

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

**TIME:** 8:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m., Thursday, August 10, 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	<b>Call to Order / Roll Call:</b>		Quorum	8:30 a.m.
2	<b>Executive Session:</b>			
	A. (None anticipated at this time)		Executive Session	8:31 a.m.
3	<b>Approval of <a href="#">Minutes</a>:</b> RFTA Board Meeting, July 13, 2017, <b>page 3</b>		Approve	8:32 a.m.
4	<b>Public Comment:</b> Regarding items not on the Agenda (up to one hour will be allotted if necessary, however, comments will be limited to three minutes per person)		Public Input	8:35 a.m.
5	<b>Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:</b>	4.3.3.C	Comments	8:40 a.m.
6	<b>Consent Agenda:</b>	2.8.11	Approve	8:45 a.m.
	A. Resolution 2017-08: Authorization to Submit <a href="#">Application</a> for Federal Transit Administration Section 5339 Bus and Facilities Grant Funding – David Johnson, Director of Planning, <b>page 10</b>			
	B. An Intergovernmental <a href="#">Agreement</a> for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Commission – David Johnson, Director of Planning, <b>page 13</b>			
7	<b>Presentation/Action Items:</b>			
	A. <a href="#">CDOT</a> Request to Use E-Bikes on the Rio Grande Trail between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale during Grand Avenue Bridge Closure – Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations, and Brett Meredith, Trail Manager, <b>page 18</b>	1.2.A.i	Discussion/ Direction	8:50 a.m.
8	<b>Public Hearing:</b>			
	A. Resolution 2017-09: <a href="#">Prohibiting</a> the Operation of a Class 1, Class 2, or Class 3 Electrical Assisted Bicycle on the Rio Grande Trail – Dan Blankenship, CEO, Paul Taddune, General Council, Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities, and Brett Meredith, Trail Manager, <b>page 20</b>	1.2.A.i	Discussion/ Adopt	9:30 a.m.
	B. <a href="#">Second</a> Reading ( <b>Continuance</b> ): Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan Update – Dan Blankenship, CEO and Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations, <b>page 25</b>	1.1	Vote To Continue 2 <sup>nd</sup> Reading	10:30 a.m.
7	<b>Continue Presentation Action Items:</b>			
	B. <a href="#">Preliminary</a> Planning Initiatives, Assumptions, and Issues for 2018 RFTA Budget, Michael Yang, Chief Financial & Administrative Officer, <b>page 29</b>	2.5	Discussion/ Direction	10:35 a.m.
<b>(This Agenda Continued on Next Page)</b>				

	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Est. Time</b>
	C. Potential By-Laws <a href="#">Amendment</a> to Permit RFTA Board Members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees to Attend RFTA Board Meetings via Telephone and/or Video Conferencing in Special Circumstances – Paul Taddune, General Counsel, <b>page 33</b>	<b>By-Laws</b>	<b>Discussion/Direction</b>	<b>10:50 a.m.</b>
	D. Integrated <a href="#">Transportation</a> System Plan and Upper Mobility Study Update – Ralph Trapani, Parsons, <b>page 35</b>	<b>4.2.5</b>	<b>Discussion/Direction</b>	<b>11:15 a.m.</b>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Board Governance Process:</b>			
	<b>A.</b> RFTA Board <a href="#">Strategic</a> Planning Retreat – David Johnson, Director of Planning, <b>page 37</b>	<b>4.3.2.A</b>	<b>FYI/Direction</b>	<b>11:30 a.m.</b>
<b>10.</b>	<b>Information/Updates:</b>			
	<b>A.</b> <a href="#">CEO</a> Report – Dan Blankenship, CEO, <b>page 39</b>	<b>2.8.6</b>	<b>FYI</b>	<b>11:35 a.m.</b>
<b>11.</b>	<b>Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:</b>			
	To Be Determined at August 10, 2017 Meeting	<b>4.3</b>	<b>Meeting Planning</b>	<b>11:40 a.m.</b>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Next Meeting:</b> 8:30 a.m. – 9:15 a.m., September 14, 2011 at Glenwood Springs Community Center. An abbreviated Board meeting will be directly followed by the RFTA Board of Directors’ Strategic Retreat, which will begin at 9:15 a.m.	<b>4.3</b>	<b>Meeting Planning</b>	<b>11:43 a.m.</b>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Adjournment:</b>		<b>Adjourn</b>	<b>11:45 a.m.</b>

**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  
July 13, 2017**

**Board Members Present:**

George Newman-Chair, (Pitkin County); Art Riddle, (Town of New Castle); Dan Richardson, (Town of Carbondale); Jacque Whitsitt, (Town of Basalt); Markey Butler, (Town of Snowmass Village)

**Voting Alternates Present:**

Kathryn Trauger, (City of Glenwood Springs)

**Non-Voting Alternates Present:**

Bernie Grauer (Town of Basalt)

**Staff Present:**

Dan Blankenship, Chief Executive Officer (CEO); Paul Taddune, General Counsel; Michael Yang, Chief Financial and Administrative Officer (CFAO); Kelley Collier, Chief Operating Officer (COO); Nicole Schoon, Secretary to the Board of Directors; Angela Henderson, Brett Meredith, Amy Burdick, Dina Farnell, Mike Hermes, Facilities & Trails Department; David Johnson, Planning Department

**Visitors Present:**

Bill Hahn, (ATU Local 1774); Mark Gould Sr., (Gould Construction); Tanya Allen, Transportation Manager, (City of Glenwood Springs); Sheryl Bower (Garfield County); Michael Sawyer, (Karp Neu Hanlon); Terry Claassen, (Pacifica Senior Living); Ralph Trapani, (Parsons); and Dave Sturges, (Citizen)

**Note: *Blue Hyperlinks to the video of the July 13, 2017 Board Meeting have been inserted for each agenda item below.***

**Agenda**

**1. [Roll Call:](#)**

**George Newman called the RFTA Board of Directors to order at 8:31 a.m.  
George Newman declared a quorum to be present (6 member jurisdictions present) and the meeting began at 8:32 a.m.**

**2. [Approval of Minutes:](#)**

**Dan Richardson moved to approve the minutes of the June 8, 2017 Board Meeting and Jacque Whitsitt seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**3. [Public Comment:](#)**

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

Mark Gould Sr. stated that Gould Construction has purchased twenty-nine (29) e-bikes for his employees to be able to get around during the Grand Avenue Bridge (GAB) Closure. He stated that CDOT had previously determined that during the GAB closure there would need to be a 25% reduction in vehicles on the road, however, it has now been determined that there needs to be a 35% reduction. He stated that the Governor of Colorado, John Hickenlooper, met with the House and Senate to define what qualifies for an "Electrical Assisted Bicycle." The qualifications of an e-bike is a bike with 750 watts or less that has a top speed of 20 miles per hour or less. [House Bill 17-1151](#) was approved and signed on April 4, 2017, and will go into effect August 9, 2017. Gould requested that the Board allow temporary use of e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail during the GAB closure. He also suggested that the Board make the use of e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail permanent.

**Newman closed Public Comments at 8:39 a.m.**

**4. Items Added to Agenda – Board Member Comments:**

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

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

Art Riddile expressed his condolences to Mike Gamba on the passing of his father, as did the other Board members. Riddile then asked how the Board would handle the discussion and decision about e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail. Newman stated that the discussion of e-bikes was not on this month's Board Agenda and so it would be an item added to the August 10, 2017 Board meeting. If the discussion of e-bikes is held off until the August 10, 2017 Board meeting, and the Board approves the usage of e-bikes on the Trail, Riddile questioned whether that would be sufficient time to give notice to the public. Newman stated, due to the time limitation on retaining a quorum, there were other items on the Agenda that needed immediate attention. So, the discussion on e-bikes would have to be postponed until the next Board meeting.

Kathryn Trauger thanked Dan Blankenship and Kelley Collier for allowing her to attend the graduation ceremony for the 2017 Leadership Academy.

Newman commented that it is unusual that the Board is struggling to attain and maintain a quorum for the Board meetings. He stated that RFTA Board meetings are extremely important and decisions need to be made, and if there is no quorum then those decisions are postponed. If the official Board member is unable to attend or must leave the meeting early, it is important that they have the alternate attend in their place.

**5. Consent Agenda:**

**A. Memorandum of Understanding between RFTA and the Town of Snowmass Village, Regarding the Transfer of Three (3) Transit Vehicles – Kelley Collier, COO**

Snowmass Village has three (3) low-floor, twenty-six (26) passenger Optima Opus transit vehicles which they are looking to dispose of. All three (3) vehicles have low mileage and are in good running condition. RFTA will utilize these additional vehicles during the Grand Avenue Bridge Project (GAB). They will more than likely run the North Pedestrian Bridge to West Glenwood Springs Mall Shuttle. After GAB these vehicles will be used for specific route needs, including back-up vehicles for Ride Glenwood Springs routes, which will free up larger RFTA buses to accommodate high capacity routes. The cost of each vehicle will be \$5,000.00, well below book value, for a total cost of \$15,000.00, which will be expended from the Fleet Maintenance budget.

**Richardson moved to approve the Memorandum of Understanding between RFTA and the Town of Snowmass Village, Regarding the Transfer of Three (3) Transit Vehicles, and Riddile seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.**

**B. RFTA 2016 Audited Financial Report – Mike Yang, Chief Financial Administration Officer**

RFTA is required to submit an annual financial statement audit, which is mandated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT), Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (MSRB), and Standard & Poor's (S&P). McMahan & Associates LLC conducted the Fiscal Year 2016 audit and review of RFTA's financial statements, budget and individual fund

statements for the year. They also audited RFTA's compliance with requirements as described in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) *Circular A-133 Compliance Supplement*.

An unqualified or "clean" opinion was received from the auditors stating that RFTA's 2016 financial statements conform to U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), and that RFTA is in compliance with the requirements for each of its major federal programs. No deficiencies were reported and no prior or current year findings or questioned costs were identified. On June 20, 2017, the RFTA Board Audit sub-committee which included Markey Butler, (Town of Snowmass Village); Ann Mullins, (City of Aspen); and Independent Financial Expert, John Lewis, (Eagle County Finance Director) met with McMahan & Associates LLC auditors. They had an in-depth review and discussion of the 2016 audit and received RFTA's audit opinion.

The sub-committee approved and agreed that the opinion of unqualified or "clean" 2016 audited financials be recommended to the RFTA Board of Directors for approval. Staff recommended that the RFTA Board of Directors approve the 2016 Audited Financial Report.

