DOUG TISDALE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I now call to order the Tuesday, April 24, 2018 RTD Board study session. The record will reflect that we are convened here, as of 5:31 PM Mountain Daylight Time, in the RTD conference rooms. I would respectfully request that everyone please silence their phones and other electronic devices.

My name is Doug Tisdale, and I serve as the Chairman of the Board. The record will reflect the attendance of all Directors in person, except for Director Anderson. And let me inquire, at this point in time, whether Director Anderson has joined us on the telephone. Director Anderson, are you there?

Hearing no response, I will take it that Director Anderson is not presently with us on the telephone. She may join us later. And, as I have indicated, the balance of the other Directors are present in person in the room.

Ladies and gentlemen, as we do at every meeting here at RTD, we will begin with a short safety briefing, because, at RTD, safety is our core value. If we have a medical emergency and 911 needs to be called, I will ask our RTD general counsel to make that telephone call. Any medically trained individuals in the room are respectfully requested to assist.

Now, if needed, there is an automatic emergency defibrillator device, referred to as an AED, that's inside a glass case located just outside this room, on the wall to the right. In the event that we must evacuate the building, for fire or any other emergency, please calmly exit out the door that you came in, at the back of this room, go up the stairs to the first floor, around the security desk, and exit through the front door. Police and security officers will be there to direct you to a safe meetup area.

Anyone needing special assistance in the event of an evacuation will be assisted by our staff as necessary. Thank you very much for your attention to our safety briefing.

Permit me to review our agenda. We have two principal topics for this study session. First, a staff update to the Board, regarding the pass program working group and the recommendations submitted by them. And then, second, a presentation of the general manager's 2019 tactical plan. And, following that, we will address other matters of which the Board should be made aware at this time.

I need to point out several things, before we begin the first presentation. This is a study session. No formal Board action will be taken at this study session.

Also, there is no public-participation period this evening. You are all more than welcome, you are invited, to submit comments to the Board via email or letters or telephone calls after the
study session this evening. Tonight, the Board is studying the matter and hearing from staff and is not taking any formal Board action.

Next, please be advised that the meeting is being digitally video recorded. Tonight will be the first test of RTD's video and closed-captioning system. This is a pilot, a beta version of this program.

The video will be available on the RTD website, no later than 10 or so business days from now, sometime on or around May the 9th or so, barring unforeseen circumstances. And, again, that will be totally accessible. There will be audio recording, and there will be closed captioning, as well.

Finally, and I sincerely hope it needs not be stated, but, in a surfeit of caution, I add the following, we respectfully request that any members of the audience refrain from any indications of support or opposition to any speakers' comments, as such outbursts are not only disruptive but also might reasonably have the effect of chilling the free expression of thoughts by speakers. Not terribly likely, with these particular speakers, but we make the note for the record.

So, that said, we turn now to the first item on our agenda, a staff update to the Board regarding the pass program working group process. And I emphasize the word "process." And, for that purpose, the chair will recognize our chief financial officer and assistant general manager for finance and administration Heather McKillop, who will introduce others with her, including Michael Washington.

But, before I actually turn it over to AGM McKillop, I want to say a personal word of thanks to the people who selflessly worked, for over a year, diligently, on the pass program working group. We appreciate that. But now, Ms. McKillop, I recognize you, and the floor is yours.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Thank you very much. So Michael and I will be walking you through a presentation that we have, and then we're going to allow ample opportunity for questions. So, if we can get through the presentation first, we're planning on doing that in 20 minutes or less. And then we'll be glad to take some feedback on some of the alternatives that we were proposing running some additional modeling on.

So, with that, I'll go ahead and get started, maybe. There we go. So the cur-- that's weird. We have a different one, there, from what we have here. But anyway.

So the current state, I just want to give you a brief recap. Farebox revenue is set by the RTD Board of Directors. You have a policy that says every three years you will look at adjusting the fare for inflation.

And there are some of the potential fare adjustments to establish a fare structure. I list those things there that are in your policy. And also wanted to let you know that their current midterm financial plan-- which, again, is our combined, now, Strategic Budget Plan (SBP) and Annual Program Evaluation (APE)-- for '18 through '23 incorporates a plan fare increase assumption in
both 2019 and 2022. And that's approximately 10% in both years. And that would be, again, approximately 3%, each year, inflation for the three years between the fare increases.

[LAUGH] I'm seeing something totally different on--

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: That's weird.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So, I can go ahead and speak to the next slide, which I'm not going to go through, but it is our current fare structure. So you should have that in your handout. Our current fare structure just flashed through, past us.

[LAUGHTER]

We're just [LAUGH] including that, so that you get a sense of what it is now and what some of the alternatives might look like, including the pass working group proposal. The next slide-- OK. So the next slide, which I should have memorized, is the pass working group recommendation. So, with that, I'm going to turn that over to Michael, to walk through that. And then I'm going to talk a little bit about alternatives.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: OK, thank you. This is Michael Washington. So-- [LAUGH] I'm sorry?

AUDIENCE: The remnants.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: The remnants. [LAUGH] OK, let's--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: At this rate, it's going to be a long night! [LAUGH]

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: [LAUGH]

HEATHER MCKILLOP: There we are.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Yes. So, with the pass program working group recommendation includes a few things I'll try to summarize the summary that we actually have here on the slide. It essentially retains our major pass programs that we're all familiar with, that being EcoPass, Neighborhood EcoPass (NECO), CollegePass, as well as Flex Pass. But, as it relates to EcoPass, Neighborhood EcoPass, and College, we would be moving to utilization-based pricing, where essentially those programs would be priced based on the trips that are taken, the cash value for the trips that are taken.

Another major element to this would be the inclusion of a three-hour pass, as opposed to a three-hour trip-- or a trip with a three-hour transfer, which is what it is that we have today. Instead, it would be a three-hour pass where one could ride to their heart's content, regardless of which direction, for three hours. This would retain the Day Pass, the Monthly Pass, retain the FlexPass. The major differences, or the major elements of the working-group recommendation includes the creation of a low-income program which would provide a 40% discount to individuals living in a
 household at 185% of the federal-- with an income of 185% of the federal poverty level, and then
a youth discount that would be a 70% discount, as well as allowing for use 12 and under to ride
free with a fare-paying rider. You can go to the next slide.

And so this is just a-- sorry? I'm sorry. Sorry about that. I don't like hearing myself. It makes me
feel nervous. [LAUGH]

So, this is actually just a table giving you a glimpse of what the fare would look like. So one of
the things that the working group was tasked with doing was meeting the SBP revenue targets
that were set. And so that would include essentially an increase. And so that was something that I
know that was, I guess, understated previously. And so I just wanted to make sure that everyone
understood that, either way, there was going to be an increase.

The baseline that the working group had to work with was $2.90. But, to make everything
balance out with the way the recommendation was laid out, it required a base fare of $3 for local,
$5.25 for regional, and $10.50 for airport. And this is just a brief overview of how the discounts
for youth would be applied to those various classes of services, as well as the 50% discount for
senior and disabled.

Go to the next slide. And this is just a slide showing how that 40% discount would essentially be
applied to all of our existing fare media.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So I'm going to spend just a few minutes on some alternatives. So the
one we just ran through with you is the full recommendation of the pass working group. We've
already modeled those assumptions.

And, as was mentioned, and I think it might be a slight misconception that's been going around,
we did give the pass working group a target that's in the SBP and the APE, a fare revenue target
that was published and identified and adopted by this Board for 2019. That did include an
assumption about a fare increase, which would be our normal three-year cycle for that. Based on
that, they did bring in that revenue amount by the proposal that you just saw that Michael went
through. So they were able to meet that revenue target with the chart that was just shown to you.
And, again, you can use that for comparison purposes.

But we also know that you wanted us to look at other alternatives that might be out there. And
one of the first things that comes to mind is that there would be no fare increase at all. So we
would not do our three-year fare increase that we typically do. And we would look and see how
that might impact the recommendations.

Now, one of the big issues is it does not meet the fare targets that we had set in the current SBP
and APE. So, right there, from the get-go, we would have to look at carving back some of our
projects or programs or something to begin with, unrelated to the recommendations of the pass
working group. So, I just want to let you know we wouldn't meet that revenue target.

The second aspect of that, though, is we wanted to look at, is there anything within the pass the
working group recommendations that could be implemented if we didn't have a fare increase?
So, for example, as Michael discussed, there were some changes around the Eco, NECO, and College Pass. There was a proposal to change it to a youth program, instead of what we have as a 50% discount for students between the age of 6 and 19. It would change it to a 70% for any youth in that category of 12 to 19. And below 12 is free.

So there would be some potential that we could implement some pieces of the pass working group recommendation with no fare increase. But it would be somewhat limited, because we would already be seeing a decrease in overall fare structure, period.

The second thing we thought we might want to look at-- and, again, these are alternatives that we're proposing tonight for your discussion, to see if you agree with us moving forward with these, because it does take significant time to model these, as well as any other proposal that you might want us to look at. But this would be a fare-increase pre pass working group recommendations. And what I mean by that is we modeled what would the fare increase be already if we implemented the fare increase that was assumed to be done in 2019.

As was previously mentioned, our local one-way would go from $2.60 to an estimated $2.90, regional one-way $4.50 to $5, and an airport one-way $9 to $10. So we would already see some change in those fares, if we went with a fare increase in 2019. And then, as I mentioned in the no fare, we would see what aspects of the pass working group recommendations could be implemented, because there would be some revenue available there if you kept the cash-paying customers at those rates. But we probably wouldn't, as we know, be able to implement the full recommendations of the pass working group. But we do believe that there would be significantly more aspects of the recommendations that we could definitely implement than compared to the no fare increase, but we would need to see what that looks like and would have to model that alternative.

So, number one, and two, the no fare increase, or the fare increase pre pass working group, would require modeling. And then, of course, we have the fare increase with the pass working group recommendations. We have modeled that already. We know there are slight changes in ridership that might impact that a little bit. But we do know that the recommendation as presented meets the fare targets within the current SBP and APE process.

So I'm going to turn it over to Michael, to talk about what we have to evaluate.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Sure. So this is Michael, again. As it relates to the pass program working group recommendations, that which is, I guess, the heaviest lift pertains to the creation of a low-income program, as well as applying the youth fare. And so one of the things that we weren't able to do as a part of the working-group process was figure out exactly how we would bring this recommendation to life. And so that's where staff has taken over.

And so what that would include is figuring out what's the best way for us to implement a low-income program, in terms of fare products, and then which media. So what I mean by that is, does a low-income discount applied to a Day Pass? And, if it does apply to a Day Pass, does it just apply to a Day Pass using mobile ticketing?
Or does it apply to our My Ride card? And, if it does, is it just a three-hour pass, or do we try to put a monthly pass on there? These are just some of the things that we're considering in trying to figure out how it is that we could actually bring this to life, as well as the cost to bring it to life. So that's essentially what it is that we're doing, now, in a nutshell. That includes some of the things that are actually mentioned there.

The other heavy lift associated with this is administration as it relates to means testing associated with the low-income program. In terms of finding out or determining whether an individual is eligible for a low-income program, we are going to have to rely on some third parties to do that means testing for us. And figuring that process out is something that we're really trying to do, at the moment. And it is a heavy lift. And so I would-- that's it.

In terms of the timeline and next steps, obviously we're here with you today, giving you the update on April 24. Next, we'd like to actually bring a draft, a more finalized draft, proposal that's fully fleshed out, for you to consider, and to allow us to go out to the public and seek public comment. And, at that time, in quarters 2 and 3, which is essentially going into June and July, we would seek public comment and parade the recommendations or the proposal to the public and try to seek their comment, get their feedback, and use that to inform the development of a final proposal to bring to you in the third quarter, where you would then hopefully make a final decision and accept or approve a final proposal with respect to fare changes. And so I believe that's the end of the presentation.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Yeah. So I'm just going to go back to the alternatives, because we'll be glad to take questions. And then, like I said, we're looking for feedback on these alternatives to model, so that we can look at what we're going to be taking to the public and ask if there's any other input that you would like to give us before we embark on that modeling exercise, in the next two weeks, to try to get that done for the May presentation.

DAVE GENOVA: Mr. Chair?

DOUG TEASDALE: Mr. General Manager, yes, sir?

DAVE GENOVA: I would just like for Michael-- I know we have some members of the pass program working group here in the audience tonight. And, Michael, could you introduce them, please?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Sure!

DAVE GENOVA: Ask them to stand up?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Yes, please. If you guys don't mind standing up. Let's see.

So we have Jeffrey Su, from Mile High Connects, we have Angie Malpiede, and we have Scott McCarey. These were-- and is that all? Oh, I, uh-- that's it.
And so these folks worked very diligently, throughout this process. I know we didn't-- I didn't make them happy all the time, but [LAUGH]-- but they stuck in there and really helped out. So, I mean, I would like to give them a round of applause.

[APPLAUSE]

HEATHER MCKILLOP: And I apologize. I told Dave I would do that, and then I completely spaced it. So-- [LAUGH] and I didn't see the hand signal--

But, yeah we appreciate-- I mean, they worked-- we had a meeting every month. But, in addition to that, there were multiple months where we had multiple meetings and then subgroup meetings. So they spent a lot of time participating in this project.

DOUG TISDALE: Well I appreciate your introducing them, because that's the reason that I acknowledged-- [COUGH] excuse me-- the collective appreciation of RTD to all the members of the group before we had Heather commence the presentation. But now it's time for questions from the Board. And we have a number of Directors who have already signed up. So let me commence with Director Folska. You are recognized.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. And thank you, Heather and Michael, and everyone who's been participating on the pass working group. And, as was mentioned, from the very beginning you guys have done yeomans' work and put a lot of your time into it. And I really appreciate it. I certainly didn't have the time to attend, so thank you for your contribution.

Michael, I have a couple questions-- and for you, as well, Heather, if you don't mind. If we didn't raise any fares, at the moment, a person could qualify for a low-income pass and get 40% off. Is that correct? Of a day pass?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: No. So, one of the-- the program that we have right now is the nonprofit program that offers a 50% discount on some fare media-- that being Day Pass books, as well as 10-ride ticket books.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK, so, forgive me, because I've not-- you know, I don't have anything to focus on, so this is out of my imagination.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: OK.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK, so, forgive me, because I've not-- you know, I don't have anything to focus on, so this is out of my imagination.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: OK.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: If, today, a person-- we don't change anything-- a person has a low-income fare, like that all-day pass. Right? So, this $5.20, half of that, right? 50% off? And they can ride all day, as much as they want. Is that how it works?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: This is Heather. Actually-- so, if you go through a nonprofit organization-- that's the key-- and you qualify under there means testing, then you can have access to some fare media. It all depends on how much money that particular nonprofit has, to be able to support the program within their own organization. And it is a 50% discount, and they
can buy-- I don't believe we allow Day Passes. I'm looking at Monica. We do. So it is Day Passes, 10-ride ticket books, and monthly passes.

The difference is the recommendation from the pass working group would open that up to people not having to go through a nonprofit program.

DAVE GENOVA And no limits.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: And then getting a 40%, discount rather than 50%?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Correct.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: So, we're going from, like, $2.60 for-- to what?

