AGENDA

RTD Accountability Committee
Governance Subcommittee
Monday, February 1, 2021
4:00- 5:00 p.m.
VIDEO/WEB CONFERENCE
Denver, CO

1. Call to Order

2. January 21, 2021 Meeting Summary
   (Attachment A)

3. Summary of the RTD Governance Roundtable #2 discussion with technical staff
   (Attachment B)

4. Introductory discussion of the Partnership focus area
   (Attachment C)

5. Next Steps

   ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6. Member Comment/Other Matters

7. Next meeting: February 15, 2021 at 4:00 p.m.

8. Adjournment
Committee members present:
Julie Duran Mullica (Chair)
Jackie Millet
Deyanira Zavala
Rutt Bridges
Lynn Guissinger
Troy Whitmore

Others Present: Doug Rex, Ron Papsdorf, Matthew Helfant, Melinda Stevens, Angie Rivera-Malpiede, Barbara McManus, Shelley Cook, Natalie Shishido, Nicole Carey, Jordan Sanchez, Bill Sirois.

Chair Mullica called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

January 4, 2021 Meeting Summary
Meeting summary was submitted. No revisions were requested.

Subcommittee timeline for completion of tasks
Chair Mullica highlighted the purpose of the agenda item to identify the upcoming schedule for the completion of the subcommittee’s work. Chair Mullica summarized the attached table indicating that the subcommittee really needs to finish its assigned tasks no later than the end of May.

- Deya Zavala: Suggested the subcommittee consider review of RTD’s annexation process as a possible policy discussion. Ms. Zavala also asked how we can build in opportunities for subcommittees to have joint discussions understanding that a number of these tasks are not mutually exclusive (e.g., partnerships task).
- Subcommittee members agreed with the timeline and content.

Briefing on travel shed conversations
Doug Rex summarized the DRCOG conversations with RTD staff about the use of travel pattern data to establish boundaries for possible subregional service councils. Both staffs agreed that the concept merited further analysis since there are clear travel patterns and seem to reveal obvious district boundaries.

- Jackie Millet: Agreed that the concept was interesting. Need more information on population and number of communities within each district.
- Deya Zavala: How old is the Location Based Services (LBS) data?
  - RTD staff said the data was collected in 2018. Staff also indicated that more recent LBS data may be sought in order to analyze any post-COVID travel pattern changes.
- Chair Mullica: Mentioned that Re-imagine RTD may have a role in evaluating the RTD Accountability Committee’s recommendations such as the subregional service council concept.
Deya Zavala: May need to consider more than four service councils to ensure adequate service delivery.

- Jackie Millet: Does a case-study exist about the Hop service in Boulder? Are there opportunities to use this model elsewhere in the region?
  - Lynn Guissinger: indicated she has been having some recent discussion about the Hop and will check to see if anything is available for distribution.
- Jackie Millet: the ability for local communities to use RTD partnership dollars could really open the opportunity to work with private business partners to provide additional service.
  - Lynn Guissinger: indicated the RTD Board is interested in partnership opportunities and understand that local government partnerships are the future to stabilize funding.
  - Troy Whitmore: Agreed with Lynn’s comment and the need to look at alternatives with local governments to have better success with service implementation.
- Jackie Millet: Mentioned conversations occurring at the state level about possible transportation funding. Ms. Millet expressed the need to stay engaged to ensure local and regional interests are part of the solution.

**Adjournment**
The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.
To: Members of the Governance Subcommittee

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2021</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Briefing on the RTD Governance roundtable #2 discussion with technical staff

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
On January 29, DRCOG staff convened a second roundtable of local technical staff to get input on a possible subregional service council recommendation currently being discussed by the subcommittee.

At the February 1 meeting, DRCOG staff will provide a summary of the conversation and insight provided.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
January 29 Roundtable #2 staff presentation

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at drex@drcog.org or (303) 480-6701.
RTD Accountability Committee

Governance Subcommittee
Roundtable #2

Douglas W. Rex
January 29, 2021
Today’s Outline

• Discussion of the subregional service council recommendation components:
  • Identified issues
  • Purpose and role
  • Council membership
  • Boundary options
  • Local service resource allocation
Task: review the structure of RTD governance and executive leadership

What problems are we trying to solve?

- Interest in local communities and residents having an elevated voice in transit service planning
- Equity (social and geographic) considerations
- Help build back confidence and/or trust.
Subregional Service Council – Purpose

- Improve collaboration with RTD on service changes
  - Increase two-way communication
- Make recommendations on proposed transit service changes
- Locally accessible public forums for transit users
- Develop community-based transit plans to identify transportation challenges in lower income neighborhoods.
Representative of the community-at-large

- Local government reps.

