

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

TIME: 8:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m., Thursday, April 13, 2017

Usual Location: Town Hall (Room 1), 511 Colorado, Carbondale, CO

(This Agenda may change before the meeting.)

	Agenda Item	Policy	Purpose	Est. Time
1	Call to Order / Roll Call:		Quorum	8:30 a.m.
2	Executive Session: Paul Taddune, General Counsel: <u>Two Matters:</u> A. Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402 (4) (e) (I); Determining positions that may be subject to negotiations: developing strategy for negotiations and instructing negotiators; and 24-6-402 (4) (a); The purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer, or sale of any real, personal, or other property interests: Cole Subdivision B. Pursuant to C.R.S. 24-6-402(4) (b) conference with attorney for the purposes of receiving legal advice on specific legal questions; and C.R.S. 24-6-402(4) (d) specialized details of investigations: Accident at GMF under investigation.		Executive Session	8:31 a.m.
3	Approval of <u>Minutes</u>: RFTA Board Meeting, March 9, 2017, <i>pg. 3</i>		Approve	9:00 a.m.
4	Public Comment: Regarding items not on the Agenda (up to one hour will be allotted if necessary, however, comments will be limited to three minutes per person)		Public Input	9:05 a.m.
5	Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:	4.3.3.C	Comments	9:15 a.m.
6	Consent Agenda: A. <u>Memorandum</u> of Understanding: Governor’s Office of Information Technology and RFTA regarding Statewide Digital Trunked Radio System Upgrade – Phil Schultz, Director of IT, <i>page 17</i>	2.8.11	Approve	9:20 a.m.
7	Presentation/Action Items: A. <u>Overview</u> of 2017 Rio Grande Recreational Trail Update – Dan Blankenship, CEO, and Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations, <i>page 19</i>	1.1	Discussion/ Direction	9:25 a.m.
8	Public Hearing: A. First Reading: Rio Grande <u>Corridor</u> Access Control Plan Update – Dan Blankenship, CEO and Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations, <i>page 24</i> B. <u>Resolution</u> 2017-06: 2017 Supplemental Budget Appropriation – Michael Yang, CFAO, <i>page 28</i>	1.1	Approve for 2nd Reading	10:00 a.m.
9	Information/Updates: A. <u>CEO</u> Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO, <i>page 34</i>	2.8.6	FYI	11:10 a.m.
(Agenda Continued on Next Page)				

	Agenda Item	Policy	Purpose	Est. Time
10	Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting: To Be Determined at April 13, 2017 Meeting	4.3	Meeting Planning	11:20 a.m.
11	Next Meeting: 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., May 11, 2017 at Carbondale Town Hall	4.3	Meeting Planning	11:25 a.m.
12	Adjournment:		Adjourn	11:30 a.m.

Mission/Vision Statement:

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

Values Statements:

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

**ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
BOARD MEETING MINUTES
March 9, 2017**

Board Members Present:

George Newman – Chair (Pitkin County); Mike Gamba – Vice-Chair (City of Glenwood Springs); Art Riddle (Town of New Castle); Dan Richardson (Town of Carbondale); Jacque Whitsitt (Town of Basalt); Jeanne McQueeney (Eagle County), Markey Butler (Town of Snowmass)

Voting Alternates Present:

Ann Mullins (City of Aspen)

Non-Voting Alternates Present:

Ben Bohmfalk (Town of Carbondale); Kathryn Trauger (City of Glenwood Springs)

Staff Present:

Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer (CEO); Paul Taddune, General Counsel; Michael Yang, Chief Financial and Administrative Officer (CFAO); Nicole Schoon, Secretary to the Board of Directors; Amy Burdick, Angela Henderson, Brett Meredith, Maura Masters, Mike Hermes, Nick Senn, Facilities & Trails Department; David Johnson, Planning Department; Paul Hamilton, Assistant Director of Finance; Kent Blackmer, Co-Director of Operations

Visitors Present:

Karl Hanlon, City Attorney, Debra Figueroa, City Manager, and Tanya Allen, Transportation Manager (City of Glenwood Springs); John Krueger, (City of Aspen); Emzy Veazy III (Citizen)

Agenda

1. Roll Call:

George Newman called the RFTA Board of Directors to order at 8:31 a.m. Newman declared a quorum to be present (eight member jurisdictions present) and the meeting began at 8:33 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes:

Jacque Whitsitt moved to approve the minutes of the February 9, 2017 Board Meeting and Markey Butler seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved. Whitsitt abstained from voting on the February minutes due to her absence.

3. Public Comment:

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

Emzy Veazy III stated that he believes the Carbondale Circular bus route deliberately ignores, avoids and evades stopping at the strip malls where Latino owned businesses operate. He stated that it denies a chance for Latino owned businesses from making more money. This decision makes it harder for

poorer individuals to frequent less expensive stores to make their dollars stretch further, and to save money. *(A copy of this document is available upon request.)*

Newman closed Public Comments at 8:36 a.m.

4. Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:

Newman asked if there were any Board Member comments or items that needed to be added to the meeting agenda.

Newman recognized and thanked Maura Masters, Amy Burdick and Dina Farnell for their gracious efforts in ordering, delivering and setting up food for each Board meeting and diligently cleaning up afterwards.

No Board member had any comments or questions.

5. Public Hearing

A. Resolution 2017-04: 2016 Supplemental Budget Resolution – Michael Yang, CFAO

Michael Yang directed the Board to page 10 of the agenda packet in order to review Resolution 2017-04: 2016 Supplemental Budget Appropriation. After all of the 2016 invoices were processed, the 2016 budget was updated to represent the numbers more accurately. All unexpended capital project budgets and related grant revenue remaining from 2016 are being carried forward to the 2017 budget. There is also a reclassification of the existing appropriated budget; from Transit Expenditures to Capital Outlay. The purpose of this resolution is to move the unappropriated funds and re-appropriate those funds into the 2017 budget. The overall impact of the resolution is an increase to the 2016 fund balance of \$1,398,776.

Newman commented that David Johnson and Jason White have been extremely successful in garnering grants for many of the projects. He requested that Yang go over those grants for a better understanding of how important obtaining these grants is to the RFTA operations.

Yang responded that included in the 2017 budget there are a few CDOT FASTER Grants for Capital Bus replacements as well as a grant from the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District (FMLD) for a Traveler Bus replacement. Grants received in 2017 are:

- 1) \$500,000, 5311 Grant for replacement of 1 MCI Commuter Coach Bus
- 2) \$183,653, FHWA Grant for the Rio Grande Trail Soft Surface & Shouldering Project
- 3) \$600,000, CDOT FASTER Grant for the expansion of the GMF
- 4) \$100,000, 5304 Grant to help offset the ITSP Project

Most grants are for the replacement of buses in 2017. In addition, RFTA received a Notice of Award last month for additional grant funds for several bus replacements; however, the CDOT contracts have not yet been executed so these grants have not been included in the 2017 budget.

Whitsitt asked how much the total replacement cost for buses is. Yang stated, approximately \$1.5 to \$ 2million for the replacement of three MCI Commuter Coach Buses.

Newman asked the Board if there were any questions about the 2017-04: 2016 Supplemental Budget Resolution. No Board member had any questions.

Whitsitt moved to approve Resolution 2017-04: 2016 Supplemental Budget Appropriation and Butler seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved at 8:42 a.m.

B. Resolution 2017-05: 2017 Supplemental Budget Resolution – Michael Yang, CFAO

Yang directed the Board to page 19 of the agenda packet to review Resolution 2017-05: 2017 Supplemental Budget Appropriation. In addition to the items being carried forward from the 2016 Budget there are several items in the General Fund to help offset costs, these include:

- 1) \$600,000, CDOT FASTER Grant for GMF Phase I
- 2) \$100,000, FTA Section 5304 Grant for ITSP
- 3) \$40,000, Increase in Interest Rates Adjustment
- 4) \$25,000, GAB Transit Mitigation from Garfield County

Yang reminded the Board, at the November Board meeting that the estimated cost for the Grand Avenue Bridge Transit Mitigation had exceeded the \$335,000 that the EOTC had committed to the project. The adopted 2017 RFTA budget included \$146,000 in operating costs in excess of the \$335,000 contribution from EOTC. With the additional funds from Garfield County of \$25,000, RFTA's portion of the cost will now be reduced to \$121,000.

Dan Blankenship stated that Garfield County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) indicated RFTA could return in 2017 to discuss additional funding once RFTA has a better understanding of the overall cost of the GAB Transit Mitigation. The BOCC also authorized RFTA to use the Garfield County Fairgrounds during the bridge closure for parking by the Rifle community to access bus services.

Butler asked how many buses it will take to accommodate riders during the GAB. Blankenship responded that there is not an exact number available, however, there will be daily scheduled runs of approximately ten (10) round trips, with five (5) of those extending on to Parachute. The unknown for RFTA is how many back-up buses will be needed to catch the overflow of riders on those scheduled runs. RFTA is planning to stage several buses, in specific locations, to help with rider overflow. This will help RFTA be as prepared as possible to accommodate riders during this time.

Yang concluded his presentation by indicating that the overall impact of the resolution is a decrease in fund balance of \$664,518.

Newman asked the Board if there were any questions about the 2017-05: 2017 Supplemental Budget Resolution. No Board member had any questions.

Butler moved to approve Resolution 2017-05: 2017 Supplemental Budget Appropriation and Kathryn Trauger seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved at 8:53 a.m.

6. Presentation/Action Items:

A. Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan Update – Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations and Dan Blankenship, CEO

Newman stated that the Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan had last been updated in 2005 and was adopted in 2006. According to a contract agreement with Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO), this plan is supposed to be updated every five years, and he added that a discussion should be had with GOCO about revising that requirement to every ten years. Two issues that have been major contributors to the delay of the update are: 1) ensuring that the corridor is not abandoned or severed in order to maintain its railbanked status; and 2) the financial implications to the municipalities if rail were to be reinstated. The draft ACP update assures that the corridor's railbanked status will not be forfeited and provides the local governments with enough flexibility to

obtain easements for crossings of the corridor that they might need in the future. However, the proposed ACP update does not obligate this Board or future Boards to any financial obligations or easements, it simply allows those negotiations to occur.

Blankenship referred the Board to page 26 of the agenda packet for a summary of the process so far in updating the ACP. During the process there were public outreach efforts and comment periods, with comments received from City of Glenwood Springs, Town of Carbondale, CDOT and Garfield County. RFTA responses to two sets of comments were provided. A Staff Working Group was also created to work collaboratively on mutually acceptable ACP language and provisions. Last year, RFTA and the Town of Carbondale reached tentative agreement on the wording in the ACP pertaining to the potential granting of easements for roadway and utility crossings, subject to approval of the RFTA Board. This was an important provision for both the Town of Carbondale and the City of Glenwood Springs.

The City of Glenwood Springs continued to have a few lingering concerns about the ACP and RFTA staff began working with City staff on additional proposed revisions. There was one last round of discussions with the City's attorney, Karl Hanlon and the City Manager, Deborah Figueroa. Hanlon and Figueroa took those revisions to the City Council who were comfortable with the proposed wording of the draft ACP Update, so that it could be presented to the RFTA Board for consideration.

Blankenship said that RFTA staff wants to discuss some of the policy issues that the Draft ACP incorporates and get a consensus of the Board to move it forward to First Reading at the April 13, 2017 Board meeting. If the Board is comfortable moving the ACP Update to the First Reading, staff will advertise a 30-day public comment period and post it on the RFTA website along with the appendices, documentation and draft Design Guidelines. RFTA will then bring the ACP Update back to the Board for the April 13 First Reading and, if approved, the Second Reading would occur on May 11, 2017. The City attorney is still reviewing the draft Design Guidelines but is comfortable with moving the ACP to First Reading.

