

AGENDA

RTD Accountability Committee
Governance Subcommittee
Monday, March 1, 2021
4:00- 5:30 p.m.
VIDEO/WEB CONFERENCE
Denver, CO

1. Call to Order
2. February 1, 2021 Meeting Summary
(Attachment A)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. Partnership Roundtable
(Attachment B)
4. Subregional Service Council Recommendations
(Attachment C)

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

5. **Next meeting: March 22, 2021 at 4:00 p.m.**
6. Member Comment/Other Matters
7. Next Steps
8. Adjournment

ATTACH A

SUMMARY

RTD Accountability Committee: Governance Subcommittee
Monday, February 1, 2021

Note: Meeting held virtually via GoToMeeting

Committee members present:

Julie Duran Mullica (Chair)
Jackie Millet
Deyanira Zavala
Elise Jones
Rutt Bridges
Lynn Guissing
Troy Whitmore

Others Present: Doug Rex, Ron Papsdorf, Melinda Stevens, Barbara McManus, Natalie Shishido, Jordan Sanchez, Bill Sirois, Debra Baskett, Debra Johnson, Justin Begley, Luke Palmisano, Alex Hyde-Wright, Ryan Billings, George Gerstle.

Chair Mullica called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

January 21, 2021 Meeting Summary

Meeting summary was submitted. No revisions were requested.

Summary of RTD Governance Roundtable #2 discussion with technical staff

Doug Rex provided a summary of the conversation held as part of a roundtable discussion with technical staff and other partners about the underlying concepts associated with a proposed recommendation on subregional service councils. The meeting was held on Friday, January 25. Below are comments/insights from subcommittee members on the various topics discussed at the December 18 roundtable:

- Rutt Bridges: While there is concern about increasing the complexity of the service decision-making process for RTD, people feel separated from the existing process and this concept would give people a better understanding of the changes.
- Deya Zavala: Is the person-trip information presented in the maps based on future growth?
 - Doug Rex said it does not. The information was from DRCOG's travel demand forecasting tool representing the year 2020 (pre-COVID).
- Elise Jones: Were there representatives at the roundtable that had participated in the DRCOG subregional forum process? Ms. Jones said that she thought the DRCOG process did a good job of utilizing data and hearing from the local communities served.
 - Doug Rex said that many of the local staff attending the roundtable had participated and expressed similar thought to Ms. Jones about the success of the DRCOG model.
- Jackie Millet: I would rather have a conversation about the opportunities to drive transit ridership versus the conversation about cutting service. However, I don't think that conversation will occur without the service councils to create the environment of positive data driven decision-making.

- Jackie Millet: The benefits of the DRCOG forum process greatly out-weighed the cost to staff due to the additional engagement between DRCOG staff and local governments. Conversations about getting people out of their cars is very important, but it can't happen without the opportunities to meet. Ms. Millet expressed her strong support for the subregional council concept.
- Chair Mullica: Agreed with Ms. Millet's comments. Chair Mullica mentioned the travel shed example presented by staff and acknowledged the geography of the subregions were much bigger than the county forums used by DRCOG and asked if they could work, because of their size.
 - Deya Zavala: Mentioned that the travel shed example includes multiple RTD districts, which could be beneficial.
- Rutt Bridges: One of the challenges is whether the subregions would be able to get the data they need to make decisions. Mr. Bridges acknowledged that the additional data requests could put a strain on RTD staff resources.
- Elise Jones: The feeling from local governments is that the cake is already baked when it reaches local communities. It would be better if local governments were on the ground floor of service discussion. Getting clear information from RTD about resources, data and a recommendation about the best delivery levels is a conversation that local communities want to be apart of. The timing of the process is essential to be in at the scoping process rather than being in a place where we are reacting to something that RTD brings to us.
- Lynn Guissinger: What I've heard is the importance of getting information to locals before decisions are made in order to provide comment and possible partnership opportunities with local governments to bring additional resources to the table to enhance service.
- Deya Zavala: The travel shed concept really appeals to me. It provides an opportunity to solve based on how people move.
- Chair Mullica: Reiterated comments made by members about the necessity of being involved early in the decision-making process. Chair Mullica asked if members had any comments on missing components to the subregional service council recommendation.
 - Elise Jones: Mentioned that some thought should be given to the type of member that is desired to be on the councils. Serving on the councils may require data review/homework so it is important to recognize that a certain level of commitment will be required. Also, ensuring that specific communities of interest that we would like to have on the committee are identified.
 - Jackie Millet: One of the reasons for the success of the DRCOG model was the presence of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). It is important to have as part of the process, stakeholders that understand the issues. The only concern is that there may be push-back from some communities about staff time dedicated to the service council concept.
 - Deya Zavala: If we do ask stakeholders to serve on the councils, we do need to provide some sort of stipend to adequately compensate them for their time. We also need to work through various partner organizations to ensure diversity of the service councils.

Introductory discussion of the Partnership focus area

Due to time constraints, this agenda item will be presented at the February 19 meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

ATTACH B

To: Members of the RTD Accountability Committee Governance Subcommittee

From: Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner
(303) 480-6731 or mhelfant@drcoq.org

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 1, 2021	Discussion	3

SUBJECT

Partnership Roundtable

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

The scope of work for the RTD Accountability Committee states that in issuing its report and recommendations, the Committee may consider, but is not limited to, including several topics including RTD's partnerships with local governments. Representatives from Via Mobility, the Denver Department of Transportation and Infrastructure, Boulder County, the City of Lone Tree and RTD have been invited to provide brief overviews of current practices with the entire Committee. Members from all three subcommittees have been invited to join this conversation.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

N/A

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Matthew Helfant, Senior Transportation Planner, at 303-480-6731 or mhelfant@drcoq.org.

