DOUG TISDALE: ...telephone other then Director Deadwyler? All right, the record will note that we've now indicated the attendance here at the meeting. Our first order of business is to review the October board meeting agenda as prepared and presented by the Executive Manager and the General Manager for our review.

And it's, as you can tell by the size of your packet, a long agenda. For the sake of the record, let me just note that the reason that I moved and am sitting now here at this end of the table is that it came to our attention that the only cameras in the room are in the far corner that I'm pointing to now near the door of the room. And we thought that for the sake of the record, the video record that is made of these meetings, that it would be beneficial to have the chair move where he sits so that people don't think I"m sending signals or whispering or doing other things like that-- not I would, but just--

JUDY LUBOW: It's so not like you.

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, right. So the draft Board meeting agenda is before you. As you can tell, as I said, it's a longish agenda by virtue of all the materials attached here. You'll see that there is a unanimous consent agenda for 1, 2, 3, 4 5 items, items A through E under Roman XI.

And then we have for recommended action a number of items being Roman XII F through Q. So it's a pretty full agenda. I will point out one thing. If you look at the-- what is it? I guess the fourth page-- I can't tell.

In any event, Roman XII, item H-- actually, item G, motion to move into executive session-- the that is there merely as a precautionary measure. We do not-- I'll say it again-- We do not anticipate the need for an executive session on that item. However, should any Director wish to have an executive session to discuss any particular details of negotiations-- not of the contract.

The entire contract is attached to the agenda. It's all there. It's all made public. But if someone would want to ask a question about negotiations, negotiations would be privileged and confidential and subject to an executive session.

So it's there merely as a placeholder because we have to give notice if we, in fact, are going to do an executive session. There are exceptions to that rule. I'm not going to burden this record with those exceptions.

The anticipation is that we would not need that and we would simply have a full discussion by the full Board of the action as moved forward by the GMOC. The rest of the agenda items, are as we have addressed in the committee meetings. All right, so discussion on the agenda-- anybody have any changes, revisions, additions you'd like to talk about to the agenda now? Because we can add them at this point if you would like.
Hearing none-- and you've had a chance, hopefully, to look at this. I think you'd seen all the materials before, in any event, in the committee presentations and so forth. May I have something to prove?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: So moved.

DOUG TISDALE: I have a motion to approve the agenda. Is there a second to that motion?

JUDY LUBOW: Second.

DOUG TISDALE: And there's a second to the motion to approve the agenda. Is there any discussion further now on the agenda for approval of this agenda? Hearing none, would all those in favor please indicate say aye? Aye.

JUDY LUBOW: Aye.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Aye.

NATALIE MENTEN: Aye.

DOUG TISDALE: Are there any--

BARBARA DEADWYLER: Aye.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Deadwyler. And are there any opposed? There are none opposed, so unanimously, the draft board meeting agenda for the October 16, 2018, meeting is approved.

We have some other matters. I have a couple of brief ones, and then we'll have the General Manager give us his update and report. The first thing is we are looking already-- is it that time?

Yes, it is. We are looking already at the question of scheduling the half-day Board-only retreat for sometime next year as we did this year and then, following that, scheduling the full day board meeting with-- Board retreat with Senior Leadership Team (SLT).

We are looking at sending out an RFP now for one facilitator to do both because we like the idea of having the facilitator who did the Board-only retreat be available to do the Board SLT retreat because it will perhaps help educate that person and facilitate the process more effectively and efficiently. So do we have at this time, Ms. McManus, any dates that you're tentatively looking at for those?

BARBARA MCMANUS: Yes, they're already on the schedule for Saturday, February 2, for the Board-only, and March 2nd, Saturday, for the Board and SLT.
DOUG TISDALE: All right, so 2/2 for the Board-only retreat, and then four weeks later on 3/2, the Board/SLT retreat. At this time, are there any members of the Executive Committee who know of conflicts or problems with those dates?

JEFF WALKER: I do not.

DOUG TISDALE: OK.

JUDY LUBOW: Nope.

DOUG TISDALE: And--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: I think I'm OK with that.

DOUG TISDALE: OK. Director Deadwyler, do you have-- do you know-- I'm sorry, never mind. I withdraw the question. I just realized. I'm sorry.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: [LAUGHTER]

DOUG TISDALE: But we'll miss you.