Blankenship asked if all of the Board members had a chance to read the ACP Update in its entirety. He referred them to the handout, which highlights the differences between the 2005 Adopted ACP and the 2017 Draft ACP. He stated that the major differences between the two documents is that there is more explanation in the 2017 Draft ACP about what railbanking is and the importance of maintain the Railbanked status of the corridor, and about the philosophy surrounding the application of the ACP. Initially, there were concerns about the tone of the document; that it seemed adversarial in some ways. The goal of the 2017 Draft ACP was to soften the tone and assure Board members, jurisdictions, and the public that RFTA wants to collaborate with them as it pertains to uses of the corridor, to the extent allowed. However, RFTA needs to protect a very valuable asset, i.e. 34 miles of continuous corridor. The corridor is currently enjoyed as a recreational trail, but it is also being preserved for a potential future rail or other mass transit system. As such, RFTA needs to have adequate policies and procedures in place to protect this valuable asset and ensure that actions taken within the corridor do not lead to a determination by the Surface Transportation Board (STB) that it has been abandoned. Yet, the ACP should be flexible enough to allow communities aligned with the corridor to have access across it.

Butler stated that she has to think about the present and the future of the corridor. She questioned what the policy on granting (public crossing) easements should be, especially about how many easements should be granted. Newman asked if granting easements would be one of the policies that would be discussed and Blankenship responded that the easement policy would be discussed during the meeting.

Butler referred the Board to page 28, number 13, of the agenda packet. She said that it appears that RFTA Board would grant easements, however, if a rail system were to be reestablished RFTA would need to pay to have that done.

Blankenship offered the following explanation involving the City of Glenwood Springs' South Bridge project. The goal there is to get as much grant revenue as possible to help construct the crossing. The City's design crosses the corridor at-grade, which should not adversely impact the reactivation of freight rail, which is a requirement to maintain the corridor's railbanked status. To obtain grants, it is important for the City to demonstrate to grantors that it has continuing control over that asset.

One of the places that an easement has been granted is for the 8th Street crossing. In that easement there is specific language pertaining to "Railbanking Protection." As part of that agreement, there was a plan for the City of Glenwood to construct abutments for a bridge. RFTA would contribute funds for a temporary rail bridge, if it becomes necessary to do so. The provision about "Railbanking Protection" states that if there is a concern raised by the STB about the crossing's impact on the ability to reactivate freight rail service, RFTA would first try to negotiate with the City to try to address the concern but, if no agreement could be reached, RFTA could terminate the easement.

In granting easements, the wording in the 2017 ACP states that as long as the crossings cross the corridor at-grade, and do not alter the alignment or elevation of the corridor, then that should not adversely impact RFTA's ability to reactivate freight rail service. If, in the future, RFTA decided to operate a freight rail system, lights and signals would be installed and, most likely the at-grade crossings would remain in place. What the ACP states is, if a public crossing sponsor's design is consistent with the ACP and Design Guidelines (DG), and the public crossing is at-grade, then most likely an easement could be granted, subject to approval by the RFTA Board. However, the easement would state that in the future, if light rail were to be constructed and modifications had to be made to that crossing, those costs would likely be borne by the light rail project rather than the community.

To explain this concept, Blankenship presented a hypothetical scenario. For example, a Light Rail system was designed and cost \$750 million to construct from Glenwood Springs to Aspen, but it excluded the cost of relocating crossings. The cost of relocating crossings would add millions of dollars more to the project, but the expectation was that that they would have to be paid by the municipalities and private land owners in order to keep the cost of the light rail system more affordable. The RFTA Board would have to vote to place a ballot question before the voters and representatives of the communities that would have to absorb the cost of relocating the crossings would most likely not vote in favor of placing the question before voters. If the question did manage to get on the ballot, then all of the constituents would need to be persuaded to pay for the regional rail system as well as for the costs their communities would need to absorb to relocate crossings. Blankenship said that if RFTA gets to a point where rail seems feasible, all of the planning, design work, and capital costs should be rolled into one package and taken to the voters.

The easement language also states that if the communities themselves want to do something to modify their corridor crossings, those costs would be borne by them, or if there are benefits to both RFTA and the communities, the costs can be negotiated. For example, if a future light rail system is constructed, there are community sewer lines, electric lines, and other infrastructure that interface with the corridor, which might not have been upgraded in many years, that communities may want to upgrade themselves. Where the line is drawn with respect to what the rail project costs are versus local community costs are would need to be negotiated.

Mike Gamba commented that railbanking pertains specifically to the ability to reactivate heavy freight rail and implementing light rail does not preserve the corridor as intended. The distinction between heavy freight and light rail is that the current design standards for heavy freight prevent the alteration of the alignment, horizontally or vertically, of the existing corridor. Light rail is not subject to those same standards. Building a grade-separated crossing for heavy freight would be vastly more expensive than building a grade-separated crossing for light rail. Light rail can go up as steep as 9% where as heavy freight can only increase 1.5%.

Blankenship responded that RFTA does not know what that future system might look like; there could be advances in technologies, weight, and speed. The system could be overhead, and could be partially in the corridor right-of-way and partially in the highway right-of-way. By preserving the corridor, it leaves the options open, but the financial aspects of the project are unknown and it is difficult to determine at this time how those costs would be shared.

Newman stated the way this Draft ACP is written it does not obligate this Board or future Boards to any financial obligations. Butler responded that she felt that the way the Draft ACP is written does financially obligate the Board.

Blankenship responded that the 2005 ACP states that new crossings in the railroad corridor should generally be prohibited. However, communities are going to want and need to develop public crossings. When the 2014 update of the ACP was presented, this led to a discussion about the desirability of granting easements to jurisdictions for public crossings, so long as they are at grade and/or are consistent with the ACP and the DG, and approved by the RFTA Board. Staff conferred with RFTA's railroad attorney, Walt Downing, who indicated that railroads typically grant easements for public crossings, with provisions that allow the railroad to do what is necessary in the future. At-grade crossings should not adversely impact the reactivation of freight rail; however, if a future light rail system necessitated a grade-separated crossing, at a location where there was an easement for an at-grade crossing, those costs would be on the rail system.

Blankenship read excerpts from page 28, number 13, of the agenda packet, which pertained to Section 17.0 of the draft ACP Update. "If a public crossing is constructed in conformance with RFTA's Design Guidelines, RFTA may be willing to grant an easement to the project sponsor, subject to the approval of the RFTA Board of Directors. The easement, however, will be subject to the following conditions and such other terms and conditions as the RFTA Board, at its sole discretion, may determine at the time of issuance."

Blankenship indicated that each easement would be developed based upon the circumstances, with some terms and conditions being consistent with other easements, and other easement agreements having unique conditions that would be subject to negotiation.

Paul Taddune stated that there is an important distinction, which is that there are public crossings versus private crossings and that easements are referring to public crossings. The main purpose of easements is able jurisdictions to garner grants to help pay for public crossings

Butler stated that the Draft ACP goes on to state that if the sole cause is the need of RFTA, such cost will be borne by RFTA. That statement gives the impression that RFTA could grant an easement for public use to attract grants, but if rail was reinstated then the entity who requested the easement is not liable for the costs, RFTA will incur the costs. From a taxpayer perspective it was community (A) who requested an easement for public crossing, now rail is being reinstated, community (B) and (C) will have an increase in taxes to help pay for an easement that community (A) requested. Butler questioned why community (A) is not required to return the crossing to its original condition and pay for the costs associated with it themselves.

Blankenship responded that all of the planning that has been done so far indicates that the rail alignment would follow the rail corridor from Glenwood Springs through Carbondale. At Catherine's Store, the alignment would switch to Highway 82 through El Jebel and Basalt as far as Wingo Junction, where it would get back into the rail corridor. It would stay in the railroad corridor as far as Woody Creek and then cut across the Roaring Fork River to Brush Creek. It would be a lot less expensive for the rail system to stay in the railroad corridor all the way from Glenwood Springs to Aspen; however, it would miss many population centers. The system should be designed to serve the population centers and make it convenient for everyone. However, there would be a significant

cost of constructing a bridge at Woody Creek to get the system over to Brush Creek, and Blankenship questioned why Glenwood Springs should absorb any costs associate with that.

Newman stated that the costs should be part of the overall system, if the Board first approves the project, understanding that any funding for a project is subject to appropriation. So, whether it is the light rail system or the need for grade-separated crossings, which will enable light rail, it is all one package in terms of what would be needed for approval by the electorate. There will be many steps in in the process, and changes could be needed at crossings in order to allow light rail to operate efficiently. These costs should be part of the overall cost of the project.

Butler reminded the Board that when there was a trail connection requested for Rock Bottom Ranch, there was a great deal of discussion about keeping the trail intact without any interruptions. Butler stated that the way she views the ACP is that it is ok to have interruptions, but it will not be a biker-friendly trail if the bikers have to stop and get off their bikes at every crossing. Newman reminded the Board that the Rio Grande Trail is a separate policy discussion.

Dan Blankenship stated that when public crossings are proposed, they must be submitted to the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). The CPUC can grant the crossings, subject to terms and conditions that the CPUC may determine. If rail were operating in the corridor, the CPUC would decide where signals and safety devices were required to be located. When it comes to crossing railroad corridors the CPUC can also allocate the cost of the crossing between the railroad and the jurisdiction proposing the crossing. The City of Glenwood Springs requires crossings, such as the one at South Bridge, which addresses safety concerns by providing an escape route if there are fires up Four Mile Canyon. People who live up the canyon would be able to get out of town without having to come back to 27th St. to go through the roundabout, etc. The South Bridge crossing was on the list of future crossings in the original Corridor Comprehensive Plan as one that was to be reviewed by the Board in the future. So it has been on the planning horizon for many years.

Whitsitt stated that the corridor is located where the railroad tracks are currently, or where they were, and in order to protect the corridor it must stay that way to accommodate freight. If there are at-grade crossings and there is no change in the grade or location, then the corridor is protected for freight. If at some point it is deemed that light rail should be established, the burden is on RFTA and the Board to manage the cost, in order to make that happen. For RFTA to preserve the corridor, crossings should remain at-grade and in the alignment remain in the current location. She requested clarification about whether the Draft ACP provides the right-of-way to trail users.

Blankenship responded that RFTA wants to encourage people to utilize the corridor. The ACP does not specify how often access across the corridor should be granted or how many trails will be allowed to connect to it. There might be different standards within a municipality versus rural areas. The next step to the ACP is to complete the Recreational Trail Plan Update, where these types of policies and guidelines and conditions incorporated.

Blankenship stated that RFTA's STB attorney, William Mullins, has reviewed the Draft ACP and has no objections with the way it is currently written.

Gamba addressed Butler's concern about granting easements. He said that if the corridor is maintained in its current configuration, there should not be a need to spend a lot of money at those crossings because simple traffic control devices could be put in place for safety.

Dan Richardson stated that the matrix, having the 2005 Adopted ACP Update and the 2017 Draft ACP Update side-by-side was extremely helpful. It reduced the amount of time spent determining the 2017 ACP changes compared to the 2005 Adopted ACP. He came into this process concerned about granting easements and RFTA bearing the costs of many of these projects. Reading through the changes, there was a decrease in concerns and it presented a sense of fairness. When the

ACP was written in 2005, the situation was entirely different than it is today. South Bridge and the 8th Street connection were not imminent at that time. The 2017 Draft ACP states that if or when the decision to move forward with light rail is made, the RFTA Board will decide how to allocate those costs. There are places within the municipalities that will have higher costs associated with the implementation of light rail and it would be unreasonable to require a municipality to pay for the cost of a grade-separation in order for a project to proceed. It is beneficial to RFTA for private crossings to be granted with a license and not an easement, and the wording is a fair compromise and the best way to implement light rail, if or when that happens.