- Transit users
  - Live, work and or go to school in the council district
  - Individuals with disabilities that use fix route

- Broad spectrum of interests and geography, for example:
  - Low income
  - Communities of color
  - Limited English proficiency
  - Older adults and veterans

- Access-A-Ride Users
Subregional Service Council – Districts

- How should the districts be formed?
- How many?
Subregional Service Council – Districts

• County Boundaries

  • Pros:
    • Recognized geo-political boundary
    • Consistent with DRCOG Subregional Forums
    • Community familiarity

  • Cons:
    • Seven councils may be too many – RTD staff resources may become an issue
    • Communities cross county boundaries
    • Majority of bus routes operate in multiple counties
Subregional Service Council – County Boundaries
(Internal Trips)

- 88% in Boulder
- 43% in Gilpin
- 71% in Clear Creek
- 66% in Denver
- 73% in Jefferson
- 68% in Adams
- 68% in Arapahoe
- 68% in Weld

DRCOG makes no claims, representations or warranties, express or implied, concerning the validity (express or implied), the reliability or the accuracy of the data herein, including the implied validity of any uses of such data. DRCOG shall have no liability for the data or lack thereof or any decisions made or action not taken in reliance upon any of the data.
Subregional Service Council – Districts

• Travel Shed
  • Pros:
    • Based on known travel patterns
    • Potential for fewer districts
  
• Cons:
  • Boundaries built around facilities…not predefined
  • Can boundaries be built acknowledging
    – equal population size?
    – community boundaries?
    – RTD Board districts?
Subregional Service Council – Travel Shed Map (Internal Trips)

Sector 1 North: 83%
Sector 2 East: 75%
Sector 3 South: 74%
Sector 4 West: 73%
• Funding allocation for “local” service
  • Equitable distribution
    • Vulnerable population
    • Population and employment should be part of the equation
    • Transparent process

• RTD scheduled to study supply and demand of service delivery
To: Members of the Governance Subcommittee

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Agenda Category</th>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2021</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBJECT
Introduction to discussions about the partnership focus area

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS
N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS
N/A

SUMMARY
One of the four subcommittee focus areas is an exploration of how to enable partnerships with other transit agencies and nonprofits to provide for better service inside and outside of the RTD service area.

The subcommittee will initiate the conversation about partnerships at the February 1 meeting.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS
N/A

PROPOSED MOTION
N/A

ATTACHMENT
1. Background information (link): RTD partnerships documentation
2. Peer research: TNC partnerships

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at drex@drcog.org or (303) 480-6701
Transit Agency Partnerships with Transportation Network Companies

DART, MARTA, King County Metro, MBTA and Miami-Dade Transit

**DART**

In 2020 Dallas Area Rapid Transit awarded Uber a three year contract to provide rideshare service to supplement DART's GoLink program, which is an on-demand shuttle service. This partnership aims to supply greater service capacity to the GoLink program which currently serves 13 different zones in the Dallas area.

DART has been piloting service partnerships with TNCs since 2017 when they partnered with Lyft to increase paratransit services provided by MV Transportation. Adding Lyft as a partner increased paratransit capacity by 7%. Through this system, MV Transportation acts as a dispatch service, scheduling and coordinating subcontractors like Lyft, taxis, or vehicles with wheelchair lifts. While the cost remains the same for riders within this system, the partnership allows for increased flexibility and capacity.

**MARTA**

The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority and Uber have partnered for a one year pilot program, MARTAConnect, that began in November 2020. The goal of this program is to provide riders with supplemental transportation and greater flexibility when there are service disruptions, given that the agency is still running limited service due to COVID-19. The pilot was launched on Election Day as MARTAConnect2Vote and provided $16 Uber vouchers to help riders access polling locations that were not covered because of suspended services. After Election Day MARTAConnect has continued with some variations. MARTAConnect provides customers with Uber vouchers when there is a planned or unplanned service disruption in order to travel to an unaffected station. Vouchers range from $3-$10, and if riders use the Uber ride to travel to their destination or past the geo-fenced station, they are charged the additional distance.

**King County Metro**

The Seattle area transit agency is in the second year of a pilot program with the public mobility service, Via, to provide the Via to Transit program. Via to Transit is an on-demand, shared shuttle service with the goal of connecting riders to bus and light rail stations. Riders can use the Via app or call to request service, which usually takes 15-20 minutes and costs the same as a Metro bus ride. The rider must either start or end their trip at one of the designated transit stations. The program has been initially successful, and after a brief suspension due to COVID-19, the program is operating again and the agency continues to monitor performance.

King County Metro has also partnered with ridesharing apps to connect riders for their carpooling program. Shared mobility options are part of King County Metro's long range plan. Partnering with private companies such as Waze, Scoop, and Rideshare help to supplement King County Metro's service and provide connections to transit and employment hubs.
MBTA
The Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority is currently conducting a paratransit pilot program partnering with Uber, Lyft, and Curb. This program is an on-demand service provided for ADA paratransit service users, aimed at lowering cost and wait times and increasing flexibility. The program requires users to sign up through the partnered companies to receive a set number of subsidized rides. Customers pay the first $2 and any amount over a $42 trip cost, with the exception of UberPOOL, for which the customer pays the first $1 and any amount over a $41 trip cost. All three companies have an option for a wheelchair accessible vehicle.

Miami-Dade Transit
In April 2020, the Miami-Dade Transit agency partnered with Uber and Lyft to supplement overnight service due to COVID-19 related service cuts. The program, Go Nightly, seeks to provide essential workers and transit dependent populations with continued transportation options during bus service suspension. This service is available along the suspended bus routes between the hours of 12 AM and 5 AM. Service is requested online or by calling, and fares for the Go-Nightly program are suspended.

Read about other transit agencies that have partnerships with TNCs in this APTA article.