JUDY LUBOW: Yes.

DOUG TISDALE: Besides, I need someone for company when I go out on my smoke break for my pipe. OK, now Ms. McManus, you had a thought you wanted to share with us?

BARBARA MCMANUS: No, I just wanted to say that we've already sent out the draft calendar for next year.

DOUG TISDALE: OK.

BARBARA MCMANUS: And we will be looking at that for final approval next month in Executive Committee.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, so be aware. Next month, please have your calendars available so that you will have a chance to comment on this. In any event, you will receive it in advance of that and will have an opportunity. Any thoughts in terms of this whole process? Vice Chair Menten.

NATALIE MENTEN: Did the draft calendar go out to us?

JUDY LUBOW: Yes.

NATALIE MENTEN: I must have missed that.

BARBARA MCMANUS: It was sent out a while ago, probably August. But I can resend it to everybody.
NATALIE MENTEN: OK, so if it's back that far, that's why I would not---

BARBARA MCMANUS: And we passed it out at SLT. But I can get you a copy too.

DAVE GENOVA: That would be good, yeah.

BARBARA MCMANUS: Yeah.

DAVE GENOVA: Maybe we can just refresh that [INAUDIBLE].

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, I think the committee and I think the full board would appreciate the opportunity to have that---

BARBARA MCMANUS: I'll send it back out.

DOUG TISDALE: --come out again just because in August, one of the last things on our mind is planning 2019.

BARBARA MCMANUS: Right.

DOUG TISDALE: But we'll see. OK, what about the idea of using one facilitator? Or is that something that the committee feels comfortable with?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: I like the consistency.

DOUG TISDALE: OK.

JUDY LUBOW: Me too.

DOUG TISDALE: All right. Any concerns expressed about that? Let me ask it that way.

NATALIE MENTEN: No, mine would-- excuse me.

DOUG TISDALE: Please.

NATALIE MENTEN: Mine would be more specific that it would be more about the individual versus the same for both.

DOUG TISDALE: Yes.

NATALIE MENTEN: So--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Who's doing it, the facil--

NATALIE MENTEN: Who's doing it-- that's correct.
CLAUDIA FOLSKA: I love the people that did it this year.

DAVE GENOVA: This last-- Susan Spero?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Yeah, she was incredible, I thought.

DOUG TISDALE: And I think-- General Manager, you can weigh in on this too because she's also facilitated other meetings, I know, for RTD in the past and, as we heard before this year, has extensive interest. But maybe you want to just add a footnote to that.

DAVE GENOVA: I will, Mr. Chair. Thank you. So yes, she has worked with our Leadership Academy and, you know, presentations on some of the course work through the Leadership Academy. And then we've also engaged her to do some employee and work group coaching from time to time as, you know, as we've seen needs to do those kind of things. And she's very effective and has, you know, a good understanding of RTD, which I think is really helpful.

JUDY LUBOW: Yeah.

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, very helpful. OK, thank you. I have one other matter that I would like to present to the committee before turning it over to General Manager Genova, and that is we have polled on the question of the potential of changing the Board meeting in November from the currently scheduled November 27 date to November 20th.

You may wonder-- and I think we addressed this in the poll. But the reason we're asking that question is when the calendar was set, APTA, the American Public Transportation Association, had not, as of that date when this calendar was set, scheduled their Transit Board Members session, which is what they now call the leadership conference. And the leadership conference will be in Washington, D.C., commencing on Wednesday morning, November 28.

And so we were simply asking whether November 20 might be a possibility. There are several members who have indicated November 20 is challenging. I know that Director Walker is planning on being at the APTA leadership conference. I am planning on being there. General Manager Genova is planning on being there, and Executive Manager McManus--

BARBARA MCMANUS: Well, two of my staff members, but not me.

DOUG TISDALE: Oh, OK, all right. Yes, all right. So we will have several Board staff together with at least two directors and perhaps more. I don't know that it's crucial, but I just wanted to raise the issue and get the comments from the committee as to how you feel about that.

NATALIE MENTEN: As indicated in my response, I have no problem with that.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, So Vice Chair Menten--

NATALIE MENTEN: --that I polled, I responded.
DOUG TISDALE: And Director Deadwyler, Second Vice Chair Deadwyler, let me ask you what are your thoughts. Should we-- and by the way, we will present this with the full Board.