Blankenship stated that ultimately what RFTA needs is a unanimous vote of the seven (7) original constituents of RFRHA; Pitkin County, City of Glenwood Springs, Town of Aspen, Town of Basalt, Eagle County, Town of Snowmass, and the Town of Carbondale. Nothing restricts the Town of New Castle from voting, however, it does not have the same veto power as the other jurisdictions, since it was not a member of RFRHA, which purchased the corridor.

Blankenship also said that the previous STB legal counsel was very conservative and felt it best if RFTA accepted no risk associated with the corridor and that RFTA should manage the corridor as if it were an active railroad. However, an active railroad does not have a Board of Directors comprised of the jurisdictions that are adjacent to the corridor and that need access across the corridor. There has to be a workable compromise that has adequate protection for the corridor, with enough flexibility so jurisdictions can get across it, because it bi-sects the valley and in some areas it bi-sects the municipalities.

According to Blankenship, Mr. Mullins believes that how stringent the ACP policies are, is all a matter of risk. If RFTA does not want to accept any risk, then the policy would state that RFTA would not allow any crossings or connections. However, a policy is only good if it can be adopted. If it cannot be adopted, it does not do anyone any good. The happy-medium is to have a policy that allows easement agreements or crossing agreements that include the type of protections RFTA needs to ensure that the STB won't rule that the corridor has been abandoned. In the current agreement with the City of Glenwood Springs regarding 8th Street, it contains a provision that states railbanking is sacrosanct. If an STB issue arises, there will be collaboration and negotiations with the jurisdiction involved and, if an agreement cannot be reached, RFTA will be free to move forward to do what it needs to do to resolve the issue.

There is a wide variety of opinions about what is necessary to adequately protect the corridor. Staff is unaware of a precedent in which the STB has determined that a Railbanked corridor has been abandoned due to the actions of the corridor owner. In most cases, it would be possible to restore the corridor as long as a connection with the main line remains.

Jeanne McQueeney said that she would like further explanation about page 30 of item d of the agenda packet which says, "Use of the Rio Grande Trail should be encouraged to the maximum extent practicable, although different standards for the trail connections could apply to urban versus rural segments of the trail,:" and item e., which says, "The City of Glenwood Springs would also like the Board to discuss alternatives to railbanking as a mechanism for preserving the corridor intact."

Gamba said that it would be helpful to initiate the discussion with regard to having different policies regarding trail connections for different sections of the corridor. He also wanted to provide some context to the topic of alternatives to railbanking. He believes there is another option to preserving the corridor and that option is for RFTA staff, with approval from RFTA Board, to acquire the seven miles of the Federal Land Grant areas. If the corridor is deemed by the STB to be abandoned, and it is no longer protected by railbanking, the ownership of the Federal Land Grant areas would revert to the adjoining property owners, leaving gaps in the remaining 27 miles of the corridor. If RFTA were to pursue a policy of acquiring the Federal Land Grant Areas, they could potentially be acquired at minimal cost. RFTA would then be able to start designing crossings for the best

technology that might exist for future light rail. It would be beneficial for the ACP to acknowledge the pursuit of this policy in order to preserve the corridor and preserve it for its intended future use.

Newman stated that this draft plan does not preclude those future discussions; rather, it allows the opportunity for those policy discussions in the future, as well as the Rio Grande Trail policy.

Ann Mullins questioned whether grade-separation would risk the railbanking status, because you might be changing the alignment of the corridor. She also questioned how easily the license agreements could be altered or terminated.

Blankenship responded that something, such as an underpass, which would not affect the grade of the corridor, and would not have any bearing on railbanking status. The type of things that would potentially affect the railbanking status would be a major swing in the alignment, significant changes in the grade elevation, and physical obstructions in the corridor. The license agreements are renewed annually and have a thirty-day termination clause. However, RFTA would give as much time as possible before terminating a license and it cannot legally deny someone access to their property. In the future, if light rail were being operated and there were several adjacent properties, which all had to cross the corridor to access their property, there might be a need to consolidate those crossings into a frontage road and have one road crossing the corridor. Depending on the system and the design, it might require negotiations with those property owners who might or might not incur some costs associated with the crossing; however, the railroad project would probably cover the majority of the costs.

Angela Henderson stated that the advantage of having the width in the corridor is that in a relatively inexpensive way, it can provide parallel access for all of the adjacent property owners getting them to one location to consolidate the crossing. It is not just 33.4 miles, it is 455 acres of land and in some places, it is 200-foot wide, giving RFTA flexibility for a future railroad system.

Whitsitt agreed that the RFTA Board should look into acquiring the seven miles of Federal Land Grant areas and, when doing so, staff should list the pros and cons of pursuing that strategy.

Richardson stated that there are benefits to not using railbanking as a tool; however, he requested that the strategy of acquiring the Federal Land Grant areas not be referenced in the 2017 Draft ACP.

Kathryn Trauger asked what the status is with regard to the Cole Subdivision. Henderson responded that documentation will be provided to the Board at the April 13 Board meeting. Board input will be needed in resolving the issues with the four adjacent property owners, who will be attending the Board meeting.

Blankenship stated that the process RFTA has been going through with these four property owners of the Cole Subdivision would be similar to the process of acquiring the Federal Land Grant Parcels.

Butler said that she understands the need for the City of Glenwood Springs to have crossings. Her concern, however, is how many that will entail.

Henderson stated that there are currently three crossings envisioned, and the City of Glenwood Springs is compiling a list of other crossings that will be needed. There are currently two items in process with the City of Glenwood Springs: 1) RFTA has provided the City with the Appendix that will go with the ACP, which lists all of the existing crossings and potential new crossings in each of the jurisdictions; and 2) Glenwood Springs will need to review the list of existing crossings, which includes utilities, roads, etc. and update it with proposed new crossings.

If the Board moves ahead with the proposed Draft ACP, Mullins questioned whether proposed new crossing proposals would come before the Board prior to approval.

Blankenship responded that with regard to easements, staff cannot convey real property, which is solely a Board decision. Each of the proposed crossings that requires an easement will come before the Board for approval. Items granted through licenses, such as a trail s or access to private property, are revocable and do not have to come before the Board for approval.

Ben Bohmfalk stated that he feels that the Draft ACP Update strikes a fair balance and compromise and that it does not impose undue risk on the corridor as-is or impose any unfair costs on municipalities to build to a specification that may never be needed. The Board must approve each easement and at-grade crossings are not anticipated to create a significant impediment to the reactivation of freight rail or impose significant costs for implementing light rail. When looking to the future and potential valley-wide light rail, it will be a complete package and there will be parts of it that are expensive, however, the proposed and existing crossings do not seem to be contributing greatly to the expenses.

Newman stated that goal for today was to present the 2017 Draft ACP Update to the Board, answer any questions regarding the Draft ACP, and if the Board agrees with the content of the plan, to allow the ACP to go to First Reading with a thirty-day (30 day) public comment period. Newman stated that there would still be a continued conversation with the City of Glenwood Springs that might alter the Draft ACP in some fashion.

Blankenship responded that the conversation with the City of Glenwood Springs is about the Design Guidelines, which are going to be an Appendix to the ACP. From one Reading to the next, there can be revisions and alterations to the ACP without having to restart the process. The existing Design Guidelines will be posted in track change mode and, as the suggested revisions from the City of Glenwood are received, there will be discussions about the revisions and the approved revisions will be incorporated into the Design Guidelines. Those changes will be highlighted and given to the Board at the April 13, Board meeting. A complete package of the final revisions will be given to the Board at the May 11, Board meeting.

The Board unanimously agreed to allow the draft Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan Update, to move forward to the First Reading on May 11, 2017.

B. RFTA Board Policy on Grants to Non-Profit and Quasi-Governmental Organizations – Michael Yang, CFAO

Michael Yang directed the Board to page 31 of the agenda packet pertaining to the RFTA Board Policy on Grants to Non-Profit and Quasi-Governmental Organizations. The current policy limits non-profit and quasi-governmental organizations from requesting more than \$50,000 during any calendar year and any additional funding requires Board approval. During the 2016 and 2017 budget process, RFTA received requests for funding in excess of \$50,000 and in both instances; the Board approved the requests for additional funding. With the growing trend of contribution requests in excess of \$50,000, staff recommends increasing the limit to \$75,000 during any calendar year.

McQueeney stated that the organizations that have requested contributions totaling over the \$50,000 threshold seem to be organizations to which the Board wants to grant the funds. She questioned why RFTA requires that these organizations to go through the approval process each year. It would be simpler to have a contract with them for the amount that they would receive each year instead of going through the grant approval process. These organizations would then have the benefit of knowing they will be receiving funds from RFTA annually, as the budget allows.

Mullins asked how long the \$50,000 limit has been in place. Yang responded that the Board approved the \$50,000 limit in 2014. The largest grantee increase is associated with WE-cycle, which received a \$10,000 increase from 2016 to 2017.

Newman said that Pitkin County's Healthy Communities Grant Program has some organizations that they have yearly requests and some that are on a three (3) year partnership basis.

Butler stated that there should be some organizations such as WE-cycle that are put on a two or three-year partnership contract with a specific amount that they will receive during those years.

Whitsitt questioned if there is a way to have a statement in the contract to assure both parties. If, unfortunately, there were no grant funds available, then RFTA would not be required to contribute for that year. Blankenship stated that all grant funding is subject to annual appropriations.

Butler suggested contacting Healthy Communities and requesting a copy of the contract that they use for the extended partnership contracts. Nicole Schoon will request information from Mitzi Ledingham from Pitkin County Healthy Communities.

Butler moved to approve the increase of the grant limitation from \$50,000 to \$75,000 and Whitsitt seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

The Board took a ten (10) minute break.

C. Regional Transit Center Feasibility Study Update – Mike Hermes, Director of Property, Facilities and Trails

Mike Hermes stated that RFTA has made several design attempts at increasing the capacity of the Glenwood Maintenance Facility (GMF), however, in the first two the amount of additional capacity was not adequate. Last year Nick Senn and Mike began working on another design to increase the capacity with the assistance of a team from Shrewsbury and Ironhorse. Ironhorse is the contractor who created the Union Station in Denver. It was determined that the GMF has a lot of potential to expand its capacity, even though it is a tight and confined area. An auxiliary parking lot is currently being constructed to help with additional bus parking capacity needed to support the Grand Avenue Bridge closure Transit Mitigation Plan.

The objective of this project is to maximize the current site of the GMF. There is not much land and maximizing the use of the current space available is the only option. The staffing needs and infrastructure needs to operate and maintain the maximum operational fleet the site can support were determined. The assumptions were that no new land for a maintenance facility would be purchased, the types of buses would remain essentially the same, no changes would be made to the fueling facility and processes, and office space would be designed to handle existing and future needs.

Operational capacity is the number of buses available on any given day. The spare ratio is the number of buses on standby. The industry standard spare ratio is 20% of operational capacity. Functional capacity is the number buses available on any given day plus the number of standby buses. Site capacity is the maximum number of buses that could possibly be parked on the site. Fueling Capacity is the maximum number of buses that could be fueled in a 24-hour period.

The first steps in this process were to review and determine:

- 1) The ultimate limiting factor for the GMF site
- 2) Personnel and space needs of every department
- 3) Vehicle Maintenance department requirements

- 4) The number and set standards for meeting rooms, restrooms, locker rooms, break rooms, and dispatch area
- 5) Space requirements for revenue, non-revenue, support staff and patron parking
- 6) Space for storage, training room, exercise room, workstations, etc.
- 7) Set square footage standards for office space

With this information, the operational capacity of the current GMF goes from 34 buses to 60; spare bus parking, 0 to 12, backlog parking, 0 to 24; and site capacity, 44 to 96. The office space of the current GMF goes from 1,225 net assignable square feet (nasf) to 3,390 nasf.