AUDIENCE: [INAUDIBLE]

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: $2.90, to ride the bus, or the train, all day. Are you shaking your head?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: No, no.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: No?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: [LAUGH]

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Yes?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: No. No, no, we weren't shaking our head. So, for the Day Pass, it would actually be-- it would actually be $3.60 for a local Day Pass. And, for a regional Day Pass it will be $6.30.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: For the 40%-- that's with the 40%--

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: With the 40% discount--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: --discount?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: --yes.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: But, right now, the 50% would be $2.50, to ride all day.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Right.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: $2.60.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: $2.60, sorry.
HEATHER MCKILLOP: And, remember, we have a cap, on the nonprofit program, of $6.8 million in face value, right now. So it--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Right, and no one has come to the table with that, right? Like, to add more money to that? Since the whole time we've had a conversation?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Correct. We don't have any additional cash in that program, other than the $6.8 million that we've contributed.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: So, then, regarding the-- now, with the recommendation, OK, the 40%. And then those students, children under 12, would ride free, with one paying full fare. Adult fare, or child fare?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: A fare-paying rider.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK. And how many children would that be?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: That limit wasn't-- that's one of the things that wasn't actually-- that detail wasn't provided in the recommendation. And so that's another thing that we as staff are evaluating, to say, what does that really look like, is that something that we can do, and what would be a realistic limit.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: So, for me, the realistic limit is no limit-- like, really no limit. Because the kids that I used to give passes to, that I don't get to anymore because they've been restricted, don't get to go with our Human Geography class, for land-use-planning purposes, from different high schools-- which escape my memory.

Now, I wanted to ask you if you could provide me with a model that does just what you suggest-- oh, yeah, one other thing. When we talk about students under the age of 12 and under-- is 12 or 11-- some kids go to school till they're 19 or 20, because of some kind of cognitive impairment. Are you familiar with that population?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Yes.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Now, would they be included with that student fare pass? Because they'd be over 18 but still a student, in those extended academic programs.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: The way that the recommendation reads is that it would apply to youth 19 and under.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: So my hope is to see that expanded to include those individuals who are still in school because they're getting supported. There's a program, for example, called Project Search. And these individuals are in school, and they're learning vocational trades at places like Children's Hospital, to be fully employed. And those passes are really important for them.
And then, finally, can you give me a model of what it would look like, with that recommendation-- is that I don't know which-- one or two-- but you don't increase the fares at all except the A Line, exempting local employees who are going to DIA (Denver International Airport) And what does it look like, for our SBP, if it's $15 each way, on the A Line? So really, people, conventioneers and so forth, that are coming here. And that's all I have. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Folska. Any further response from Heather and Michael, before I go to our next speaker?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: No, at the end we'll wrap it up and see what you really want us to run, as far as the model. Because we can't run 15 of them. So, we'll have to come to consensus on that.

DOUG TISDALE: 15 or more!

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Yes. [LAUGH] I was hoping to keep it there.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you. All right, Director Williams, you are recognized.

KATE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chair. I guess this question is not specifically to Heather and Michael but maybe more to the staff in general. I did gather that we are talking, down the road, about putting the proposal out to the public. And I'm wondering if we don't have that backwards, if we couldn't maybe do some kind of a survey on our website, asking the public, the ridership, what it is that they want.

Because one of the issues that I have heard a lot is that this program is penalizing other riders and that, you know, it's the finite amount of money, and so some get less and some have to pay more. And I've just heard that outlook, which was not really a large part of the pass program working group.

And so I'm wondering if we could do some kind of a survey, you know, on our website, and ask all of our partners and the advocates and everybody that's been involved to ask, beforehand, and then maybe we would see that 70% of our riders did want this or 70% of our riders did not want it. So I just think, rather than us doing all this work-- because the pass program working group has given us a really nice working model-- if we could start looking at that, before we go nine months down the road and then start asking people for their input.

DAVE GENOVA: We can give that a look and report back.

KATE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Look into that.

KATE WILLIAMS: Oh-- and the only other thing-- so I have another one that's really a comment, I guess, instead of a question. And you all should know, I think everybody here
knows, I went to all of the pass program working group meetings, and I have staff who was on it. So I've been following this for a long time.

And I think that Michael really did a gentle job of notifying us that who determines the income of people who qualify is a huge piece. It's very much out of our purview, as a transportation company, to be determining what people's income is. I get that, to make this thing work, that's a piece that has to happen someplace, but I don't think it's something that we want to do.

And, since we are not going to do it, we need to look at who is going to do it, who's offering to do that, what's it cost, what's our liability, in that issue. So I just want to make sure that everybody is considering that, when we continue to discuss a low-income-qualified pass. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Williams. Director Broom, you are recognized, sir.

BOB BROOM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple questions. [COUGH] Excuse me. In one of the earlier pages of your presentation, you referenced a 10% increase to cover inflation. And I'm just curious, are you looking at the CPI (Consumer Price Index)? Are you looking at some other index?

And then, further, beyond that, it seems like that number's-- if you use some kind of an index like that, it really seems out of place. This Board just approved an 8% salary increase, followed by two 3%-ers, and the price of diesel fuel has certainly gone up more than 10%. I just don't understand why you've used that 10% number.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So we used Moody's, the Denver-Boulder CPI inflationary rate. So it's just a combined three years of what that projected inflationary rate was at that time. And so that's what we used.

We have typically not used, to inflate our costs, here, any type of other index, such as a construction cost index or a commodity index of any kind. Not that we couldn't, we just haven't. And so, in the past, the historical way of calculating that fare increase has been based on what the projections were for inflation, from one fare increase to the next fare increase.

BOB BROOM: OK. The second question relates to how you calculate how many people who currently pay our full fares will avail themselves of this other, lower fare based on their income level. And then, also, how does that impact the total ridership in the system, where, if this fare were lower, it might attract more riders?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: So we actually relied on survey data that we had collected back in the summer of 2017 to determine what proportion of our ridership would qualify for a low-income discount. And, in this instance, at 185% of the federal poverty level, I believe it's about 25% of our ridership that would qualify for that discount, if I recall correctly. I'll have to double-check that number, but that's essentially what we used.
HEATHER MCKILLOP: And I was just going to add to that-- this is Heather-- that the model does assume what additional ridership we might gain. And also, remember, there's other aspects of the pass working group, such as the adjustments to the Eco, NECO, and CollegePass that could mean that we would lose some ridership, because currently they have quite a large discount and we would be eliminating that discount altogether with this recommendation. So our consultants that did the modeling had taken into consideration all of those things to come up which was the equilibrium that was needed to balance to the SBP and APE fare revenue.

BOB BROOM: Mhm. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Broom. Director Archuleta, you are recognized, sir.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: Thank, you Chair Tisdale. Hi, Mike, I-- [LAUGH] by the way, Mike, you've got a great voice. I think you should be a speaker, myself.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: [LAUGH] Thank you.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: The low-income fare and the youth fare, you say you're still evaluating it. What are some of the ideas that you're throwing around? I mean, I'm sure you're throwing some ideas around about it. I mean--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Oh, we're throwing a lot of ideas around.

[LAUGHTER]

So, the youth isn't quite as difficult. It's the low-income. And it was alluded to, before, it's really the income-verification piece of it. And right now we use discount cards, so that the driver can say, I have a discount card, you purchased a discount fare media, I can correlate the two, I let you on. Or, when I'm doing fare checking, that's an easy way to do that.

So a couple of things we've talked about is, how do we potentially, if we need to, get those discount cards out to a huge portion of the population, at an easy methodology and low cost? How can we potentially do an electronic verification of income, that we never even see, we're just told that somebody qualified. And that involves working with the state. So we have reached out to the state and are working with some people there.

So, that hadn't been explored before but will definitely be a cheaper implementation-- probably maybe not cheaper initially implementation, but ongoing-- would definitely be more economic. And so we are talking about all of those different things. Nothing, at this stage, has been finalized, because it is a major endeavor and things that people hadn't thought about before. So.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: All right. Well, thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Archuleta. Director Lubow, you are recognized, ma'am.
JUDY LUBOW: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. And I want to thank everybody who's worked on the pass working group, and also the staff, for all the incredible work. This stuff is so complex and very difficult. So, thank you for everything you've done.

Personally, I am very in favor of a low-income pass and also an extended youth pass. In fact, this is one of the most exciting things that have come up, in the five years that I've been on the Board. It's very personally fulfilling.

So, it's not perfect, because nothing's perfect in this world, but I support the idea of the recommendation of the pass working group, with, however, some changes. So I'm one of those 15 changes that you're (LAUGHING) going to have to deal with. I think that we need more money. Because I think this is important enough to not just assume that we're restricted by the midterm funding.

I don't think that we should be restricted by it. I think, personally, we should see more RTD funding but also very much more private funding. And, from my discussions with some staff at Mile High Connect, that there is the possibility, the very distinct possibility, of getting private funding. And that was part of the recommendations from the pass working group, that RTD continue working with our private and public partners to look for some of that funding. I think they mentioned almost $3 million a year. I mean, that would go a long way. And I think we should very much consider it, and I would support that.

Let me get my notes, here. Oh, yes. One of the changes that I wanted to see, that I felt that we probably perhaps needed more RTD money but maybe private money, is that I would hate to see these wonderful discounts burden the people that just don't make the cut, the financial cut, but are still low-income people. Because then what we're doing is we're placing the burden from one set of low-income people to another.

So I personally would not support stopping the 10-ticket pass and also the My Ride discount. Because those are the discounts that many low-income folks can afford, since what I've been told is that many people can't afford buying the 30-day monthly pass. They don't have the money to aggregate to do that.

So, if that is true, and I suspect it is, then what we're doing by this proposal is cutting, is hurting those people by cutting those 10-ticket passes and the My Ride. And I would like to see that changed. And that would mean it's going to cost some more money, so we're going to have to be willing to look for more money, either with RTD's funding or private. And I think, for me, that's very important. So I'm voting for that one of 15 changes, to make your life difficult. But I do believe that.

The other thing that I wanted to talk about is, I think we're reaching a point of fare increases, that we're reaching a point of almost diminishing returns. That the fares are getting to be so high that they're becoming inequitable and also counterproductive, in terms of people not riding. And I think that it's time for us to look at our model, which says that, oh, every three years we're just going to tack on 10% more money.
I no longer feel that that's appropriate. And I understand we need to find alternative sources. We can't just operate without money. But I don't think it's right to just be charging people more than $3 for a local ride.

So I think we need to look at alternatives. And I've thought of some, myself, which I won't bore you with tonight. But I think we need to be willing to look outside the box, with that. So--

Oh, yes. And just one additional thing is that I really, really urge staff to work with our private and public funders to get more funding for these passes. I think it will work, and I think we need to try that. OK, that's it for me. Thank you very much.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Lubow. Director Deadwyler, you are recognized, ma'am.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: Thank you, Chair. I think my question has been answered somewhat. It's on the means testing. Because I know that it's not something this agency should do. But, if we have to contract with somebody and pay somebody to do that, how are you factoring in that cost into these discounts?

Before you answer--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Oh-- sure.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: Well, go ahead-- you can answer that.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: OK. So I'll answer the first half. So we haven't yet. So that was one of the things that the pass working group had not addressed, was the cost of implementation. So that's one of the things that staff, we have to bring back to you and let you know what we're thinking that might look like.

I think we all agreed, RTD, we are not in the business of means testing. And so there are people that do that, as part of their services. And so we have to figure out, if we move forward, how is the best way to do that, and the most efficient way, and creates the least amount of burden on both sides, both the customer side and RTD side. So I don't have a good answer for you yet on that, except that it was not considered in the modeling at this point in time.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: Thank you, Heather. Because I personally would hate to see us go out and hire somebody to come in and do that work and then find out that it's very costly. You know? And that's the burden that we'll have to bear, because it would be our responsibility to pay for it, maybe.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So, just to give you a perspective, because we had to do a recent fiscal note on this that we'll be discussing tomorrow in committee, we did look to King County, because they're probably the most-- although they're a county versus a multicounty jurisdiction, they have implemented a program that's probably most similar to this and had been used by Mile
High Connects as an example, in the past. Their implementation costs were in excess of $3 million the first year.

And then their ongoing cost varies, depending, because they don't actually control the cards. They use the ORCA card, which is not under their purview, so they do have to pay for that, a cost for that. So that wouldn't be something-- we'd have to pay for card production costs.

So it's not exactly apples to oranges, but their ongoing costs that they pay the social-service agencies, as well as some nonprofits, is about $1 million to $1 million and a half per year, to do the means testing. As I mentioned, we're looking at other options that would diminish that cost. I don't know if it's possible, but we're definitely looking at other ways other than actually paying it. We're fortunate, in this state-- or unfortunate, depending on your perspective, if you're a county or the state-- [LAUGH] but the state keeps a database, several databases, at the state level that contains all that information in there, on a statewide basis.

So, we're looking at options, there. There's no guarantee the state would allow us to access that information, but it is something we're considering. And we're trying to have conversations with the state about that. But, yes, there is a cost administration.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: Right. And then I notice that we're not talking much at all or anything about more of the nonprofits that already are receiving discounts. And it's, why aren't we doing more with them, you know, with this pass program, than just trying to launch something brand-new out there? You know, why aren't they-- because they do their own means testing, I think. You know?

And I know people don't want to go to a nonprofit, but it's successful. And for us to take on an additional burden, couple of million dollars a year, trying to figure out if they're really low-income, why aren't we using that? And then you said it's about 25% of the ridership that is below the poverty level. Is that what I heard?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Of our eligible riders, yes.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: Eligible riders. And my thing is, one of the things that Claudia brought up was children under 12 can ride free with one paying adult. And that's not something that I can support, in terms of unlimited children. And I mean that, because we can get a teenager that's going to pay $0.90 and drag along 10, 12 kids for free. That's taking seats from other paying passengers, you know, to ride them across town, for whatever reason. So that's not something I can support. But those are my comments. That's all.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Deadwyler. Director Walker, you are recognized, sir.
JEFF WALKER: Thanks. I think it's important to remember that these recommendations are from the pass program working group, not necessarily from RTD. This is what the group came up with.

One of the questions I had is about nonprofits. And I'm wondering, I think I heard someone at our last public comment period, last Board meaning, who's from a nonprofit, and some--anyway. So, I'm wondering how they feel, the nonprofits that have participated.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: So, the general feedback that we got is that they would still like an opportunity to be able to purchase fare media on behalf of low-income individuals, which is something that the working group considered and is included in the overall recommendation, that nonprofit organizations would still be able to purchase fare media on behalf of these low-income individuals.

JEFF WALKER: Is there any concern that, if it were implemented, that it would eat into some of their client base?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Yes. Uh--

JEFF WALKER: Go ahead, please.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Yes, that was a concern. And mainly because transportation is a part of a suite of services that they're offering to their clientele.

JEFF WALKER: Right, and that's what I was thinking, is that they might lose that one person who also needs another type of service that's there. But, because they can get part of their service someplace else, then that other available service isn't attained.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Absolutely.

