AGENDA

RTD Accountability Committee
Monday, May 10, 2021
8:30 am - 10:00 am
VIDEO/WEB CONFERENCE
Denver, CO

1. Call to order

2. Public comment
Up to 20 minutes is allocated for public comment and each speaker will be limited to 3 minutes. The RTD Accountability Committee requests that the public comment be limited to an item on the Committee's current agenda. Please note: public comment may also be submitted in writing to Matthew Helfant (mhelfant@drcog.org). Comments received will be shared promptly with RTD Accountability Committee members.

3. April 12, 2021 RTD Accountability Committee meeting summary
(Attachment A)

4. Co-Chair Report

5. RTD update

DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. Follow up discussion on RTD response to Covid-19 relief spending recommendations

7. Subcommittee recommendation status reports
(Attachment B)

8. Discussion on next steps after final report submittal
(Attachment C)

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

9. Letter regarding state transportation funding proposal
(Attachment D)

10. Member comment/other matters

11. Adjournment

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Elise Jones (Co-Chair)
Crystal Murillo (Co-Chair)
Deyanira Zavala
Rutt Bridges
Chris Frampton
Rebecca White

Jackie Millet
Dan Blankenship
Krystin Trustman
Lynn Guissinger
Troy Whitmore

Others Present: Douglas W. Rex, Debra Johnson, Mac Callison, Luke Palmisano, Alex Hyde-Wright, Adam Zarrin, Jean Sanson, Debra Baskett, Jordan Sanchez, Roger Sherman, Natalie Shishido, Holly Buck, George Gerstle, Tanya Eydelman, Kathleen Bracke, Michael Ford, Julie Kirk, Doug MacLeod, Angie Rivera-Malpiede, Bill Sirois, Maux Sullivan, Bill Van Meter, Brian Welch, Joel Noble, Ronald Short, Peggy Catlin, Allison Crump, Molly McKinley, Melanie Choquette, Shelley Cook, Lindsey Alarcon, Michael Davies, Nataly Handlos, Christina Zazueta, Erik Davidson, Justin Begley, Henry Stopplecamp, and DRCOG staff.

Call to Order
Co-Chair Murillo called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

Public comment
Alex Hyde-Wright wanted to provide some comments and suggestions for fares and pass ideas that Boulder County staff had been working on. Regarding fares, Mr. Hyde-Wright suggested getting rid of the regional fare and to just have a local and airport fares, then make the non-cash fare cheaper than the cash fare for both to incentivize the use of MyRide mobile app and other non-cash options to expedite the boarding process. To address the equity concerns of making the cash fare more expensive, Boulder County suggests increasing the number of retail locations where people can purchase and reload MyRide cards for better accessibility. Another suggestion was to make all the discount group fares free: for youth up to age 19, seniors riders with disabilities, and anyone who qualifies with the LiVE program.

Ronald Short expressed his concern for the current RTD AC recommendations for the CRRSSA funds. He wants to make sure that this committee is looking into taking care of RTD's employees and that financials will be used to make sure that current jobs are being paid fairly (i.e. light rail operators, bus drivers, etc.). He was also concerned about the focus and potential investment around electrification of RTD's vehicle fleet. He is worried about investing more money in a project that could potentially fail and waste those funds.

Co-Chair Report
Co-Chair Jones reported that HB-1186 passed out of the House Transportation Committee on March 30. An amendment was added to the bill that reinstated the 58% cap on current contracting but redefined how that was measured using more commonly used transit terms. The bill then moved to the full House and it passed on a vote of 38 to 24. It will now go to the Senate Transportation Committee for discussion and vote.

March 8, 2021 Accountability Committee meeting summary
The summary was accepted as written by the committee. Co-Chair Murillo just asked that her last name be spelled correctly throughout the summary.
Subcommittee reports:

- Finance Subcommittee – Rutt Bridges reported the Finance and Operations subcommittees had a joint meeting on March 17 and received a debrief of the Governance subcommittee recommendations that focused on the subregional service councils. Both committees had an in-depth discussion of performance measures for the RTD Dashboard. That meeting concluded with a presentation by Mr. Bridges on the economics and opportunities of First/Last Mile TNC partnerships. At the subcommittees April 7 meeting, Rebecca White led a discussion of the goals and objectives for a public-facing RTD Dashboard and some of the opportunities and challenges it presents. Ron Papsdorf provided a brief overview on the remaining unfinished corridors of the FasTracks voter approved initiative. Mr. Bridges presented a financial analysis of the challenges presented by the B-Line/Northwest Rail and the large subsidies RTD would assume on its completion.
- Governance Subcommittee – Doug Rex reported the subcommittee finalized its subregional service council recommendation. They are also in the process of drafting a partnership recommendation built off the COVID relief funding recommendations made by the full committee. The subcommittee began the conversation on the RTD service area, which is the third focus area Governance was asked to address.
- Operations Subcommittee – Deya Zavala reported at their April 7 meeting, they had an in-depth conversation around the RTD Dashboard, with North Highland facilitating the conversation, as well as sharing a few recommended metrics and promoting a focus on fare service and customer service. There was a fares and pass roundtable that was hosted by Mile High Connects on March 29.

RTD Update
Debra Johnson, RTD GM and CEO, provided an update to the committee. On March 29, CEO Johnson provided a response letter to the committee regarding their initial recommendations for the CRRSSA funds. Once those funds became available, RTD issued an immediate rescission of previously laid off frontline employees to maintain staffing levels and support operations. RTD has also provided financial support to contractors during the pandemic and will continue to support these partnerships. Part of RTD's recovery plan will be to conduct a system wide fare study and equity analysis to help improve ridership and evaluate their fare structure. The agency agreed that helping with vaccine distribution is important, so RTD staff has engaged with local and state health officials on ways they can assist with the vaccine distribution. Due to the numerous vaccine events across the metro area, RTD promoted how customers can conveniently use their services and provided free shuttle service for the large vaccination event at the National Western Stock Show Complex. Exploring partnerships will be part of the Reimagine RTD effort as staff will work with regional partners on the mobility plan for the future and continuing to focus on partnerships will be key to providing a positive transportation future to get people to places, they need to go, when they want to get there.

Potential comments on Draft Legislative Proposal on State Transportation Funding re:
state transit funding
Co-Chair Jones provided a brief overview of the proposal to the committee. The proposal
would raise about $3.9 billion over 10 years for transportation spending through a
combination of several new transportation fees and state general funds. Approximately
70% of the funding would be allocated through the Highway Users Tax Fund and the
remaining funding is proposed to be allocated to a new Nonattainment Fund, an expanded
Multimodal and Mitigation Option Fund, and three new enterprises totaling $724 million for
electric vehicle charging infrastructure, vehicle fleet electrification incentives, and public
transit electrification. Legislative leadership expect to release bill language by the end of
April/early May 2021. The committee has considered weighing-in on whether or not the
allocation for multimodal transit and bike/ped is adequate and members indicated that they
want an increase in multimodal funding. Co-Chair Jones also wanted to point out that the
package is sufficient when it comes to electrification and the investment in both charging
infrastructure and electric vehicle purchases. Conversely, the investment in road capacity
expansion is a concern and would not help in terms of reducing emissions and VMTs,
especially since the governor's climate roadmap calls for a 10% reduction in VMT by 2030.
This proposal would not directly allocate funds to RTD as the governor stated that the
organization needs reform, not more funding.

Co-chair Jones produced a draft letter to Senator Winter and Representative Gray on
behalf of the committee, regarding comments they would like to have considered/included
in the proposal. This was presented to the committee to weigh-in and provide feedback.
Overall, the committee liked the draft, but needed more time to review it since it was not
distributed before the meeting. Members agreed to take the following 48 hours to review
and submit feedback, so they did not take a vote at this time.

*Update: The committee reviewed and agreed on the final draft via email, with Rebecca
White abstaining from any kind of approval/vote.*

Service Council Recommendations
Doug Rex explained the recommendations to the committee. The Governance
Subcommittee has discussed concepts associated with the service council concept,
including two roundtable conversations with representatives from local governments and
other stakeholders across the RTD service area. The Subcommittee had an opportunity to
weigh in on draft recommendations in March. They also had a chance to highlight any
considerations for the equity assessment that will accompany the recommendation for
the full RTD Accountability Committee's consideration. The draft recommendation for the
full committee's consideration/feedback. Lynn Guissinger took these recommendations to
the RTD Board for comment and the Board had a very robust conversation around them.
The board was concerned about the concept of geographic equity and how it can conflict
with social equity.