The current process creates a backlog of buses waiting to be fueled, which is a limiting factor and impedes getting the buses out and back on the road for customers. The greatest backlog begins around 1:00 p.m. and continues through 9:00 p.m.

The Basis of Design (BOD) was an accumulation of the information acquired from the Initial Plan of Improvements (IPOR) to develop a plan that would fit on the existing space. It is a comprehensive approach to leverage the entire site to meet the project goals and envision the maximum, optimal development of the Regional Transportation Center (RTC). This creates and allows ten lanes for buses to maneuver in and to be fueled, washed and readied for service. One of the biggest advantages is that this allows buses to be stored indoors with less time needed for warming up and idling.

The design build project will allow several contractors the opportunity to bid on the project and RFTA will then be able to choose and utilize the appropriate contractor. Advantages of the design build process are that the project will be "shovel ready" for a much lower initial investment by RFTA. This method also maximizes the projects design and construction value as related to needs, expectations and goals. This method can also incorporate the design fees into the construction contract where they are potentially reimbursable with grant funds.

RFTA's next steps are to develop a scope of work for the Program of Requirements (POR), which is included in the 2017 budget. Procurement documentation will be developed including performance specifications for the site and building systems. The project's general conditions will include what the City of Glenwood Springs requires. Construction cost estimates will help determine which items are needed and which items can be removed from the project. This project allows many different options for both internal and external transportation entities.

Richardson asked how to move forward. Hermes responded that we could go forward with several aspects without any commitment from funding entities. Certain portions of this project can be done as funding entities, such as the Department of Transportation, determine the need, such as the parking garage for potential the Hanging Lake shuttle service...

Art Riddle asked where the funding for this project is coming from. Hermes responded that the entire amount of funding is not needed all at once, because the project will be completed in phases. RFTA will create plans that allow portions of the project to be completed at certain times. RFTA is currently seeking a TIGER grant and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has several State of Good Repair grant programs. This will be a build as the project identifies and receives funding.

Kathryn Trauger asked if Greyhound could potentially utilize the facility as well. Hermes responded that we could potentially collaborate with Greyhound. The one concern would be that the buses of other entities could not interfere with the servicing of RFTA buses during the peak times.

Newman stated that Pitkin County went below the industry standards when they were creating office spaces. He would like the numbers on the office spaces presented to be looked at to see if there is a way to reduce the cost of them. Hermes responded that there is not a definitive standard

when dealing with the industry standards for office space. What RFTA used in this study was a standard right in the middle of the current options. The study also went by the standard of office desks and how those are being built as a starting place for the size of office spaces.

7. Information/Updates:

A. CEO Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO

Blankenship reported that the January 2017 RFTA Board meeting was video recorded; however, there were several technical issues with the video. The vendor has worked through those issues and staff is reviewing the quality of the recording. The vendor worked with RFTA's Communications Department and is able to upload it three ways. We can use the RFTA public website, You Tube, or Private Vimeo account. Once staff and the Board have reviewed the January video, it will be placed on one of these platforms. The Board can decide whether this is the option wants to proceed with or if there is a different vendor should be evaluated.

Thanks to Diane Mitsch-Bush and Jacque Whitsitt who went to the House Transportation Committee hearing. With Republican sponsors in both the House and Senate, House Bill 17-1018 that extends the sunset on the Regional Transportation Authority property tax authorization until 2029, passed and was signed into law by Governor John Hickenlooper on March 1, 2017. Blankenship was honored to have been able to attend the ceremony. Others who attended the bill signing were Senator Bob Garner; Representative Larry Liston; Jerry Braden, CASTA Lobbyist; and Ann Rajewski, Co-Director of Colorado Association of Transit Agencies (CASTA). This allows RFTA the option to pursue a property tax to replace buses, in the event that Federal and State funds are not available or insufficient in the future.

With the Grand Avenue Bridge closure, RFTA's Operations and Vehicle Maintenance Departments are concerned about having adequate personnel to support the Transit Mitigation effort. There is a great deal of unknowns, such as what the demand for transit service will be. CDOT is going to have an intense marketing campaign in order to persuade the community to utilize alternative transportation during the GAB closure period. The inability to forecast the number of riders is concerning due the number of buses and personnel that RFTA will have available.

Blankenship requested the Board to approve discontinuation of the Bike Express for this coming summer season, which operates on Saturdays and Sundays. In 2016, the Bike Express operated for 26 days with approximately 1100 total rides, but only 134 bikes were transported. The bike racks on the BRT service should be able to accommodate the number of riders with bikes, which should not significantly inconvenience anyone. The operating cost of the Bike Express is approximately \$26,000 and is offset by \$5,000 to \$6,000 in fare revenue. This service takes three buses and requires new decals and maintenance to take the seats out and put the bike racks in the buses.

Bohmfolk suggested that if the Bike Express is eliminated, there could be an opportunity to eliminate or lower the cost to passengers who utilize the bike racks. Blankenship stated that the extra cost for transporting bikes is to help control the number of passengers with bikes because there are only four bike racks per bus. He stated that it would take some research to determine if that cost could be lowered or eliminated.

Newman stated that the demand for the buses used for the GAB Transit Mitigation would be higher during the week than on the weekends and that maybe there would still be enough buses to allow operation of the Bike Express. Blankenship responded that in order to equip the bus with the appropriate equipment, the seats on the low floor have to be taken out, which leaves 12-14 seats in the back of the bus. Monday through Friday, during the GAB closure, all buses will be needed as well as all of the seats, and it would not be feasible to have to take out the seats and put them back in every weekend.

Butler stated that while the Bike Express is valuable to the public, during the GAB it is just not practical this year. The focus needs to be on getting the community through the congestion during this time.

McQueeney asked if RFTA has spoken to ECO Transit about buses that they might have and not be utilizing, and if RFTA could potentially use them during the GAB. Blankenship responded that RFTA has not spoken to ECO Transit about borrowing buses during this time but it could definitely be an option. RFTA will need to get some experience during the actual closure in order to determine what the increase in riders will be, and whether more buses will be needed. The other limiting factor is the number of drivers for the buses that RFTA currently has. During the winter season, RFTA employs approximately 165 drivers, and for the GAB RFTA will need to employ 185 drivers.

Newman stated that there needs to be communication with the community and businesses that the BRT buses can carry four bikes, but that during this summer season the Bike Express will not be available.

The Board unanimously approved discontinuing the Bike Express for 2017 summer season.

George Newman reminded the Board that the World Cup Ski Races are coming to Aspen and asked staff what is being done about additional buses and services.

Kent Blackmer stated that RFTA is expecting the concerts to be the primary impact on transit services. RFTA has been in contact with the City of Aspen and Aspen SkiCo, and both agreed to provide funds for RFTA to offer additional buses and services during the week and through the weekend. RFTA will be providing additional buses and services as necessary during the World Cup event.

8. Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:

- A. Clean Energy Workshop Opportunities
- B. First Reading of the Draft ACP
- C. Rio Grande Trail Policies

9. Next Meeting: 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., April 13, 2017 at Carbondale Town Hall, 511 Colorado Avenue.

10. Adjournment:

Richardson made a motion to adjourn the Board meeting and Riddile seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Newman adjourned the Board meeting at 11:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:
Nicole R. Schoon
Secretary to the RFTA Board of Directors

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

Meeting Date:	April 13, 2017
Agenda Item:	Memorandum of Understanding: Governor’s Office of Information Technology and RFTA regarding Statewide Digital Trunked Radio System Upgrade
Presented By:	Phil Schultz, Director of IT
Policy #:	2.8.11: Board Awareness and Support
Strategic Goal:	N/A
Staff Recommends:	Authorize the RFTA Board Chairman to execute the Statewide Digital Trunked Radio (DTR) System Upgrade MOU with Governor’s Office of Information Technology subject to approval as to form by the General Counsel.
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In July 2011, RFTA joined the Statewide Digital Trunked Radio system. Prior to that time, RFTA had a lease with Holy Cross, for approximately 13 years, to use its regional trunked analogue radio system. However, Holy Cross’ analogue radio system technology became obsolete and RFTA had no other viable alternative other than joining the statewide DTR system. 2. There was no cost to join the State’s system; however, RFTA was required to upgrade all of its base stations, and its mobile and hand-held radios from analogue to digital, at a cost of approximately \$400,000. Because of the 2011 upgrade, RFTA has experienced a significant improvement in the clarity and coverage of its radio communications throughout its service area, which extends from Rifle to Aspen. 3. In 2011, the OIT upgraded the software for the statewide DTR system, at no cost to RFTA, so long as RFTA agreed not to disconnect from the statewide DTR system for a period of 5 years. If RFTA decided to disconnect from the statewide DTR system within 5 years of the effective date of the MOU, RFTA would be responsible for reimbursing the OIT for the software upgrade, in the amount of \$16,230, paid back in sixty (60) monthly installments of \$270.50. RFTA, however, did not disconnect during the term of the MOU. 4. Currently, OIT is planning a series of five future DTR system software upgrades commencing in September 2017 and every two years after that. Each time there is an upgrade, RFTA will have the option to remain connected to the DTR system or to disconnect from it. If RFTA agrees to remain connected, there will be no charge for the upgrade unless RFTA subsequently decides to disconnect from the DTR system before two years have elapsed. In that event, RFTA would incur an apportionment of the upgrade cost in the amount of \$6,370. The last of the five upgrades is expected to occur in 2025, which means RFTA would potentially need to remain connected to the statewide DTR system until December of 2027 unless, for some reason, it decided to disconnect from the DTR system sooner. 5. Due to the numerous advantages of using the statewide DTR system, and the significant cost to RFTA that would be associated with replacing this system, there is very little possibility that RFTA will want to disconnect from the statewide DTR system in the foreseeable future.

	6. Staff recommends that the RFTA Board authorize the Board Chairman to execute the MOU.
Background Information:	See Core Issues
Policy Implications:	Board Management Limitation 2.8.11 states, "The CEO may not fail to supply for the Board's consent agenda, along with applicable monitoring information, all decisions delegated to the CEO yet required by law, regulation, or contract to be Board approved.
Fiscal Implications:	None, unless RFTA disconnects from the DTR system, which is highly unlikely.
Attachments:	See "RFTA OIT DTR Upgrade MOU" included in the April 2017 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.

