunity for Board members to meet COO candidates.	In progress	Butler	In progress

Finance Department Update – Mike Yang, Director of Finance

2015 Budget Year				
General Fund				
	April YTD			
	Actual	Budget	% Var.	Annual Budget
Revenues				
Sales tax (1)	\$ 4,315,821	\$ 3,903,504	10.6%	\$ 18,934,000
Grants	\$ 313,464	\$ 313,464	0.0%	\$ 5,937,550
Fares (2)	\$ 1,482,088	\$ 1,597,798	-7.2%	\$ 4,642,000
Other govt contributions	\$ 25,833	\$ 25,833	0.0%	\$ 5,877,388
Other income	\$ 158,408	\$ 154,323	2.6%	\$ 413,000
Total Revenues	\$ 6,295,614	\$ 5,994,922	5.0%	\$ 35,803,938
Expenditures				
Fuel (3)	\$ 739,358	\$ 846,155	-12.6%	\$ 1,949,623
Transit	\$ 5,831,157	\$ 5,819,847	0.2%	\$ 18,219,320
Trails & Corridor Mgmt	\$ 96,497	\$ 89,727	7.5%	\$ 398,960
Capital	\$ 144,963	\$ 144,963	0.0%	\$ 12,200,699
Debt service	\$ 493,703	\$ 493,702	0.0%	\$ 2,383,459
Total Expenditures	\$ 7,305,678	\$ 7,394,394	-1.2%	\$ 35,152,061
Other Financing Sources/Uses				
Other financing sources	\$ -	\$ -	#DIV/0!	\$ 1,670,374
Other financing uses	\$ (773,928)	\$ (773,928)	0.0%	\$ (2,640,032)
Total Other Financing Sources/Uses	\$ (773,928)	\$ (773,928)	0.0%	\$ (969,658)
Change in Fund Balance (4)	\$ (1,783,992)	\$ (2,173,401)	-17.9%	\$ (317,781)

- (1) Sales tax is budgeted and received two months in arrears (i.e. February revenues are received in April).
- (2) Through April, fare revenue is down approx. 4% compared to the prior year. This decrease is being monitored and appears to be primarily attributable to the timing of bulk pass orders by outlets and businesses. The chart below provides a April YTD 2014/2015 comparison of actual fare revenues and ridership on RFTA fare services:
- (3)

Fare Revenue:	Apr 14 YTD	Apr 15 YTD	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Regional Fares	\$ 1,525,092	\$ 1,482,088	\$ (43,004)	-3%
Advertising	\$ 18,731	\$ -	\$ (18,731)	-100%
Total Fare Revenue	\$ 1,543,823	\$ 1,482,088	\$ (61,735)	-4%
Ridership on RFTA Fare Services:	Apr 14 YTD	Apr 15 YTD	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Highway 82 (Local & Express)	331,040	363,793	32,753	10%
BRT	296,294	309,568	13,274	4%
SM-DV	48,911	41,450	(7,461)	-15%
Grand Hogback	29,968	29,553	(415)	-1%
Total Ridership on RFTA Fare Services	706,213	744,364	38,151	5%
Avg. Fare/Ride	\$ 2.16	\$ 1.99	\$ (0.17)	-8%

- (4) Fuel appears to be under budget thus far and staff will continue to monitor this situation.
- (5) 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.

RFTA System-Wide Transit Service Mileage and Hours Report								
Transit Service	Mileage April 2015 YTD				Hours April 2015 YTD			
	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.
RF Valley Commuter	1,448,704	1,434,093	14,611	1.0%	65,071	65,908	(837)	-1.3%
City of Aspen	183,454	187,344	(3,890)	-2.1%	20,333	20,345	(12)	-0.1%
Aspen Skiing Company	204,679	211,094	(6,415)	-3.0%	14,297	14,154	143	1.0%
Ride Glenwood Springs	41,097	39,612	1,485	3.7%	3,208	3,196	12	0.4%
Grand Hogback	73,710	74,514	(804)	-1.1%	2,829	2,844	(15)	-0.5%
X-games/Charter	3,745	4,094	(349)	-8.5%	546	474	72	15.2%
Senior Van	6,587	6,803	(216)	-3.2%	605	613	(8)	-1.3%
Total	1,961,976	1,957,554	4,422	0.2%	106,889	107,534	(645)	-0.6%