Timetable/Schedule
Matthew Helfant provided a brief overview of the timeline to the committee. A final report
that includes all recommendations is due by July 1. A timetable has been drafted for
completing this requirement on time. The following was presented to the members:

- May 19th – last subcommittee meetings- wrap up draft recommendations
- Equity analysis for each draft recommendation should take 2-3 weeks and can start as soon as a draft recommendation comes from a subcommittee and multiple analyses can be done concurrently- some of these recommendations should come from the subcommittees prior to the last meetings.
- May 19th through early June - public and stakeholder engagement around the draft recommendation - online surveys
- June 14th - public hearing and anticipated adoption of subcommittee recommendations by the full committee
- June 28th - approval of final report at an additional full committee meeting

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Member comment/Other matters
Rebecca White asked if the committee could receive an update at the next meeting on the stimulus funding. Ron Papsdorf agreed that staff will provide that update.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 9:56 a.m.

ATTACH B

To: Members of the RTD Accountability Committee

From: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director
            (303) 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
May 10, 2021	Discussion	7

SUBJECT

Subcommittee Recommendation Status Reports

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

All three subcommittees have been working on forming draft recommendations for the consideration of the full committee. The draft recommendations are in various stages of development. Each subcommittee chair will report on the status of recommendations. Where there are draft recommendations or other documents for the full committee to discuss they are included for committee review and discussion.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Draft Performance Measure Recommendations from North Highland Presentation (Operations Subcommittee)
2. Draft Recommendations on Streamlining Fares, Passes, and Service (Operations Subcommittee)
3. Draft Partnership Recommendations (Governance Subcommittee)
4. RTD service area recommendations (Governance Subcommittee)
5. Draft – Equity Assessment for Subregional Service Council Recommendation (Governance Subcommittee)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Doug Rex, Executive Director, DRCOG at drex@drcog.org or (303) 480-6701, or Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6731 or mhelfant@drcog.org.

AGENDA

INTRODUCTIONS

ANNA DANEGGER

VICE PRESIDENT

Anna.Danegger@NorthHighland.com

TANYA EYDELMAN

PROJECT MANAGER

Tanya.Eydelman@NorthHighland.com

ALA BATTIKHI

DATA & ANALYTICS SME

Ala.Battikhi@NorthHighland.com

SARAH GOSSELIN

CONSULTANT

Sarah.Gosselin@NorthHighland.com

Develop metric recommendations reflective of RTD's performance

PURPOSE STATEMENT

Review proposed performance metrics

REVIEW OUR PREVIOUS DISCUSSION

OUR APPROACH TO PERFORMANCE METRICS

Performance Metric Areas

Peer Agencies

| Operational Effectiveness | Financial Performance | Customer Experience | Community Engagement |

| Equity & Accessibility | Environmental Impact | Safety |

- Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART)
- Utah Transit Authority Board of Trustees
- LA County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)
- Portland Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon

Objectives within these metric areas were defined following a review of minutes and material from previous Committee meetings. For each objective, between 1 and 3 metrics were identified.

PROPOSED METRICS

METRIC TABLE - SAMPLE

OBJECTIVE: INCREASE RIDERSHIP

Metric	Percent boarding change by mode
Calculation	[(Boardings on Bus FY2021 YTD) − (Boardings on Bus FY2020 YTD)] ÷ Boardings on Bus FY2020 YTD
RTD Goal	+2.10% each fiscal year
Frequency	Quarterly
Notes	• It is assumed RTD's Automatic Passenger Counting (APC) System can capture boardings. • This metric should be reported quarterly and compared to the Fiscal Year to Date from the prior Fiscal Year to Date so as to capture the seasonal fluxes in ridership. • RTD currently captures this metric in quarterly Board Reports.

North Highland is recommending 22 unique performance metrics covering 7 metric areas.

OPERATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Metrics that indicate RTD's success in providing services

Objective	Metric	Current RTD Metric
Increase ridership	Percent boarding change by mode	RTD captures overall ridership increase
Provide dependable service	Percent of on-time performance by mode	Local, regional, light rail and commuter rail on-time performance
Ensure fleet reliability	Percent of vehicles over their useful life	Average age of the bus fleet

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

Metrics that indicate RTD's effective use of financial resources

Objective	Metric	Current RTD Metric
Efficiently manage finances	Operating cost recovery ratio	Same
	Percent increase in fare revenue	Same
	Cost per mile as compared to peer agencies	N/A
Achieve outstanding financial performance	Bond Rating	N/A

CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE

Metrics that indicate customers are satisfied and have a positive experience

Objective	Metric	Current RTD Metric
Provide an excellent rider experience	Percent of time passengers are in crowded conditions	N/A
	Average facility and vehicle cleanliness complaints per month	Graffiti and facility maintenance complaints
Engage with customers	Call answer rate efficiency (in seconds)	Average Telephone Information Center speed of answer
	Average time to resolve issue	Average response time to customer complaints

NORTH HIGHLAND

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Metrics that indicate the extent to which agencies are partnering with the community

Objective	Metric	Current RTD Metric
Partner with the community	Number of civic engagement presentations	RTD captures this metric by department and/or purpose

EQUITY & ACCESSIBILITY

Metrics that indicate the extent to which RTD services are available to all riders

Objective	Metric	Current RTD Metric
Serve all populations	FTA Title VI Triennial review compliance	Reviews are completed but are results are not included in the quarterly Board Report
	Percent of customers indicating service frequency meets their needs	N/A
Serve all customers	Percent of elevator/escalator availability (in time)	N/A
	Adherence to ADA zero denials service request mandate	Same

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Metrics that indicate the positive impact transit has on the environment (and/or mitigate negative environmental impacts of other transportation alternatives)

Objective	Metric	Current RTD Metric
Improve the environment	Percent of low emission vehicles in fleet	N/A

SAFETY

Metrics the indicate the system is safe for employees and riders

Objective	Metric	Current RTD Metric
Operate a safe system	Number of preventable accidents per 100,000 miles	Same
	Signal violations	N/A
Keep employees safe	Number of reported employee equipment accidents	N/A
Keep the system secure	Offenses per 100,000 riders	N/A
	Average response time to emergency dispatch calls	Same

NEXT STEPS

As a final step in this assessment, the RTD Accountability Operations Subcommittee can expect a final report

The final report will include:

1. A description of the project scope and objectives
2. A description of our approach
3. The results of our research
4. These recommendations including:
   a. A proposal for calculating the metrics
   b. Target (i.e., target performance against metric)
   c. Reporting frequency
   d. Assumptions, definitions as required and other notes as needed

NORTH HIGHLAND

THANK YOU

www.northhighland.com

Thank you

RTD Accountability Committee: Operations Subcommittee

Recommendations on Streamlining Fares, Passes, and Service

Background:

As the Operations Sub-Committee considers operational goals, it has reviewed the findings of the State Auditor Report in addition to assessing current challenges and opportunities for increasing ridership. With the recommendation to remove the fare box recovery ratio, this recommendation considers goals to assess performance and ease of use in addition to specific recommendations related to fares and passes as we consider one of the recommendations.

Recommendations

The RTD Accountability Committee offers the following recommendations to RTD on Operational Goals and Opportunities to **simplify fare and pass structures by focusing on the user experience, increasing ridership, and improving operator/rider experience:**

1. **Consolidate all discounts into a free fare that would cover for equity populations (youth, senior, disabled, and low-income).**
   - Eliminate exact change requirements for discounted fares.
   - Recognizing the potential barriers to free fares, the committee recommends consolidating fares as **single 50% discount**

2. **Identify strategies to simplify *pass structures***
   - Implement a "family plan" benefit for all RTD pass-holders, where an adult can purchase fare media using one smart card for their multiple individuals.
   - Standardize existing deep discount group pass programs (EcoPass, NEcoPass, College Pass) into one brand, EcoPass, focused on incentivizing use:
     - Exploring a "pay as you go" pass with fare capping/accumulators
     - Making **Ecopass** available to every employee in the district (~1.5 million) through a monthly, per employee transportation fee assessed on employers
     - Explore the implementation of a recurrent "membership" model
   - Incentivize individuals & organizations to purchase passes in bulk by:
     - Extending discounts for bulk purchases.
     - Enabling contributions to mobile wallets from multiple entities: both the employee/resident, and from employers/governments/non-profits, allowing employers to match contributions directly on the pass media of the employees.
   - Explore a "connect card" that allows riders to use transit fare across various entities (for example: CDOT's Bustang, and microtransit/mobility options).
   - Replicate pass types on the mobile platform with fare capping/accumulators (ex: if you purchase fare amounts that add up to a day/monthly pass, your fare is automatically converted as opposed to over-paying).