JEFF WALKER: So, Miss McKillop, you mentioned that there were some changes in ridership under the PPWG (Pass Program Working Group) recommendations. And I might have missed it. Could you repeat that--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Yeah. This is Heather. So what I was referring to is, their recommendation was based on a certain revenue projection and a certain ridership number. That included that the N line would open in 2019. As we normally do every year, we look at ridership and adjustments for those type of things. So, when will the G Line open, when will the N Line open-- those type of things.

So, outside of their control, we may have to adjust that ridership number, which in fact would have an impact on fare revenue and then therefore an impact on the proposal that was made. So that's the reference that I was making.
JEFF WALKER: OK. All right, thank you. Do you know how many companies-- two more questions. Do you know how many companies participate in the FlexPass program?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: FlexPass, I do not know, off the top my head. We’ll have to check. I thought you were going to say "nonprofit," and I know that number-- 362. [LAUGH] As of last count. But we'll check on FlexPass.

JEFF WALKER: OK. Because I'm wondering-- that's a benefit that a lot of companies use to entice employees to come work for them, as opposed to someplace else. And if that benefit were taken away, or-- yeah, taken away, I guess, or eliminated--

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: So, the working-group proposal retains the FlexPass program, but the discount is what would go away that's presently available.

JEFF WALKER: Right, yeah. And, without the discount, then, what's the point?

[LAUGHTER]

And then my last question is, do you know how many square miles are in the local service area?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Oh, man, that's--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Don't we have 2,340--

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: That was a good stump-the-chump question, right there.

[LAUGHTER]

HEATHER MCKILLOP: I want to say it's two thousand-- in Dave's presentation, he has, I believe-- do we have it in that? For tactical plans. But I think we have, like, 2,340 square miles in our-- 2,430 square miles.

JEFF WALKER: That's the entire district.

DOUG TISDALE: It's the size of the state of Delaware, just for convenient reference.

JEFF WALKER: No, what--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

JEFF WALKER: I have a different question. I'm asking, just for local fare, how far can--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Oh, how far can you go, for the local fare? Oh, that varies, depending on--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]
JEFF WALKER: And the reason I'm asking is because I've lived in several cities-- Cleveland, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, et cetera. And they have different service size areas. They also have different types of fares. They have rush-hour fares.

We don't, this area, geographically, jurisdictionally, isn't set up to accommodate the same type of fare structure that Cincinnati does. Once you cross that city line, at city limit in Cincinnati, across the Ohio River, boom, $0.50 more. Right? And that's only 77 square-- 77 square miles is what Cincinnati is.

I'm sure the local fare is a lot larger than Cincinnati's local fare. And, plus, Denver doesn't have a, RTD doesn't have a, rush-hour fare. Used to, until '09, or something like that. Anyway.

So I'm wondering how nuanced the discussion became when we talked about the price of fares, what we, the people who ride RTD, get for that fare. You know, so, for $4.50 I can go 60 miles, pretty much, from Parker to Longmont. I can't do that in Cincinnati or Cleveland or many others.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: So, just so I can make this an answerable question for myself, would this be, how far could one ride, in three hours, on a local-- for a local fare?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Or how many miles are contained within the local fare jurisdiction?

JEFF WALKER: Well, not necessarily how many miles. That depends on the type of service-- if it's a train or an express. But I'm just wondering how big of an area can somebody cover for a local fare, compared to, like, a Seattle or a Cleveland or, you know, the other systems that I'm more familiar with. So, even though it might hit $3 a ride, what do we get? How far can you-- without-- on one seat, two seats, with same fare?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: We will check on that and get back to you.

JEFF WALKER: Thank you.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: And I mean "you," the bigger group, before somebody says, can you please send it to all of us. [LAUGH] We're just going to whisper it in Jeff's ear. [LAUGH]

DOUG TISDALE: Is that all, Director Walker? Thank you very much. Yes, whenever you say "you," we understand you mean "y'all."

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Yeah. The bigger "you."

DOUG TISDALE: That's right. We accept that. Chair Sisk, you are recognized, sir.

CHARLES L. SISK: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. And good evening to everyone. Initially, I know that there are members of the working pass group, and I know we've said "thank you" to you. One of the ways I'm going to say "thank you" to you is I'm going to say I'm going to support what you've suggested, that you bring here. Because it's something that, I think, I really like the fact that we're addressing low fare for people that direly need it. And we need to support them.
But, on the other hand, we've got to have some modicum, here, so that we can support that both ways. We have to provide-- and I think the working group has done a great job. So, from that standpoint, I would say this.

I think it's incumbent-- one of the-- you know, the devil's in the detail, as far as the EcoPass. Very concerned about how that shows up. The students, you know, how we're going to handle that.

But I do think that we need to have a plan that goes out to the public. You know, we've already been out to the public. I think it's up to the Directors to step up and say, this is what we're going to support. And then have the feedback. Because then you've got something upon which people can say, OK, you've done this, and let's go forward. Let's go forward, or let's make changes.

So, I'm all in favor of more public engagement. But it's time for us to get on the horse and ride, here, and quit shoving this down the way. Second thing that I would suggest is this.

I know that we're looking at being mechanized. And thank goodness for the smart cards and things like that. But it seems to me that the coin shuffle continues with this fare.

And so the thought that I had was, why don't we reduce the fares, or increase the fares, to the next quarter, so people are not fumbling around for two nickels, five pennies. Because that becomes, then, a time issue for people that are Boarding the buses. And there are people that have the $0.20, or maybe they've got a quarter--

So I just think that we should go to the nearest quarter or the lower quarter and find a way to use, to go to a quarter system, as opposed to a dime and a nickel. Suggestion, but, again, I want to make sure that it's-- and how that rubs. I was just looking at it, there's some that, you know-- I mean, it seems to go forward. But, again, you'll have to look at that in terms of the economics. And that's the suggestion that I-- thank you.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Thanks.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Chair Sisk. Director Mihalik, you are recognized.

KEN MIHALIK: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. And thank you, Mrs. McKillop and Mr. Washington. I was wondering if you wouldn't mind elaborating more. Director Walker kind of talked about the-- or has embedded in his questions, the elimination of the discount on Eco, NECO, student passes. If you wouldn't mind elaborating on what your modeling discovered about that.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: So, in short, as it relates to Eco, NECO, College, what we really modeled was moving to utilization-based pricing, where we would take all the rides that are taken under EcoPass and the various locations in employer sizes and say, this many trips were taken. And so, for that, next year, the pricing will be based on that utilization, to follow the true insurance model, to say, RTD's essentially taking on the risk of you having these Boardings.
Upon that, we want to make sure that your rate is relative to that risk of a Boarding, under those certain groups with those employers.

As it relates to CollegePass, it's actually priced on an organization basis, where they essentially are given a price based on their individual utilization as a university. And then we would price that, offer a per-pass price that's reflective of that utilization. And the same would be on the neighborhood basis, as it relates to Neighborhood EcoPass.

KEN MIHALIK: Just to follow up-- in your modeling, though, was there a change in the number of riders, because of that alteration in pricing?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Absolutely. We did see some fluctuations in the-- especially as it relates to EcoPass. And so one of the things that we saw was that there would be a reduction, or some attrition, if you will, do to price increases that some employers would see. And so one of the things that we're doing, to try to retain employers, or that was a part of the recommendation from the working group, is that we would phase in price increases, so that we could retain those employers that would see a substantial increase, a 20% increase or more. And so, to retain them, we would actually phase in their pricing so they wouldn't see that full increase on the first year. It would be phased in, their increase would be phased in, over three years.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: And, if I could just add to that. The process behind the three years for the working group was that would be before the next potential fare increase went into effect. But, if they saw a decrease-- which there were substantial number of businesses that would see a decrease, also-- the decrease would go into effect year 1. So, that was based on the recommendation.

So there is a shifting in who's paying for what. And part of that would have had to occur anyhow, because we had not accounted for some major openings. So anything that opened since the West Line had not been accounted in our buckets. [LAUGH] And so we need to adjust that, anyhow. But this was a further refinement of that, past what we would have normally done.

KEN MIHALIK: That is all.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Mihalik. Before acknowledging Director Folska, because she has already spoken, I will acknowledge Chair Hoy. Chair Hoy, the floor is yours.

LARRY HOY: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. So, one of the things that I'd like to point out is that the student passes will be heavily utilized by the City of Denver, their school system. And that, beyond the borders of Denver, the suburbs are going to have a difficult time taking that same advantage of those lower fares. My thought process goes this way, that the City of Denver is built in such a fashion, and their school districts are built in such a manner, and our routing has been focused on their schools, that these kids can hop on and get a cheaper fare than the yellow bus.
And that really is the motivation, in my opinion, behind that student fare, that the City of Denver's public schools are taking a ride on our back. When Johnny gets to the bus stop and pays his fare, and five more buddies hop on, and they all go to school, the taxpayers of our district pay for that. There's no such thing as lowering somebody's fare, unless somebody else pays more.

As witnessed by these charts that we have, here, as near as I can tell, we would have a greater fare increase if we include more discounts. If we include less discounts, we have a lesser fare increase. To Director Lubow's point of view, if you don't qualify for the low fare then you're going to pay more than if we didn't have a low fare. Because somebody has to pay for that low fare.

I think that, generally, it looks like about 11% to 16%. So the increase has to go-- the numbers that were shown here would be around 10%, 11%. And, if we do these discounts, it will be more like 15%-- something like that.

So I think that the students should be the responsibility of the school districts. Because my school district, in Jefferson County and Adams County and Littleton and Aurora, will--

CHUCK SISK: [INAUDIBLE]

LARRY HOY: Same thing, up north.

CHUCK SISK: Don't forget north.

LARRY HOY: There you go. Can't really use it like Denver does. So that's one thought, there. The other thing is, just in general on a low fare, if we take an imaginary--

Well, let's just do this. The minute somebody pays a local fare, the taxpayers pay three times that amount, whether they're the one getting on the bus or not. So-- imaginary numbers, but this will give you a kind of an in-your-face description.

I get on the bus, I pay $2.50, let's say. That means $7.50 came from the taxpayers. How much more do we need the taxpayer that doesn't get on the bus to pay? That's the problem I have.

And, by the way, there's somebody in the audience who's listening to this, just cringing. And I know that that person has already said a prayer for me.

[LAUGHTER]

And I won't name names, [LAUGH] but, you know-- and this isn't necessarily what that person would like to hear. So I'm just struggling with some of this. Maybe there's a solution--

And, by the way, I do not have a problem with giving discounts to anybody-- anybody-- as long as somebody else is paying for it. But, when our taxpayers have to pay for, it just doesn't sit right. You know, if their church wants to go out and take advantage of our program, or if the
YMCA or the YWCA or 9 to 5 or whoever wants to raise money and help these people get around town, on our transit system, I'm good. I'm good.

I don't want them not to have a discount. I just don't want the 3 million people in our district to subsidize it. And I don't even think I had a question, did I? You guys have just been sitting there, listening!

[LAUGHER]

Thank you very much.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Taking notes.

LARRY HOY: Thank you.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: I feel compelled to just to state a few things, as it relates to the youth pass and that proposal. The reason why the working group felt so compelled to include that recommendation has to do with the fact that, as the working group traveled around the district hosting these meetings, we heard, at every single one of those meetings, support for the youth program, from folks within those districts-- or, I should say, within those areas within the district. And I do want to tell you one story that we heard, as we were talking with nonprofits, regarding youth that are actually staying in campgrounds, the Red Rocks campgrounds, and are boarding one of our regional routes to get to a local service, to get to a Jeffco school, and saying that the youth proposal would actually help these individuals that are camping right now, these youth that are camping right now and having to use our regional service to get to our local service to get to school.

And so, while Denver certainly-- and I completely agree with you-- stands to benefit from this, at a great level, because of the amount of service that we provide, there are definitely youth that are struggling that are in a vulnerable position that could benefit from this, as well, outside of Denver. I would also say that Boulder Valley schools, as well as Jeffco and some other schools, have expressed-- and Adams County, as well-- have expressed interest in this program. I just wanted to make that known, that we didn't just hear from Denver.

LARRY HOY: And I'll bite my tongue. Thank you.

[LAUGHER]

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: I'm sorry, I wasn't trying to be argumentative. I'm sorry.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you, Chair Hoy, we appreciate that. And actually I didn't hear Cherry Creek or Littleton or Englewood districts mentioned in that recital, either.

[LAUGHER]
I am going to recognize Director Solano. But, as I do so, I'm going to ask if Director Anderson is on the phone. I will--

LORRAINE ANDERSON: I am.

DOUG TISDALE: And I will be acknowledging you next, after Director Solano. And I just wanted to give you that heads-up. So, at this time, I recognize Director Solano.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. I just wanted clarification on that EcoPass. What size of employers do they have to be, to be able to benefit from the EcoPass or subsidize their employees?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: As it stands today, just one employee. You can have one employee and qualify for an EcoPass.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: OK, so they pay into their employee's pass?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Yes.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: OK, but then, let's say you have an employer that does not want to pay into a pass. So this employer would have to pay top fare.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: They can pass the cost on to their employee.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: OK.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: And, if I can clarify, whether or not they pass the cost on to their employee or not, it would depend on what geographic location they're in and the size of the employer, as to what bucket they fit in and how they're priced. And I think the calculation we did was, four employees kind of is the break-even. I mean, we welcome people with one or two employees, but, if you look at it from a cost-benefit perspective, it's about four employees where it starts making sense to get into the program.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: OK, one more question, if I may. OK, on the Neighborhood EcoPass, who subsidizes that?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Who subsidizes it?

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: Yeah, I mean, where do they get the benefit? Who pays for their benefit?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Are you talking about, as it relates to the working-group recommendation?

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: No, no, the neighborhood EcoPass.
MICHAEL WASHINGTON: OK, so, the-- well, with the working-group recommendation--

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: Oh, yes, that's correct.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: --with respect to the Neighborhood EcoPass, there is not intended to be any sort of cross-subsidization, per se. All the subsidization would happen within the neighborhood, within neighbors actually subsidizing other neighbors within that neighborhood. The program is supposed to be revenue-neutral, under the working-group recommendation.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: So certain neighborhoods could have a tax or a property increase or a pool, a fund, or something, to pay for these passes, or--

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Sure.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: --whatever they wanted--

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: However they want to pay for it, as long as they get us the check, you know?

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: Got it. OK, thank you.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: [LAUGH]

HEATHER MCKILLOP: I'm going to go on the record that Michael said that, not me, but--

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: That's right, the record will reflect.

[LAUGHTER]

Chair Anderson, let me just acknowledge that I will, after hearing from Chair Anderson, come back to Director Catlin next. And then we'll see if the others who have indicated they wish to speak again really do. But, first, Chair Anderson, you are recognized.

LORRAINE ANDERSON: Thank you, [LAUGH] Chair Tisdale. You know, I remember all of the-- you know, almost everyone who has spoken to what, over the years, about low-income fare. I think what has struck me the most, and probably means the most, is for families to be able to travel together, and with a parent or an adult paying, and the children, the children ride free. I think that promotes families. And it certainly promotes families using our transit system, for pleasure, on weekends. And I think that's good for ridership.

