

AGENDA

RTD Accountability Committee
Governance Subcommittee
Monday, October 19, 2020
4:00- 5:00 p.m.
VIDEO/WEB CONFERENCE
Denver, CO

1. Call to Order
2. October 5, 2020 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)
3. Governance Subcommittee Strategic Priorities
(Attachment B)
4. Next Steps

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

5. Next meeting: November 2, 2020 at 4:00 p.m.
6. Member Comment/Other Matters
7. Adjournment

SUMMARY

RTD Accountability Committee: Governance Subcommittee
Monday, October 5, 2020

Note: Meeting held virtually via GoToMeeting

Present:

| | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Elise Jones (co-chair) | Boulder County Commissioner |
| Julie Duran Mullica | Northglenn City Council Member |
| Kathy Nesbitt | VP of Admin, University of Colorado |
| Jackie Millet | Lone Tree Mayor |
| Deyanira Zavala | Exec. Dir., Mile High Connects |
| Lynn Guissing (Ex Officio) | RTD Board Member |

Others Present: Doug Rex, Ron Papsdorf, Melinda Stevens, Angie Rivera-Malpiede, Jordan Sanchez, Mac Callison, Ashley Stolzmann, Bill Van Meter, Barbara McManus, Debra Baskett, George Gerstle, Kathleen Bracke, Luke Palmisano, Miller Hudson, Nicole Carey, Natalie Shishido

Executive Director Rex called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

September 16, 2020 Meeting Summary

Meeting summary was submitted. No revisions were requested.

RTD Board of Directors Redistricting Process

Bill Van Meter, Assistant General Manager – Planning, provide a history and overview of the upcoming redistricting process which occurs after each decennial census.

- Elise Jones: How was the 15 board member total derived?
 - Mr. Van Meter replied: In the early 80's, a number of legislators were frustrated with 21-member appointed board and legislative action limited the size of the Board to 15 elected members.
- Julie Duran Mullica: How have cities been added or removed from the district?
 - Mr. Van Meter replied: The original boundary included the entire counties of Adams, Arapahoe, Weld, Douglas. Throughout the years Weld county de-annexed, as well as portions of other counties. A Special District law allowed any newly annexed land to be in the RTD service area if a jurisdiction was partially or wholly within the RTD boundary. Generally, if a property owner or group of property owners want to annex into the District it has to petition RTD to do so. Neighborhoods or new developments can also petition into the District, but it would require an affirmative vote of its residents. Similarly, communities such as Castle Rock have de-annexed out of RTD through a vote.
- Deya Zavala: How does redistricting effect bus service?
 - Mr. Van Meter replied: Service operations is a consideration in redistricting and boundary decisions. For example, when a larger development petitions into the district an analysis is done in order to determine if they can accommodate the additional service.

- Elise Jones: suggested that RTD should look more favorably on establishing partnerships with service providers outside the district
- Jackie Millet: suggested more conversation is warranted about a smaller RTD Board
- Julie Duran Mullica: more discussion needs to occur on how RTD can provide better service in areas that do not have a lot of service.

Update on Governance Models

Executive Director Rex provided the subcommittee with an update on the new governance model in Salt Lake City. Mr. Rex also shared LA Metro's governance model highlighting their use of local service councils throughout LA Metro's service area. The five service council districts are responsible for planning and improving the implementation of transit route service changes, as well as calling and conducting public meetings for all major service changes.

- Elise Jones: Is there shared funding between LA Metro and the service councils? How do local governments like the model? Why did they go to this model? Were they experiencing similar problems?
- Deya Zavala: How does LA Metro (service councils) interact with their community residents?

Next Steps

Topics for upcoming meetings include

- LA Metro Local Service Council presentation
- Areas of exploration and questions posed by the governance subcommittee.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

ATTACH B

To: Members of the RTD Accountability Committee Operations Subcommittee

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

| Meeting Date | Agenda Category | Agenda Item # |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| October 19, 2020 | Informational | 3 |

SUBJECT

Continue conversation about governance subcommittee's strategic priorities

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The subcommittee will continue its conversation about strategic priorities initiated earlier in the day at the full RTD Accountability Committee. Agenda will include further refinement of strategic priorities and consensus on what the subcommittee will focus on over the next two months.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Draft RTD Accountability Committee: Initial Subcommittee Focus Areas
2. Governance Subcommittee Request Tracking Matrix

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: Initial Subcommittee Focus Areas

The Committee's mission is to provide feedback and a set of recommendations for improvement to the operations of and statutes related to RTD, to the board and staff of the RTD, the Governor, the General Assembly, and the public.