**Trauger moved to approve the RFTA 2016 Audited Financial Report and Markey Butler seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.**

6. [Appeal:](#)

**A. Request for Reconsideration of Staff Recommendation for Private Access Location – 0295-0297 Rio Grande Lane, Carbondale, CO; Pacifica, Senior Living RE Fund LLC – Michael Sawyer, Karp Neu Hanlon and Terry Claassen (Pacifica, Senior Living RE Fund LLC)**

Angela Henderson presented additional information and exhibits for further clarification on the access locations in question. Staff agrees with the developer that the 1994 access license granted by the D&RGW to Paul and Ceila Nieslanik was for the southeastern access at the western end of the paved parallel access road within the railroad corridor. The 1994 D&RGW Private Way License was associated with Mile Post (MP) 373 + 525 feet (or MP 373.1 according to RFTA's survey). Staff believes the dirt road access, on the southwest border of 297 Rio Grande Lane was an informal unlicensed access that allowed the Nieslaniks to move cattle and farm equipment on and off the corridor.

Staff strongly disagreed that the 2007 license issued by RFTA to the Licensee was for the dirt road access located at the southwestern boundary of the developer's property. In correspondence from Mike Hermes to Karen Crownhart, in 2007, Crownhart had related that the property owned by Paul and Ceila Nieslanik was going to be subdivided and that she wanted a separate access license for her parcel. Hermes stated that the subject parcel currently had an access license with the D&RGW for a crossing at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and that her request for a new access license would be considered an existing use. Hermes said he would grant Crownhart two (2) new access licenses in RFTA's name for a *single crossing* at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, once the lot split was completed..

In 2007, Hermes issued the Licensee a new access license and referenced the access license to Contract No. MP373.18. Although the Licensee address was listed as 297 Rio Grande Lane, the access license did not relate to the mailing address, it correlated to the Contract MP number and, more specifically, to the following language:

*"WITNESSETH, that RFTA, for and in consideration of the covenants and agreements of the Licensee contained herein and upon the terms and conditions stated, hereby licenses and permits and use of a non-exclusive access road ("Access Road") within RFTA's Railroad Corridor ("Corridor"), the Corridor being 100 feet wide, that is to say 50 feet on each side of the center line of the railroad tracks, adjacent to the Licensee's property. The Access Road is more particularly described as a 20 foot-wide driveway (driving surface) known as 2<sup>nd</sup> St. in Carbondale, Colorado."*

Nowhere in Hermes' correspondence was there mention of granting an access license for the western dirt road access, or about extending the paved road further to the west. The 2007 license Contract No. MP 373.18 is further to the east of MP 373.1, which was the D&RGW's 1994 reference for the Nieslanik's driveway at the western end of the paved parallel roadway. The license issued by Hermes to the Licensee was issued before RFTA's survey of the corridor was completed. As early as 2001, RFTA staff had identified the 1976 D&RGW Private Way License issued to Paul Nieslanik, John F. Nieslanik, and Robert R. Nieslanik, Box 122 Carbondale, Colorado 81623 as pertaining to MP 373.17. Following the survey, and based on the 1994 D&RGW exhibit, it was determined that this access reference should actually be MP 373.1.

Staff has agreed to issue a license to the developer for the existing paved access for which there are two existing licenses belonging to previous property owners. The developer is proposing to extend the paved portion of Rio Grande Lane further to the west and utilize more of the right of way in a constrained area of the Railroad Corridor. Staff believes the developer is incorrectly claiming that the informal dirt road used for farming activities is licensed. Mike Hermes, Director of Facilities, Property and Trails, issued the second license to the property owner and identifies that the license was for the paved access and not the informal dirt road farm access.

Michael Sawyer, Karp Neu Hanlon stated that the developer is requesting that RFTA grant a new access that is between the historic accesses at 295 and 297, using the consolidation criteria in the RFTA Access Control Plan. Sawyer stated that there is not supporting evidence pertaining to the access points for the two (2) licenses. Per documentation, RFTA granted the Crownhart's specific access to their property at 297 that allows RFTA to work with the developer to create a consolidated access point between the two (2) current access points.

Access licenses are not transferable, therefore when the property was transferred from the Nieslaniks to the Crownharts, there was no longer legal access. Therefore, Karen Crownhart requested a new license from RFTA in 2007, stating "the address for my property is 297 Rio Grande Lane, Carbondale...we are looking for access across 2<sup>nd</sup> street and then along the bike path to this address." There are no legal easement rights across 295 which would give legal access to 297, therefore, if the access did terminate at the edge of the pavement at 295, there would be no legal access to the property at 297.

Terry Claassen stated that there is a significant grade change from the current 295 access point to the 297 access point. The consolidation of the access points will allow proper access for emergency vehicles as well as pedestrian access, which is important to the development of the property.

Mr. Sawyer stated that when Mr. Claassen purchased the property, he relied on the notice that RFTA had given. There is nothing in the license agreement that would give notice to the purchaser that the document failed to provide access to the boundary of 297, but stopped 100' short. Sawyer requested that the Board overturn the decision of RFTA staff to deny the consolidation of the access point requested, and for RFTA staff to work with the developer to obtain a license for that consolidated access point.

Staff recommended that the RFTA Board of Directors not vote to reconsider or overturn staff's decision to deny the developer's request to relocate and extend the current paved access.

**Trauger moved to overturn RFTA staffs' decision to deny the developer's request to relocate the Private Access location. There was no second to the motion and the motion failed. The RFTA Board of Directors thereby upheld RFTA staffs' decision to deny the request by Pacifica, Senior Living RE Fund LLC to relocate the access to their property.**

**Note: E-bikes:** At this point in the meeting, there was a discussion about allowing the temporary use of e-bikes during the Grand Avenue Bridge closure, specifically on the segment of the Rio Grande Trail between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale. Roland Wagner, CDOT's Glenwood Springs' Resident Engineer, addressed a letter to the RFTA Board, on July 5, 2017, making this request. There was a brief discussion about the request, with some Board members expressing support and others believing that the potential safety issues involved, due to the higher speeds of e-bikes, needed additional study. In addition, since the letter from Mr. Wagner was received after the agenda was distributed, the issue was not included on the agenda or noticed, and the public had not been given an opportunity to comment on the matter.

**Dan Richardson moved that RFTA allow temporary e-bike access as defined by State Law during the Grand Avenue Bridge closure. This temporary access is explicitly terminated when the bridge closure is over. And, as part of the motion, he suggested granting staff the authority to terminate access if safety is compromised. Art Riddile seconded the motion. Four votes were cast in favor and two were opposed, so the motion failed.**

## 7. Presentation/Action Items:

### A. Potential By-Laws' Amendments to Permit RFTA Board Members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees to Attend RFTA Board Meetings via Telephone and/or Video Conferencing in Special Circumstances – Paul Taddune, General Counsel

Postponed to the August 10, 2017 Board meeting, due to absence of a quorum.

### B. [Integrated Transportation System Plan Update](#) – Ralph Trapani, Parsons

Ralph Trapani stated that on June 13, 2017 the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) held a meeting, which was very well attended and included 2 Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) representatives, one from Grand Junction, and one from Denver. It was suggested during the TAC meeting that a formal RFTA ITSP presentation be presented at an Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (IMTPR) meeting. Staff noted that all of the alternatives currently meet the original project goals, and so it was suggested that they be categorized into short, medium, and long-term improvements. Once they are categorized into short, medium, and long-term improvements, they will be tied to potential supporting revenue streams by alternative.

The final Upper Valley Mobility Study (UVMS) presentation was made to the EOTC on June 15, 2017 and the final report was submitted to EOTC staff and officials. A UVMS public workshop was held on May 31, 2017, at the Aspen Colorado Mountain College (CMC), and was attended by thirty (30) members of the public. Several comments from those who attended were: 1) LRT is preferred, regardless of cost, and if Aspen were to implement the LRT it could potentially motivate down-valley to implement as well; 2) there was a general concern about the community's will to move the Marolt crossing forward; 3) realignment of the Marolt Crossing would allow for a better flow of traffic and reduce congestion; 4) concern about transferring ridership at the Brush Creek lot and could create a time penalty (approximately three (3) minutes; and 5) the twenty-year (20) system-wide ridership would only increase by 4,000 per day, and there was a suggestion of doubling that number (8,000 per day). Potential solutions offered were: 1) a solution that does not require continued building, such as road construction; 2) congestion pricing at peak hours to help reduce peak flow; and 3) ride-sharing and metering.

Parsons recommendations include:

1. Phased Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) alternatives and operational phases, which include rolling stock and managing service plans, and build phases;

2. Support for Light Rail Transit (LRT). Anything done for the BRT phase will support the LRT, both in the development of facilities and the increase in ridership.

Phased BRT alternative components of the operational phases include:

- Phase 1: Using existing funds to optimize service plans for Buttermilk, Snowmass, BRT and Valley routes
- Phase 2: Replace one (1) Buttermilk and two (2) Snowmass Village route buses with 40-foot electric buses, replace BRT and Valley/SH 82 buses with 60-foot electric buses, and replace remaining route buses with electric buses
- Phase 3: Retrofit buses with autonomous control, which will allow running on a dedicated guideway from Brush Creek into Aspen

Phased BRT alternative components of the build phases include:

- Phase 1: Design and right-of-way acquisition for alignment across the Marolt easement
- Phase 2: Build a preferred alignment across the easement, which would optimize the BRT services and build continuous dedicated bus lanes from Brush Creek to Buttermilk

Phasing allows support of an incremental funding approach by using a mix of existing federal, state, and local sources. Existing sources include, mass transit tax, RTA sales and use tax, service agreements, grant revenue, and operating revenue. Potential federal and state sources include, New/Small Starts grants, FTA Section 5339 discretionary bus and LoNo grants, TIGER grants, and FASTER grants. Potential local funding sources include, lane usage fee, utility fee, special improvement district, expand sales and use tax, expand mass transit tax, lodging tax, property tax, parking revenues, naming rights/private contributions, P3, and EOTC surplus funds. Local funding sources that have been eliminated are tolls, VMT tax, weight mile tax, gas tax, vehicle registration fee, development impact fee, and tax increment financing.

The next task is the Ballot Initiative, about which Bill Ray from WR Communications has been consulted to develop a ten (10) question survey, which will be an automated pre-recorded survey sent out to RFTA eligible voters with landline phones. The survey goal is to receive at least 300 responses and offer a perception of the community's viewpoint related to RFTA and transportation issues. Ray will also conduct six (6) in-person stakeholder (i.e. chamber of commerce, local officials, tourism industry, etc.) discussions. The information received from these discussions combined with the survey results will be compiled and presented at the Board Retreat on September 14, 2017.