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

Meeting Date:	April 13, 2017
Agenda Item:	Overview of 2017 Rio Grande Recreational Trail Plan Update
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, CEO, Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations
Policy #:	1.1: The Rio Grande Trail is Appropriately Protected and Utilized
Strategic Goal:	Complete all sections of the Updated Rio Grande Corridor Comprehensive Plan
Staff Recommends:	FYI: Discuss overview of the Recreational Trail Plan and provide input to staff.
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the March 9 discussion of the proposed update of the Access Control Plan (ACP), some Board members expressed a desire to know more about the how the Recreational Trail Plan Update relates to the ACP Update. 2. Of particular concern, was the extent to which new trail connections to the Rio Grande Trail should be approved. 3. Some Board members believe that developing new trail connections, particularly in more urbanized areas, will and should encourage greater utilization of the Rio Grande Trail. 4. Other Board members believe that having too many trail connections could degrade the experience of trail users, if they impede cycling on the Rio Grande Trail. 5. Staff believes that each proposed trail connection should be evaluated based upon its merits and the unique circumstances involved, and that there are ways to mitigate adverse impacts on the quality of the mainline Rio Grande Trail user experience. 6. Staff also believes that there could be different standards for trail connections in the more urbanized areas than there are for ones in the rural areas. 7. The purpose of the overview of the 2017 Recreational Trail Plan Update is to provide the Board with background regarding the content of the 2005 Recreational Trail Plan. Hopefully, this will assure the Board that there will be an opportunity to address issues related to trail connections, as well as the quality of the trail-user’s experience, as the 2017 Recreational Trail Plan is updated. 8. Staff recommends, however, that the Board adopt the 2017 Access Control Plan Update prior to updating the 2017 Recreational Trail Plan.
Background Information:	See Core Issues.
Policy Implications:	Board End 1.1 states, “The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized.”
Fiscal Implications:	None at this time.
Attachments:	Please see excerpts from the 2005 Recreational Trail Plan, below. Also, the complete 2005 Recreational Trail Plan can be found beginning at page 30 of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan For The Aspen Branch Of The Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Corridor 2005 Rio Grande Corridor Comprehensive Plan Update, by following this link: https://www.rfta.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2005_Comp_Plan.pdf

2005 Recreational Trails Plan Update

IV. TRAIL PROGRAMMING AND DESIGN PRINCIPLES

A. General

- Improve the quality of life for residents through the development of the corridor that meets expressed community transportation and recreation needs.
- Plan for a continuous trail throughout the corridor.
- The proposed trail alignments (paved and soft-surfaced) shall be restricted to use of the linear RFTA property to the fullest possible extent.
- Maximize recreation, education and interpretation opportunities.
- Develop a trail system that provides a quality experience for both local and visiting users, and results in economic benefits to the valley.
- Minimize impact to adjacent landowners from existing and proposed activities (transit, river access, etc)
- Take advantage of existing corridor resources including access points, road grades, trail connections and river access.
- Plan for the ultimate development of appropriate support facilities such as water stations, restrooms, picnic shelters, etc.
- Consider implementation costs.

C. Trail Use

- Design for multi-purpose use and provide interest and variety for users.
- Provide for a wide variety of high-quality, non-motorized, passive and active recreational experiences and opportunities.
- Provide a trail suitable for non-motorized commuting. Only non-motorized use shall be allowed, except for emergency and trail maintenance access.
- Trail design shall accommodate hiking, running, biking, skating, equestrian and challenged users. Other uses identified include picnicking, wildlife viewing, cross-country skiing, photography, river, environmental education/interpretation and public land access. Local communities may decide independently with respect to skaters, equestrians and other uses within developed areas.
- Plan shall accommodate specific design requirements and constraints of programmed uses.

D. Linkage

- 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 center and to other resources throughout the valley.
- 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
- Trail system shall emphasize regional recreational concept and commuter functions.
- Identify or develop off-street access to schools for student commuting and environmental education. Provide for convenient, direct access and use by residents and visitors. Identify trail access points considering proximity to residential, educational and employment centers.

From Pitkin County Open Space and Trails “Trails Design and Management Handbook” provided for comparison with RFTA’s Recreational Trail Plan:

Provide spur trails for access.

- *Wherever possible, increase the accessibility of the trail system by creating access spurs into neighborhoods, developed areas, business centers, schools, community facilities, which serve large numbers of people, nearby roads, and other trails. These spurs need their own corridors as well.*
- *Create possibilities for loops and varied trips. A network of trails allows for many more possibilities than a single trail.*
- *Whenever possible, connect trails, create loops, and create alternate ways to travel (including loops, which are part trail, part quiet roads).*

F. Safety

- Develop safe and secure trails for users and adjacent property owners.
- Provide sufficient trail pavement width to minimize user conflict.
- Provide adequate shoulder width and sight distance to enhance trail user safety.
- Locate trail access points and support functions considering safety, visibility and emergency access.
- Provide barrier fencing at convergence areas to protect trail user from transit hazards.
- Provide perimeter fencing where needed to protect property privacy or livestock.
- Utilize discrete or unobtrusive barriers to direct the trail user away from hazards and sensitive natural areas.
- **Recommend grade-separated rail and major roadway trail crossings.**
- Consider solar-powered emergency call boxes in isolated areas and at trailheads.

V. TRAIL SYSTEM ELEMENTS

B. Road and Transit Crossings

Crossings of public roads and private drives are required throughout the corridor. **Grade separated trail crossings are highly recommended for highway crossings of State Highway 133 at Carbondale and State Highway 82 at Wingo.** Due to poor sight lines and proximity to State Highway 82, the intersection of the trail with Grand Avenue at **Buffalo Valley is also recommended** for a grade-separated crossing.

The plan for the transit overpass at State Highway 133 accommodates a trail platform. At Wingo Junction, the trail plan recommends a bridge crossing of both State Highway 82 and the proposed transit line. Existing State Highway 82 underpasses adjacent to the corridor provide safe access across the highway near Aspen Glen, Carbondale and Emma. **For at-grade road and private drive crossings, trail design should emphasize safety.**

Basic safety elements include right-angle intersections, adequate sight distances, warning signs and pavement markings for both trail and roads per the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) standards. Measures should be included to restrict trail access by unauthorized vehicles. The trail plan recommends additional design treatment for public road crossings to further enhance trail safety, identity and recognition. Site improvements can include special crosswalk paving, landscaping, trail signage, rustic fencing and potentially lighting to enhance these trail entrances.

A main objective in the trail alignment design process seeks to minimize rail corridor crossings. Severe topography, river adjacencies and other corridor constraints require the trail to cross the potential transit alignment up to seven times along the corridor. **It was strongly recommended by the Trails Task Force that the plan include grade-separated crossings for all trail-transit intersections.** The plan includes

underpasses at these locations to improve trail safety and reduce visual impacts. **At grade crossings are suitable prior to transit line implementation.**

The following language regarding the Recreational Trails Plan is included in the 2017 draft ACP Update:

V. Rio Grande Trail – Recreational Trails Plan

The overall intent of the Recreational Trails Plan is to develop a trails and recreation plan for the Corridor that provides a wide range of public recreational opportunities including trails, river access, wildlife viewing, habitat conservation and educational and interpretive activities.

The purpose of the Recreational Trails Plan is as follows:

- To provide a continuous trail between Glenwood Springs and Woody Creek within the Railroad Corridor that has been environmentally cleared through a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process;
- **To work with other Trails organizations in the Roaring Fork Valley to explore additional recreational and commuter connection opportunities;**
- To meet the expressed community recreational needs;
- **To develop trails programming and design principles that will provide a quality trail experience;**
- To plan for support facilities such as trailheads and parking;
- To minimize impacts on adjacent landowners; and
- To develop implementation costs.

The Rio Grande Trail construction was completed in 2008. The RFTA Trails Department continues to work with RFTA's member jurisdictions, other local jurisdictions, and other trails consortiums to stay up to date on the latest recommended safety improvements and recommendations for trail construction and amenities to keep the Rio Grande Trail one of the best and most widely used trails in the state.

VI. 9.0 Rio Grande Trail within the Railroad Corridor Requirements Defined

Trail Use: The Rio Grande Trail (RGT) is designed, built, and operated within the Railroad Corridor and is operated for multi-purpose use. **Trail uses, include walking, running, biking, skating, equestrian, and cross-country skiing, should be encouraged.** No motorized use except for emergency access and maintenance will be allowed. No camping or open fires will be allowed on the Railroad Corridor.

Linkages: **Access and increased connections to the trail should be encouraged to maximize use by, between, and among neighborhoods and communities. Insofar as connections are consistent with the ACP and DG, and would not degrade the overall quality of the RGT user experience or safety, every effort will be made to allow for easy, convenient, and direct access to the trail.** Connections will be coordinated to provide access consistent with the purposes of this policy. A regional recreational experience for all individuals and non-motorized modes will be emphasized as a part of the trail experience. Trail access is governed by RFTA's Recreational Trails Plan and administered by RFTA's Assistant Director, Project Management & Facilities Operations & RFTA's Trails Manager and staff. Design principles are located in:

- RFTA's Recreational Trails Plan
- AASHTO "Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 4th Edition"
https://bookstore.transportation.org/collection_detail.aspx?ID=116 or Appendix A
- FHWA – FTA – United States Department of Transportation Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and recommendations
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/overview/policy_accom.cfmhttp://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/bp-guid.cfm (see section 10, Design Guidance); http://www.dhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/guidance/manuals.cfm

Environmental Impacts/Mitigation: The overriding goal of trail design and management has been to protect the natural quality of the Corridor. This was done through minimization of impacts to the natural environment through design, management, and education. Sensitive areas were identified and mitigation measurements were and will continue to be implemented where appropriate.

Safety: Safety of the trail user and the adjacent landowners has been addressed through design and management techniques. This includes providing adequate width to avoid user conflicts, situating trail access points so that they are sensitive to safety, and should include providing barrier protection where appropriate between trail and transit, when transit returns to the Railroad Corridor. Perimeter fencing is also used in various locations to reduce conflicts with livestock and wildlife.

Implementation: Implementation of the overall trail system has been a regional effort that included the local, federal, and state government agencies. RFTA was responsible for implementing the sections of trail not developed by local jurisdictions.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
 “PUBLIC HEARING” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 8. A.**

Meeting Date:	April 13, 2017
Agenda Item:	Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan Update
Policy #:	1.1: The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized
Strategic Goal:	Complete all sections of the updated Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Comprehensive Plan
Presented By:	Dan Blankenship, CEO Angela Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management and Facilities Operations
Recommendation:	Approve the 2017 draft ACP Update on First Reading with the proposed revisions recommended by RFTA’s railroad attorneys, William Mullins and Walter Downing.
Core Issues:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The 2001 Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO) Legacy grant stipulates that the Corridor Comprehensive Plan (CCP) should be updated every five years. The CCP was last updated in 2005 and adopted in 2006. Technically, the CCP should have been updated in 2010 or 2011, however, due to the staff effort required to implement BRT, the CCP update process was postponed until 2014. 2. Elements of the CCP that should be updated on the 5-year cycle are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Access Control Plan (ACP): The update addresses revisions to access control policies as well as updates the inventory of existing and anticipated uses of the corridor, such as crossings, utilities, and encroachments. b. Recreational Trails Plan (RTP): The update will address the interim recreational trail, which was completed in 2008, as well as any changes to goals and policies. c. Overview of Compliance with requirements of the GOCO Legacy Grant: The overview will serve as a reset to bring actions taken on the corridor since the last update current with GOCO. 3. Adoption of the components of the Comprehensive Plan Update requires a unanimous vote of the seven original constituent members of the Roaring Fork Railroad Holding Authority (RFRHA). The New Castle Board Member can vote on the Access Control Plan, but his/her vote would not be binding because New Castle was not a constituent member of RFRHA. 4. At the March 9, 2017 meeting, the RFTA Board unanimously agreed to schedule the draft 2017 ACP Update for First Reading at the April 13, 2107 meeting. 6. Since the March meeting, RFTA’s railroad attorneys, William Mullins and Walter Downing have performed a final review of the ACP and have written letters, each with a recommendation they believe would strengthen the document. 7. Mr. Mullins recommends adding language similar to that which is contained in the City of Glenwood Springs’ 8th Street Easement Agreement to Section IV, 17.0 of the ACP as follows: <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Easements for public roadway crossings and utilities, which are conveyed by RFTA to jurisdictions shall contain the following provision:</p>

Railbanking Protection. “Jurisdiction” acknowledges that RFTA's Corridor is not abandoned and is under the jurisdiction of the federal Surface Transportation Board. “Jurisdiction” further acknowledges that the Corridor is "railbanked" under the National Trails System Act, 16 U.S.C.§1247(d), so that RFTA is required to preserve the Corridor for future rail use. “Jurisdiction’s” improvements and use shall not interfere with RFTA's use of the Corridor for transportation, shipping, trail, and/or conservation purposes and that no disturbance or interference of said any such uses shall be allowed hereunder without the prior written approval of RFTA. This Easement shall not be deemed to give “Jurisdiction” exclusive possession of any part of the Easement area described, and nothing shall be done or suffered to be done by “Jurisdiction” at any time that shall in any manner impair the usefulness or safety of the Corridor or of any track or other improvement on the Corridor or to be constructed thereon by RFTA in the future. If RFTA in its sole discretion upon advice of legal counsel believes that an action permitted by this Easement has or will cause a severance of the Corridor from the UPRR main line, RFTA shall notify the “Jurisdiction” and RFTA and the “Jurisdiction” shall work together to revise this Easement to correct the potential severance or impediment to freight rail service. Only in the event no modification can be agreed upon, may RFTA terminate this Easement.