Core Problems at RTD the Committee Needs to Address

- Assuring financial stability by addressing insufficient revenues, an unsustainable financial model, high debt load and operating within available resources and available contingency plans
- Rebuilding trust and transparency with constituents
- Increasing ridership to address both post-COVID-19 losses and pre-COVID-19 declines
- Ensuring appropriate levels of service, especially for transit-reliant and vulnerable populations
- Strengthening partnerships with local governments, other transit agencies, non-profits and other entities such as Districts and Regional Transportation Authorities (RTA's)
- Addressing unfinished FasTracks corridors
- Encouraging RTD to innovate and anticipate new dynamics and trends
- Refocusing RTD on serving core mission: serving transit markets well
- Addressing work force challenges, such as operator shortages, compensation, hours, etc.

The subcommittees will focus their initial inquiry and development of recommendations in the following areas:

Governance Subcommittee

1. Explore and develop an alternative governance structure and deployment of transit services proposals that follow a regional/subregional model and partnership with local governments, with the following potential characteristics:
 - Use of community-based transit planning
 - A regional/local division of RTD funding and routes, with RTD focusing on regional routes and local governments focusing on local transit networks that meet regionally established criteria and can be competitively contracted out. Consideration of the disparities in amount of local funding governments from high income and low-income areas could supply should be included.
 - The ability/requirement for locals to match a portion of RTD funds to leverage additional local funding. Match requirement could be lower for counties with higher low income/vulnerable populations to address equity concerns.
 - A DRCOG Subregional TIP Forum-type process and structure with RTA's, counties, cities or other regional jurisdictions serving as subregions
 - Adherence to consistent performance criteria throughout RTD's service area, e.g., MetroVision goals
2. Explore how to enable partnerships with other transit agencies and nonprofits to provide for better service outside and inside RTD boundaries, e.g., using the HOP in Boulder as a local model and the Fort Collins/Transfort Flex as an inter-regional model.
 - This model can be useful for providing service to low ridership areas such as Evergreen
3. Assess whether the size and structure of RTD's service area is appropriate relative to its ability to provide transit service.
4. Assess whether the RTD Board would be more effective with a different size or structure, e.g, elected vs. appointed, number of districts, at-large vs. districts, representation at both the regional and subregional scale (e.g., DRCOG subregional forums, LA Metro, etc.).
 - Consider the addition of select community/organization representatives connected with key transit user groups, ex-officio members such as a representative of CDOT, DRCOG, the state legislature, governor's office, or others

Operations Subcommittee

1. Assess and make recommendations on how RTD fares and pass programs can be improved to increase equity, ridership, affordability and ease of access.
 - Make eco passes available to riders outside of their employment
 - Consider an expansion of mobile ticketing
 - Consider allowing for rear loading of buses
2. Make recommendations on how RTD can enhance service delivery to transit-reliant, vulnerable populations (i.e., older adults, communities of color, people with disabilities, low income, zero car households) through different models of service delivery (e.g., contracting out to local providers, use of Lyft/Uber/TNCs, vanpool support, etc.) and reflecting changing travel trends post-COVID-19.
 - Consider changes in service provision that focuses on higher density areas rather than entire eight county area
 - Look at first and last mile deficiencies
3. Focus on proactive, community-based transit service planning and operations (e.g., work with locals to develop options for service changes, integrate transit routes and stop/stations with local land use plans, seek out partnership opportunities, etc.). Strengthen and formalize coordination between RTD and cities and counties with development review review/approval of projects and design of transit service for key developments.
4. Undertake an overall organizational assessment (human resources, work culture, management and governance of the District; organizational and Board structure).
5. Emphasize social/environmental justice and equity analysis to influence transit services provided, and how needed changes are determined.