I would like to see some way to lower the fares for all. Because I am concerned about ridership. We have to build our ridership. And I don't know if any of you travel during peak hours on interstates, but it's really slow.
And so it would be better if more people rode on our transit system. So I kind of like the idea of not raising fares. And I like the idea of working with nonprofits to aid those people in the communities that really need help.

And so that's kind of where I am. I think it ought to be the same fare for everybody, with the exception of those who are really in dire need, and they can get that help through the nonprofits that are out there. We certainly have a lot of good nonprofits. And, if we get more ridership, maybe we won't have to raise fares as often.

So, that's where I'm coming from. And I also have a concern on the FasTracks side, about-- and I may be wrong, but I think Heather alluded to the N Line and the ridership there. And so I'm concerned, if we price our G lines and our services too high, that people won't ride them. And so that sort of skews all of the planning that we've done through the years.

So, you know, whoever would have thought that transportation fares would be so complicated?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: [LAUGH]

LORRAINE ANDERSON: And hopefully I did hear some chuckles, because this is serious stuff. And I think that everybody's opinions, because each of us represent different areas, makes a difference in what we're doing. So, all I can say is, staff really have their job cut out for them. And I will yield the floor, now. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Chair Anderson. We appreciate your observations, as well. Let me now recognize Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Thank you, Chairman Tisdale. Forgive me, because I'm kind of late to the game on this thing, and I'm trying to understand. With respect to the EcoPass program, back when I bought EcoPasses for my employees, a number of years ago, my understanding was that, in order to participate, you have to have 100% of your employees in the program. And, in doing so, you got a discounted fare for the EcoPass. And so I willingly did that, in lieu of paying for parking for my employees. But, if you eliminate the discount, aren't you eliminating the incentive and running the risk of losing a number of employers, who will drop off?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: This was a big topic of discussion during the working-group effort. And one of the things that was acknowledged is the fact that, because it utilizes an insurance model and allows for cross-subsidization, not just among employees of the same employer but among multiple employers and all their employees, it results in lower per-pass prices. And thus it's its own discount, so to speak, in that employers and employees are subsidizing each other.

So those that ride a lot, they do experience that discount, so to speak. And those that don't ride at all, or that ride just to go to one Bronco game, they may have paid, you know, $300 for that one Bronco ride. So that's the way in which-- those are the benefits of the program.
PEGGY CATLIN: And I understand that. But that was based on a lower fare. And I just guess I'm concerned that eliminating that discount for a group then reduces the incentive for that employer to participate. I guess that's my concern.

A second point I had is that I was looking at all the different permutations that you could create, to model this thing, and it's just mind-boggling. Is there some way to bracket, kind of, an upper side and a lower side? Or maybe you've done that already. And then everything else would kind of be on a gradient, in between those minimum and maximums, to try and eliminate all of the what-if scenarios.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So that was the attempt of doing what the three alternatives were that we presented, which was a no-increase, is there anything we can do, from the pass working group recommendations? And then the pass working group recommendations, which were the upper boundary, as we saw them. So then, within that, there's a lot of variation that you could do.

We went with, what would the fare increase have looked like without those recommendations, and then how could we apply some of those recommendations to that scenario? As you heard tonight, there's a lot of--

PEGGY CATLIN: Well, and I guess--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: --middle ground, there.

PEGGY CATLIN: And I think I understood that part, but I'm also hearing some that either would go above that threshold or below that threshold, with some of the suggestions that I've heard tonight. And so, I guess that would be my question.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: [INAUDIBLE] I think we haven't gone back and talked about that, because those just came up tonight, or-- of course, we had some inkling that there might be some of that. But I think we think that those thresholds-- to go below that fare revenue target that we currently have would be detrimental, in my opinion, to the organization, to have recommendations that exceed the pass working group. We couldn't see a way of funding that within RTD.

I know there's been discussion about outside money, but we've been working on that for-- I've been here three years, that those conversations have taken place. So we were trying to do those boundaries within the three alternatives that we gave you, knowing that there's a lot of variation within those.

PEGGY CATLIN: Yeah. And then my final point is just one of observation, in a different industry, and in a different state that I was working in, for a client. We were working on low-income means-tested tolls, in the tolling industry. And the third-party means-testing was very, very complex and expensive.

And there was always the case of people going above or below the threshold, on any given time, and how often do you means-test, and taking somebody out once they've been in, and vice versa,
can be problematic. So I just think that that's a pretty tall order. And to get a handle on that would be helpful, at least for me. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Catlin. Before going around again and asking if the speakers who have signed up really do have other questions, let me ask a couple, if I may. And that is, in looking at page 70 of your presentation, you indicate that the proposed fare increases as suggested by the pass program working group will apparently offset any reduction in ridership and will provide sufficient revenue to make all of the changes that the pass program working group has suggested. Am I reading that correctly?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: That is correct.

DOUG TISDALE: And you have, in fact, modeled that, you tell us, from data that you looked at during the course of the pass program working group.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: That is correct.

DOUG TISDALE: Relative to the creation of the model, did you have a survey of riders, relative to their acceptance of a fare increase in the amounts indicated? Or did you make projections? How did we, in fact, make those estimates that ridership will fall x% but increased riders will be y%, and so forth?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: Yeah, sure. So, there wasn't a survey, per se, but we did use a standard elasticity, a standard elasticity model, to determine that sensitivity to pricing.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: And the same consultant that was used in the last, and was involved in the last increase that we did, in 2016, is the same-- different title of company, but same group. And so they had experience in attending all the public meetings that we had conducted through the last price increase, and the changes that were made there, and the considerations that the Board had us going through that process, also. So, although it was mostly model-driven, they did have the experience of going through that last process with us.

DOUG TISDALE: And, just since you raised the last process, what's the experience that we have experienced, relative to the projections made when the last fare increase was done and our reality in terms of ridership adjustment following that rate increase?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So, ridership is a little difficult, because it has been down nationwide. So we don't know if that's in relationship to the fare increase or if that's attributable to other factors that we're experiencing. Remember, our ridership is just down slightly, compared to the national trend.

Our fare revenue, though, has, as you have seen year-over-year exceeded the expectation. It's not quite as high as we thought it would be this year, but that is mainly due to the opening of the G Line, as far as revenue. But it did exceed our expectation.

DOUG TISDALE: All right, thank you.
HEATHER MCKILLOP: I should say-- I apologize-- "meet or exceed," I should say. And it depends on the category. [LAUGH]

DOUG TISDALE: And then, next, the nonprofit program, the $6.8 million of face value for a nonprofit being available for purchase at 50% of face, that is also proposed to be continued, pursuant to the pass group recommendations?

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: So it essentially-- no, no, not in the pass program working group recommendation. Instead, nonprofits would essentially be able to purchase fare media on behalf of low-income individuals, without a cap.

DOUG TISDALE: Alright, so, instead of having a $6.8 million cap at face value, they would simply, pursuant to the low-income program, pursuant to representation made that they are acquiring these for purposes of sharing with low-income riders, would acquire as much as they wanted.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: At a 40% discount.

DOUG TISDALE: Alright thank you. And then, also, am I correct that our local bus and rail, under the fare increase that you intend to present-- absent anything from pass program working group, you had intended to present an 11-and-1/2% fare increase, essentially across the Board-- 11 and 1/2% for local, about 11% for regional, and 11% for airport, as was originally proposed. And now you're coming back, actually, at 16.7% increase on airport and regional and about 15 and 1/2% on local. Am I correct on those numbers?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Yes. And, again, it's closer to the 10%. But, because of the rounding due to people not wanting to put pennies in, it does go closer to the 11% in some of those areas. And, yes, it's correct that the base fare-- which we refer to the $2.60, the $2.90, the $3 as the base fare-- yes, those percentages are accurate.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, all right. Because I'm looking at what I will call-- because I don't like to use pennies, either-- so I say 17% increase in the airport fare. And I'm just wondering what the impact of that is in your modeling.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: The impact, it does show some sensitivity to pricing, that there would be some loss in ridership. The one thing I do want to-- a slight nuance to add-- is that the projected 11% increase in revenue is an increase in revenue, not necessarily an increase in the fare price. The fare price has to go up higher than 11%, to account for the elasticity or that loss in ridership. Does that make sense? I know it's kind of--

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: Well, it's close. And I don't want to burden the conversation with that now, because the realization is coming to me, and, I think, to all of us, that obviously we're going to need to see-- at some point, and tonight is not that time. But we're going to need to see some of the modeling that you've got, relative to these various recommendations. Because I think, as
some of the Directors have pointed out, there may be some tweaking that needs to be done, in order to achieve this.

Because, quite honestly, if, in fact, it were accepted as true that we could simply adopt this fare increase, do everything as requested by the pass program working group, and have zero impact on our ridership, wow! I think that's an easy discussion.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Can I clarify?

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: I didn't mean to imply it would have zero impact on our ridership. When we do a model, they model the ups and the downs. And there are going to be increases in certain areas in ridership and decreases in certain areas in ridership.

But what they were modeling to was, with the pass program proposal, can we meet the revenue target-- not can we meet the ridership target, but can we meet the revenue target-- knowing that we will lose certain riders and gain other riders? So the totality of that impact is what balances. And so I just want to clarify that, because I want to make sure you knew the target was not to meet ridership. It was to meet that fare target. And knowing that, by doing certain things in Eco and NECO and certain things in low-income, you would have a package that tried to maintain the ridership as well as balance to that fare revenue target. If that makes sense.

DOUG TISDALE: No, I appreciate that. And I think we will look forward to seeing further submittals, as we do move on in this process. Alright. Now, before I go to the Directors who have spoken before, I'm going to ask you each, we'll impose a one-minute rule for this and see if Director Menten-- who is not in the queue, but I think her computer may be acting up. Do you have a minute?

NATALIE MENTEN: Please.

DOUG TISDALE: Please. Let's recognize our first Vice Chair Menten.

NATALIE MENTEN: Alright. So, I apologize. I have a vet appointment that I do have to go to tonight that I couldn't put off. But, right now, the way this stands is it leaves us with a $2 million negative situation, as proposed. Am I right?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: No. As the pass working group proposal is proposed, it gets us almost within $1 million. I think it's actually $1 million over the fare revenue target that's set in the SBP and APE for 2019.

NATALIE MENTEN: OK. And then, when I look at the pass working group website, there was pretty good modeling done there. And I'm just wondering if that is pretty much the latest version, the one that was either February or March. Is that the latest set of modeling numbers that you've got?
HEATHER MCKILLOP: That is the latest modeling we've done on the pass working group proposal. We'll be doing additional modeling on the other ones that we talked about tonight, for the May meeting and beyond.

NATALIE MENTEN: Alright. Thank you. That is all that I have.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director. All right. We'll go back around. I'm going to ask, please, can we do a one-minute rule? Director Archuleta, you're recognized.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: Thank you. [LAUGH] Since we're opening up the southeast rail, the north line-- and the northeast-- what is it? --northwest rail and the G Line, wouldn't that create enough revenue for where-- you know, I'm thinking we're going to price ourselves out of the market. I mean, if you're boosting the price up that high, a lot of people just say-- you know, because we're going to-- once we get those other trains going, it's going to bring the revenue in. Or maybe I'm wrong.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So this is Heather. Let me answer that real quick. So the fare revenue projections that we have in the SBP/APE for 2019 that we gave the pass working group to balance to included additional ridership projections and revenue projections related to both the southeast corridor opening, the G Line, and the N Line, all by end of 2019.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: But are we going to price ourself out of the market, when we're raising these rates? I mean, that's what I'm--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So our current model that we model does not say we're going to do that. But, again, it's a model.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: Yeah--

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So-- [LAUGH] we can only rely on the best information that we have at the time.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: Thanks.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Archuleta. Director Folska, you've got one minute.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. I'm going to say a few things. And, if I'm wrong, would you just cut me off and tell me I'm wrong, please?

[LAUGHTER]

And this might be wrong. I think that to take a train from Heathrow to London is approximately 20 pounds each way. Is that about right?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: I have no clue. I've never been to London.
HEATHER MCKILLOP: But we can check it out. Somebody's going to google it, real quick, for you.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Oh, well, maybe that's, like, $22 each way, you know, 11 pounds. Anyway. So, you know, it's not cheap. Anyway, so it's expensive.

Every single public transportation system on the planet is subsidized by somebody-- the government. And, in this case, in the United States-- and, as we see with our full funding grant agreements-- everything we do is subsidized by the federal taxpayer, the state taxpayer, and our local taxpayers. And we also know that there is going to be an ask to go to the vote to increase the sales tax again, to support the subsidies of these fares.

As far as a third party for testing eligibility, we have been doing that. And I don't know if it costs us anything to have Easter Seals certify the eligibility of our disabled riders, but it seems like a pretty efficient model. And do we pay them?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Yes, we do.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK. So that's one thing. So I'm wondering why we think it's acceptable for the poorest people in our system, who are transit-dependent either permanent or economically, to subsidize corporations, when we have so many corporations with so much money who would benefit-- you know, even if they paid full fare for every single employee, it's cheap. It is the cheapest transportation. It's the state of the art. And I'm not willing to subsidize corporate America on the backs of our transit-dependent riders.

And, finally, since we are going to be cutting service, I don't think it's reasonable to increase fares. That's all I have to say.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you, Director Folska. Director Williams, can you do it in a minute?

KATE WILLIAMS: [SINGING THE "JEOPARDY" THEME] OK. I would like the Board to think about, when they're doing their homework on this, I think you should look at who was on the pass program working group. There was a representative of Denver Public Schools on the group, and the school choice program is impacted by, and impacts, the relationship between Denver Public Schools, RTD, and the student riders. So I would just like everybody, as we progress, to be aware of that. Thank you, less than one minute, goodbye.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you, and well done. Chair Hoy, you're recognized.

LARRY HOY: I'll be in London in July, and I'll get back to you on those fares.

[LAUGHTER]
This is Larry's First Theorem of Price Increases. You will never lose enough business to not gain money, when you do a price increase. I didn't say that right, but you understand what I'm saying?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: Yes.

LARRY HOY: It's just that, when we're dealing with this many people, and some elasticity, and not a big increase-- 3% a year is not a big increase-- you'll always make more money, after the fare increase. And something that we heard a little bit about earlier that I've talked about since I've been on this Board, and I was told by a retiring leadership guy that, no, it just doesn't work, we tried that, it may today because we have electronic fare media, a graduated fare, all day long, depending on peak, nonpeak, just like we do on the toll roads.

I think there's a big advantage for that. And, for people that are low-income that may not have a job, they may be able to use that system to drive, or ride, while the fare is at a lower rate. That's it, thank you!

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Chair Hoy. Director Lubow.

JUDY LUBOW: OK, quick, thank you. Can you summarize what RTD would be subsidizing, on an annual basis, this fare discount? Can you say it's $4 million a year--?

HEATHER MCKILLOP: So, do you mean just specifically for a certain program, like the youth or the low-income, or--

JUDY LUBOW: The whole magilla that we're proposing.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: That's difficult. Based on the modeling, we were able to show-- we use dollar arrows and dollar signs, versus that, to be able to show that our previous estimates for the low-income were in the $7-to-$11 million range that we've been working with for the last few years. But I think you have to keep in mind that, when the pass working group did it, they did it as an entire package on purpose.