### C. [Grand Avenue Bridge Project Update](#) – Kelley Collier, COO

Route schedules have been finalized, printed, and distributed. There are currently 174 CDL Operators on staff, 8 are Relief Supervisors that will be supervising full-time during the detour. 165 Operators will be needed at the onset of the GAB mitigation service to cover scheduled routes, additional GAB service, Maroon Bells service, and Music Associates of Aspen (MAA) service (runs until August 18<sup>th</sup>). Extra-board operators will be needed to cover minimal vacation slots and any additional operator absences as well as possible back-up service shifts, depending on ridership demands.

The Facilities Department has been finalizing park and ride plans and will shift staffing schedules and locations to support the additional facilities and increased ridership. RFTA will be supplying and installing fencing, poles, signs, and bike racks in early August.

Parking spaces are available at the following locations: 1) **Parachute:** parking for 50 vehicles and 8 bicycles; 2) **Rifle:** Metro Park, 50 parking spaces and 8 bicycles close to the bus stop. Additional spaces at the Rifle Fairgrounds with 100 spaces and potential increased capacity as needed and 24 bicycles; 3) **Silt:** Silver Spur, near the Co-op bus stop on SH6, parking of 50 additional vehicles and 8

bicycles as well as additional bicycle storage at the Firehouse stop (16 spaces); 4) **New Castle:** Main and 6<sup>th</sup> stop (16 spaces), PNR can support 50 cars and 16 bicycles; and 5) **Glenwood Springs:** Amtrak Station stop (24 spaces).

The Vehicle Maintenance Department will move all extra buses (15-20) to Glenwood during the GAB Project. Because of the additional vehicles assigned from the GMF and parking layout needed to accommodate the higher service levels, there may need to be additional shifts assigned as overtime. Due to tight space constraints within the shop in Glenwood, heavy repairs will be done at the Aspen facility, which will require vehicle exchanges between the shops. Additional overtime shifts may be assign in the Aspen shop to facilitate the exchanges and repairs. Vacations have been suspended to ensure that the maximum number of employees are available. Outside vendors are available to assist with any engine and transmission issues allowing Maintenance to focus on daily bus related problems and maintenance

8. **Public Hearing:**

A. **Second Reading: Rio Grande Corridor Access Control Plan Update (Continuance)** – Dan Blankenship, CEO and Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations

**Whitsitt moved to approve a continuation of the Second Reading: Rio Grande Corridor Access Control Plan Update and Markey Butler seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.**

Butler left the Board meeting at 10:17 a.m., a quorum was no longer present.

9. **Board Governance Process:**

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

Jacque Whitsitt, George Newman, and Dan Richardson will be members of the subcommittee. They will meet prior to the August 10, 2017 Board meeting to discuss and establish the content of the Board Strategic Planning Retreat.

10. **Information/Updates:**

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

11. **Issues to be Considered at Next Meeting:**

Electrical Assisted Bicycles allowed on the Grande Rio Trail.

12. **Next Meeting:** 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., August 10, 2017 at Carbondale Town Hall, 511 Colorado Avenue.

13. **Adjournment:**

**The Board meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.**

Respectfully Submitted:

Nicole R. Schoon

Secretary to the RFTA Board of Dire

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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Resolution 2017-08: Authorization to Submit Application for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5339 Bus and Facilities Grant Funding
<b>POLICY #</b>	<b>2.8.11 Board Awareness &amp; Support</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	<b>Maintenance:</b> The fleet will be maintained and replaced in a financially sustainable manner
<b>Presented By:</b>	David Johnson, Director of Planning Jason White, Assistant Planner
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Approve Resolution 2017-08
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<p>Planning staff recently submitted a proposal through the FTA 5339 Bus &amp; Bus Facilities program to replace four (4) 1994 workhorse 57-passenger MCI diesel coaches with four equivalent battery electric commuter coaches. These vehicles would be used on longer-haul routes, such as BRT and Valley routes from Aspen to Glenwood Springs, and on the Grand Hogback. RFTA is requesting \$3,300,000 in federal funds (75%) and RFTA is matching \$1,100,000 in local funds (25%), for a total project cost of \$4,400,000. Grant awards are expected to be announced in November/December 2017. RFTA has received local letters of support for its grant application, and has requested a joint letter from its Congressional Delegation.</p> <p>The experience gained through this pilot BEB program will serve as the foundation for expansion of electric buses throughout RFTA's 70-mile service region, as RFTA gains experience and confidence in rapidly evolving battery technology and improved operations. RFTA is learning that a catalyst for both public and private electrical vehicles will be well-spaced charging stations to reduce concerns about batter range.</p>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	RFTA Board Governing Policy 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.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	If the grant is awarded, RFTA will be awarded \$3.3 million in Federal funds and a \$1.1 million local match would be required. Depending upon the battery range at the time of the bus order, RFTA may need to purchase depot and, possibly, in-route, charging equipment, which could add another \$500,000 or so to RFTA's local contribution for the vehicles.
<b>Attachments:</b>	Yes, please see Resolution 2017-08, attached below.

Director \_\_\_\_\_ moved to adopt the following Resolution:

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-08**

**Resolution Supporting the Submission of an Application for a Grant from the Federal Transit Administration Section 5339(b) Bus & Bus Facilities Program for the Replacement of Four 45' Diesel Commuter Coaches with Four 45' Battery Electric Commuter Coaches**

**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**, the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) is a political subdivision of the State of Colorado, and therefore an eligible applicant for a grant awarded by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA); and

**WHEREAS**, RFTA is submitting a Federal Transit Administration Section 5339 Grant Application for **four (4) 45' Battery Electric Commuter Coaches**, requesting a total award of **\$3,300,000**.

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

1. The RFTA Board of Directors strongly supports the Section 5339 Bus and Facilities Grant Application submitted by RFTA and, if the grant is received, will appropriate the required local matching funds.
2. If the grant is awarded, the RFTA Board of Directors strongly supports the completion of the project.
3. The Board of Directors of RFTA authorizes the expenditure of funds necessary to meet the terms and obligations of any grant awarded pursuant to a Grant Agreement with the FTA.
4. The vehicles will be owned by RFTA and will be registered to and operated by RFTA for the next 12-15 years. RFTA will continue to maintain the electric buses in a State of Good Repair and will appropriate funds for maintenance annually.
5. In the event FTA awards less funding than requested, RFTA will purchase fewer Battery Electric Commuter Coaches or purchase CNG or Clean-Diesel Commuter Coaches instead.

6. If a grant is awarded, the RFTA Board of Directors hereby authorizes the CEO to execute a Grant Agreement with the FTA.

**INTRODUCED, READ AND PASSED** by the Board of Directors of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority at its regular meeting held the 10<sup>th</sup> day of August 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 August 10, 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 10th day of August, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicole R. Schoon, Secretary to the Board

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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	An Intergovernmental Agreement for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Commission
<b>POLICY #</b>	<b>2.8.11 Board Awareness &amp; Support</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	CEO: Build partnerships with Garfield County and Western Colorado County Communities
<b>Presented By:</b>	Dan Blankenship, CEO
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Approve the IGA
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<p>The IGA, attached below, formally provides RFTA a vote on the Intermountain Transportation Planning Commission, where regional transportation planning is reviewed, and decisions about regional multimodal transportation projects and Federal and CDOT funding are made.</p> <p>Political subdivisions of the State of Colorado have the authority pursuant to Article XIV, section 18 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 29-1-201 <i>et seq.</i>, Colorado Revised Statutes, to enter into intergovernmental agreements for the purpose of providing any service or performing any function which they can perform individually.</p> <p>The Rules and Regulations for the Statewide Transportation Planning Process and Transportation Planning Regions, Section IV, Transportation Planning Regions, Item F, specify that the long-range transportation plans for <b>Roaring Fork Transportation Authority</b> will be integrated and consolidated into the Regional Transportation Plan for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region.</p> <p>Section 43-1-1101 C.R.S. recognizes Regional Planning Commissions as the proper forum for required transportation planning.</p> <p>The parties to the Agreement desire to cooperate with the Colorado Department of Transportation in the transportation planning activities to determine the mobility needs of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region, and incorporate the needs and recommendations of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region into the Statewide Transportation Plan.</p> <p>The Intermountain Planning Region, consisting of the areas within the counties of Eagle, Garfield, Lake, Pitkin and Summit, was designated in the Rules for the Statewide Transportation Planning process as adopted by the Transportation Commission of Colorado and effective October 30, 1992,</p> <p>The Regional Transportation Planning Commission will be responsible for reviewing the progress and product of the Colorado Department of Transportation or their designee related to transportation planning and analysis activities to incorporate the needs and recommendations of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region, suggesting updates and amendments as necessary to the State Transportation Plan pursuant to all applicable federal and state laws and rules or regulations including public participation provisions, selecting a representative to the Transportation Advisory Committee, and participating in the State Transportation Improvement Program development process.</p>

	<p>The Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for so long as the parties to the Agreement consider necessary to review completion by the Colorado Department of Transportation of a Regional Transportation Plan for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region or for periodic updates or amendments as may be required. Any party to this Agreement may, however, terminate its participation in this Agreement six months after providing written notice of such termination to the other parties of this Agreement. This Agreement may be terminated at any time by agreement of all parties to this Agreement unless a grant contract is in effect with the State. In this case, the State must approve such termination and arrangements for completing the project.</p>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	RFTA Board Governing Policy 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."
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	N/A
<b>Attachments:</b>	Yes, please see the Intergovernmental Agreement for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Commission, attached below.

**AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR  
THE INTERMOUNTAIN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMISSION**

THIS AGREEMENT, effective as of \_\_\_\_\_, by and among the following:

1. Eagle County
2. Garfield County
3. Lake County
4. Pitkin County
5. Summit County
6. Town of Avon
7. Town of Basalt
8. Town of Eagle
9. Town of Gypsum
10. Town of Minturn
11. Town of Red Cliff
12. Town of Vail
13. Town of Carbondale
14. City of Glenwood Springs
15. Town of New Castle
16. Town of Parachute
17. City of Rifle
18. Town of Silt
19. City of Leadville
20. City of Aspen
21. Town of Snowmass Village
22. Town of Blue River
23. Town of Breckenridge
24. Town of Dillon
25. Town of Frisco
26. Town of Silverthorne
27. Town of Montezuma
28. Roaring Fork Transportation Authority

WHEREAS, the parties to this Agreement which are political subdivisions of the State of Colorado have the authority pursuant to Article XIV, section 18 of the Colorado Constitution and Section 29-1-201 *et seq.*, Colorado Revised Statutes, to enter into intergovernmental agreements for the purpose of providing any service or performing any function which they can perform individually, and;

WHEREAS, the Rules and Regulations for the Statewide Transportation Planning Process and Transportation Planning Regions, Section IV, Transportation Planning Regions, Item F, specify that the long-range transportation plans for **Roaring Fork Transportation Authority** shall be integrated and consolidated into the Regional Transportation Plan for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region, and;

WHEREAS, Section 43-1-1101 C.R.S. recognizes Regional Planning Commissions as the proper forum for required transportation planning, and;

WHEREAS, Section 43-1-1102 C.R.S. requires that Regional Planning commissions formed for the purpose of transportation planning must be formed pursuant to Section 30-28-105 C.R.S., and;

WHEREAS, the parties to this Agreement desire to cooperate with the Colorado Department of Transportation in the transportation planning activities to determine the mobility needs of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region, and incorporate the needs and recommendations of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region into the Statewide Transportation Plan, and;

WHEREAS, the Intermountain Planning Region consisting of the areas within the counties of Eagle, Garfield, Lake, Pitkin and Summit was designated in the Rules for the Statewide Transportation Planning process as adopted by the Transportation Commission of Colorado and effective October 30, 1992, and;

WHEREAS, the parties to this Agreement are governing bodies or officials having charge of public improvements within their jurisdictions in the Intermountain Planning Region, and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section IV-B of the Rules, the parties to this Agreement represent units of general purpose local governments representing at least 75% of the population and 50% of the land area of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereby mutually agree as follows:

1. Designation of Regional Transportation Planning Commission. The parties to this Agreement shall have one representative each on the Regional Planning Commission for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region.
2. Responsibilities of the Regional Transportation Planning Commission. The Regional Transportation Planning Commission shall be responsible for reviewing the progress and product of the Colorado Department of Transportation or their designee related to transportation planning and analysis activities to incorporate the needs and recommendations of the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region, suggesting updates and amendments as necessary to the State Transportation Plan pursuant to all applicable federal and state laws and rules or regulations including public participation provisions, selecting a representative to the Transportation Advisory Committee, and participating in the State Transportation Improvement Program development process.
3. Contracting. The Regional Planning Commission may, with the consent of the parties to this Agreement, contract the services of other eligible individuals or entities to carry out all or any portions of the responsibilities assumed by the Regional Transportation Planning Commission under this Agreement.
4. Distribution of state or federal funds. The Regional Transportation Planning Commission may, through contracts or Memoranda of Agreement, receive and expend state or federal funds designated for regional transportation planning.
5. Term of Agreement. This Agreement shall remain in full force and effect for so long as the parties to this Agreement consider necessary to review completion by the Colorado Department of Transportation of a Regional Transportation Plan for the Intermountain Transportation Planning Region or for periodic updates or amendments as may be required. Any party to this Agreement may, however, terminate its participation in this Agreement six months after providing written notice of such termination to the other parties of this Agreement. This Agreement may be terminated at any time by agreement of all parties to this Agreement unless a grant contract is in effect with the State. In this case, the State must approve such termination and arrangements for completing the project.
6. Modifications and Changes. The terms of this Agreement may be modified at any time by agreement of all parties to this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement, Exhibit A, on the day first written above as evidenced by the attached certification designating the local jurisdiction's representative to the Intermountain Transportation Planning Commission and certified by the appropriate authorized official.

**INTRODUCED, READ AND PASSED** by the Board of Directors of the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority at its regular meeting held the 10<sup>th</sup> day of August 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 August 10, 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 10th day of August, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicole R. Schoon, Secretary to the Board

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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	CDOT Request to Use E-Bikes on the Rio Grande Trail between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale during Grand Avenue Bridge Closure
<b>Policy #:</b>	<b>1.2.A.i: There is safe usage of trails and transit</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	Successfully implement Grand Avenue Bridge Replacement project transit mitigation plan
<b>Presented By:</b>	Angela M. Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management and Facilities Operations Brett Meredith, RFTA Trail Manager
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prohibit the use of e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail (RGT) through the adoption of Resolution 2017-09; or</li> <li>2. Allow the temporary use of e-bikes on the RGT, specifically between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale, for the duration of the Grand Avenue Bridge closure, August 14<sup>th</sup> to Thanksgiving week.</li> </ol>
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Public Process</b> – Staff believes it would be beneficial to gather more public input prior to making a decision regarding whether to allow e-bikes to use the RGT. Ideally, staff would prefer more time to hold public meetings to collect input from all users of the RGT. This topic was intended to be included as a part of the Recreational Trail Plan update that will get underway later this year.</li> <li>• <b>Safety-</b> Although there may be other reasons why people might want to prohibit e-bikes on the RGT, the primary one that staff hears from opponents, concerns safety. With uncertainty about how the number of users of all types could increase during the Bridge closure, staff is concerned about adding another layer of potentially higher-speed users to the mix. Staff recognizes that the speed of some road bikers is already a concern, however, due to their heavier weights and higher potential speeds, collisions or crashes on e-bikes could result in more severe injuries than on regular bicycles. The potential also exists for there to be greater numbers of inexperienced cyclists traveling at higher speeds on e-bikes, who might not have the skill to react safely to avoid hazards. Given the 10-foot width of the trail, 1-foot soft surface oversteers on each side of the trail, precipitous drop-offs in some locations, root heaves, pavement irregularities, other trail users (some with dogs), and wildlife, the potential for people traveling at 20 mph to have mishaps is undoubtedly greater than for the typical bicycle rider traveling at lower speeds.</li> <li>• <b>Enforcement</b> – The RFTA Trails’ staff currently has no enforcement authority and cannot monitor speeds or issue tickets to users for any violations of the Rio Grande Trail rules and regulations. If the RFTA Board decides to allow the temporary use of e-bikes between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale during the GAB closure, staff will need additional resources between</li> </ul>

	<p>Glenwood Springs and Carbondale, to assist with enforcement and potentially allow for the issuance of tickets to those violating the rules and speed limit on the trail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Pro:</b> Temporarily allowing e-bikes on the segment of the RGT between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale could provide real-world experience to help inform a future RFTA Board discussion about whether e-bikes should be permanently allowed or disallowed on all or certain segments of the RGT.</li> <li>• <b>Con:</b> If e-bikes are allowed on the RGT, temporarily during the Grand Avenue Bridge closure, it could make it more challenging to disallow their use after the closure.</li> </ul>
<b>Background Info:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roland Wagner, CDOT’s Glenwood Springs Resident Engineer, addressed a letter to the RFTA Board, on July 5, 2017, requesting that e-bikes be allowed to use the segment of the RGT between Glenwood Springs and Carbondale temporarily during the closure of the Grand Avenue Bridge.</li> <li>• Colorado House Bill 17-1151 (effective 08/09/17), redefines “Motor Vehicle” to remove Electrical Assisted Bicycles and allows Class 1 &amp; Class 2 pedal assisted electric bicycles (e-bikes) on Bike or Pedestrian paths where bicycles are authorized to travel. Class 1 e-bikes have a top speed of 20 mph and must be pedaled in order to be electrically assisted. Class 2 e-bikes have a top speed of 20 mph and have a throttle, so that they need not be pedaled to be electrically assisted.</li> <li>• HB 17-1151 allows jurisdictions to prohibit the operation of all classifications of e-bikes on Bike and Pedestrian paths.</li> <li>• HB 17-1151 also mandates that all e-bikes have labels permanently attached that contain the Classification Number, Top Assisted Speed and the Motor Wattage of the e-bike.</li> <li>• Class 3 e-bikes, with a speed of 28 mph or greater are prohibited from using Bike and Pedestrian paths, unless specifically permitted by the responsible authority.</li> </ul>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	RFTA Board End Statement 1.2.A.i., states, “There is safe usage of trails and transit.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Unknown at this time. RFTA may need to incur the cost of Trail rules’ enforcement in the future, whether or not e-bikes are permitted to use the RGT.
<b>Attachments:</b>	Yes, please Roland Wagner letter requesting approval for the temporary use of e-bikes during the Grand Avenue Bridge Closure, contained in “RFTA Rio Grande Trail – Ebikes Req.pdf,” included in the August 2010 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.

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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Resolution 2017-09: Resolution Prohibiting the Operation of A Class 1, Class 2, Or Class 3 Electrical Assisted Bicycle On The Rio Grande Trail
<b>POLICY #</b>	<b>1.2.A.i: There is safe usage of trails and transit</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	Continue to update all plan elements of the Corridor Comprehensive Plan
<b>Presented By:</b>	Dan Blankenship, CEO Paul Taddune, General Counsel Angela Henderson, Assistant Director of Project Management and Facilities Operations Brett Meredith, Trail Manager
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Take public comment and adopt, revise and adopt, or not adopt Resolution 2017-09
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<p>On April 4, 2017, Governor Hickenlooper signed House Bill 17-1151 Concerning the Regulation of Electric Assisted Bicycles (i.e. e-bikes) that becomes effective on August 9, 2017.</p> <p>The practical effect of this legislation is that e-bikes shall be deemed the same as bicycles on public trails or bike paths unless the local authority prohibits the use of e-bikes in accordance with the legislation.</p> <p>A Public Hearing on this issue is scheduled on August 10, and proponents and opponents may be present at the Board meeting to speak in favor or against allowing the use of e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail.</p> <p>Several other jurisdictions have passed resolutions prohibiting the use of e-bikes on some or all of the trails they manage, or placing other restrictions on them, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USFS &amp; BLM - Banned</li> <li>• Great Outdoors Colorado - Banned</li> <li>• Fort Collins – Banned</li> <li>• Boulder – Allows electric bikes on its paved paths, with the exception of paths through open space areas. Boulder has restricted the power of the motors, and topped the speed at 15 mph</li> <li>• Durango – Limited Access – Designated sections of multi-use hard surface trails on the Animas River Trail, Trial Period of 1-Year, Class 1 only</li> <li>• Steamboat – Class 1 only, 1-Year Trial Period on the Core Trail</li> <li>• Breckenridge - Banned</li> <li>• Jefferson County – Class 1 only, 1-Year Trial Period on designated sections of the trail</li> <li>• Grand Junction Colorado Riverfront Commission - <i>Colorado Riverfront Commission members said they fear allowing e-bikes could open the door for other types of motorized vehicles, like all-terrain vehicles, motorcycles and Segways. “We’re not against e-bikes,” Brad Taylor (Co-Chairman) added. “E-bikes have their place. People can ride on the city streets where it’s legal.”</i></li> <li>• Vail – Allows Class 1, with a restriction of 500 watts (instead of 750 watts, as the HB allows)</li> </ul>