Finance Subcommittee

1. Review and make recommended changes to RTD to achieve a more sustainable financial model, including review of investment policies/guiding principles, debt, regional/subregional funding allocation, and statutes that limit opportunities for revenue generation, cost savings and increased ridership, including provisions that:
 - Require RTD to raise a certain amount through fares (this is a barrier to lower cost service).
 - Limit RTD's ability to develop anything but parking lots on its properties (e.g., rather than affordable housing and key services at TOD sites that can generate transit riders and potentially revenue).
 - Limit RTD from charging for parking. Examine how changes in parking policies and pricing could increase revenues, TOD and ridership.
 - Affect RTD's ability to contract for cheaper service delivery.
2. Review FasTracks spending and make recommendations on how to achieve an equitable resolution for the unfinished FasTracks Corridors. This will include answering the following questions:
 - How have FasTracks and base operating monies been generated and spent to date across the RTD service area?
 - How much of base funding has been diverted to FasTracks projects?
 - What is the cost of finishing FasTracks?
 - How can unfinished corridors be served in a cost effective and cost efficient manner (e.g., project completion, equivalent mobility, financial, etc.)?
3. Make recommendations on how to improve financial transparency to build back public trust and demonstrate RTD accountability to the voters and policy makers, such as the development of a public, online dashboard to show how RTD money is generated and spent, similar to CDOT's dashboard regarding SB 267 funds.
4. Examine partnership opportunities (i.e., with CDOT, local governments, human services agencies, non-profits, private sector, etc.) to enhance mobility services, allow RTD to focus on delivering the types of service(s) they can do most effectively/efficiently, and leverage RTD funding and/or decrease costs of service.

**RTD Accountability Committee
Governance Subcommittee
Status Report – Information Requests**

| Date | Information Request | STATUS | | |
|------|---|--|---|-----------|
| | | Outcome | Follow-up | Completed |
| 10/5 | RTD Legislation – explore restrictions on use of RTD property | Finance subcommittee to discuss | | |
| | LA Metro Service Councils – How do these councils interact with community residents and how do they like the model? | Set up briefing with LA Metro Staff | November 2 Governance Meeting | |
| | LA Metro Service Councils – What was the impetus for the change to the service council model? | | | |
| | LA Metro Service Councils – Do local governments like that model and is it working? | | | |
| | LA Metro Service Councils – Is there shared funding? | | | |
| 9/28 | How to bring local elected officials into the decision-making process | Governance case study review | ongoing | |
| | Pros/cons assessment of different government models | Staff developing matrix of governance models | Matrix to be provided at upcoming meeting | |
| | Description of LA Metro governance model | Set up briefing with LA Metro Staff | November 2 Governance Meeting | |
| | Map of RTD-description of history, why the way it is | Set up presentation w/ RTD Staff | Bill Van Meter presentation at 10/5 meeting | |
| | Total cost to build out Fastracks: total costs so far and costs of remaining system build-out | To be discussed by another subcommittee? | | |
| | Geographic distribution of capital and operating costs/expenditures | To be discussed by another subcommittee? | | |

**RTD Accountability Committee
Governance Subcommittee
Status Report – Information Requests**

| Date | Information Request | STATUS | | |
|------|---|--|---|-----------|
| | | Outcome | Follow-up | Completed |
| | Staffing structure, labor costs, compensation vs peer agencies | | | |
| | Evaluation of local government role in enhancing/expanding services | | | |
| | Evaluation of contracted vs directly provided services | | | |
| 9/16 | Explore Regional/Subregional TIP model concept (share funding and planning authority with communities) | Set up briefing with LA Metro Staff | November 2 Governance Meeting | |
| | Explore governance models (attn on local govt concepts) | Case study of governance models | Case study presented at 9/28 meeting and 10/5 meeting | |
| | Local Govt Survey (satisfaction survey – what could work better?) | | | |
| | RTD Director District Map – How are the districts established? How often are they updated? | Set up presentation w/ RTD Staff | Bill Van Meter presentation at 10/5 meeting | |
| | RTD’s relationship with other transit agencies outside the district (also relationship with CDOT). Understanding of RTD’s role in a larger state transit system | | | |
| | Elected vs. appointed governance model (pros and cons) | | | |
| | Economic Development Objective – should include transit-oriented housing | Added to RTD Accountability Committee Objectives | | |

**RTD Accountability Committee
Governance Subcommittee
Status Report – Information Requests**

| Date | Information Request | STATUS | | |
|------|---|---|-----------|-----------|
| | | Outcome | Follow-up | Completed |
| | Statute review related to RTD land use restrictions | To be conducted by finance subcommittee | | |
| | RTD re-branding? Maybe a ppt from VIA | | | |