Because-- and one of the things that they specifically put in their recommendations is they didn't want some proposals implemented without others. And let me just give you an example of what I think they meant, based on some conversations I've had, is that they don't want us to right-size or price according to utilization the Eco, NECO, and CollegePass and eliminate those discounts, if those discounts in theory weren't being passed on to the low-income program. So we were taking all the upside but not implementing any of the, quote-unquote, "downside."

And I say that from a revenue perspective, not necessarily how you feel about the programs but just a revenue perspective. And I believe that's what the intention was, is that they would like to see it done as a package, just so that the-- you're cross-subsidizing within the package itself, kind of like what we do with EcoPass. So, at least-- I don't know if you feel any differently, but I think that is really--

Because you can see how that could happen. You would implement one thing without another.
JUDY LUBOW: But I'm trying to get a handle on what it costs us annually. And I don't know-- go ahead.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: We can provide that detail to you.

HEATHER MCKILLOP: We'd have to look at that in more detail.

MICHAEL WASHINGTON: --from the last modeling.

JUDY LUBOW: Thank you very much.

DOUG TISDALE: All right. I do not see any other Directors in the queue, at this point. I want to thank you all very much. We've had a very thorough, complete discussion that is only the next step in this process. It is a process. It will continue on, with more information being provided by staff, and then further consideration by the Board. And that has already been discussed and is part of the presentation that we gave to you earlier, through Heather and Michael.

The Chair will now call for a five-minute recess in our proceedings before addressing with the next agenda item. That is, five minutes.

(Note to viewers: A brief portion of the meeting was inadvertently not recorded.) --2019. That's next year. This has been formulated by our general manager, based upon the Board and the senior leadership team retreat conducted on Saturday, March 3, 2018, looking to the needs and strategic priorities of RTD for calendar year 2019. It is my privilege now to recognize our general manager and chief executive officer, Mr. David Genova. David.

DAVE GENOVA: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Board. We will try to work through the tactical plan presentation quickly. You have hard copies in front of you, I believe, or to be passed out. Do we have, um--

WOMAN: Well, we have the retreats, I don't know--

DAVE GENOVA: Well, if not, we will have--

DOUG TISDALE: For the sake of the record, I will note we do not have hard copies of your presentation. We know that soft copies, electronic copies, have been emailed to the Board and are available. We may have hard copies that will soon be available.

But, in the meanwhile, please proceed, knowing that we do have electronic copies that we can look at. And I know that it's up on the screen, at this point. And I believe that we might, in short order, have hard copies for the Directors.

DAVE GENOVA: Thank you very much. So, as we do every year, we're presenting the tactical plan that's based on the strategic priorities that have come out of the Board retreat. This will be-- so I'll walk through just a very brief presentation, tonight. We have a PowerPoint that's just a
very brief outline. And then there's a lot of narrative in the overall package that you've had emailed to you and that you'll have shortly in a hard copy that has a lot more information.

I will just go through the highlights, tonight, and then allow you some time to sit with the narrative and then be able to provide any questions or comments or input to me, after this evening. You could just email me directly, if you have any comments about any of the strategic priorities, as then I work towards developing the task goals for 2019 that will come out of these priorities.

So I have the entire senior leadership team joining me here tonight. And, after I do the presentation, all of us will be available for any particular questions. So we have Heather McKillop, our CFO (Chief Financial Officer), Henry Stopplecamp, Bill Van Meter, Scott Reed, Dave Jensen, Bruce Abel, Mike Meader, and Rolf Asphaug. And I think we're looking for Michael Ford, but he will be here. I saw him earlier.

All right, the very first-- and these are in no particular order. They're, in fact, just done in the order that they show up in the outline, from the report that came out of the Board senior leadership retreat. So the first one we will start with is enhancing safety and security.

And so we have a number of items, here. Mike Meader and his team have come up with a very robust plan. And also there were some other contributors to this work.

The Board knows that safety and security are our core values, and protecting our employees and our patrons is our number one greatest responsibility. So, the Board's also aware that there's new safety rules from FDA that we are working through, not only this year but we'll be working into implementation of those next year and beyond. And a lot of that deals with the state safety oversight certification that I had mentioned to the Board last week, that Colorado is now one of eight states that achieved that certification a year ahead of time.

So a lot of what we'll be doing will support that, but a lot of it will just be supporting good safety management. Beginning with talking about safety management systems, you've heard Mike Meader talk about SMS, as we'll be referring to that. Over time, we've had a little bit of training with you. There's four pillars within SMS, which I'll remind the Board. And those four pillars are safety policy, safety risk management, safety assurance, and safety promotion.

The very first item, as you see these bullets outlined on the slides tonight, each bullet, as we go through the presentation tonight, for formatting purposes, each bullet has a subsequent narrative attached in the tactical plans. And so the first one is implementation of automated accident hazard and OJI (on-the-job injury) data collection. A lot of this work that we do now is done manually. And so we really want to be able to be more efficient with how employees can, number one, actually report information to us and then, once it gets to us, then how we deal with it, how we can go about our assessment, follow-up, trending, and reporting. And so we'll be working on implementation of an automated program for 2019.

The next topic I'll talk about is the promotion of enhanced safety capabilities. Again, SMS requires a strong employee interaction and participation. And so we will be working with various
groups, to promote new safety programs, educate employees on processes. We're wanting to enhance our safety communication boards in all the RTD facilities, do a quarterly-semiannual safety roadshow, and then also make sure that we're meeting adequately with the union executive board, quarterly, to discuss safety programs and what's happening.

Next item, initiate a safety audit process of bus operations. And I'll give you a little bit of an explanation around this. It's not that we don't do this already. We look a lot at the different things that are being done in bus operations, from a safety perspective. But in the light rail, for example, we have an internal safety audit process that we do jointly with the Colorado Public Utilities Commission. And that has been required by the FTA (Federal Transit Authority) state safety oversight laws.

It's required on light rail. It's not required on bus. We've been doing this since the late 1990s, on the rail side. We want to implement a similar program that we have on the rail side that mimics what we're doing on rail on the bus side. So that's something that we've been-- and I personally have been wanting to do, being formerly in the safety-officer seat. So I'm glad to see that we are prioritizing that for 2019.

Next item is commencing a program for safety champions in every department. And these will be supervisors and managers and other people that can really have a deeper understanding of some of the things we're doing in safety and act as ambassadors throughout all the RTD divisions. We'll be enhancing safety training for employees, doing a better job of a centralized tracking program for that, developing a Safety 101 course for supervisors and managers.

And then the next item, under Safety, and then we'll move into some security items, is expanding our safety-certification process throughout all of our projects. So this is something you've probably heard me talk a lot about, when we open a new major capital project or corridor, that we've gone through the safety and security certification process. It's a very robust process that starts with design criteria, goes through making sure that we're designing certain elements into the design, we verify that, we build it that way, and then we verify that it was built according to those requirements. So, again, on the light-rail side, this is required by our state safety oversight requirements.

And we do this, to a good degree, on some of our other larger projects that aren't necessarily light rail. Denver Union Station is a perfect example. But we want to expand this out, across the entire district, even to smaller projects. And the value in this is to make sure that we're identifying and addressing hazards as we're working on projects, before we construct them and build them, so that we're being proactive in that regard.

So, bunch of stuff on safety. And now I'd like to step into the second half of this strategic priority, and that is security. Let me begin by just talking about, that we have a very layered approach to security.

So some of the things you see very readily, on a regular basis. A lot of the things, you don't see, as far as the various security layers that we have through the district. Some of the things are physical in nature, and you see those, like the security officers that provide presence and patrols.
You know, at this building, at stations, on rail lines, on and off bus lines. And some of the things are systems, like video surveillance, emergency telephones, the security command center that a number of you saw the security command center that's at the commuter rail maintenance facility, when we were there last week.

But there's a lot of things, like plainclothes officers and other things, that really aren't visible. So we're really wanting to work on how we increase the perception of all the different things that we do for security, not just for employees but also for patrons. So the first area to talk about, under there, is under rail security enhancements.

And many of you know that we have transit security officers that ride light rail. And then they also-- I should say "patrol," instead of "ride." They patrol light rail, and then they also patrol the commuter rail. And you may recall that, on commuter rail, it's a little bit of a different model, because, because of our emergency-preparedness requirements under the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), we have to have a second crew member on every train. So you've got to have your engineer or your operator, and you've got to have somebody else that understands all of the emergency-response procedures.

We took advantage of the fact that we already have about a 75% coverage of security on the trains, to just increase that presence a little bit. And then that second person has become our security officer for commuter rail. It's been a really great model, as far as not just addressing the FRA regulatory requirement but having the enhanced security physical presence on the train, having them act as ambassadors. I get compliments, almost weekly, on what a great job those security officers do.

They also do fare inspection. And you'll notice that, on commuter rail, we do a lot more fare inspection, nearly 100% fare inspection, because we have that officer on every train. And, again, on light rail it's about a 75% ratio.

These officers also are doing other patrols around Union Station and some other areas. Obviously we can't have officers everywhere. So some of the things we want to do, here, is have better ways to gather data and use more with that data, so that we can send our resources in kind of a task force approach, in other ways, to utilize our resources as best we can. So, hopefully using data to be able to do that well.

Next item is under Education and Training. Oh, you can-- yeah. Not yet. Thank you. [LAUGH]

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah. So, under Security Education Training and Marketing Programs. And this, really what we want to do is, as I described earlier, there's a lot of need out there for a security perception. And so we need to do a better job of education and training and marketing about what we actually are doing today, so that people can feel comfortable with those kinds of things.

So we're working on those things, to include those types of programs, a security road show for employees, and then making sure that we're using as many of our metrics as we possible, in our
security dashboards. And using that information around the system, not just for employees but also patrons.

Another area we want to enhance is our emergency-management programs. We do have good emergency-management procedures and programs. We have a continuity-of-operations plan. There is always room for improvement, in these areas, so we're going to be working towards enhancing these things.

One area that we don't have specific coverage on is, we don't have one person that's, like, the dedicated emergency manager. This function is really kind of spread out over a number of people that work in the security and law-enforcement groups. So we're going to be taking a look at whether that would be a resource that would help us on the emergency-management side.

We're going to be developing specific incident action plans, or IAPs, for all kinds of different scenarios that we can actually-- you know, those kinds of scenarios that we can anticipate. And so that we would have very detailed response plans for each one of those. We have some forms of those now, but we want to expand those and do more with them. We want to do more with tabletop exercises, training programs, a mass-notification protocol for specific employee groups, under our ReadyOp Program, and of course continue to pursue FTA and TSA (Transportation Security Administration) grant funding for other types of activities.

Let's talk about increased security measures for bus operations. So, in our visits around the divisions, I know that myself, Michael Ford, and Bruce Abel, as we're talking to bus operators, one of the things that they talk about is that they'd like to see more physical security presence out in the field and out on buses. And obviously we can't have security officers everywhere, all the time, on every bus. But there are things that we can do to help the visibility there, not only for employees but also for our patrons.

The other thing I'll mention is that we know that we are under increasing incidents, over the last three years. And this isn't just happening here locally. It's kind of a national trend. It's a global trend.

But I'll tell you, this morning, I got up this morning, checked my email, there were two security-related incidents that were reported, through our security command center, that occurred last night. So it's really almost a daily basis, where-- not necessarily where something happens, but there's something security-related that's getting reported that is of concern. So we can't afford not to address these things and not let them continue to grow.

So I talked about the security road show that we'll be doing. We'll be reinforcing our de-escalation culture, amongst our operators. We will be adding transit security patrols to bus routes that are near our rail patrol routes, so we can kind of use those resources as best we can.

We're going to take some of our plainclothes officers and turn them into-- have them in a uniformed presence, so that people actually see them. One of the conversations that we were having at East Metro, for example, was that the operators aren't seeing a police presence on the
buses. And we know that we have plainclothes officers out there. So we want to make that more visible, for our operators. And then also patrons.

We're going to organize an operator assault coalition that will work with our union representatives, to just make sure we're really representing the employees well, when they are a victim of an assault and a case goes to court, so that we are present and supporting the employees in those kinds of things. And, on that issue, too, I've already started conversations with CASTA--that's the state, Colorado Association of State Transit Agencies-- about an interest of possibly looking at legislation to try to increase the severity of the penalty, you know, if a bus operator or other transit worker is assaulted.

And some of the things we have now that may seem kind of minor are very challenging for enforcement. But I think this is an area where we've seen other countries, for example, like Canada has been successful in doing more of a national kind of a thing, where infractions against transit workers are very serious offenses. So, this is a conversation that I've opened up with CASTA, to look at, as well.

One other item I'll mention here, and this is very interesting. For those of you that were at the commuter-rail maintenance facility, you know that we can do a live look on a commuter-rail train at the security center. So the commuter rail's the only mode that we can do that on. We cannot currently do that on buses, and we can't do it on light rail.

But we have the capability to get there, with our bus systems, the video systems that we have on buses today. So we'll be looking into that evaluation, of being able to do a live look, a live video look-in, and then being able to actually talk to the bus-- you know, this is outside of our normal radio system and other protocols that we have. But this is where the security center can actually do a live look-in, make announcements on that bus, if the operator has an issue. So, just another area that we're looking into. For us to be able to do that on rail, it's more challenging because the video equipment that we have on the rail, on the light-rail vehicles, needs to be upgraded before we're able to do that.

Data analysis. I think I've already mentioned a little bit more about just being able to use data analysis to do better resource allocation of where we're putting our security measures. So now we'll get into addressing the next strategic priority-- addressing service and human capital balance. And so I want to start this with this diagram.

So, this diagram, what it shows is it shows wages-- well, it's titled "Expansion, Economy, and Wages." And it may seem familiar to some of you, because I used a similar slide in the state-of-the-district at the end of last year, when we were talking about mandating and how we got in the situation that we're in with labor. So what this slide shows is it shows starting wages from 2003 through August of 2017 and what the Denver average is.

The reason I show wages on this slide is that you can see that, over 15 years of wages, there were 10 years where wages were flat or were not increased. And that's for a variety of reasons. One, a couple are really related to the economy. You can see where I placed a bar in there, from 2007 to
2009, where we had the really major recession that impacted all of us, nationally, but us pretty well here as an organization.

And then, at the same time, I've included some arrows where we've done major system expansions. So we have the southeast rail extension in 2006, the W Line in 2013, Denver Union Station in '14, the Flatiron Flyer, University of Colorado A Line, the B Line in 2015, and then the R Line in 2017. So, while we've gone through a period of flat wages, very tough economic times, we've also gone through a great period of expansion.

And if I was to take the graph even a little bit sooner and go to 2000 and 2001, we'd have two more light-rail openings and one more recession. So I use this, and I give this background, to say that the place that we find ourselves with human capital, we got there over a long period of time. And so, a lot of this particular strategic priority goes towards helping us get back into balance with the service we operate and the capital that we have available.