	<p>Articles discussing regulations of e-bikes on public bike trails and the controversy created by e-bikes can be accessed by clicking on the following links:</p> <p>e-bike studies and regulations, and where accepted, by state:  <a href="http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/e-bikes">http://www.peopleforbikes.org/pages/e-bikes</a></p> <p>USFS Policy on e-bikes: <a href="http://www.peopleforbikes.org/page/-/20160324ElectricBikesAndTrailManagement.pdf">http://www.peopleforbikes.org/page/-/20160324ElectricBikesAndTrailManagement.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.bikeroar.com/articles/trail-troubles-the-e-bike-controversy">http://www.bikeroar.com/articles/trail-troubles-the-e-bike-controversy</a></p> <p>Resolution 2017-09, attached below, provides the Board the ability to prohibit e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail. However, the Board may revise Resolution 2017-09 prior to its adoption, based on public comment.</p> <p>The Board may:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allow Class 1 but not Class 2 or 3 e-bikes on the corridor or certain sections of the corridor, indefinitely or for some period of time, such as during the Grand Avenue Bridge closure</li> <li>2. Prohibit Class 1, 2, and 3 e-bikes on the corridor or certain sections of the corridor for some period of time while it researches the matter more fully</li> <li>3. Prohibit all classes of e-bikes indefinitely</li> </ol> <p>RFTA operates through actions of the RFTA Board pursuant to the Colorado Regional Transportation Act. Six affirmative votes of the Board are required to enact the Resolution prohibiting e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail. Article III of RFTA’s IGA, as amended provides the required vote for approving a resolution as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Section 3.09. Resolutions and Voting.</b> All actions of the Board shall be by resolution, which may be written or oral. Except as otherwise provided in Section 3.10 hereof, resolutions of the Board shall be adopted upon the affirmative vote at a meeting open to the public of a minimum of two-thirds of the Directors then in office who are eligible to vote thereon voting. In addition to the minimum two-thirds rule, a resolution of the Board shall be approved only when at least two less than the total number of members vote for such resolution. The Authority shall provide at least 48 hours’ written notice of meetings to each Director and Alternate Director and to the Governing Body of each Member. Notwithstanding any other provision hereof, a Director shall disqualify himself or herself from voting on any issue with respect to which he or she has a conflict of interest, unless he or she has disclosed such conflict or interest in compliance with sections 18-8-308 and 24-18-101 et seq., Colorado Revised Statutes, as amended.</p> <p>At this time, staff believes that if a resolution specifically prohibiting e-bikes on the Rio Grande Trail is not approved by the RFTA Board, by default, e-bikes may be considered permitted on the Rio Grande Trail as of August 9, 2017.</p>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	RFTA Board End Statement 1.2.A.i., states, “There is safe usage of trails and transit.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Unknown at this time. RFTA may need to incur the cost of Trail rules’ enforcement in the future, whether or not e-bikes are permitted.
<b>Attachments:</b>	Yes, please see Resolution 2017-09, attached below. Also, please see a copy of HB 17-1151 and letters from the public contained in “Community Letters.pdf,” included in the August 2017 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.

\_\_\_\_\_ moved to adopt the following Resolution:

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
ROARING FORK TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
RESOLUTION NO. 2017-09**

**RESOLUTION PROHIBITING THE OPERATION OF A CLASS 1, CLASS 2, OR CLASS 3  
ELECTRICAL ASSISTED BICYCLE ON THE RIO GRANDE TRAIL**

**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**, the Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) owns and co-manages 34 miles of the Rio Grande Railroad Corridor and the Rio Grande Tail, between the City of Glenwood Springs and Woody Creek; and

**WHEREAS**, RFTA constructed and maintains a 10’ wide, multi-use Rio Grande Trail for non-motorized uses (walking, biking, and equestrian); and

**WHEREAS**, Class 1 Electrical Assisted Bicycle means an electrical assisted bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling and that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches a speed of twenty (20) miles per hour; and

**WHEREAS**, Class 2 Electrical Assisted Bicycle mean and electrical assisted bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance regardless of whether the rider is pedaling but ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches a speed of twenty (20) miles per hour; and

**WHEREAS**, Class 3 Electrical Assisted Bicycle means an electrical assisted bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance when the rider is pedaling and that ceases to provide assistance when the bicycle reaches a speed of twenty-eight (28) miles per hour; and

**WHEREAS**, Pursuant to Colorado Revised Statues, 42-4-1412, Section 5, Part 14(a)(II): A local Authority may prohibit the Operation of a Class 1 or Class 2 Electrical Assisted Bicycle on a bike or pedestrian path under its Jurisdiction; and

**WHEREAS**, Pursuant to Colorado Revised Statues, 42-4-1412, Section 5, Part 14(b): A person shall not ride a Class 3 Electrical Assisted Bicycle on a bike or pedestrian path unless: (I) The path is within a street or highway; or (II) The Local Authority permits the Operation of a Class 3 Electrical Assisted Bicycle on a path under its Jurisdiction; and

**WHEREAS**, RFTA has deemed Class 1, 2, and 3 Electrical Assisted Bicycles, a potential safety hazard for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrians due to their speed and mass; and

**WHEREAS**, RFTA desires to prohibit the use of Class 1, 2, and 3 Electric Assisted Bicycles on the Rio Grande Trail as an alternate mode of transportation, except that this prohibition shall not apply to the use of an Electrical Assisted Bicycle on the Rio Grande Trail by a person with a disability, if such use is authorized by applicable state or federal law.

**(REST OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the RFTA Board of Directors as follows:

Section 1. That the operation of Class 1, 2, and 3 Electrical Assisted Bicycles on the Rio Grande Trail are hereby prohibited.

Section 2. The RFTA CEO and management staff are hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to implement this resolution.

Section 3. This resolution was adopted in accordance with the governing documents of RFTA, and is now in full force and effect.

**INTRODUCED, READ AND PASSED** by the RFTA Board of Directors at its regular meeting held the 10<sup>th</sup> day of August 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 August 10, 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 10th day of August, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nicole R. Schoon, Secretary to the Board

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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Second Reading (Continuance): Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Access Control Plan Update
<b>Policy #:</b>	1.1: The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	Complete all sections of the updated Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Comprehensive Plan
<b>Presented By:</b>	Dan Blankenship, CEO Angela Henderson, Assistant Director, Project Management and Facilities Operations
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p>On July 12, the RFTA General Counsel and staff met with Steve Skadron, RFTA Board Member and Mayor of Aspen, Jim True, City Attorney, City of Aspen, and Mick Ireland, citizen, to discuss their concerns about the current draft of the 2017 Access Control Plan Update. It was agreed that the City would provide RFTA staff with its proposed revisions of the ACP. Subsequently, a meeting will be scheduled to discuss the proposed revisions with the Cities of Aspen and Glenwood Springs, the Town of Carbondale, and other interested parties, with the hope of reaching agreement on them. <b>Staff recommends that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading of the draft 2017 ACP Update be continued until the <u>October 12, 2017 RFTA Board meeting.</u></b></p> <p><b><i>No new information has been provided below.</i></b></p>
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. Elements of the CCP that should be updated on the 5-year cycle are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Access Control Plan (ACP):</b> 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.</li> <li>b. <b>Recreational Trails Plan (RTP):</b> The update will address the interim recreational trail, which was completed in 2008, as well as any changes to goals and policies.</li> <li>c. <b>Overview of Compliance with requirements of the GOCO Legacy Grant:</b> The overview will serve as a reset to bring actions taken on the corridor since the last update current with GOCO.</li> </ol> </li> <li>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.</li> <li>4. At the April 13, 2017 meeting, the RFTA Board unanimously agreed to schedule the draft 2017 ACP Update for Second Reading at the May 11, 2107 meeting.</li> <li>6. As was reported at the April 13 meeting, RFTA’s railroad attorneys, William Mullins and Walter Downing performed a final review of the ACP in April and wrote letters, each with a recommendation they believed would strengthen the ACP document.</li> </ol>

7. Mr. Mullins recommended adding language similar to that which is contained in the City of Glenwood Springs' 8<sup>th</sup> Street Easement Agreement to Section IV, 17.0 of the ACP as follows:

Easements for public roadway crossings and utilities, which are conveyed by RFTA to jurisdictions shall contain the following provision:

**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. The Board indicated that it was amenable to including the suggested revisions (above) of the ACP in the final draft of the ACP that is being presented for adoption at the May 11, 2017 Second Reading. That document, along with the Design Guidelines (DG) and the 2017 – 2005 ACP Comparison Matrix Revised 05-11-17, 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. As was reported at the April 13, 2017 Board meeting, the major differences between the proposed 2017 ACP Update and the 2005 ACP Update are as follows:

- a. The 2017 ACP Update makes it clear that maintaining the corridor's Railbanked status ***is of utmost importance*** in order to keep the 34-mile continuous railroad corridor intact.
- b. The 2017 ACP Update 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 and DG, 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. Notwithstanding this assurance, the ACP also states that no action which, in the opinion of RFTA's railroad engineers and attorneys, would jeopardize the railbanked status of the railroad corridor will be approved.

- 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 allocation of costs shall be by further agreement, or if no agreement, then as determined by the CPUC in a hearing.

Easements for public roadway crossings and utilities, which are conveyed by RFTA to jurisdictions shall contain the following provision:

**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

	<p>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.</p> <p>f. 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.</p> <p>g. 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.</p> <p>h. Denials of crossing proposals can be appealed to the RFTA Board.</p> <p>11. The Design Guidelines (DG) 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. The DG are considered advisory, as is other information included as Appendices to the ACP. Staff believes these documents should be allowed to be updated and revised as necessary without further action of the Board.</p> <p>12. Staff recommends that the RFTA Board approve the 2017 draft ACP Update on Second Reading with the proposed revisions recommended by William Mullins, Walter Downing, and staff.</p> <p>13. Following approval of the ACP, staff will begin working on the update of the Recreational Trails Plan and other sections of the Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Comprehensive Plan. Each section of the Plan, as well as the overall Comprehensive Plan will require a unanimous vote of the seven constituent governments of the Roaring Fork Railroad Holding Authority. Adoption of the ACP Update will provide staff with policies by which to review future proposed uses of the corridor and enable staff to devote its full attention to completing the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	Board End Statement 1.1 says, "The Rio Grande Corridor is Appropriately Protected and Utilized."
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Approximately \$150,000 has been budgeted in 2017 for the Comprehensive Plan Update and other corridor management-related tasks.
<b>Attachments:</b>	Yes, the Draft ACP Update Revised 05-11-17, a 2017 – 2005 ACP Comparison Matrix, and the proposed Design Guidelines can be reviewed by following this link: <a href="https://www.rfta.com/trail-documentation/">https://www.rfta.com/trail-documentation/</a>