3. **Convene community, business and anchor institutions (hospitals, universities, school districts) utilizing passes on a regular basis to determine updates to the agreements.**

4. **Implement equity in fare evasion**

   Per the presentation from RTD's Chief of Police to the Operations Subcommittee in December 2020, the fine for fare evasion on RTD services is $75 and is set by state statute. Given that fare evasion and illegal parking are similar offenses, this raises some equity concerns that transit riders pay higher fines than car drivers.

Draft Partnership Recommendations

As RTD continues to evaluate new innovative solutions to improve service delivery, collaborative partnerships will be an important facet of its strategic plan. Building on the RTD Accountability Committee's partnership recommendations for the use of COVID-19 relief funding, the governance subcommittee recommends RTD consider the following:

- Clearly identify and communicate guidelines and goals for partnerships in order to ensure consistent and equitable access to these opportunities. Such goals might include increased ridership, cost efficiency, service to underserved communities, first/final mile connections, and any other goals/criteria deemed appropriate by RTD.
- Leverage existing and new partnerships to improve service efficiency and grow ridership. RTD should emphasize partnerships with local governments, anchor institutions, transportation management organizations (TMOs) and employers or employment centers who have a unique understanding of local mobility needs.
- Incentivize communities to enter cost-sharing arrangements with RTD to provide new or existing local transit solutions in an effort to minimize service gaps and increase ridership.
- Explore opportunities to provide cost-effective local transportation services through collaboration with existing mobility service providers (e.g., Via, Uber, Lyft) in areas where traditional fixed route may not be the most appropriate mobility solution. Also, explore opportunities to contract with other third party providers that may specialize in a particular service (e.g., paratransit) at a reduced cost.
- As more federal funds become available, expand these partnership opportunities to improve service efficiency.
- Consider developing a competitive Innovation Grant program to drive bold ideas to increasing ridership. Recipients would receive funds to dive deeper into project concepts and implementation, creating models of innovation for the entire service area.
- Encourage RTD's public-facing dashboard to include a component that highlights existing private and public partnerships.
- Regularly evaluate the success of existing partnerships by predetermined metrics and "re-scope" relationships to ensure maximum benefit.

Draft Service Area Recommendations

Understanding that Reimagine RTD's scope includes a task associated with the service area issue, the subcommittee decided its best approach would be to provide the following questions/comments for the Reimagine RTD team to consider:

- It is important to not only right-size the geographic boundaries of the district, but to right-size the service over time as the region continues to grow. If minimum service levels cannot be provided by RTD and no third-party partnership can be established to deliver a minimum viable product, then should RTD explore removing affected areas from the RTD boundary?
- What are the trip purposes most in demand along the edges of the RTD district? Work, retail, or medical trips? Trips to/from anchor institutions or other special generators?
- Should all areas within a certain distance of a light rail or commuter rail line/station be included in the RTD boundary?
    - Are there other areas adjacent to the current RTD Boundaries where providing transit is appropriate due to factors such as good connectivity, potential high demand, high density, or concentrations of populations likely to use and benefit from transit such as low-income, zero car households, older adults, or individuals with disabilities?
- What are some innovative micromobility options RTD should implement to meet the needs of communities where fixed guideway service may not be suitable?

Draft – Equity Assessment for Subregional Service Council Recommendation

Background:

An ad hoc equity working group of community leaders and organizations was convened by Mile High Connects. This working group includes representatives from Conservation Colorado (transit advocacy & environmental justice), Colorado Criminal Justice Reform Coalition (justice reform & health care), Colorado Cross-Disability Coalition (transit advocacy & disabilities rights), Denver Streets Partnership (transit advocacy), and the Fax Partnership (housing & business). The overall desired outcome of the convening was to assess the RTD Accountability Committee's Governance Subcommittee's proposed recommendation of Subregional Service Councils. The comments and recommendations are offered with an understanding that input was being sought from community organizations outside of the RTD Accountability Committee's standing process. It should also be noted that this ad hoc group had limited information on the background and history of how the recommendation was formulated.

The equity working group used the RTD Accountability Committee's Equity Assessment Template to conduct a holistic review of the Subregional Service Council Recommendation key components, which include:

- Membership
- Districts
- RTD Resource Allocation

Equity Assessment: Membership

How could this recommendation benefit or burden communities of concern? Is there likely to be an increase or decrease in equity?

The recommendation of implementing subregional service councils could benefit communities of concern as they continue to champion for transit equity in their respective communities. The recommendation lends voice to residents and decisionmakers in a meaningful way. Representation on the councils was raised as a potential burden to community residents if they are not compensated for their time, talent, and treasure. There was some concern that this might be perceived by residents as another forum to express concerns but not necessarily be a part of influencing how change happens.