So everyone is aware that we do have a pretty serious shortage of bus and rail operators. And that was driving a lot of the mandating that we're doing now. And that was the major theme, really, if you will, behind the negotiations that we just concluded with the ATU (Amalgamated Transit Union), back in February. So, continuing into next year, we'll be, of course, implementing all of the CBA requirements. We're going to continue to look for improvements for those quality-of-life issues that we can hopefully make for our employees. So, outside of wages, what are the kinds of things that we can do for them to make their work more desirable and not as challenging for them?

In the area of recruitment, we've done a lot over the last two years. We intend to keep those things in place and do more in terms of focusing our recruitments in areas where we think we have good work pools to be available. We realize that the four main things that you have to have, to become an operator, is you have to have a driver's license, you have to have a good record, you have to be able to pass a background check, pass a drug screen, and you have to be able to communicate, read, and write in English. Those are the four basic things.

And so what we're going to be working towards is, you know, how do we work with other organizations that are looking to place people in employment and good jobs, good jobs that we have? How do we look towards working with these organizations to break down those barriers, so that people can qualify for our jobs? Because recall that, once they're on Board, we provide the training. We provide the CDL (Commercial Driver's License) and all of that.

So we'll be doing some focus-based recruitment. We'll continue to use the WInv (Workplace Initiative Now) program for screening and recruitment. We'll be implementing technology into the application and hiring process, as well.

Regarding retention, one of the major things we want to do, here, is to try to provide additional resources to employees, to provide assistance to them, as far as, like, technology, day care, errands, banking. You know, how do we take a nontraditional job of someone that's working split shifts, and how do we help give them tools and coaching that they need to try to take care of life's business and necessities around working that kind of a split-shift schedule? We'll also be
working towards exploring mentoring or buddy programs and really fostering and developing a coach-first culture, where employees feel safe, where, if they have issues, if they need some additional learning or training, they can come to us in an area of safety where they can receive coaching and not be fearful.

Service. The Board knows that we go through our service changes three times a year. And there's a lot of information, in the packet, under this priority and the process of what we do and how we do the service adjustments. And then there's also information about our service standards, as well. And I won't get into a lot of detail on the standards, but I think central to this issue is being able to evaluate our standards, in terms of policy, and then being able to balance out our service standards with providing the best service that we can across the district.

Let's see if there's any other highlights in here. I think we can go to the next one. And Heather's already ahead of me. Thank you. Fiscal Sustainability. Good! No, that's perfect. You're right in the right place.

Well, let me mention, before we get into fiscal sustainability, that a number of these strategic priorities are not really just kind of one-year efforts. Right? I mean, they are things that we pay attention to every year, and we need to, to be successful. And, in fact, fiscal sustainability has been a strategic priority for the district for a number of years, through this process.

So being fiscally sustainable means that we sustain our organization on our spending, our tax and other policies, without threatening our government solvency or defaulting on our liabilities. And so we've categorized our fiscal sustainability into several categories-- excuse me-- revenues, reserves, liabilities, promised expenditures, and policies. And I'll go through each one a little bit.

So the Board knows that we have multiple funding sources, but the sole biggest funding source is sales tax. And, while it's the largest, it's probably the one we have the least influence on. Right? Because it is a matter of what happens in the economy.

We've been utilizing the Leeds School of Business since 2011 to do our forecasting for us, as we build our budgets. And we just had a report from Leeds School of Business. And one of the things I want to mention is that the 2019 revenue forecast, they're predicting about a 6.6% in 2019.

Some of the questions I get, as we're out and about the district with our stakeholders, is, well, you know, the economy is still growing, so what are RTD's plans? Are you going to expand? Are you going to stay the same? Are you going to reduce services? What are you going to do? And basically my response is that, yes, the economy's still growing, sales taxes are still growing, but they're growing at more of kind of a sustainability rate, as opposed to an expansion rate.

We'll continue to track and report sales-tax revenues, as we do every month. That will certainly be part of our 2019 program, as well. The second-largest funding source we have are federal grants. And these federal grants come in a variety of sources.
We get formula grants, 5307 Urbanized Area Formula grants, state of good repair grants, and bus-and-facility grants. That'll be an important part of our mix, as we continue through fiscal sustainability. New start grants, we currently have one active new start grant, and that's the Eagle Project. And, in fact, next year, 2019, is our last year where we'll receive a payment of about $63.3 million is the last payment--oh, it's right there in front of me. But I went to the lifeline, instead.

[LAUGHTER]

Which is helpful. It's helpful, yeah. So actually next year we'll close out--I mean, we'll have some items that we have to close out of that grant. But it will be the last payment that we get.

And we currently have no other projects that meet criteria for new-starts funding. And the Board may recall that, some time ago, we went through the exercise--Bill, when did we do that? Where we looked at all the unfunded corridors.

BILL VAN METER: 2016.

DAVE GENOVA: In 2016. We looked at all the unfunded corridors, ran them against all of the pertinent federal requirements, to try to determine which ones might be good candidates. And we really didn't have any that really lined up well with all of the federal requirements. So, while we don't have anything right now in the queue, that's an area where we'll continue to pursue, as we're able.

The next grant category is small-start grants. And we do have one right now, and that's the southeast rail extension project. And I'll just remind the Board that that was, the small start was, a one-payment. So we already received all of the money, under that grant, in one payment. And, of course, you know, that project is moving along well, and we'll be hopefully closing that one out soon.

We get a variety of other grants and possibly some Homeland Security grants. We'll continue to pursue those as vigorously as we possibly can. But our last major funding source we have is farebox revenue. We've talked a lot about that earlier this evening. But this is the funding source that we have the most ability to influence. So it is right and just that we pay so much attention to it, in terms of where we are going with our fares and the overall revenue picture for the district and how that might impact ridership. And the Board heard, earlier, that the midterm financial plan, which is what we used to call the SBP, for 2018 through 2013 does incorporate, or assumes, two planned fare increases in 2019 and 2022.

Another item I want to talk about are reserves. We have fiscal policies, as the Board's aware, on our reserves. And we're going to continue to work on meeting those policy requirements for the reserve amounts that appear in those. We're a little bit behind on those, as we have been over time, but we will continue towards working towards those having three months of operating expenditures, both for the base and for FasTracks.
I'll just point out to you that there's a table, in this part of the strategic priority-- it's just kind of for informational purposes-- that lists the economic cycles that have been happening over time. Just reference that. You can look at that at your leisure.

Next category I want to talk about a bit is debt. And the Board knows that we utilize debt in a variety of ways. We do certificates of participation and other kinds of activities.

But the one thing I really want to point out, here, that's important is that we are currently less than our 1.2 times annual debt service ratio. So we're currently at about a 1.0 ratio. And, to bring that at our current, how we're doing things currently, to really bring that to a 1.2 times, would take us till about 2026.

We're concerned about that. We're going to be working on ways to improve that, in the 2019 process and forward, because that's something that the bond-rating firms look at. And, if we don't meet our Board-adopted policies in this area, then we can be downgraded on our lending instruments and then thus be paying more. So we're going to continue to look for ways to improve that.

I also talk about refunding. And we've taken a lot of advantage of refunding and refinancing, over the last couple of years. And so we'll continue to look for any opportunities we can, there.

And then I'll just point out to you that, on page 5 of this priority, we have outlined the debt, the major debt, of the district, which totals to about $3.9 billion. And you can see the different kinds of debt instruments we have, the percent rates, and the totals, and, I think, even kind of the maturity dates, in there. But, if you want more information on that, we'd be happy to do that. But we wanted to include that, so it was front and center with the Board.

We also have promised expenditures that we need to track and be mindful of. And then, particularly, one of the things that we talk about here, in the strategic priority, is the unfunded corridors are one of the things we keep in this category. The Board knows that we have four projects in the FasTracks program that we've yet to complete-- the southwest corridor, the central rail. I'm sorry, southwest corridor extension, the central rail extension, the remainder of North Metro, and then the remainder of the northwest rail from Westminster to Longmont.

The 2017 estimated cost to completing these projects is about $2.2 billion. I should say, that's the capital cost to complete these projects. It doesn't include any operating and maintenance funds. I'm going to talk about those, the unfunded corridors, a little bit more in another one of the strategic priorities, a little bit later. And then the last thing I mention under this priority is policies, which we will be looking at through 2019.

All right. This is a new area for a strategic priority, for the Board, that we haven't really at least identified with this particular name. And this is addressing future transportation needs and methods. And we've discussed a lot, I think, about how the industry is-- and not just the transit industry, but transportation in general. You know, we are in the midst, or right on the edge, of a transportation transformation.
So we need to work, as an agency, toward positioning ourselves that we'll be able to meet the changing needs in the transportation environment, whether it's technology, whether it's the way services are provided or who provides them. And so a lot of the things we're working on in this area speak to that. Some of the things that we'll mention under here is alternative service delivery approaches. The Board knows we've been operating call-and-ride services for a long time, which is really a demand-- a demand on response. What am I trying to say?

AUDIENCE: Mobility on demand.

DAVE GENOVA: Mobility on demand. Thank you. Yes. And so, you know, it's interesting. We've been operating call-and-rides for how long, maybe, Bruce?


DAVE GENOVA: OK. And so, really, it is mobility on demand. It's just, the way we look at mobility on demand today is different than how we looked at it previously. So, really, the call-and-rides are a form of micro transit. We'd like to look at ways to make those more efficient, from a cost standpoint and then also just from a user standpoint, as far as the technology interface and how that goes.

We've talked about the request for information that we put out, on mobility on demand, transportation as a service, and technology providers. We will be advancing that. We're starting this dialogue with our stakeholders on a regional mobility strategy. We had our first workgroup meeting on that today. What we're hoping is to take that to a broader audience, throughout this year, and then start to implement some things on that, some alternative service delivery projects, in 2019, as a result of our work with that.

We'll be looking at other kinds of focus service improvements, including bus rapid transit, working with our local communities on ways that we can identify additional corridors. We will have construction, hopefully, of the Route 15L underway in 2019. And we'll be looking at some other things.

First and final mile access, we have the first and final mile strategic plan underway. And our goal is that the recommendations for that project will be finalized and ready for action starting in 2019. And then, I think, the biggest component of this entire priority is the system's optimization plan. And what we're proposing to do, here, is to take a look at the complete bus network. We would be looking at rail, as well, but I think there's a great opportunity to look at our entire bus network with a fresh perspective, a fresh start.

It's been built over a number of years. When we do our service adjustments, those are really minor changes that we do. We've done some major changes, as we've rolled out new rail corridors, but we haven't just taken a look at the entire system on a whole. If you could pick it up and put down the most efficient network that you possibly could and serve as many people as we could, what would that look like? So we want to take that on, beginning in 2019.
And then I have a section on unfunded corridors. You heard me mention the projects that we still have to complete under the FasTracks program. And I wanted to point out a couple of things, here.

I already mentioned the total cost to complete all of them, from a capital aspect, of $2.2 billion. But, when we went out with the FasTracks vote, we had an estimate of $4.7 billion. So we said give us $.004 of sales tax, and we'll build $4.7 billion worth of projects.

To date, RTD has expended and/or committed $5.6 billion, through 2020. So, while we've been successful in being able to build more in terms of dollars, we still have these four projects. We're still committed to them. We will continue to pursue all opportunities that we can, for capital funding and operations-and-maintenance funding, including reduction of the debt.

I think the Board knows, we've talked about our current debt now does not allow us to do any other significant additional borrowing or bonding. Even though, as I mentioned federal grants earlier, we will continue to pursue any and all federal grants, including TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery). We'll continue to pursue private-sector involvement. We've had a number of conversations with some private-sector firms, several on the northwest rail, and most recently we've been talking to one on the central rail extension.

We'll also be looking at ways to make the projects more achievable through scope review. So, for example, what we're doing on the northwest project right now, with the stakeholders, on working on a peak type of a service delivery. Another project that I want to take a closer look at is the central rail extension. In terms of, it's just .8 of a mile, are there ways to decrease the capital cost of that project by reviewing our design criteria and really trying to do some other forms of risk mitigation and risk management, at the same time working with the city to see if they can maybe compromise on some of their requirements, and see if we can drive down the cost of that capital project. So those are other kinds of things we'll be looking at, as well.

And then technology. We launched a variety of things, in the last couple of years. We will continue to look at making improvements in those areas. The Mobility Choice blueprint is scheduled to be completed the end of this year, Bill? Yes? And so we're looking to see what comes out of that blueprint, for opportunities, blueprint opportunities, that will be available to us in 2019.

And then the last topic I'll cover is electrification of the bus fleet. We already have 36 mall shuttles that are all electric. And we're looking at opportunities on how we can do more subfleets and electrification. We have an opportunity, with the VW settlement, to do that.

But we're also spending time looking at not only how do we get electric bus fleets in but how do we get the infrastructure at our facilities? Are there P3 opportunities to do this? These are things that we will be actively looking at.

OK, rolling right along, we are at the final strategic priority. So, not least, but the final one we'll talk about tonight is asset management and state of good repair. And this has also been one that
has been recurring, the last couple of years, and also needs to be ongoing very tightly linked to fiscal sustainability. And then also our safety program.

The Board knows we have a very robust asset management and state of good repair program. It's a great tool for us, because we are using it for risk management, as we look at the renewal of assets and the repair of assets, in terms of how long can we keep rolling stock-- can we extend useful life through optimizing maintenance? But, when we do that, we're very confident that we're able to do that, because, every year, every major asset, including every piece of rolling stock, gets a condition assessment.

So we have a very good handle on the conditions of all of our assets, on a year-to-year basis. We can drill way down into even subsystems on the asset. So this program has been really great for us, as we are dealing with having to do projects-- try to address project needs that we have, much greater project needs than we have the resources to accomplish.

So, continuing path will be to continue towards ISO 55000 certification. I talked about extending useful lifes of fleet. I talk about some details, in here, about our strategic asset management plan and then also our asset management plan that will be deliverables in 2019, along with some other types of documents, here. Mike Meader could answer specific questions about those things if you-- if you said, what's the difference between a samp and an amp?

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

DAVE GENOVA: An S?

[LAUGHTER]

And then a couple of other topics, under here, maintaining infrastructure and rolling stock. Of course, very important to us. Will be a very huge focus for us, in '19 and beyond.

And then expansion-- managing and expansion of facilities. So, you know, the Board's aware of the variety of facilities we have. Most of the bus facilities are in the the 27- to 40-year-old range. They are at capacity, in terms of the number of buses that we have in the system.

So we need to be cognizant of this, in planning in the future, in our midterm financial plan, for additional facilities. But then also, as we shift to not only keeping these facilities in good repair so we can maintain our existing fleets, but also, what are the opportunities either to bring in electrification infrastructure to existing facilities, or do we need to go to new facilities?

So I know that I went through that pretty quickly. I just wanted to be cognizant of the time this evening. There's a lot of information in the narratives for you to look at, at your leisure. And we're happy to take any questions, comments, or input tonight. But also keep in mind that you can continue to email me your thoughts and ideas.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Mr. General Manager. We have obviously enjoyed the opportunity to have you present, orally, what you've also given to us in writing, which we can
then take the time to look at and study. And so, of course, this is not the Directors’ only chance to ask questions of the general manager concerning these items. Having said that, let's go to the queue and have several questions asked, now. Director Folska, you are recognized.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. General Manager, that was really an excellent overview. And I'm sure more questions will come up, as we sort of go through the details of your presentation.