8. Mr. Downing recommended adding the following provision to Section V, 5.0, A:

Notwithstanding anything in this document to the contrary, nothing herein is intended to grant to or permit any adjacent landowner or public entity any greater rights of access over, under, along or across the Corridor than they would otherwise have under Colorado law or to impair or limit RFTA's rights as a public entity and landowner in managing its Corridor.

9. Pending RFTA Board review and approval, these changes to the 2017 draft ACP Update recommended by the attorneys have not been incorporated into the 02/28/17 draft ACP submitted to the Board at the March 9, 2017 meeting. That document, along with the Design Guidelines and 2017 – 2005 ACP Comparison Matrix and other supporting documentation can be found under the heading of “ACCESS CONTROL PLAN UPDATE,” by following this link: <https://www.rfta.com/trail-documentation/>. **Note:** Inadvertently, three sections of the Table of Contents in the 02/28/17 draft ACP Update were omitted. These sections have been added to the Table of Contents and are highlighted in red font in the draft ACP copy posted on the RFTA website.
10. The major differences between the proposed 2017 ACP Update and the 2005 ACP Update are as follows:
- a. The 2017 ACP Update emphasizes the need to maintain the corridor's Railbanked status in order to keep the 34-mile contiguous corridor intact.

- b. The ACP assures parties proposing public or private uses of the corridor that RFTA will endeavor to work cooperatively with them, consistent with the policies stated in the ACP, to help them achieve their objectives in the most efficient and cost-effective manner possible, including collaborating with sponsors during the planning and design processes for their projects.
- c. The 2017 ACP Update allows for the approval of public at-grade crossings that are consistent with RFTA's ACP and Design Guidelines (DG) if they will not preclude or unreasonably impair RFTA's ability to reactivate freight rail service or to activate commuter rail, subject to such terms and conditions as approved by the RFTA Board. Private at-grade crossings consistent with the ACP and DG can be approved by a terminable license agreement.
- d. The 2017 ACP Update states that if a grade-separated crossing is proposed before rail is active in the corridor, it should be constructed in accordance with RFTA's DG and be consistent with the ACP. However, the RFTA Board can grant a variance from the ACP and DG subject to an agreement to restore the corridor or remove any temporary impediment at such time that RFTA elects to reactivate freight rail service.
- e. The 2017 ACP Update states that if a public crossing is designed consistent with RFTA's DG or otherwise approved by the RFTA Board of Directors, RFTA will grant an easement to the project sponsor, subject to the approval of the RFTA Board of Directors and/or the CPUC. The easement, however, will be subject to the following reservation and such other terms and conditions as the RFTA Board, in its sole discretion, may determine at the time of issuance:

Should RFTA need to extend, modify, or relocate a crossing to accommodate the activation of freight or passenger rail service on the Corridor by RFTA, RFTA shall be entitled to do so as long as the extension, modification, or relocation does not substantially and materially interfere with the connectivity of the crossing after review and approval of plans detailing the extension, modification, or relocation by the public entity holding the easement, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld, and if applicable, approval by the CPUC. If the sole cause of the need for such extension, modification, or relocation is the needs of RFTA, such cost will be borne by RFTA if RFTA approves the project and costs thereof; it being understood that any funding for such a project is subject to appropriation of funding. If the public entity holding the easement should desire to extend, modify, replace, relocate, or remove the crossing to further its needs, then such cost shall be borne by the public entity. Any such extension, modification, relocation, or replacement or repair by the public entity shall only be made in accordance with plans prepared by the public entity and reviewed and approved by RFTA, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld, and approval by the CPUC, if CPUC jurisdiction is exercised. For extensions, modifications, or relocations that are jointly caused and will benefit both parties, the

	<p>allocation of costs shall be by further agreement, or if no agreement, then as determined by the CPUC in a hearing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e. The 2017 ACP Update states that access and increased connections to the trail should be encouraged to maximize use by, between, and among neighborhoods and communities. f. Unless an emergency exists, amendments of the ACP will require two readings by the RFTA Board of Directors prior to adoption and can only be adopted in the same manner that the ACP is adopted, i.e. by a unanimous vote of the seven original RFRHA member jurisdictions. g. Denials of crossing proposals can be appealed to the RFTA Board. <p>11. The Design Guidelines are still undergoing a review by City of Glenwood Springs staff and will be included for review prior to the Second Reading of the draft ACP Update on May 11, 2017.</p> <p>12. Staff recommends that the RFTA Board approve the 2017 draft ACP Update on First Reading with the proposed revisions recommended by William Mullins and Walter Downing.</p>
Policy Implications:	Board End Statement 1.1 says, "The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized.
Fiscal Implications:	Approximately \$150,000 has been budgeted in 2017 for the Comprehensive Plan Update and other corridor management-related tasks.
Attachments:	Yes, please see "B.Mullins 4-6-17 Ltr on ACP.pdf" and "W.Downing 2017-04-06 ACP Letter.pdf" included in the April 2017 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
 “PUBLIC HEARING” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM #8. B.**

Meeting Date:	April 13, 2017																														
Agenda Item:	Resolution 2017-06: 2017 Supplemental Budget Appropriation																														
Presented By:	Michael Yang, CFAO																														
POLICY #:	2.5: Financial Planning/Budgeting																														
Strategic Goal:	N/A																														
Recommendation:	Adopt Supplemental Budget Appropriation Resolution 2017-06																														
Core Issues:	<p>As part of our on-going review, staff has identified the following items where additional appropriations are being requested:</p> <p>General Fund:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legal Fees – Eminent Domain Attorney services for ongoing matters regarding <i>Sos v. RFTA</i>. The additional appropriation is needed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. \$37,400 increase to Transit expenditures 2. Additional Employee Housing – to help accommodate the increased number of bus operators to support the upcoming Grand Avenue Bridge transit mitigation plan, staff has located and identified additional employee housing units in Snowmass Village through the Aspen Skiing Company and in the Town of New Castle. The units in Snowmass Village are short-term rentals from May to October (12 beds). The units in New Castle are long-term rentals starting in May (5 beds). These additional units will increase RFTA’s employee housing to a total of 52 beds: <table border="1" data-bbox="755 1060 1209 1344" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Employee Housing</th> <th># of Beds</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Burlingame - long term</td> <td align="right">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carbondale Main St.</td> <td align="right">7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Carbondale Parker House</td> <td align="right">24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Snowmass Village (ASC)</td> <td align="right">12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>New Castle</td> <td align="right">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td align="right">52</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In order to secure these units and get the necessary lease agreements in place, additional appropriations are needed. The following chart shows the breakdown of the expenditures and estimated revenues related to the additional units (<i>note that the estimated revenues reflect only those units where employees have been identified; however, staff anticipates additional revenues after the upcoming hiring period has been completed and remaining units have been filled.</i>):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="576 1585 1388 1753" style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>SMV (ASC)</th> <th>New Castle</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Expenditures</td> <td align="right">\$ 37,200</td> <td align="right">\$ 28,000</td> <td align="right">\$ 65,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Est. Rental Revenue</td> <td align="right">\$ (15,700)</td> <td align="right">\$ (19,900)</td> <td align="right">\$ (35,600)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Net Outflow</td> <td align="right">\$ 21,500</td> <td align="right">\$ 8,100</td> <td align="right">\$ 29,600</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. \$65,200 increase to Transit expenditures b. \$35,600 increase to Other Income 	Employee Housing	# of Beds	Burlingame - long term	4	Carbondale Main St.	7	Carbondale Parker House	24	Snowmass Village (ASC)	12	New Castle	5	Total	52		SMV (ASC)	New Castle	Total	Expenditures	\$ 37,200	\$ 28,000	\$ 65,200	Est. Rental Revenue	\$ (15,700)	\$ (19,900)	\$ (35,600)	Net Outflow	\$ 21,500	\$ 8,100	\$ 29,600
Employee Housing	# of Beds																														
Burlingame - long term	4																														
Carbondale Main St.	7																														
Carbondale Parker House	24																														
Snowmass Village (ASC)	12																														
New Castle	5																														
Total	52																														
	SMV (ASC)	New Castle	Total																												
Expenditures	\$ 37,200	\$ 28,000	\$ 65,200																												
Est. Rental Revenue	\$ (15,700)	\$ (19,900)	\$ (35,600)																												
Net Outflow	\$ 21,500	\$ 8,100	\$ 29,600																												

3. **Additional Facilities Technician II** – The Facilities Maintenance Department needs an additional Maintenance Technician II to support the RFTA Operating Facilities, including all offices, the BRT stations and bus stops, and employee housing. Facilities has been stretched to cover 7 day a week shifts with existing FTEs and during the 2017 budget process identified the need to expand. It was decided to continue to operate at base staffing levels for the time being. Facilities is facing further shortages with multiple employees out on extended leave. In order to provide a base level of service, an additional position is needed. The anticipated start date is May 1 and the total estimated cost for compensation and benefits is approximately \$39,700. For budget year 2017, there have been approximately \$8,000 of savings in compensation in the department which can offset a portion of the cost for the additional position:

4.

Fund	Allocation	Est. Total Cost	Less Savings	Budget Needed
General Fund	60%	\$ 23,900	\$ (7,000)	\$ 16,900
Bus Stops/PNR	40%	\$ 15,800	\$ (1,000)	\$ 14,800
	100%	\$ 39,700	\$ (8,000)	\$ 31,700

Costs are allocated 60% to the General Fund (includes facilities/offices/housing) and 40% to the Bus Stops & Park and Ride (PNR) Special Revenue Fund (SRF) (includes bus stations and park and rides). A transfer to the Bus Stops & PNR SRF is needed to fund the 40% of allocated costs. The additional appropriations are needed:

- a. \$16,900 increase to Transit expenditures
- b. \$14,800 increase to Other financing uses

Bus Stops & Park and Ride Special Revenue Fund:

5. **Additional Facilities Technician II** – to reflect the 40% allocation of costs related to the additional position and funding via transfer from the General Fund.
- a. \$14,800 increase to Other financing sources
 - b. \$14,800 increase to Transit expenditures

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:

Net increase (decrease) to 2017 fund balance by fund:

General Fund	\$ (98,700)
Bus Stops/PNR Special Revenue Fund	-
Total	\$ (98,700)

Attachments:

Yes, please see Resolution 2017-06 attached below.