ATTACH C

To: Members of the RTD Accountability Committee Governance Subcommittee

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

Meeting Date	Agenda Category	Agenda Item #
March 1, 2021	Discussion	4

SUBJECT

Subregional Service Council Recommendations

PROPOSED ACTION/RECOMMENDATIONS

N/A

ACTION BY OTHERS

N/A

SUMMARY

In that last couple months, there have been several discussions and stakeholder engagements, including two roundtable discussions with representatives from local governments across the RTD service area, on the service council concept. Based on input gathered from the dialogue, staff have drafted recommendations for Subregional Service Councils (attached).

At the March 1st meeting, subcommittee members will have an opportunity to weigh in on the draft recommendations. The subcommittee will also get a chance to highlight any equity considerations before staff completes a draft equity assessment to accompany the recommendations. A copy of the equity assessment mission statement has been included for reference. Input from this meeting will be incorporated into the recommendations and equity assessment for the full committee's consideration.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS/ACTIONS

N/A

PROPOSED MOTION

N/A

ATTACHMENT

1. Draft Subregional Service Council Recommendations
2. RTD Accountability Equity Assessment Document

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If you need additional information, please contact Douglas W. Rex, Executive Director, at 303-480-6701 or drex@drcog.org.

Subregional Service Council Recommendation

Revise RTD’s transit service planning process by establishing subregional service councils. Service councils will have responsibility for developing and recommending “local” transit service plans for the RTD Board’s consideration. The RTD Accountability Committee believes the introduction of this concept will:

- improve collaboration between RTD and the communities it serves.
- increase opportunities for public input through locally-accessible forums.
- advance social equity goals by developing community-based transit plans that identify transportation and service gaps, especially in low income and minority neighborhoods.
- promote innovative mobility solutions at a local level consistent with the RTD Board’s overall service goals and objectives.
- provide an opportunity to address geographic equity and rebuild trust and transparency with constituents.

Membership

The RTD Accountability Committee recommends service councils be representative of the community-at-large. Service council membership shall include:

- Elected representatives from each city/town/county within each council district.
- A broad spectrum of interests and geography to ensure social, economic, financial, and environmental equity considerations are represented.
- Transit Users: residents who live, work, or attend university within the council district.

Districts

The RTD Accountability Committee recommends RTD establish a workgroup of regional stakeholders to comprehensively evaluate the following two service council boundary concepts to ascertain the best fit for the Denver region. The workgroup shall consider the role and purpose of the service councils, community cohesion and RTD staff resources in its analysis.

1. County Boundaries: The RTD service area encompasses wholly or partially Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield, Denver, Douglas, and Jefferson counties. The establishment of service councils based on this pre-determined geo-political boundary would appear logical since local governments residing in the same county already have a familiarity with each other. Additionally, county-based service councils would be consistent with the already established DRCOG subregional forums which are utilized for transportation planning and funding decisions.
2. Travel Shed: A valuable tool for visualizing and analyzing mobility patterns. In the Denver region, known travel behavior makes this concept a viable option particularly if fewer service districts is the objective.

RTD Resource Allocation

RTD Accountability Committee acknowledges the critical role RTD plays in fulfilling the mobility needs of Denver area residents. Understandably, taxpayers are interested in having more information of how their tax dollars are being used to create an equitable transit system. As a result, the RTD Accountability Committee recommends RTD develop and submit to the subregional service councils an annual report illustrating how the revenues generated in each subregion are used to provide transportation “value” to the residents of the subregion.

RTD Accountability Committee
Equity Assessment Mission Statement

Social, economic, financial, and environmental equity is a paramount consideration for the RTD Accountability Committee. The Committee will consider the needs of communities of concern, including but not limited to minority, low-income, individuals with disabilities, older adult, and veteran populations. Effort will be made through the Committee's work to ensure benefits are shared across the RTD service area and that no one group bears a larger burden of environmental or financial impacts. Actions that include spatial and other forms of analysis, community engagement, and consulting experts will be used at appropriate times to inform the work and final recommendations of the Committee.

Operationalizing Equity in the Deliberation of the Committee and Subcommittees

Each subcommittee will engage community organizations with expertise in equity such as the Center for Community Wealth Building, the Denver Institute of Equity and Reconciliation, and Mile High Connects during their initial deliberations as part of the research phase. During the formation and consideration of issues and policy options, an equality lens will be applied. This lens should include the following questions:

1. How could this recommendation benefit or burden communities of concern? Is there likely to be an increase or decrease in equity?
 - a. How are we defining benefit and burden?
 - b. How do we measure this impact?
2. Could this recommendation impact specific communities or geography more than others? If so, which communities and how?
 - a. What are the demographics of the most impacted areas?
 - b. Are neighborhoods equally required to help achieve the policy recommendation? If not, does this raise issues of equity and justice?
3. Could there be unintended consequences? If so, can they be mitigated?
4. Does this policy/strategy address historic, systemic, environmental, or institutional barriers that have impacted this community?

DRCOG staff and/or the on-call consulting team will assist subcommittees and the Committee to conduct appropriate equity assessments of draft recommendations. Draft recommendations, along with the assessments, will be made available for public review and input. Each subcommittee will consider the assessment and any input obtained through public engagement before making final subcommittee recommendations to the full committee.

The full committee will consider subcommittee recommendations and finalize draft recommendations to bring to a public hearing. Input received from the public hearing will be considered before the committee makes final recommendations. As needed, dissenting opinions will also be included with the final recommendations.