When you're thinking-- the section about making, looking at the system brand-new, as a whole, with a fresh view, sort of taking it out and then throwing it back down in the most efficient way, my question is, are you considering the growth over the next 15, 20, 30 years, as you do that, to support the changing demographic?

DAVE GENOVA: Yes, we will. And I'm glad you asked the question, because I left a piece of this out that's important. So we will take in the mid- and the long-term planning in that, as far as growth and what the needs are going to be looking at. But one thing I neglected to mention, if I can have a moment [LAUGH] of privilege, here, Mr. Chair, is that this will be a very stakeholder-driven kind of a process, as well.

So, similar to what we did with the pass program working group, in engaging our stakeholders throughout the region in this conversation and in the process, to help us kind of develop what it looks like, as opposed to us developing it and then going out for comment. So I just wanted to make sure I got that in there, because it's an important part of the plan.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK. And then a couple other things. This is really going to sound ridiculous. But I just had this idea. I had this game, as a kid. It was, like, an art thing. You might remember it, some of you know. You put these little circles on some paper, stick them in with pins, and then you have pens, different colors, and you go around. Do you know I'm talking about?

AUDIENCE: Spirograph.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Oh, yeah! You guys loved it, right? So, I'm thinking, you know, like, maybe our bus system isn't going straight out, like spokes on a bike or something, but that there's wheels of different sizes, you know, or circles, where they're circulating. And then one comes in and then hooks onto here, and it goes like that. Did you get that?

DAVE GENOVA: We got it. Everything's on the table.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Yeah, I don't know. I mean, it could be completely ridiculous. But anyway, regarding the 2004 promise to the taxpayers, of needing, you know, a certain amount of tax revenue to do this $4-billion FasTracks, that's an estimate. It was over 14 years ago. Things change, prices escalate, expand.
You've already got more than $5 billion in the ground, which is more than what you thought that the original estimate would be. Now we only need $2 billion to finish FasTracks, right?

DAVE GENOVA: Yes, $2.2 in capital.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: $2.2 billion. So, yeah, I think we're in good shape.

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Folska, we appreciate that optimistic assessment. Director Archuleta, you are recognized.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: Thank you, Chair. Dave, how many security people are employed by RTD? How many— what's the total on that?

DAVE GENOVA: Mike, you want to take that?

[LAUGHTER]

MIKE MEADER: This is high technology. This is Mike Meader. We've got approximately 280, 285 people on the security side, the contracted security. We've got seven transit police officers that are part of RTD. And then we use contracted police officers, from Denver, Aurora, and Lakewood, as well.

And we have a dog, a canine, too. That's right.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: [LAUGH] That's probably the best one. No, because I rode the light rail, one time, and I didn't get checked or nothing. It was— are we checking the light rail at all? Or--

MIKE MEADER: We do. We don't have the people, like General Manager Genova mentioned, on the commuter-rail side, we have 100% coverage.

ERNEST ARCHULETA: Yeah, I know that was pretty well covered, but the light rail is--

MIKE MEADER: The light rail, we don't have the resources to have a person on every train. Now, that's something that we're looking at, that could do those things. So we do target the fare inspection. We have a fare-inspection task force that goes around, from line to line, at different times of the day. And then we're using some of the data that we collect, from a crime perspective, to kind of assign resources where we see those times of days, where we see some spikes in activity, or we're just trying to address some of those kinds of things.

So you won't always see a person on every single light-rail train. But we're covering, we're typically covering all of the lines throughout the week, each week, where we have people on there at certain times.
ERNEST ARCHULETA: All right, thank you.

DAVE GENOVA: It would be desirable to have one on every light-rail train. But I get into conversations with our financial people on that.

[LAUGH]

DOUG TISDALE: It's a worthy goal, so we thank you for continuing to examine it. Thank you, Director Archuleta. Director Williams, you are recognized.

KATE WILLIAMS: I feel like this was a setup. So I had this the little idea, kind of like Claudia's, with the-- on the-- at DIA, they have volunteers, and Amtrak has volunteers, who ride the train. And, as our population is aging, perhaps we could look at recruiting a volunteer force that would have a little, you know, an RTD shirt and be a presence on the train. And they would get to ride the train for free. So it's just a thought I'm throwing out there that might fill a number of things.

Yeah, as soon as-- no, Bruce is going to sign up for that, as soon as he retires.

[LAUGHTER]

DAVE GENOVA: I have the shirt for him.

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: Because it seems Walmart is already adequately staffed, so--

[LAUGHTER]

BRUCE ABEL: I will need to give two weeks' notice at Walmart.

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Williams. Chair Hoy, you are recognized.

LARRY HOY: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. So, I was thinking about these unfunded corridors and wondering how often-- or maybe, when was the last time-- we did a ridership projection, and what's involved in that? I'm not-- I mean, we don't have the money today, so I don't want to belabor that. But what's involved? Is that--

I mean, DRCOG gets involved. I think they've always been wrong, either high or low. I'm sorry, DRCOG, if you're listening. But they have been! I mean, that's just a fact. So tell us about that.

BILL VAN METER: So this is Bill Van Meter, AGM of Planning. The last time we've specifically carefully looked at the forecasts for the four unfunded corridors was as part of the 2016 assessment. We run the ridership forecasting model regularly, for different purposes.
And, you are right, that forecasting model is maintained by the Denver Regional Council of Governments. RTD takes the lead on enhancing and maintaining the transit forecast. But the last time we did specific looks at those corridors was in support of the effort General Manager Genova referenced earlier, to assess eligibility for federal funding.

LARRY HOY: And it would help us, in our planning efforts, to decide where to spend our money. I mean, if, you know, we've got to get the biggest bang for the buck.

BILL VAN METER: So it's Bill Van Meter, again. One of the things that we can do-- because, when we run the model, we get forecasts for all the corridors. We just haven't carefully looked at those corridors, in recent model runs. Which are focused primarily, frankly, on State Highway 119 bus rapid transit, in support of the National Environmental Policy Act and preliminary engineering study, there.

But we can look back through and see if we see any noticeable differences on those lines.

LARRY HOY: And may I ask one more question?

DOUG TISDALE: Yes.

LARRY HOY: Thank you. So, this is regarding routing. I think it was Houston that tore up their whole route system and redesigned it and redeployed it. I think I've heard rumors that we may have that same thought process going on. Do we plan to do that and, if so, when and how?

BRUCE ABEL: I think that is what General Manager Genova was referring to as the "system optimization and the COA study." And I think that you just really hit the nail on the head, in terms of the policy deliberation, where you talked about getting the best bang for the buck. Because one of the real questions that faces any organization such as ours is the balance between maximizing ridership and providing some service to everybody. Which is especially important in a district such as ours, where we cover some, I'm going to say, 2,400 square miles, as opposed to...

[LAUGHTER]

MAN: Give or take.

BRUCE ABEL: --getting down to the gnat's posterior. So that really is going to become part of the crux of the question that we talk about, in T2, you know, the transportation transformation, is taking a clean look at everything, like Houston. How do we shake it up?

But the real critical issue is, what's our real policy objective? Maximize ridership. Max it to the max, versus provide something to everybody. Or, what's the balance that we want to strike between those two extremes on the pendulum.

LARRY HOY: I probably won't be on the Board when that discussion comes up. That's all I have. Thank you.
DOUG TISDALE: Thank you, Chair Hoy. We appreciate that. Chair Anderson, just a heads-up. I'm going to recognize Director Broom and then Director Walker. And then, Chair Anderson, if you have a question or comment, we will come to you. Director Broom, you are recognized.

BOB BROOM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Putting on my old DRCOG Board hat, as imperfect as that might be--

[LAUGHTER]

--you can't help but notice there's a lot of growth going on on the Front Range. And we all know that's going to continue. The boundaries of RTD has stayed fairly static. I mean, I know that there's a few annexations that go on, from time to time, but there's still a lot of areas that are in DRCOG's urban growth area that aren't in the district.

And I think we need to review that, because it really doesn't make any sense to wait until those areas have all built out and you've lost all the use tax on building construction materials, to bring them into the district. And so maybe what it takes is one vote to take this box and make this box out of it, in one fell swoop, rather than just taking 50 acres at a time. And that might help the long-range financial picture. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Broom. Director Walker, you are recognized.

JEFF WALKER: Thanks. You guys certainly aren't planning on sitting on your hands, for 2019. The- let's see, which one is it? The safety and security one. When I get the bus home or to work, sometimes I'll chat with the bus drivers for a little bit. And this reflects a lot of what I hear from the bus drivers about their number one concerns about the job.

Like I said before, they love the job. It's just, they have some concerns like everybody would. And that's one of the big ones. And it looks like you're addressing a lot of their concerns, in here.

One concern, caution, I'm sure you guys have thought of it, sure you all have thought of it-- and this is just to let you know that I've thought of it, too-- the system optimization, following on the heels of what might be a fare-- what might be a fare increase, for some, maybe a reduction for others-- could look like a, eh, they gave us something but now they're taking more away. So I'm not sure-- I'm sure the Communications department has been well considered that and have a role in that. But that's something that we'll have to be very cautious about, to make sure that--

My understanding, my view of this, is that we're improving service for everybody, although some might have a specific reduction. But the overall population-- ridership, constituents, and even people who don't ride the bus or train-- will see an improvement in the overall system. So that's just one observation that I have about this.

But, otherwise, it looks like you're chock full of stuff to do, all of next year, and, I guess, getting into the latter part of this year's developing the plans for that in the budget. So, thanks. That's it.
DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Walker. Chair Anderson, are you on the line with us? And do you have a comment?

LORRAINE ANDERSON: Yes, I am. I certainly want to appreciate AGM Abel's answer to Director Hoy's question. And, also, I want to recognize Director Broom's observations about DRCOG. And it's been a while since I've been there-- don't know how long it's been since Director Broom has been there, but DRCOG is certainly not imperfect, but some of the things we did back then are probably outdated. And that's why transportation planning takes such a long time, that what you think one decade doesn't follow for the next.

I want to thank General Manager Genova for a great update on the strategic plan. I think it is covering all of the things that we need to be aware of for the future. And I appreciate specifically all of the security issues that you were talking about, because many of my constituents have experienced unpleasant situations as they use RTD and, oh, by the way, they are people who need to use RTD.

So I appreciate that. And I am looking forward to the updates, so we can talk about the G line. Thanks!

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: (LAUGHING) Thank you very much, Chair Anderson. That's right, and we are all looking forward to the Colorado Public Utilities Commission diligently and more promptly completing its work as assigned, and the completion of their written opinion, at last, granting our appeal and request.

Are there any other Directors who have questions or comments for General Manager Genova, at this time? Director Williams, can you do it in a minute?

KATE WILLIAMS: If I can push the button. I think, unless I mistake myself, this is the last time that we're going to see Assistant General Manager Abel sitting at that table. And so I thought maybe we should just want to be aware of that.

DAVE GENOVA: In his current role, yes. So he'll still be back, next month, when we acknowledge him for his retirement, as we do other employees. But he will be around on a bit of a part-time basis, for a bit.

KATE WILLIAMS: Oh, that doesn't break my heart.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Can he drive a bus?

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: And, for those who--

DAVE GENOVA: He didn't pass the test.
BRUCE ABEL: Only to provide comic relief to others.

DOUG TISDALE: And, regarding Mr. Abel, the record should reflect that, this Thursday morning, from 10:00 until noon, here in the building, there will be a reception to which all of the Directors are invited. Director Broom, you have a final comment?

BOB BROOM: Uh, yes. Yes. I was led to believe we were going to get an update on the marijuana revenue situation.

DOUG TISDALE: And we shall, in short order, under other matters. So, are there any questions relative to Mr. Genova and the 2019 tactical plan? Let me say, then, Mr. Genova-- and I'll recognize you in a second-- that it's been a terrific report. We do appreciate that. And Chair Anderson also has access to her emails, so that she will be able to see the written presentation that we received by hand this evening. So that information is there, and that will be made available on the website, as well. Mr. Genova, the last word is yours.

DAVE GENOVA: Thank you I just want to acknowledge and recognize the senior leadership team, because everybody contributed lots of work and energy into the tactical plan. So it takes all of us to do this. So-- to them, as well.

[APPLAUSE]

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much. We appreciate that. That concludes the general manager's 2019 tactical plan presentation. We turn now to other matters.

There are two other matters that we would like to bring to the Board's attention at this time. First I would like to bring to the Board's attention at this time a proposed bill, in the Colorado House of Representatives, specifically being House Bill number 18-1401. You were provided a copy, provided with a copy of that bill, last week, by Sherry Ellebracht, our government-relations officer, and then again early yesterday, by me.

This discussion is for the purpose of determining whether there is a consensus response to the following question-- specifically, does this Board support, or oppose, proposed legislation-- and specifically House Bill 18-1401-- that would have the effect of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) assisting in and providing oversight of the Regional Transportation District, in connection with the discharge of certain of RTD's operational issues and duties? To repeat-- our discussion is intended to lead the determination of whether there is a consensus on the part of the Board in response to the question presented.

This discussion neither requires, nor will it result in, any formal action by the Board, in the form of a motion or the conduct of business. And so now, as your college professor always said at the end of every exam question, "discuss." Director Peggy Catlin, I acknowledge you, as a former CDOT official, first.

PEGGY CATLIN: Thank you. I have some concerns with this bill. When CDOT's Division of Transit and Rail was first established, it was really established to help plan and administer grants
on behalf of all of the rest of the state of Colorado not covered by RTD. I have spoken with CDOT's legislative liaison, and they are not in the least bit interested in this bill and will be testifying against it.

I have some concerns about CDOT overseeing the role of RTD as a district agency enabled by state legislation. It just simply isn't in the purview of CDOT to do that. Furthermore, I can't imagine that it would be economical for them to oversee something that they don't know anything about, at this point. And $80,000 just simply wouldn't cut that, in their budget. And I think they have prepared a fiscal note saying so.

Secondly, I have a very hard time justifying to the taxpayers of other economically challenged areas, such as Conejos County, Otero County, Huerfano County, that their tax dollars would be used to subsidize low-income patrons of a transit provider from which they would see no benefit. I do applaud the efforts, in trying to seek additional funding for RTD to implement some of these low-fare strategies. But I think this bill is not the correct avenue. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Catlin, those words are of tremendous import and significance to this Board, by virtue of your history and prior experience. So we greatly appreciate that. Director Williams, you are recognized.

KATE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chair. As a CDOT grantee, myself, in my day job, I spend a lot of time over there. I think they're great people. I don't think they want us. I don't think we want them.

However, I would be willing to entertain any kind of partnership that would give us some funding. And CDOT happens, at this time, to have an excess of funds that they have received, and we should be aware of that. So perhaps we should say to them, how much? We'll talk. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Williams. Director Walker, you are recognized.

JEFF WALKER: Thanks. In a former life, I used to manage grants for CDOT at DTD. Although I'm very much in favor of the spirit in which this bill was introduced, I don't think that-- like Director Catlin said, I don't think it's the right avenue. Assistance is greatly appreciated. I think assistance is sought, in many instances, by this agency, these partnerships that we forge with private- and public-sector entities.