2014 Financial Statement Audit – Schedule

2014 Financial Statement Audit Schedule		
Date	Activity	Status
5/4/2015 – 5/8/2015	Start of Audit – auditors conducting onsite fieldwork	COMPLETED
6/24/2015	Audit Report will be reviewed by the RFTA Board Audit Subcommittee . A meeting will be held at RFTA's office at 10am-noon (1340 Main Street, Carbondale) with the Audit Subcommittee, the auditor and staff to discuss the audit in detail.	<i>On schedule</i>
7/3/2015	Final Audit Report to be distributed to RFTA Board with July Board Packet	<i>On schedule</i>
7/9/2015	Presentation of Final Audit Report at RFTA Board Meeting by Auditor	<i>On schedule</i>

Current Audit Subcommittee Members:

1. **Kathy Chandler-Henry**, RFTA board vice-chair,
2. **Jacque Whitsitt**, RFTA board member,
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. **Michael Yang**, RFTA Director of Finance
4. **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 June 11, 2015

Capital Projects Update

Rubey Park Renovation Project:

The unusual spring rains have set the Rubey park renovation project back by approximately five days and pushed back the opening of Durant Street from June 1st to June 5th but otherwise the project is proceeding as anticipated. The removal of the building is proceeding and by the Friday, June 5 a majority of the building will have been removed from this site. The general contractor, PCL, is doing a very good job of managing construction activities as well as vehicle and pedestrian traffic around the site and we have not had any significant issues or complaints from the public or adjacent property owners that have reached the level of an official complaint.

AMF Phase 3- Indoor Bus Storage:

The project to expand the Aspen Maintenance Facility by 17,000 ft.² is moving forward as anticipated. Final bids for the project will be due towards the end of July and at that time staff will have a more detailed report to the Board. The key milestones dates for procurement process for the project are as follows:

- Plans released- May 29
- Pre-bid-June 3rd
- Questions due- June 5th
- Responses to questions due-June12
- Final bids due- June 23rd.

Assuming that bids for the project are within the current budget, staff will then begin negotiating a contract with the apparent low bidder. This process generally takes 4 to 6 weeks and staff is projecting the selected contractor will mobilize on the site sometime in late August. This start date gives the contractor enough time to complete the deep utilities and hopefully much of the entryway and asphalt associated with the project. The majority of the construction of the building addition will begin in the spring of 2016.

West Glenwood Park and Ride Project:

The 90% plans for the West Glenwood Springs' trail and park and ride project are due to staff this month.

GMF Expansion Project:

The Glenwood Maintenance Facility (GMF) expansion project has been broken down into six phases and staff has been applying for a number of grants to provide funding for this facility. The selection criteria for each grant dictates which phase of the project staff submits for that particular grant application. Currently the funding picture for the project is as follows:

- RFTA has been awarded the CDOT grant for \$500,000 with \$125,000 match.
- RFTA has been awarded a DOLA grant for \$105,000 with a \$105,000 match
- Staff has submitted an additional DOLA grant for \$1.5 million with a \$1.5 million RFTA match or matching funds from other grants which staff is in the process of applying for.

The process of constructing the GMF expansion project with multiple small grants requires that staff change the design, phasing and construction sequence to match the current funding program. Each new grant requires a juggling of all of these processes and makes for a rather difficult project management process. While this method of funding the project can be a little unwieldy, it is the reality of how this

project will be funded and constructed and staff will have to be as creative and flexible as possible in the management of this project.

Carbondale Park and Ride:

Staff has completed the bidding process for this project and staff has identified an apparent low bidder. At this time staff is waiting on concurrence from CDOT on the bid we have received and our intent to award the contract. Staff is working with CDOT to move this step forward as quickly as possible so that the contract can be awarded and put in the general contractor's construction schedule.

New Castle Park and Ride:

On Thursday, May 14, RFTA staff met with the GCFLMD Board of Directors and was granted a one-year extension of the grant for the New Castle park and ride construction project. Under the terms of the GCFLMD grant RFTA now has until October 15, 2016 to complete the project. The next step for staff is to ask CDOT to advance the funding they had committed to the project from fiscal year 2016 to fiscal year 2015. Staff is in the process of drafting a letter to CDOT with this request and will report to the Board on CDOT response as soon as we have that information.