Could this recommendation impact specific communities or geographies more than others? If so, which communities and how?

The recommendation of having a stakeholder group assess the best strategy to implement the service council boundaries could see varying impact depending on the infrastructure in place for stakeholders to engage in a meaningful process. For example, counties with a more robust Local Coordinating Council (LCC) or municipalities with dedicated transportation planning resources may be most affected. Similar, transit advocate participation in the stakeholder group was not explicit, which could negatively affect community residents who rely on transit.

a) **What are the demographics of the most impacted areas?**
   This recommendation could affect all communities of concern.
b) **Are neighborhoods equally required to help achieve the policy recommendation? If not, does this raise issues of equity and justice?**

Could there be unintended consequences? If so, how can they be mitigated?

The equity working group shared the unintended consequence of having elected officials disproportionately represented on the Subregional Service Councils as creating a political body that might create a power dynamic in terms of community resident participation. This can be mitigated by ensuring that resident leaders have a seat at the table, there is transparent and open communication in place, and the districts do not align.

<u>Equity Assessment: Districts</u>

How could this recommendation benefit or burden communities of concern? Is there likely to be an increase or decrease in equity?

This recommendation could make it easier for individuals engaged in LCCs to have their recommendations considered, which could increase equity.

Could this recommendation impact specific communities or geographies more than others? If so, which communities and how?

This recommendation could negatively affect underrepresented communities. This means that well-organized communities and/or communities/individuals with higher incomes may be more adequately represented on Subregional Service Councils.

- a) **What are the demographics of the most impacted areas?**
  This recommendation could affect all communities of concern.
- b) **Are neighborhoods equally required to help achieve the policy recommendation? If not, does this raise issues of equity and justice?**

Could there be unintended consequences? If so, how can they be mitigated?

The equity working group shared the unintended consequence of having elected officials disproportionately represented on the Subregional Service Councils as creating a political body that might create a power dynamic in terms of community resident participation. This can be mitigated by ensuring that resident leaders have a seat at the table, there is transparent and open communication in place, and the districts do not align.

<u>Equity Assessment: RTD Resource Allocation</u>

How could this recommendation benefit or burden communities of concern? Is there likely to be an increase or decrease in equity?

Overall, the equity working group shared that increased transparency, information, and communication, would benefit communities of concern. There is, however, potential for communities to not benefit from the information provided because they do not understand how to review and interpret it. It is recommended that the information be understandable to all of its intended audience and that resources be made available to help with understanding and interpretation.

Could this recommendation impact specific communities or geographies more than others? If so, which communities and how?

This could impact specific communities more than others due to the level of understanding and comprehension of an annual report and how the information is conveyed. For example, a community that has the resources to analyze RTD's spending and the context of service will be better positioned to organize and fight for specific allocations than other districts.

    a) **What are the demographics of the most impacted areas?**
        This recommendation could affect all communities of concern.

    b) **Are neighborhoods equally required to help achieve the policy recommendation? If not, does this raise issues of equity and justice?**

Could there be unintended consequences? If so, how can they be mitigated?

While increased transparency can be very valuable, it can only be so if those it is intended for can comprehend and engage with the information provided. So as to avoid invaluable efforts to produce information that isn't readily understood by all, consider creating a more robust system around the release of the annual spending report to actively engage community in question and answer as well as feedback sessions. This would build deeper relationships and understanding, a growing foundation of trust.

ATTACH C

To: Members of the RTD Accountability Committee

From: Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director
           (303) 480-6701 or drex@drcog.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
May 10, 2021	Discussion	8

SUBJECT

Discussion on Next Steps After Final Report Submittal

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

After the final report is adopted and submitted to RTD, the Governor, and the Legislature by July 1st, RTD will have thirty days to respond to recommendations included in the report. The Co-chairs and subcommittee chairs wish to have a discussion with the entire committee on possible follow up after RTD responds. They have suggested having another RTD Accountability Committee Meeting sometime after RTD submits their formal response.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Doug Rex, Executive Director, DRCOG at drex@drcog.org or (303) 480-6701, or Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6731 or mhelfant@drcog.org.