But the oversight gives me pause. There are better-- I think, from having worked here, and from having two neighbors who currently work for CDOT-- I think there are better ways for CDOT staff to utilize their time and state to use its money. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Walker. I'm also authorized to represent to you that Director Deadwyler has indicated her opposition to this. So, by way of a straw poll, drawing a consensus, we're looking for, yeah, a thumbs-up, thumbs-down.
Let's see, how many thumbs up? How many support? How many thumbs up? I see none.

How many thumbs down? I see all of the thumbs down. Thank you very much. That establishes a consensus. And we will be in a position to testify, tomorrow, relative to that consensus. And--ah, Director Folska, y-- oh, I'm sorry! Director Anderson.

LORRAINE ANDERSON: Can I say--

DOUG TISDALE: I'm sorry-- Chair Anderson, please, excuse me! Thank you.

LORRAINE ANDERSON: Well, as a former chair of DRCOG, as a former co-chair of the State Transportation Advisory Committee, I want you to know that they represent the whole state. And we are, if you look at the area of the whole state of Colorado, we are a very small area-- I will grant you, a huge, a huge part of that state. And I don't think that CDOT needs to manage our business. We are here to manage our business.

And, as we have always cooperated with CDOT, we should continue to do that. And I certainly agree with Director Catlin, who absolutely knows how CDOT works. So, thank you very much, Chair Tisdale, for letting me speak on this issue. But I am a no vote on this.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Chair Anderson, we appreciate that. And the thanks actually go to Director Folska, who reminded me that I did neglect to check in with you. So, again, that constitutes a unanimous negative consensus from the Board.

The second other matter for your attention this evening relates to Senate Bill 18-088, which was signed into law by the governor shortly after approval by the General Assembly earlier this year. Senate Bill 18-088 was a so-called marijuana tax fix. That law posed a question to the Boards of the special districts that were impacted by the admittedly inadvertent elimination of marijuana sales-tax revenues to special districts. To update us on very, very recent developments in this regard, some as recent as this morning, I now recognize our general counsel, Rolf Asphaug. Rolf.

ROLF ASPHAUG: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. As I've already reported to the Board by email, RTD and the Scientific and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD) have won our case before the Colorado Supreme Court, concerning the constitutionality of House Bill 13-1272. That bill brought RTD's and SCFD's tax exemptions in line with the state of Colorado's sales-tax exemptions. The Supreme Court held that, even though the bill resulted in a projected revenue gain of $2.7 million per year for RTD, at the time the bill was introduced, and $250,000 per year for SCFD, when you viewed those amounts as a percentage of revenue and budgets those amounts were so small as to be considered what's called de minimus, which is a fancy legal term for "minimal" or "marginal."

The court also noted that it was very clear that the intent of the bill hadn't been to create new taxes or tax policies but was instead to fix administrative problems-- namely, the confusion to vendors and the confusion to the state in having to juggle different sets of exemptions. So the court concluded that a bill like this one, that has only an incidental and minimal effect on tax revenue, doesn't trigger the need for a vote of the people, under the Taxpayer Bill of Rights, also
known as TABOR. In its opinion, the court also noted the undisputed fact that at least some of the tax changes at issue had already been approved by RTD voters in 1973, when they voted for a broadly worded and unqualified sales tax.

Finally, the unanimous decision also emphasizes that TABOR is to be, quote, "viewed through a lens of practicality and workability," unquote, and that, quote, "reasonableness temper TABOR's grip," unquote. So, with this court decision in hand, I now want to turn to this year's marijuana tax bill, as the Chair pointed out, Senate Bill 18-088, which was signed into law at the end of January, and some fast-approaching decision points that we need to make you aware of, so that you can decide what you'd like to do.

As you may recall, Senate Bill 88, like House Bill 1272, also fixed an administrative problem--in this case, a problem that arose from last year, when, in a lengthy and complex last-minute bill, the General Assembly inadvertently stripped some dozen or more special districts, including RTD and SCFD, of the marijuana sales taxes that they had already been allowed to receive, by vote of the people, approving the constitutional amendment to legalize and tax marijuana. Senate Bill 88 states that the districts will be allowed to resume collecting the marijuana tax, but their governing bodies first have to notify the Colorado Department of Revenue (DOR) that they believe they don't need a vote to do so.

Several of the smaller districts affected by the glitch have already passed resolutions and have notified DOR that they don't need a vote, based on their own facts, and are asking to have the marijuana tax revenues start flowing again. DOR has told us that, because SCFD and RTD share the same boundaries, they don't want to start collecting marijuana taxes for either RTD or SCFD until both of them decide whether a vote is needed. And, if one of them decides they do need a vote, then neither will get tax revenue until that vote takes place.

DOR has also told us that they will only make the tax-collection changes twice a year--July 1 and January 1--and that they need to know 45 days ahead of time whether the governing body has given the go-ahead. 45 days before July 1 is May 17. SCFD has told us--and this is just a very recent development--that they are planning to have their Board consider a resolution this Thursday, the day after tomorrow.

I don't want to prejudge their process or the outcome, let alone ours, but I think SCFD will decide that they don't need a vote. And that means that, if--if--our Board concludes that RTD also doesn't need a vote to resume collecting marijuana revenue, and if--if--our Board decides to pass a resolution to that effect before May 17, RTD could conceivably again receive the $6 million or so per year of marijuana revenues shortly after July 1, rather than waiting until next year at the earliest.

I've promised you a legal opinion for you to consider before reaching your decision as to whether a vote is needed. And, now that we have the court decision on our TABOR case, which contains some language that's very on point, I believe we can get that to you pretty quickly. That's the end of my report, Chair Tisdale.
DOUG TISDALE: So now there's another question to be presented to the Board, for a straw poll, specifically, Department of Revenue set the deadline of May 17 for action, if we were to consider the possibility of collecting taxes, commencing July 1. Department of Revenue has also said that, if one district decides there must be an election, they will not proceed with payment to any district, pending the outcome of such elections. So, looking at the calendar, the Board does not have a formal Board meeting until Tuesday, May 22, which is five days after the Department of Revenue deadline. If-- and this does not in any way, shape, or form prejudge the issue-- the Board wishes to consider this question-- not take action, but just consider the question-- prior to the Department of Revenue deadline, we would have to convene a special Board meeting before May 17.

Currently, there is no meeting scheduled for Tuesday, May 1. We had a study session, but we vacated the study session. There is no meeting scheduled for Tuesday, May 8. There is a Finance and Audit Committee meeting scheduled for May 15. So, merely for purposes of considering this question, and not attempting to influence or affect how this Board will ultimately proceed, we would need to call a special Board meeting for one of those three days-- either May 1 or May 8, when we do not have meetings scheduled, or May 15, when, in fact, we happen to have a committee meeting scheduled and we could convene a special Board meeting.

You may know that Article IV, Section 2 of our bylaws provides that the Chair may, in emergency circumstances, when deemed appropriate, call a special meeting, this chair mentioned to staff. We will not do that. We will have a straw poll of the members, to see how you feel.

So the choices are Tuesday, May 1, Tuesday, May 8, Tuesday, May 15. You may discuss, or we could simply ask for a show of hands on each of those dates. But, Director Williams, I see you're there, so let me recognize Director Williams.

KATE WILLIAMS: I'd like to suggest that we have a special, brief meeting on Tuesday, May, 1- - that we get at it as quickly as we can get at it, to make a statement about our commitment to this situation. And then, at that time, we'd make a decision. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much. Chair Hoy, your thoughts.

LARRY HOY: Thank you. If every vote counts, I won't be able to attend a May 1, unless it was that quick. I mean, you know, then I could. Certainly could do on the 15th, when we're going to be scheduled to be hearing-- just for comment.

DOUG TISDALE: No, I appreciate that, because the point is, we know that we're all here on the 15th-- or at least supposed to be. So that's one thought. And I recognize Director Williams's comment, relative to making a point which has merit also, but we want to be sensitive to people's schedules. Director Folska, your thoughts.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Why can't we do it right now?
DOUG TISDALE: Because we have to actually post a notice of a special meeting. So we can't just decide, you know, I'm in the mood for a special meeting. OK, everybody ready? OK. So we do have to actually post it.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: So you need 24 hours?

DOUG TISDALE: That I can't tell you. That would be a legal opinion that the guys who get paid the big bucks have to answer.

ROLF ASPHAUG: There are a couple of considerations. One is, I would like to be able to provide you with an opinion and with a resolution, and I've drafted a resolution, but I just want to make sure that we're in a posture with-- we're depending upon what the Board does, we have a good record to take to a court if, in fact, we're challenged. I think a little more time would be appropriate, so that we can show that the decision was made in a deliberate manner.

But the 24 hours is the minimum timeframe that's required for posting a meeting. We additionally have to have three or more Board members adding an item to an agenda.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK.

DOUG TISDALE: Director Solano.

PAUL DANIEL SOLANO: Thank you, Chair Tisdale. I feel that we shouldn't rush to a decision. May 1, to me, is too soon. I'll be out of town, I think, that first week. And May 15 is perfectly fine with me.

DOUG TISDALE: All right, any other people who would like to speak on that? All right. If not, then let me ask for a show of hands. All those who would like to establish a consensus for Tuesday, May 1, please indicate by raising your hand. All right, all those in favor of Tuesday, May 8?

And you can vote for more than one of these, obviously, folks, understand that. You don't have to select just one. All those in favor of Tuesday, May 8, indicate by raising your hands. All those in favor of Tuesday, May 15, please indicate by raising your hands. The consensus established by the Board is that Tuesday--

LORRAINE ANDERSON: I raised my hand.

DOUG TISDALE: And I-- I was-- I saw that! You know, they don't believe me, but I saw that.

LORRAINE ANDERSON: [LAUGH]

DOUG TISDALE: I did. I did! Thank you, Chair Anderson. All right. So we have a unanimous consensus to proceed on Tuesday, May 15, with a very brief special Board meeting, for the single purpose of addressing this issue. And our legal counsel will provide for an appropriate
resolution and opinion and other written materials, as necessary for that meeting. General counsel.

ROLF ASPHAUG: Yes, Chair Tisdale. Just to point out, this won't be some sort of private, secret opinion or anything like that. No, it will be in the form of a recommended action, with an explanation. I think that there's been language in the most recent court opinion that is very, very on point. And we'll explain that. And we'll explain, in essence, the situation as to whether taxing marijuana again would be a new tax or not be a new tax under TABOR.

DOUG TISDALE: How disappointing. I was hoping we'd have a star chamber.

ROLF ASPHAUG: [LAUGH]

DOUG TISDALE: Director Catlin.

[LAUGHTER]

Thank you, Chair Tisdale. I noticed that the threshold for de minimus was $2.2 million. But we're talking about over $6 million. Do you know with the threshold would be?

ROLF ASPHAUG: I don't think that that will be an actual factor in this case, but I'll be happy to address that.

PEGGY CATLIN: OK, thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Chair Hoy, your final thoughts.

LARRY HOY: Yeah. Perhaps a question. How does a motion get to the Board without going through committee? Is that-- we can deal with that? I just don't want to be surprised on the 15th, or whatever it is.

ROLF ASPHAUG: Yes, we can deal with it through any--

BARBARA MCMANUS: Through a decision from the Chair or three or more Board members--

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

ROLF ASPHAUG: And I'm pretty confident we have a decision from the Chair.

DOUG TISDALE: In other words, as a special Board meeting the Chair actually has the unilateral right to call a Board meeting. But I said I would not do that. I wanted to come here and have all of you do it. So I think, in effect, I've had about 12 or 13 people call a special Board meeting, so it was not a unilateral action of the chair.

LARRY HOY: OK. Just wanted to make sure we didn't get caught up. Thanks.
DOUG TISDALE: Well said. Thank you. We appreciate that. Director-- I'm sorry, there are no other Directors here. Chair Anderson, any other final thoughts or comments for this meeting?

LORRAINE ANDERSON: I would like to let everybody know how upset my community is about the lack of effort on the part of the Colorado PUC to issue the written requirements so we can proceed to opening the G Line. I have to tell you, people invested in our city, for businesses and for the ease of getting to work via the G Line, and it is not happening. And I understand it is because of the Colorado PUC's inability to issue the written regulations that they want RTD to adhere to.

So, I am totally disappointed. This should have been done almost a year and nine months ago. We have had all of the infrastructure put in. We have done testing. And we are still awaiting the Colorado PUC.

So, I keep getting emails, I keep getting Facebook issues, I keep getting Nextdoor issues posted, that says how lame actually RTD is. And I know it is not RTD, and it is not Denver Transit Operators. It is the Denver-- it is the Department of Colorado PUC. So I am totally disappointed in their inability to respond quickly to what they need to do, as an agency. And so I'm hoping that somehow, quickly, we will get more information. Because my community is totally upset. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Chair Anderson. And, if you could see, there were many, many head nods here in the room, lots of people nodding, relative to your comment. So we appreciate that.

And I will just point out one thing, for those of you who are not coming-- I think it may be sold out-- DRCOG awards banquet-- because we've talked too much about DRCOG tonight-- is tomorrow evening. And, I assure you, it will be extremely rewarding for you, if you are present for that dinner. So, please, if you can make it, do so.

Seeing no further other matters or discussion--

KATE WILLIAMS: Wait, Judy.

DOUG TISDALE: Wait? Oh! I'm sorry.

WOMAN: It's all right.

DOUG TISDALE: Do I-- my screen got shut off!

WOMAN: It did!

DOUG TISDALE: I can't see anything, here. I apologize. Director Lubow.

JUDY LUBOW: OK. I don't want to take up people's time, because everybody wants to leave, but I did want a discussion about the A Line snafu that happened. Because I think it's not good
for us. It's not good for the people on there. So perhaps, the next time we'll meet is the 15th, I will bring this up again, and we can talk about it.

DOUG TISDALE: General Manager Genova, do you want to comment on that?

DAVE GENOVA: I'll just let the Board know quickly that Michael Ford and the team will be doing a debriefing meeting with DTP (Denver Transit Partners), I think, Thursday?

MICHAEL FORD: Thursday, correct.

DAVE GENOVA: So the whole team will be there. We'll go through a major debriefing with them. It was unsatisfactory to all of us. And we'll get down to the bottom of it.

JUDY LUBOW: And will we hear about it on the 15th? Or I will at least bring it up again.

DAVE GENOVA: We're happy to report out, yes.

JUDY LUBOW: Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, there will be a report. And Mr. Ford, as a rider on one of the stranded trains, will be able to provide us a great deal of personal insight associated with all of that.

MICHAEL FORD: And frustration, too.

[LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: Anything else for the good of the cause? Anything else for the good of the cause? Anything for the good of the cause? None.

Seeing no other further matters or discussion, the Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn the RTD Board session of April 24, 2018. Second? All those in favor, aye. Any opposed? None. Passes unanimously.

Thank you. We stand adjourned, at--

LORRAINE ANDERSON: Aye! [LAUGH]

DOUG TISDALE: --8:42 PM.