Facilities Updates

Glenwood Maintenance Facility:

The testing of the integrity of both the inner and outer tanks of the water/oil separator at the GMF has been completed and staff is currently waiting on the official report for the testing company. However from the preliminary test results it appears that the outer tank has been compromised and is allowing water to leak into the space between the two tanks. It is not possible to repair holes in the outer tank in a cost efficient manner, so it appears that staff will have to remove and replace the tank. Staff is currently researching the cost and timing to replace the tank and researching if the existing tank can be used until a replacement project can be organized.

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

Facilities, Rail Corridor & Trail Update

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, is currently at **96%** 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 **97%**.

Rio Grande Trail and Corridor

Corridor Access Control Plan (ACP) Up-Date: Staff continues to work through an update to the ACP. Staff put the “draft” ACP and Design Guidelines (DG) out for a public comment period from January 9th through May 9th and held 8 Open Houses to discuss the ACP history and process, answer questions, and encourage the public to provide comments related to the draft documents. The public comment period for the ACP and DG has now closed and staff is in the process of reviewing all of the comments and working with the attorneys and engineers to develop initial responses for each of the comments. Once the comments and initial responses have been assembled they will be distributed to the ACP work group for a discussion and incorporation into the “draft” ACP. Because staff anticipates that this process will take some additional time to work through, the timeline for completion of the update of the ACP has been extended: (See updated timeline below)

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 www.rfta.com	1/9/2015	5/9/2015
Compilation of ALL Comments, Public, Board and Jurisdictional comments	5/11/2015	5/15/2015
ACP Work Group Meeting	5/11/2015	As Needed
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	6/19/2015
ACP Work Group Meeting to review and discuss initial responses to public comments and incorporation into the Draft ACP - Will attempt to schedule two separate meetings to work through all of the initial responses	6/22/2015	7/17/2015
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, discussing our ACP with the STB for direction, submitting proposed projects (8th St., Southbridge, 14th St., Industry Way, etc. to the STB for a "declaratory Judgement"	6/22/2015	7/17/2015
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	7/24/2015
Final Review of ACP & DG by Attorneys and Engineers	7/27/2015	8/7/2015
ACP & DG Update to RFTA Board to review the	8/13/2015	8/13/2015
RFTA Board of Director final comments to staff incorporated into the DRAFT ACP & DG	8/14/2015	8/21/2015
Presentation of ACP & DG to RFTA Board	9/10/2015	9/10/2015

The RFTA Board of Director's also directed staff to work collaboratively with the Town of Carbondale staff and the City of Glenwood Springs' staff and their legal experts to develop options for protecting the Railroad Corridor. Ideally, Eric Hocky to the City of Glenwood Springs and Charles Montange, RFTA's Railbanking expert, can confer to determine whether their differing opinions about the measures needed to preserve the corridor's Railbanked status can be reconciled.

Also, RFTA and the City may want to seek a declaratory judgement from the Surface Transportation Board (STB) as to whether any of the proposed crossings, i.e. 8th Street, 14th Street and Southbridge in Glenwood Springs, and Industry Way in Carbondale, would constitute a severance of the RFTA Railroad Corridor if not constructed according to the proposed ACP Design Standards and Guidelines.

Because essentially the same members of the Carbondale and Glenwood Springs' staffs that will be participating in the ACP work group will also be participating in this process, RFTA staff will schedule both groups to meet on the same days (see highlighted timeline above) in an attempt to streamline the process and, hopefully, reach a consensus on issues in order to address the overall concerns of the RFTA Board of Director's regarding the proposed update of the ACP.

Wye Area Appraisal: RFTA has been coordinating an appraisal of the UPRR exclusive easement in the Glenwood Springs Wye Area. The appraisal will use an appropriate methodology for the valuation of the UPRR easement in the Wye Area. It has taken more time than originally anticipated for the appraiser to identify the appropriate appraisal methodology for the UPRR's easement; however, the appraisal is now nearing completion. A portion of the cost of the appraisal will be reimbursed to RFTA by the City of Glenwood Springs, up to a maximum of \$10,000.