ATTACH D

April 15, 2021

Dear Senators Winter and Fenberg and Representatives Gray and Garnett,

Thank you for your ongoing leadership in working to solve Colorado's transportation challenges. As members of the RTD Accountability Committee (RTDAC) that you and Governor Polis created last year, we'd like to provide you with input on your transportation funding proposal. In particular, we would like to express our strong recommendation that the draft legislation be amended to include additional funding for transit and other multimodal transportation options.

As you know the RTDAC was created to provide recommendations on how RTD could improve its operations to help achieve better and more equitable service, expand ridership and improve the agency's financial sustainability. Our nine months of analysis and inquiry have confirmed our understanding that transit systems like RTD's deliver multiple critical benefits to the region and state beyond those directly experienced by those who use bus and rail, making them an appropriate and necessary recipient of increased public investment.

Transit contributes to the state and regional economy by providing mobility for Coloradans traveling to and from their workplace, school, shopping, medical appointments, recreational opportunities and cultural events, as well as serving out of town visitors. Public transit systems represent an affordable and equitable mobility option for older adults, people with disabilities and youth who cannot drive, as well as community members who cannot afford to own a car. By providing an alternative to single-occupant vehicle travel, transit helps reduce traffic congestion for those who do drive cars. Transit systems are also a key solution to reducing the air pollution that degrades our public health, generates the brown cloud that mars our world class views, and drives our region's serious non-attainment status for meeting the Clean Air Act's ozone standard. Similarly, significantly increasing ridership on buses and rail lines is necessary to meet the state's climate targets set in House Bill 19-1261; Governor Polis' Climate Roadmap sets a goal of 10% reduction in vehicle miles travelled by 2030, which is not possible with only modest levels of multimodal investment. Conversely, increasing funding for roadway expansion as the primary means to address Colorado's mobility challenges will further exacerbate our ozone and climate emission woes, undermine our investments in transit, and ultimately increase congestion through induced demand.

Consequently, while we greatly appreciate that your draft proposal includes new multimodal funding for transit and funding for transit electrification, we believe it doesn't go far enough. The RTDAC urges you to provide comparable investment between multimodal transportation options and road infrastructure spending by significantly increasing monies in the Multimodal Options Fund and Non-Attainment Fund, so that Coloradans can enjoy improved transit service, and local communities can improve first and final mile bike and pedestrian connections and microtransit opportunities to help users easily access those transit systems.

Overall, Colorado contributes significantly less money to its transit agencies than other states. According to the [FTA's 2019 National Transit Database](#), in Colorado, the state funded only 0.33% of transit operating costs and 2.59% of transit capital costs in 2019, compared to the much higher national average of 23% and 23%, respectively.

While we applaud CDOT's effort and commitment to outreach in developing of the 10 Year Plan, we do not believe the Plan has enough funding for transit projects, especially in the Denver metro area. CDOT's [10 Year Plan](#) lists $4.9 billion worth of transportation projects with less than 9% for transit. With more than half the state's population living in less than 8% of its land area, the Denver metro-area offers the

best opportunity to replace driving trips with transit and other clean transportation modes. To cut transportation pollution and improve system efficiency, Colorado must invest heavily in transit service where we have the highest concentration of people and jobs.

DRCOG identified 10 Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) projects in their [2050 MetroVision](#). Each of these projects were selected through an extensive vetting process in RTD's [2019 BRT Feasibility Study](#)based on their ability to generate ridership, improve equity, reduce emissions, and improve connectivity and access. Yet the 10 Year Plan lists and just partially funds a few of these projects. CDOT's 10 Year Plan should include significant funding to complete all 10 Bus-Rapid Transit (BRT) projects in the DRCOG region by 2030, projects that align with state and regional transportation goals to reduce congestion and pollution, while improving safety, equitable, and affordability.

We also believe it is essential that the legislation state explicitly that HUTF dollars can be spent on transit operating and maintenance costs, which can help create a more sustainable funding stream for ongoing transit operations in communities around the state. Additional transit service along existing transit routes would dramatically improve access to jobs for millions of Coloradans, especially in the Denver metro area. For example, according to the Transit Center, a 40% increase in RTD transit service – about $74 million per year – would allow Denver residents to access four times more jobs in a 30-minute transit commute.

Thank you again for your leadership and your willingness to consider our comments.

Sincerely,

RTD Accountability Committee:
    Elise Jones, Co-Chair
    Crystal Murillo, Co-Chair
    Dan Blankenship
    Rutt Bridges
    Chris Frampton
    Jackie Millet
    Julie Mullica
    Krystin Trustman
    Deya Zavala