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
“PRESENTATIONS” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 7. B.**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Preliminary Planning Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues for 2018 RFTA Budget
<b>Policy #:</b>	<b>2.5 Financial Planning/Budgeting</b>
<b>Action Requested:</b>	Discuss the 2018 budget initiatives, assumptions and issues and give staff direction.
<b>Presented By:</b>	Michael Yang, Chief Financial & Administrative Officer; Paul Hamilton, Director of Finance
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On a fund basis, staff will highlight issues associated with the 2018 budget and seek direction from the Board. A list of budget assumptions, issues and highlights is provided on the following pages.</li> <li>○ The 1<sup>st</sup> draft budget will be presented for the Board’s consideration at the abbreviated September 14, 2017 meeting, prior to the Board Retreat.</li> <li>○ The 2<sup>nd</sup> draft budget will be presented for the Board’s consideration at the October 12, 2017 meeting.</li> <li>○ The final budget will be presented for the Board’s review and adoption at the November 9, 2017 meeting.</li> </ul>
<b>Background Info:</b>	See Core Issues
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	Board Financial Planning/Budgeting policy 2.5.1 states, “The CEO shall not allow budgeting that Omits credible projection of revenues and expenses, separation of capital (including replacement and depreciation) and operation items, cash flow projects, and disclosure of planning assumptions.”
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Inaccurate forecasts of revenues and expenditures could result in the unanticipated use of fund balance in order to achieve the Authority’s goals and objectives.
<b>Options:</b>	Discuss 2018 budget overview information and provide staff with direction.
<b>Staff Recommend:</b>	See budget overview information.
<b>Backup Memo?</b>	Yes, see the list of 2018 budget initiatives, assumptions, and issues provided on the following pages.



## 2018 Budget: Preliminary Planning Initiatives, Assumptions, and Issues

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

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

- Align budget with goals identified in the current Strategic Plan document.
- The initial budget should be a balanced budget and, if possible, add to fund balance. Any budgeted surplus may be used to fund projects or needs that may come up during the year through a supplemental budget appropriation resolution.
- Consider adjustments to services, if necessary, before recommending the use of fund balance.
- The budget should adhere to the financial reserve thresholds in accordance with Policy 2.5.5.
- Consult with RFTA member jurisdictions' Finance Directors to obtain their sales tax revenue estimates for the budget year. RFTA's sales tax revenue estimates will be calculated based on the information provided by each jurisdiction. Update forecasts accordingly throughout the budget process.
- Develop revenue estimates for Operating and Capital Grants, and other governmental contributions.
  - Federal Assistance from the FTA Section 5311 Operating Grant was \$1,014,550 in 2017 to support our regional transit services.
  - State Assistance from the CDOT FASTER Operating Grant was \$200,000 in 2017 to support our I-70 regional transit Hogback Service.
  - The Elected Officials Transportation Committee (EOTC) contributed \$615,726 in 2017 to support the no-fare Aspen/Snowmass regional transit services and staff must calculate and confirm their contribution amount for 2018.
  - Garfield County contributed \$703,000 in 2017 to support the Grand Hogback bus service and staff will confirm their contribution for 2018.
  - City of Rifle contributed \$20,000 in 2017 to support the Grand Hogback bus service and staff will confirm their contribution for 2018.
- Fare revenue
  - There has not been any discussion of any upward fare adjustment for 2018. Any evaluation of fare changes can be directed by the Board.
- Develop Transit Service Plan, initially, based upon status quo service levels with updates for seasonal date changes. The temporary GAB transit service mitigation plan budgeted in 2017 will not continue in 2018, resulting in a reduction of total transit hours and mileage in 2018. Staff will cost out potential adjustments to services that may be requested by RFTA and its contracting partners:
  - Highway 82 Corridor/BRT Service
  - Grand Hogback I-70
  - Aspen Skiing Company service contract
  - City of Aspen municipal service contract

- City of Glenwood Springs municipal service contract
- Potential Hanging Lake Shuttle (new)
- Adjustments to service hours and miles may result in adjustments to Bus Operator shifts, Mechanic positions, parts and fuel.
- Departments will submit their draft budget requests which can include new positions. Management will evaluate each new position request and prioritize them based on need and available resources. Any new positions identified by management as a priority will be incorporated into the budget.
- Departments will submit their capital item and project requests. Management will evaluate and prioritize them based on need, available resources and how they fit with strategic goals. Priority items will be presented along with the draft budget. Capital grants will be strategically pursued to help fund these items and only those that are awarded will be included in the budget or presented in a supplemental budget appropriation resolution over the course of the budget year. Financing options will also be considered, as needed.
- Due to timing issues, any unexpended capital items and projects (and any related grant revenues) budgeted for in 2017 may need to be re-budgeted in 2018 in order to complete the project.
- Any additional Board priorities should also be incorporated into the budget's planning assumptions.

*New Budget issues:*

- Outcomes from Integrated Transportation System Plan (ITSP)
- Potential new Hanging Lake Shuttle seasonal service

*Continuing Budget issues and considerations:*

- In 2017, Sales and Use tax revenues through April (or June collections) and have exceeded budget estimates by approximately 6%, most of which is due to Use tax. Transit fares also exceed budget estimates by 4%. Staff will continue to maintain a conservative approach regarding these rates.
- In 2017, management obtained fixed price transit fuel contracts to manage the volatility normally associated with fuel prices. This approach continues in 2018 where staff has currently locked approximately 95% of its diesel fuel needs for the 2018 budget which reflect a 1.5% decrease from the current year's weighted average cost per diesel gallon. Staff is actively monitoring fuel prices and may lock the remaining needs for 2017 in the near term. The current CNG pricing will be assumed in budget preparations.
- Historically, RFTA experienced 10% annual increases in healthcare costs. In 2016, RFTA experienced a 5% decrease in Medical premiums. In 2017, renewal rates were relatively unchanged. The preliminary annual increase for 2018 is anticipated to be around 8%. More information regarding the increase will become available in the coming weeks. Staff continues to review the current plan design to identify possible changes for consideration, if any.
- Historically, the high cost of living in the Roaring Fork Valley has challenged the Authority's ability to hire and retain qualified personnel. Management continues to review and refine RFTA's compensation package with respect to wages, incentive programs, and benefit enhancements, including employee housing, in order to remain competitive in the local job market. As part of the compensation review, a market survey will be conducted in September for all job descriptions and any potential adjustments will be identified and considered as needed. The Collective Bargaining Unit comprised of full-time bus operators are subject to scheduled pay increases in accordance with their contract.

- As of July 2017, the overall occupancy rate for RFTA employee housing (seasonal and year-round) is at 95%. Year-to-date rental income has increased by approximately 7% from the prior year. Staff will continue to monitor the local rental housing market, current rental leases, and anticipated seasonal hires during the budget preparations.
- Request for Funding Application Forms are required to be completed by organizations seeking financial support. New this cycle is the opportunity to request multi-year financial support. The deadline for requests related to the 2018 budget year will be in September. Staff will review funding applications and present them in the draft budget submitted to the Board.
  - Note that at the June 8, 2017 Board meeting, the Board unanimously approved a five-year WE-Cycle – RFTA Partnership Agreement (at a minimum of \$100,000 per year, subject to annual appropriations), which will be incorporated into the 2018 draft budget.
- Other issues and priorities as identified by the Board.

**Bus Stops/PNR Special Revenue Fund**

*Budget Initiatives, Assumptions and Issues:*

- Develop Vehicle Registration Fee estimate based on historical data and trends.
- Budget bus stops and park and ride operating expenditures based on historical data, trends and needs.
- Similar to the current year, additional resources needed to fund the operating and maintenance costs associated with BRT stations and park and rides will be transferred from the General Fund using available Sales Tax Revenues.

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS**  
**“CONSENT” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 7. C.**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Potential By-Laws Amendment to Permit RFTA Board Members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees to Attend RFTA Board Meetings Via Telephone and/or Video Conferencing in Special Circumstances
<b>POLICY #</b>	<b>By Laws: Section 6.07. Quorum</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Presented By:</b>	Paul Taddune, General Counsel
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Discuss whether to amend the By-Laws to permit RFTA Board Members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees to attend RFTA Board meetings via telephone and/or video conferencing in special circumstances
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<p>Section 6.07 of the RFTA By-Laws states:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Section 6.07. <b>Quorum.</b> At meetings of the Board of Directors at least two thirds of the Directors then in office who are eligible to vote therein shall be necessary to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. If a quorum is present, action by 2/3 majority of Directors present and eligible to vote shall be the act of the Board of Directors, unless the act of a greater number is required by the I.G.A. or applicable law.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RFTA has a 2/3rds supermajority requirement to achieve a quorum for Board meetings. To adopt the Rio Grande Railroad Corridor Comprehensive Plan, a unanimous vote of the seven original constituent members of the Roaring Fork Railroad Holding Authority is required. A 2/3rds affirmative vote is also required to adopt routine resolutions of the Board.</li> <li>2. This relatively high threshold for a quorum and to adopt Board resolutions, can be problematic when representatives from three or more RFTA jurisdictions are unable to attend Board meetings.</li> <li>3. While Board meetings have rarely been cancelled due to a lack of a quorum, it has happened on several occasions.</li> <li>4. Cancelling Board meetings could be detrimental if there are time-sensitive Board actions required</li> <li>5. Staff proposes that the Board amend its By-Laws to permit Board Members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees to participate in RFTA Board meetings via telephone or video conferencing in special circumstances, as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. When there is one or more time-sensitive Action Item(s), which in the judgment of the Board Chair and CEO, would potentially cause harm to RFTA and/or the public if not acted on at a meeting for which there would not be a quorum of Board representatives from RFTA jurisdictions in attendance.</li> <li>b. When there is one or more time-sensitive Action Item(s) and a quorum cannot be achieved, Board members who cannot attend the meeting, but</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	<p>who could participate via telephone or video conference, must have a legitimate reason for not attending the meeting.</p> <p>c. When there is a quorum in attendance at RFTA Board meetings, other Board members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees cannot participate in the meeting via telephone or video conferencing unless a vote of greater than a 2/3rds majority is required.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Staff is in favor of amending the By-Laws to permit Board Members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees to participate in RFTA Board meetings, when a quorum or the necessary majority for adopting Board resolutions cannot be achieved.</p>
<p><b>Policy Implications:</b></p>	<p>Special circumstances may occur, which may require Board Members, Alternates, or Elected Official Designees to participate in Board meetings via telephone or video conferencing. Otherwise, the Board meeting would need to be cancelled. When scheduled meetings are cancelled, it can be inconvenient for the public and disruptive for those planning to appear before the Board. When there are time-sensitive agenda items that must be postponed, it could potentially cause harm to RFTA and the public.</p>
<p><b>Fiscal Implications:</b></p>	<p>None anticipated.</p>
<p><b>Attachments:</b></p>	<p>Yes, please see "RFTA Board Remote Attendance.pdf," included in the August 2017 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.</p>