Director _____ moved adoption of the following Resolution:

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-06

2017 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Pitkin County, Eagle County, the City of Glenwood Springs, the City of Aspen, the Town of Carbondale, the Town of Basalt, and the Town of Snowmass Village (the “Cooperating Governments”) on September 12, 2000, entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement to form a Rural Transportation Authority, known as the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (“RFTA” or “Authority”), pursuant to title 43, article 4, part 6, Colorado Revised Statutes; and

WHEREAS, on November 7, 2000, the electors within the boundaries of the Cooperating Governments approved the formation of a Rural Transportation Authority; and

WHEREAS, the Town of New Castle elected to join the Authority on November 2, 2004; and

WHEREAS, certain revenues will become available and additional expenditures have become necessary that were not anticipated during the preparation of the 2017 budget; and

WHEREAS, upon due and proper notice, published in accordance with the state budget law, said supplemental budget was open for inspection by the public at a designated place, a public hearing was held on, April 13, 2017 and interested taxpayers were given an opportunity to file or register any objections to said supplemental budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority that the following adjustments will be made to the 2017 budget as summarized herein:

General Fund

Revenue and Other Financing Sources (OFS):

Type	Amount	Explanation
Other Income	\$ 15,700	Est. Rental Revenue at SMV (ASC) Housing
Other Income	19,900	Est. Rental Revenue at New Castle Housing
Total	\$ 35,600	

Revenue & OFS Summary	Previous	Change	Current
Sales tax	\$ 21,288,000	-	\$ 21,288,000
Grants	3,628,703	-	3,628,703
Fares	4,869,000	-	4,869,000
Other govt contributions	1,780,517	-	1,780,517
Other income	539,140	\$ 35,600	574,740
Other financing sources	1,330,900	-	1,330,900
Total	\$ 33,436,260	\$ 35,600	\$ 33,471,860

Expenditures and Other Financing Uses (OFU):

Type	Amount	Explanation
Transit	\$ 37,400	Legal Fees
Transit	37,200	RFTA Employee Housing at SMV (ASC)
Transit	28,000	RFTA Employee Housing at New Castle
Transit	16,900	Allocation of additional Facilities Tech II position
Other financing uses	14,800	Transfer to Bus Stops & PNR SRF
Total	\$ 134,300	

Expenditures & OFU Summary	Previous	Change	Current
Fuel	\$ 1,408,112	-	\$ 1,408,112
Transit	20,542,633	\$ 119,500	20,662,133
Trails & Corridor Mgmt	471,720	-	471,720
Capital	6,611,351	-	6,611,351
Debt service	1,902,244	-	1,902,244
Other financing uses	3,357,485	14,800	3,372,285
Total	\$ 34,293,545	\$ 134,300	\$ 34,427,845

The net change to Fund balance for this amendment is as follows:

Revenues and other financing sources	\$ 35,600
Less Expenditures and other financing uses	(134,300)
Net increase (decrease) in fund balance	\$ (98,700)

Fund balance Roll Forward: Net Change in Fund balance

Resolution	Beginning Balance	Change	Ending Balance
			\$ 17,442,398*
2016-16 & 2016-17	\$ 17,442,398	\$ 773,357	18,215,755
2017-02	18,215,755	(1,217,301)	16,998,454
2017-05	16,998,454	(413,341)	16,585,113
2017-06	16,585,113	(98,700)	16,486,413
Total Net Change		\$(955,985)	

* Budgeted

Bus Stops & Park and Ride Special Revenue Fund

Revenue and Other Financing Sources (OFS):

Type	Amount	Explanation
Other financing sources	\$ 14,800	Transfer from General Fund
Total	\$ 14,800	

Revenue & OFS Summary	Previous	Change	Current
Other income	\$ 480,000	-	\$ 480,000
Other financing sources	288,939	\$ 14,800	303,739
Total	\$ 768,939	\$ 14,800	\$ 783,739

Expenditures and Other Financing Uses (OFU):

Type	Amount	Explanation
Transit	\$ 14,800	Allocation of additional Facilities Tech II position
Total	\$ 14,800	

Expenditures & OFU Summary	Previous	Change	Current
Transit	\$ 768,939	\$ 14,800	\$ 783,739
Total	\$ 768,939	\$ 14,800	\$ 783,739

The net change to Fund balance for this amendment is as follows:

Revenues and other financing sources	\$14,800
Less Expenditures and other financing uses	(14,800)
Net increase (decrease) in fund balance	\$ -

Fund balance Roll Forward: Net Change in Fund balance

Resolution	Beginning Balance	Change	Ending Balance
			\$ 97,204*
2016-16 & 2016-17	\$ 97,204	-	97,204
2017-06	97,204	-	97,204
Total Net Change		-	

* Budgeted

That the amended budget as submitted and herein above summarized be, and the same hereby is approved and adopted as the amended 2017 budget of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority, and be a part of the public records of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority.

That the amended budget as hereby approved and adopted shall be signed by the Chair of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority.

INTRODUCED, READ AND PASSED by the Board of Directors of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority at its regular meeting held the 13th day of April, 2017.

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

By: _____
George Newman, 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 April 13, 2017 (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 _____, 2017.

RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
“INFORMATION/UPDATES” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 9. A.

CEO REPORT

TO: RFTA Board of Directors
FROM: Dan Blankenship, CEO
DATE: April 13, 2017

Chief Operating Officer – Kelley Collier, COO

RFTA Leadership Academy

April 19, 2017 kicks off the RFTA Leadership Academy. Andrea Palm-Porter from the Roaring Fork Center for Community Leadership has been contracted to help train and further develop RFTA’s current and future leaders. The Academy will consist of five full-day sessions for 28 managers and supervisors across all departments and will cover a variety of topics including Communication, Decision Making, Coaching, Empowering, Leading Change, and Conflict Management.

Transportation HB 17-1242 Update

HB 17-1242, New Transportation Infrastructure Funding Revenue, passed out of the House March 31, 2017 with a 41-24 vote and will move to the Senate in the near future. The full bill text and all amendments can be found on the Colorado Legislative website: <http://leg.colorado.gov/bills/hb17-1242>. Below, please find a summary from Colleen McLoughlin, Campaign Organizer, Colorado Public Interest Research Group (CoPIRG):

1. 0.62% sales tax, and a reduction in vehicle registration/late fees for the next 20 years - there was an amendment to completely remove the late fees added by FASTER. This should have only a minor impact on the overall revenue but will be very pleasing for those Coloradans who have been hit by the fee.
2. Voters would vote on this package in November 2017.
3. A net amount of new money in the \$600-\$650 million per year range, which would grow/shrink if sales tax revenue grows/shrinks.
4. Of the total money raised, \$375m will go to CDOT for statewide priority projects. CDOT will need to develop a list of projects that money will be invested in. That can include multi-modal projects. This amount for CDOT was what we were assuming all along but there was an amendment to clarify it.
5. 70% of the rest of the money will go to local governments and they have maximum flexibility for how to use the money - this includes transit, walking and biking.
6. The other 30% of the rest would go to multi-modal options. A maximum of 75% of that money would go to transit. A minimum of 25% would go to biking and walking.
7. A new multi-modal committee to distribute the transit money. The committee would be staffed by CDOT and the decision makers would be made up of transit agencies, municipal planners, local governments and a transit affordability advocate.
8. The multi-modal committee would be tasked with identifying transit affordability strategies including reduced-fare and fare-free service. There was an amendment to clarify this.
9. Disability advocate would be on a new oversight committee and an amendment clarified this person who be someone with a disability and that ped/bike money can be used for infrastructure that benefits those in motorized wheel chairs.

10. Modes like demand response vans and shuttles that help people age in place are specifically called out in the bill's legislative intent.
11. There's a matching requirement for the transit money and the ped/bike money. An amendment created exceptions for smaller communities and transit agencies.

As the bill progresses, we will update the Board and attend committees to testify as needed.

Washington, D.C. Delegation Visit

A big thank you to Aspen Mayor, Steve Skadron, for making the trip to Washington, D.C. Kelley Collier, Chief Operating Officer, David Johnson, Director of Planning, and representatives of Prime Policy Group, met with the staffs of Congressman Tipton, Senator Bennett, and Senator Gardner. The story about the uniqueness of RFTA, the services provided, and the long term funding, fleet, and facility needs was successfully delivered.



Video Recording Update

AV Experts has agreed to work with RFTA staff and continue Board video recordings. The April meeting is being recorded and will be uploaded in a timely manner to www.rfta.com.

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

The "04-13-17 Planning Department Update.pdf," can be found in the April 2017 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.

2017 Actuals/Budget Comparison (February YTD)

2017 Budget Year				
General Fund				
	February YTD			
	Actual	Budget	% Var.	Annual Budget
Revenues				
Sales tax (1)	\$ 51,971	\$ 58,998	-11.9%	\$ 21,288,000
Grants	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 2,245,050
Fares (2)	\$ 711,721	\$ 739,933	-3.8%	\$ 4,869,000
Other govt contributions	\$ 26,667	\$ 26,667	0.0%	\$ 1,475,961
Other income	\$ 86,279	\$ 86,279	0.0%	\$ 499,140
Total Revenues	\$ 876,637	\$ 911,876	-3.9%	\$ 30,377,151
Expenditures				
Fuel	\$ 309,313	\$ 357,929	-13.6%	\$ 1,408,112
Transit	\$ 3,608,236	\$ 3,815,642	-5.4%	\$ 20,512,634
Trails & Corridor Mgmt	\$ 32,758	\$ 34,111	-4.0%	\$ 471,720
Capital	\$ 58,883	\$ 56,720	3.8%	\$ 4,474,801
Debt service	\$ 238,712	\$ 238,712	0.0%	\$ 1,902,244
Total Expenditures	\$ 4,247,901	\$ 4,503,114	-5.7%	\$ 28,769,511
Other Financing Sources/Uses				
Other financing sources	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,330,900
Other financing uses	\$ (399,367)	\$ (399,367)	0.0%	\$ (3,382,485)
Total Other Financing Sources/Uses	\$ (399,367)	\$ (399,367)	0.0%	\$ (2,051,585)
Change in Fund Balance (3)	\$ (3,770,631)	\$ (3,990,604)	5.5%	\$ (443,945)

(1) Timing issue as January sales tax revenue will be deposited in March.

(2) Through February, fare revenue is down approx. 1% compared to the prior year. Over the course of the year, the timing of bulk pass orders by outlets and businesses can affect the % change. The chart below provides a February 2016/2017 comparison of actual fare revenues and ridership on RFTA fare services:

Fare Revenue:	Feb-16	Feb-17	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Regional Fares	\$ 715,287	\$ 708,742	\$ (6,545)	-1%
Advertising	\$ 1,800	\$ 2,979	\$ 1,179	66%
Total Fare Revenue	\$ 717,087	\$ 711,721	\$ (5,366)	-1%
Ridership on RFTA Fare Services:				
Highway 82 (Local & Express)	141,697	140,835	(862)	-1%
BRT	175,033	179,261	4,228	2%
SM-DV	26,354	26,213	(141)	-1%
Grand Hogback	16,583	17,453	870	5%
Total Ridership on RFTA Fare Services	359,667	363,762	4,095	1%
Avg. Fare/Ride	\$ 1.99	\$ 1.95	\$ (0.04)	-2%

(3) 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 budget.