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

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	Integrated Transportation System Plan (ITSP) Update
<b>Policy #:</b>	4.2.1: Board Job Products
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	Complete Stages 3 and 4 of Phase I of the Integrated Transportation System Plan (ITSP)
<b>Presented By:</b>	Ralph Trapani, Parsons Transportation Group (PTG)
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Discuss progress of the ITSP and provide comments
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<p>The Consultant Team and RFTA continue to develop scopes and conceptual cost estimates for the various service and capital alternatives that emerged as long-term priorities during Stage 1 (Visioning) and Stage 2 (Determine Future Needs). The alternatives will be grouped into a matrix of short-term (0-5 years), medium-term (6-10 years) and long-term (11-20+ years) projects. These alternatives will be ready for review and prioritization by the Board at the RFTA Board Retreat on September 14.</p> <p>Alternatives include regional service enhancement and optimization, development of local transit circulator systems, renovation and expansion of fleet and facilities, expansion of the bike-sharing program, ride sharing programs, implementation or expansion of park and ride facilities, and the construction of bicycle/pedestrian crossings of SH82 and SH133. RFTA will need to secure additional, long-term funding to achieve public demands for safe, reliable multimodal transportation alternatives as regional population and employment growth continues.</p> <p>Over the next several months, RFTA intends to assess the electorate’s perception of RFTA and its views on transportation priorities. The results of this statistically informal snapshot of community perception, consisting of a 10-question telephone survey and stakeholder interviews, will be presented at the Board Retreat.</p>
<b>Background Info:</b>	<p>RFTA and Parsons Transportation Group have completed Stage 1 of the ITSP: <b>Define the Vision</b> and Stage 2: <b>Determine Future Needs</b>. We are now in Stage 3: <b>Analyze Options</b>.</p> <p>Based on the outreach efforts of Stage 1 and the forecasted needs of Stage 2, RFTA and PTG have developed a list of proposed service and capital alternatives to consider for evaluation in Stage 3, to be grouped into a matrix of as many as three sets of integrated, multimodal system plan alternatives.</p>
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	Board Job Products Policy 4.2.1. A. & B. states, “The Board is the link between the “ownership” and the operation organization. The Board will assess the needs of the ownership as they relate to RFTA’s activities and scope of influence, and will develop Ends policies identifying the results RFTA is to produce to meet those needs. The Board will inform the ownership of the organizations expected future results, and its present accomplishments and challenges.”

<p><b>Fiscal Implications:</b></p>	<p>In 2016, RFTA budgeted a total of \$560,000 for Stages I and II of the ITSP.</p> <p>Phase I of the ITSP has 4 stages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Define the Vision</li> <li>2. Determine Future Needs</li> <li>3. Analyze Options</li> <li>4. Develop Financial Sustainability/Financing Plan</li> </ol> <p>Phase I, Stages 1 and 2 were completed by early 2017; Stage 3 will be completed by end of 2017.</p> <p>Phase II of the ITSP will be the implementation phase, assuming the Board decides to move forward with any of the preferred multi-modal transportation alternatives identified in Phase I.</p>
<p><b>Attachments:</b></p>	<p>None. A presentation regarding the preliminary matrix of alternatives will be made by Ralph Trapani, PTG, at the Board meeting.</p>

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
“GOVERNANCE PROCESS” AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY # 9. A.**

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	August 10, 2017
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	RFTA Board Strategic Planning Retreat
<b>Policy #:</b>	<b>4.3.2.A: Agenda Planning</b>
<b>Strategic Goal:</b>	<b>Update RFTA 5-Year Strategic Plan</b>
<b>Presented By:</b>	David Johnson, Director of Planning
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p>Please provide direction regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential Agenda topics</li> <li>• Retreat Agenda Board Subcommittee members</li> <li>• Input on facilitator selection and other issues and preferences</li> </ul>
<b>Core Issues:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. According to the Board’s Agenda Planning Policy 4.3.1, “The Board’s annual planning cycle concludes on the last day of July, so that administrative planning and budgeting can be based on accomplishing a one year segment of long-term Ends,” however, the Board has generally opted to conduct its retreat earlier.</li> <li>2. Policy 4.3.2.A. states, “The annual (planning) cycle will start with the Board’s development of its agenda plan for the next year. The Board will identify its priorities for Ends and other issues to be resolved in the coming year, and will identify information gathering necessary to fulfill its role. This may include methods of gaining ownership input, governance education, and other education related to Ends issues, (e.g. presentations by futurists, advocacy groups, demographers, other providers, staff, etc.).</li> <li>3. Each year, the RFTA Board typically conducts a 7-hour Strategic Planning Retreat in lieu of the regularly scheduled June or July Board meeting. This year the Retreat is being conducted in September, so that finalized service alternatives derived from the Integrated Transportation System Plan can be presented, discussed, and prioritized by the RFTA Board.</li> <li>4. The Board Retreat Subcommittee drafted the topics and the agenda and selected the location (Rocky Mountain Institute) and the facilitator (pending RFTA staff negotiation).</li> <li>5. The Board Subcommittee now seeks review and comment from the entire RFTA Board.</li> </ol>
<b>Background Info:</b>	See Core Issues.
<b>Policy Implications:</b>	See Core Issues.
<b>Fiscal Implications:</b>	Budget for facilitation is approximately \$3,500
<b>Attachments:</b>	Yes, please see the “Draft” Retreat Agenda, attached below.

## RFTA Board Retreat – Proposed Agenda

**Date:** September 14, 2017

**Location:** Rocky Mountain Institute (Pending)

8:00-8:30: *Breakfast*

**Board Meeting:**

8:30-9:15: Consent Agenda and Brief Draft Budget Presentation

**Board Retreat:** Proposed Goals:  
**1.** Define Growth Scenarios  
**2.** Select and prioritize ITSP Alternatives  
**3.** Propose funding sources and plans  
**4.** Establish key milestones and decisions, and time frames

9:15-9:30: Introductions - Meeting Goals: Facilitator

9:30-10:15: Informal Telephone Survey Results Bill Ray

10:15-10:30: *Break*

10:30-11:00: Presentation of Alternatives Ralph Trapani

11:00-12:00: Prioritization of Alternatives Facilitator/Staff

12:00-12:30: *Lunch*

12:30-2:00: Discussion of potential revenue sources Facilitator/Staff

2:00-2:45: Timing of Potential Election/Next steps Facilitator/Staff

2:45: Adjourn

**RFTA BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING**  
**“INFORMATION/UPDATES” AGENDA SUMMARY ITEM # 10. A.**

**CEO REPORT**

**TO:** RFTA Board of Directors  
**FROM:** Dan Blankenship, CEO  
**DATE:** August 10, 2017

**Grand Avenue Bridge Closure Transit Mitigation Plan:** On Monday, August 10, the existing Grand Avenue Bridge (GAB) will close for construction of the new bridge, until about Thanksgiving. RFTA, the City of Glenwood Springs, CDOT, and numerous community organizations and businesses have been planning and coordinating for two years to mitigate the impacts of this unprecedented bridge closure on commuters, residents, and visitors who must enter and exit Glenwood Springs from Interstate 70. RFTA will be providing free ramped up commuter bus services from Parachute, Rifle, Silt, and New Castle to the north side of the new pedestrian bridge in Glenwood Springs. RFTA will provide two free shuttles within Glenwood Springs to help move people around town and between the AMTRAK station and the 27<sup>th</sup> Street BRT Station, where transfers to/from regional commuter buses can be made. In addition, the Ride Glenwood Springs bus service will be free and operate between the north side of the pedestrian bridge to the West Glenwood Mall. More information on the GAB transit mitigation services can be obtained at [www.rfta.com](http://www.rfta.com) or by clicking on this link: <https://www.rfta.com/gab/>

**Sales Tax on Marijuana:** An apparent drafting error on Senate Bill 17-262 has resulted in special districts, such as Denver RTD and RFTA being excluded from collecting sales tax on recreational marijuana. In the case of Denver RTD, that will mean the loss of about \$6 million in revenue per year. In 2016, RFTA collected approximately \$116,000 in sales tax revenue on the sale of recreational marijuana. Through June 2017, RFTA’s sales tax collections on recreational marijuana were approximately \$55,000, up approximately 22% from the same period in 2016. Denver RTD and other Regional Transportation Authorities, including RFTA, may seek to have the tax restored in the next session of the State Legislature. For more information regarding this issue: <http://completecolorado.com/pagetwo/2017/07/07/rtd-faces-big-cuts-following-senate-bill-267-drafting-error-special-districts-to-lose-millions-in-revenue/>

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

The “08-10-17 Planning Department Update.pdf,” can be found in the August 2017 RFTA Board Meeting Portfolio.pdf attached to the e-mail transmitting the RFTA Board Agenda packet.



**Finance Department Update – Mike Yang, Chief Financial and Administrative Officer**

**2017 Actuals/Budget Comparison (May YTD)**

2017 Budget Year				
General Fund	June YTD			Annual Budget
	Actual	Budget	% Var.	
<b>Revenues</b>				
Sales and Use tax (1)	\$ 8,412,668	\$ 7,938,293	6.0%	\$ 21,288,000
Grants	\$ 1,316,707	\$ 1,316,707	0.0%	\$ 3,628,703
Fares (2)	\$ 2,228,440	\$ 2,156,902	3.3%	\$ 4,869,000
Other govt contributions	\$ 1,594,209	\$ 1,591,444	0.2%	\$ 1,780,517
Other income	\$ 383,547	\$ 377,384	1.6%	\$ 614,940
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$ 13,935,571</b>	<b>\$ 13,380,731</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>\$ 32,181,160</b>
<b>Expenditures</b>				
Fuel	\$ 753,614	\$ 770,615	-2.2%	\$ 1,408,112
Transit	\$ 9,876,115	\$ 10,173,987	-2.9%	\$ 20,685,734
Trails & Corridor Mgmt	\$ 154,367	\$ 155,449	-0.7%	\$ 471,720
Capital	\$ 1,852,783	\$ 1,852,765	0.0%	\$ 6,611,351
Debt service	\$ 955,743	\$ 955,742	0.0%	\$ 1,902,244
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>\$ 13,592,622</b>	<b>\$ 13,908,559</b>	<b>-2.3%</b>	<b>\$ 31,079,161</b>
<b>Other Financing Sources/Uses</b>				
Other financing sources (3)	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%	\$ 1,330,900
Other financing uses	\$ (1,339,591)	\$ (1,339,591)	0.0%	\$ (3,372,285)
<b>Total Other Financing Sources/Uses</b>	<b>\$ (1,339,591)</b>	<b>\$ (1,339,591)</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>\$ (2,041,385)</b>
<b>Change in Fund Balance (4)</b>	<b>\$ (996,642)</b>	<b>\$ (1,867,419)</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>\$ (939,386)</b>

(1) Sales and Use tax revenue is budgeted and received 2 months in arrears (i.e. April sales tax is received and reflected in June). Actuals exceed budget primarily due to Use Tax revenues.