RFTA System-Wide Transit Service Mileage and Hours Report								
Transit Service	Mileage February 2017 YTD				Hours February 2017 YTD			
	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.
RF Valley Commuter	755,279	755,362	(83)	0.0%	34,858	34,892	(34)	-0.1%
City of Aspen	105,854	105,805	49	0.0%	11,678	11,636	42	0.4%
Aspen Skiing Company	116,347	123,069	(6,722)	-5.5%	8,546	8,260	286	3.5%
Ride Glenwood Springs	19,781	19,607	174	0.9%	1,588	1,578	10	0.6%
Grand Hogback	36,142	36,121	21	0.1%	1,415	1,444	(29)	-2.0%
X-games/Charter	4,027	4,147	(120)	-2.9%	469	423	46	10.9%
Senior Van	2,460	2,846	(386)	-13.6%	404	316	88	28.0%
Total	1,039,890	1,046,957	(7,067)	-0.7%	58,958	58,549	409	0.7%

Roaring Fork Transportation Authority System-Wide Ridership Comparison Report				
Service	Feb-16 YTD	Feb-17 YTD	# Variance	% Variance
City of Aspen	341,770	385,686	43,916	12.85%
RF Valley Commuter	535,475	526,961	(8,514)	-1.59%
Grand Hogback	16,583	17,453	870	5.25%
Aspen Skiing Company	300,183	303,132	2,949	0.98%
Ride Glenwood Springs	32,221	29,249	(2,972)	-9.22%
Glenwood N/S Connector		-	-	N/A
X-games/Charter	28,978	28,265	(713)	-2.46%
Senior Van	659	692	33	5.01%
MAA Burlingame			-	N/A
Maroon Bells	-	-	-	N/A
Total	1,255,869	1,291,438	35,569	2.83%
Subset of Roaring Fork Valley Commuter Service with BRT in 2016				
Service	YTD Feb 2016	YTD Feb 2017	Dif +/-	% Dif +/-
Highway 82 Corridor Local/Express	141,697	140,835	(862)	-1%
BRT	175,033	179,261	4,228	2%
Total	316,730	320,096	3,366	1%

2016 Financial Statement Audit – Schedule

Date	Activity	Status
5/1/2017 – 5/5/2017	Start of Audit – auditors conducting onsite fieldwork	<i>On schedule</i>
6/15/2017 - 6/30/2017	During this period, staff anticipates that the Audit Report will be reviewed by the RFTA Board Audit Subcommittee . A meeting will be held at a RFTA office in Carbondale between the Audit Subcommittee, the auditor and staff to discuss the audit in detail.	<i>Email will be sent to Audit Subcommittee to establish date & location of meeting.</i>
7/7/2017	Final Audit Report to be distributed to RFTA Board with July Board Packet	<i>On schedule</i>
7/13/2016	Presentation of Final Audit Report at RFTA Board Meeting by Auditor	<i>On schedule</i>

Facilities and Bus Stop Maintenance April 13, 2017
Capital Projects Update

Basalt Underpass:

The Basalt Underpass project is proceeding on schedule and the mild winter weather has been beneficial to the project. The traffic switch to move Highway 82 traffic to the south side of the project was completed on March 17th. Overall, the switch went well and with the exception of a few issues with the signals, there were no significant problems. The excavations for the north side of the underpass are now complete and the contractor has begun to set forms and place steel for the first concrete pour. The excavations on the south side of the project have been backfilled and the grade has been set for the path leading out of the underpass. Work on the architectural components such as the gabion walls has begun.

Glenwood Springs Expansion Phase 1:

The project to expand parking at the GMF is moving forward and the contractor is currently moving fill from the south side of Wulfsohn Rd. to create the parking area to the north side of Wulfsohn and placing it to facilitate the construction of the next phase of the West Glenwood Springs Park and Ride. The mild winter has also helped this project get off to an early start and staff is currently optimistic that construction will be completed in time for the Grand Avenue Bridge mitigation service to begin.

**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 unit, is currently at **88%** 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 **91%**.
- As of February 1, 2017, RFTA has 12 two bedroom seasonal units at Burlingame. The Burlingame seasonal housing is currently at **60%** occupancy. The seasonal housing will be turned back over to Burlingame on April 30th.
- RFTA signed a master lease agreement with SKICO, similar to the lease RFTA has with Burlingame. If the Board approves the supplemental Budget request, staff will secure 12 beds in the SKICO housing for the summer season (05/01/2017 – 10/31/2017), in an attempt to help house the additional staff needed to accommodate the Grand Avenue Bridge project.
- If the Board approves the supplemental budget request, staff will be securing two townhomes in New Castle, one 2 bedroom unit and one 3 bedroom unit, in an attempt to help house the additional staff needed to accommodate the Grand Avenue Bridge Project.

RFTA Railroad Corridor

Right-of-Way Land Management Project: Along with its legal and engineering consultants, RFTA staff has been working on completing the following tasks in 2017:

- RFTA has filed a "Notice of Intent to Partially Vacate and Modify the Notice of Interim Trail Use (NITU)" with the Surface Transportation Board (STB). This process will remove the East Leg of the WYE area in Glenwood Springs and designate the West Leg of the WYE as our main connection to the Interstate Rail System. A copy of the filing is available on the STB website at this link:

[https://www.stb.gov/filings/all.nsf/ba7f93537688b8e5852573210004b318/aa7b27903e1b5a528525803e00688992/\\$FILE/241632.pdf](https://www.stb.gov/filings/all.nsf/ba7f93537688b8e5852573210004b318/aa7b27903e1b5a528525803e00688992/$FILE/241632.pdf) . The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) filed an intervention due to historic (4F) concerns related to removal of the East Leg of the WYE. The City worked with SHPO to develop a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that outlines the potential adverse effect to the historic Railroad Corridor and the stipulations the City has agreed to undertake because of the adverse effect. The MOA should satisfy the concerns of the Surface Transportation Board (STB) and allow them to terminate the interim trail use on the East leg of the WYE, recognize the interim trail use on the West Leg of the WYE which will now serve as RFTA's connection to the interstate rail system and issue RFTA a replacement Notice of Interim Trail Use (NITU).

- An update to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. ***The first document to be updated is the Access Control Plan. This item will be on the agenda for a first reading at the April 13th meeting and if passed, a second reading May 11th.***

Once the draft versions of ACP and DG are finalized and approved by the RFTA Board then staff will send out both documents to GOCO, with an updated list of crossings including existing crossings that have not been previously approved, any potential new crossings being proposed, as well as any new crossings that might be on the horizon, to secure GOCO's approval of the ACP, DG, and updated list of crossings. ***The ACP and DG with all associated documentation are available on the RFTA website at <http://www.rfta.com/trail-documentation/>.***

- With acceptance of the ACP 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 for RFTA that may 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. Staff will begin with an update to the Recreational Trails Plan and then update 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 (fgrow) areas identified up and down the Railroad Corridor. One of the fgrow areas encompasses a neighborhood in Glenwood Springs referred to as the Cole subdivision. This neighborhood is located directly across the street from the Walmart Shopping center at 32nd Street (see the survey sheet below). ***(UPDATE) Staff is in the process of finalizing the scope of the project and will be providing information to the RFTA Board of Directors for review at the April 13, 2017 meeting.***



- **Recreational Trails Plan Update** - Staff will begin working on the update for the Recreational Trails Plan sometime in 2017. Staff will be using the Pitkin County Rio Grande Trail Management Plan as the starting point for the update and will be inviting the public to participate in this process. Staff will also be working with the Pitkin County Open Space and Trails team to establish a permanent location for their 20' trail easement.
- **South Bridge** –
No new updates this month.
- **8th Street Crossing Project by CDOT and the City of Glenwood Springs** –
No new updates this month.
- **Covenant Enforcement Commission (CEC)** – The annual CEC meeting is usually held in November but this year's meeting will be held on **May 22nd from 6pm to 8pm**, to coincide with the second reading of the ACP. The CEC was established because of an agreement between RFTA, the Roaring Fork Railroad Holding Authority ("RFRHA"), and the Board of Trustees of Great Outdoors Colorado ("GOCO"). GOCO provided funds for the purchase of the Corridor in 1997. Originally, RFRHA was required to place a conservation easement on the entire Corridor. Based on concerns about getting federal funding for future RFRHA transportation projects, the Conservation Easement was removed from the entire 34 miles of the Corridor and replaced with Conservation Covenants, in ten discrete areas. GOCO allowed modification of its original grant agreement in return for RFRHA identifying the covenants. The CEC is made up of members from the original members of RFRHA, Pitkin County Open Space and Trails (POST) and two at-large community members that reside in Pitkin County and Eagle County. In practice, a consultant with familiarity with the Corridor and the Covenants performs an inspection of the Conservation areas and presents a report to the CEC. Based on the annual CEC meeting, a draft recommendation letter is prepared for the RFTA Board of Directors for review and comment and then a final letter is sent to GOCO, along with a copy of the report. The 2016 Conservation Area Report has been prepared by Newland Project Resources, Inc. - Tom Newland. The staff report will be put together by Brett Meredith, RFTA's Trails Manager. Both reports will be available on the website beginning April 21st and emailed to the CEC members, along with an agenda in preparation for the meeting. To date the meeting invitation emails have been sent and the meeting has been scheduled.



Rio Grande Trail Update

- Staff has been researching and preparing for 2017 projects; which include cleaning debris from retaining walls, goats, revegetation, ArtWay projects, and bridge repair.
- Staff continues working to beautify the corridor through Carbondale, the Rio Grande ArtWay.
- The Masterplan is on RFTA's website. <http://www.rfta.com/trail-documentation/>
 - Please feel free to reach out to Brett Meredith, bmeredith@rfta.com if you have any questions, comments and/or concerns regarding this process
- Funding is needed for an irrigation system, picnic areas, art installations, native landscapes, a Latino Folk Art Garden, and creating a Youth Art Park
 - Staff is working with the Carbondale Rotary clubs, Carbondale Arts, and DHM Design to design the DeRail Park (SH 133 across from the Park and Ride) site. Construction will begin in the spring of 2017

- Staff is working with SGM (Glenwood Springs' office) to design the Roll Zone portion of the ArtWay. Construction has begun on this project. If you have time after the meeting today, you should walk out and look at the work that is taking place in Carbondale
 - A volunteer work day to build single track will occur on April 8th from 8am-4pm
- The public has been supportive and interested groups and businesses are signing up for participation
- RFTA Staff sent a letter to Wheel Circle neighbors asking them to remove their personal belongings from RFTA ROW by April 1st
- Staff secured a Colorado Parks and Wildlife grant to fund a soft-surface trail through Carbondale and shoulder repairs along the lower 20 miles of corridor.
 - RFTA received the executed grant contract on October 6th and staff is coordinating with the contractor and preparing for the project
 - Construction on this project is underway
- Staff is preparing for spring and trail season along the corridor.
 - The gates at Catherine Bridge and Rock Bottom remain closed until April 30th, 2017 at 5:00pm
 - Staff has been out on the trail picking up trash, trimming trees, and finding weeds
- Staff submitted a grant through the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy asking for \$50,000 for design and repair money for 2 bridges, in hopes of repairing the Sopris Creek Bridge and the Roaring Fork Bridge in the next 18 months.
- Staff noticed a large cottonwood tree leaning over the trail and creating a safety concern. Earthwise Horticultural was hired to remove the tree and any other unsafe trees in the area.
- Staff is working with Bill Holmes to replace a plugged culvert near MM 3.0.
- Staff noticed a construction project taking place in the corridor, without RFTA permission. Cedar Networks, a utility company had a contractor out trenching and installing conduit for Fiber Optic cable (see photos below). Angela Henderson is working with the Utility Company to resolve and recover the disturbed area.
 - Trail staff has secured a quote to have a professional landscape company to seed/hydromulch the disturbed area in the attempt to restore/revegetate. RFTA will either submit an invoice to Cedar Networks to reimburse RFTA for this work or have Cedar Networks pay the landscape company directly for this work



Photo 1 – Trenching in progress



Photo 2 – Picture of the disturbance. Contractor left and did nothing to reseed/revegetate. This is extremely frustrating for trail staff because of noxious weeds mitigation and efforts to reestablish native grasses, etc. This disturbance will be a large setback for this area.

- Staff observed the Thompson Glen ditch maintenance crew cleaning the ditch and dumping the spoils on RFTA property. This is a huge issue for trail staff due to the noxious weeds it spreads. Staff needs to find a common ground with the ditch company to change this behavior.