(2) Through June, fare revenue is up by approx. 4% 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 June 2016/2017 comparison of actual fare revenues and ridership on RFTA fare services:

Fare Revenue:	Jun-16	Jun-17	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Regional Fares	\$ 2,064,003	\$ 2,134,050	\$ 70,047	3%
Maroon Bells	\$ 70,156	\$ 78,845	\$ 8,689	12%
Advertising	\$ 9,479	\$ 15,545	\$ 6,066	64%
<b>Total Fare Revenue</b>	<b>\$ 2,143,638</b>	<b>\$ 2,228,440</b>	<b>\$ 84,802</b>	<b>4%</b>
Ridership on RFTA Fare Services:	Jun-16	Jun-17	Increase/ (Decrease)	% Change
Highway 82 (Local & Express)	436,114	451,577	15,463	4%
BRT	424,140	442,350	18,210	4%
SM-DV	44,343	45,164	821	2%
Maroon Bells	26,333	29,043	2,710	10%
Grand Hogback	49,959	56,680	6,721	13%
<b>Total Ridership on RFTA Fare Services</b>	<b>980,889</b>	<b>1,024,814</b>	<b>43,925</b>	<b>4%</b>
Avg. Fare/Ride - Regional	\$ 2.16	\$ 2.14	\$ (0.02)	-1%
Avg. Fare/Ride - MB	\$ 2.66	\$ 2.71	\$ 0.05	2%

(3) Approximately \$1.29 million has been budgeted as a transfer from the Capital Projects Fund assuming that RFTA issues the remaining bonding authority of \$7.1 million and reimburses the General Fund for this amount using bond proceeds. If RFTA does not

issue bonds, then the budget will need to be amended to remove this transfer, resulting in a budgeted change in fund balance of -\$2.2 million compared to -\$939,386.

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

RFTA System-Wide Transit Service Mileage and Hours Report								
	Mileage June 2017 YTD				Hours June 2017 YTD			
Transit Service	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.	Actual	Budget	Variance	% Var.
RF Valley Commuter	1,984,002	1,969,348	14,654	0.7%	90,070	89,744	326	0.4%
City of Aspen	285,902	285,066	836	0.3%	31,469	31,350	119	0.4%
Aspen Skiing Company	196,241	216,428	(20,187)	-9.3%	14,599	14,480	119	0.8%
Ride Glenwood Springs	61,059	59,605	1,454	2.4%	5,112	4,850	262	5.4%
Grand Hogback	105,977	105,744	233	0.2%	4,166	4,227	(61)	-1.4%
Specials/Charters	4,027	4,488	(461)	-10.3%	469	435	34	7.9%
ADA/Senior Van	8,597	9,725	(1,128)	-11.6%	1,369	968	402	41.5%
MAA Burlingame	3,578	3,914	(336)	-8.6%	268	295	(26)	-9.0%
Maroon Bells	11,591	9,990	1,601	16.0%	960	743	216	29.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,660,974</b>	<b>2,664,308</b>	<b>(3,334)</b>	<b>-0.1%</b>	<b>148,483</b>	<b>147,092</b>	<b>1,391</b>	<b>0.9%</b>

Roaring Fork Transportation Authority System-Wide Ridership Comparison Report

Service	Jun-16 YTD	Jun-17 YTD	# Variance	% Variance
City of Aspen	707,270	807,371	100,101	14.15%
RF Valley Commuter	1,302,978	1,305,686	2,708	0.21%
Grand Hogback	49,959	56,680	6,721	13.45%
Aspen Skiing Company	467,171	468,399	1,228	0.26%
Ride Glenwood Springs	95,834	90,721	(5,113)	-5.34%
Glenwood N/S Connector	1,312	-	(1,312)	N/A
X-games/Charter	29,440	28,265	(1,175)	-3.99%
Senior Van	2,036	2,199	163	8.01%
MAA Burlingame	5,420	9,082	3,662	N/A
Maroon Bells	26,333	29,043	2,710	N/A
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,687,753</b>	<b>2,797,446</b>	<b>109,693</b>	<b>4.08%</b>

Subset of Roaring Fork Valley Commuter Service with BRT in 2017

Service	YTD June 2016	YTD June 2017	Dif +/-	% Dif +/-
Highway 82 Corridor Local/Express	436,111	451,577	15,466	4%
BRT	421,140	442,350	21,210	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>857,251</b>	<b>893,927</b>	<b>36,676</b>	<b>4%</b>

2018 RFTA Annual Budget Schedule

Date	Activity	Status
8/10/2017	Discussion/Direction/Action: Preliminary planning initiatives, assumptions and issues.	On schedule
9/14/2017	Presentation/Direction/Action: 1 <sup>st</sup> draft budget presentation	On schedule
10/12/2017	Presentation/Direction/Action: 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft budget presentation	On schedule
11/9/2017	Public Hearing: Final budget presentation and adoption	On schedule

Facilities and Bus Stop Maintenance August 10, 2017

**Capital Projects Update**

**Basalt Underpass:**

The Basalt underpass project is approximately 85% completed and the project has met all major milestones to date.

- The paving for Highway 82 has been completed.
- The transition to the new signal poles and mast arms and final lane striping will be completed Saturday August 5<sup>th</sup> and the traffic lanes should be in their final configuration by Sunday. Most of the traffic control should be removed from the site over the weekend; however, there will still be some barrels and traffic control throughout the site.
- Once the traffic signal is operational, the pedestrian traffic will be routed through the new underpass and the at-grade crossing will be closed.
- BRT shelters should be back open and in operation in early September.

**Grand Avenue Bridge:**

The Facilities staff has been working on creating new bus stops and park and rides to support the GAB project.

- On August 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>, staff will be creating temporary park and rides in Silt and Parachute as well as establishing a bus station at the Rifle Fairgrounds to provide additional park and ride capacity in these communities. These stations will include bike racks, trashcans, and temporary shelters (at the Rifle and Parachute stops).
- The Facilities and Operations Departments have coordinated to create and install directional signage to direct passengers to new facilities and bus stops and these will be installed prior to the bridge closure on August 14<sup>th</sup>.
- Staff has discussed a number of contingency plans and the entire Facilities' staff is on standby the week of August 14<sup>th</sup> to handle any issues that arise related to the closure.

**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 14 unit complex with 24 beds unit, is currently at **96%** occupancy.
- RFTA's allotment of long-term housing at Burlingame in Aspen, consisting of four one-bedroom units, is currently at **100%** occupancy.
- RFTA Permanent employee housing is currently at **97%**.
- RFTA signed a master lease agreement with SKICO for 4, four bedroom summer seasonal units, similar to the lease RFTA has with Burlingame. The SKICO housing is currently at **75%**.
- RFTA has signed a master lease agreement with Preferred Properties for two townhomes in New Castle, 1 three bedroom unit and 1 two bedroom unit. The New Castle Housing is currently at **80%** occupancy.

## 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:

- An update to the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. ***The first document to be updated is the Access Control Plan. This item was on the agenda for the April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting and was successfully and unanimously passed. It will be on the October 12<sup>th</sup> agenda for a second reading.***

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. ***A final version of the ACP and DG with all associated documentation is 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 will enable it to have railroad and legal experts review, assess and report on proposed development impacts along the corridor along with recommendations regarding potential mitigation of the impacts that RFTA can provide to permitting jurisdictions.
- Once the process for the ACP is complete and the forms and review process has been finalized, staff will begin updating the rest of the Comprehensive Plan. 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.
- Federal Grant Right of Way (fgrow) project – Staff has been working with members of the Cole subdivision on a project to clean up the property issues involving 4 individual neighbors in this neighborhood. As of the July 13<sup>th</sup> meeting, staff was informed by one of the property owners in this subdivision that they are working through a claim involving the title company that produced the title work for the acquisition of their parcel. As a result, staff has put this project on hold pending the outcome of this claim. Staff will update the Board as this process progresses.
- **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. One of the subjects that will be addressed as a part of this process is the use of e-bikes.
- **South Bridge** – Staff met onsite at the South Bridge location on 08/03/17 with CDOT, Glenwood Springs and Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) to review the process for updating the South Bridge environmental assessment(EA). The CPW staff has recently turned over due to retirements within CPW and the City and CDOT wanted to review the 6F process with the new CPW staff in order to update the Environmental Assessment for the South Bridge project.
- **8<sup>th</sup> Street Crossing Project by CDOT and the City of Glenwood Springs - No new updates this month.**



## Rio Grande Trail Update

- Staff continues working to beautify the corridor through Carbondale, called 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](mailto: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 has begun and a new fence has been installed
    - Landscape and irrigation design is next up for DeRail Park
  - Staff has worked with SGM (Glenwood Springs' office) to design the Roll Zone portion of the ArtWay. A "single track" has been constructed (with the help of over 50 volunteers!) in the corridor adjacent to the asphalt from 8<sup>th</sup> St. down to DeRail Park
  - The public has been supportive and interested groups and businesses are signing up for participation
- 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
  - Construction began on April 5<sup>th</sup> on the soft surface trail and retaining walls and shoulder repair
  - Issues with the contractor have led to complications and a delay in the project
    - Staff is working through the process to resolve the issues amicably and to pay the contractor for the work completed to date
    - This job will need to be reassessed with estimated completion in the Fall of 2017 or Spring of 2018
    - The grant expires on Dec. 31, 2018
- Staff is busy with trail season and keeping the trail safe is the primary goal
  - Staff has been out on the trail picking up trash, trimming trees, clearing sightlines, and finding/pulling weeds
  - Staff has begun the annual process of grinding the root upheaval bumps and painting any new ones that pop up
- Staff has been researching and preparing for 2017 and 2018 projects; which includes cleaning debris from retaining walls, goats, revegetation, ArtWay projects, and bridge repair
- Repairs are being planned for the Sopris Creek Bridge and the Roaring Fork Bridge in the near future
- Staff has been fielding calls and emails regarding e-bikes and their allowed use on the Rio Grande Trail
  - Staff has been researching and coordinating with member jurisdictions and other agencies