We're not going to make that decision. We're teeing it up for a determination by the full Board. That's what we do. We tee things up. But I'd like to get her remarks too, and then did you want to supplement first?

NATALIE MENTEN: Well, yeah, I just-- the poll was sent to the full Board already, right?

BARBARA MCMANUS: Yes.

DOUG TISDALE: Right.

NATALIE MENTEN: With out full response?

BARBARA MCMANUS: Yes.

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, and they're--

NATALIE MENTEN: --they already kind of decided, right?

DOUG TISDALE: I think two-- remind we now. Was it two who said tentative and one who said no?

BARBARA MCMANUS: Yes. well, Director Folska and Director Hoy will not be here, and Director Anderson was tentative.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, all right. So we have--

BARBARA DEADWYLER: And I'd also add that I would not be there.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, so--

BARBARA DEADWYLER: That's the week of Thanksgiving, and I'm cooking.

DOUG TISDALE: Right, now-- and that's the reason, quite honestly, that the scheduling originally when Chair Hoy and Executive Manager McManus made that determination. And they pulled the meeting from Thanksgiving week.

BARBARA MCMANUS: Yeah.

DOUG TISDALE: But as I say, that was before we knew about the APTA, which created a problem. And I know--

NATALIE MENTEN: Both are a problem, both weeks--
DOUG TISDALE: Yeah.

NATALIE MENTEN: --are a problem.

DOUG TISDALE: So both weeks are a problem. And what I want to do-- yes, and Vice Chair Menten, you're right that we've already polled on it. But I do want to at least get the full Board-- and we can do this during other matters at the Board meeting on Tuesday night-- say, well, let's get a real sense. But Director Folska, since you were one of the no's, I mean, you're-- you are unavailable--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Absolutely impossible.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, all right. And 27th, you would be available.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Absolutely.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, all right. That-- that's good to know. And we just have to see because we try to the greatest extent possible to accommodate everyone. And where we can't do that, we accommodate the most that we can. Director Lubow, anything you want to share on that?

JUDY LUBOW: I'm just wondering where we're landing on that. It seems pretty similar. But in addition, we have some staff members [INAUDIBLE] the 27th. So--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Well, you have a COO (Chief Operations Officer) also who can run the meeting and be there in Dave's place, I would assume, or whoever. And I mean, right now, you're saying two Board members will not be there on the 20th or the 27th--

DOUG TISDALE: Seventh.

BARBARA MCMANUS: --right?

DOUG TISDALE: Mm-hm.

BARBARA MCMANUS: I mean, two versus three.

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, and that's a very fair observation. So as I say, my only reason for bringing it up is to say that we'll ask it as a question. And this will be one of those-- I suppose we could do it as a head nod or an attaboy as opposed to a vote on changing it and to see whether or not that would be good. But it may be-- and I think that Director Folska raises an excellent point-- that we have a COO who can also do it. But perhaps we'll look at what we anticipate the agenda will be--

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah--

DOUG TISDALE: And how we can proceed.
DAVE GENOVA: Possible it could be a light month. I don't know. Given all the action [INAUDIBLE] we had this week.

DOUG TISDALE: Since we're doing the heavy lift in October?

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

DOUG TISDALE: Right, right, OK. All right, well, those were the two points that I wanted to bring up in other matters to make sure that the committee was fully informed as to everything that is going on that impacts the Board directly.

And I'll ask General Manager Genova to give us his report now, and I will respectfully ask you to include-- and he and I have already discussed this, so it's not a surprise. But I just say for the sake of the record-- to include a discussion about the Downtown Denver Partnership (DDP) forum that is scheduled within the next couple weeks regarding proposals for use of our 20,000 square feet that we own at Civic Center Station that sits on Colfax Avenue that currently, you may recall, is the sea of gravel that we have out there in front of Civic Center Station. All right, so General Manager Genova--

NATALIE MENTEN: Could you--

DOUG TISDALE: --the floor is-- I'm sorry.

NATALIE MENTEN: Could you expand on what that is? I'm not--

DOUG TISDALE: No--

NATALIE MENTEN: --familiar with this.

DOUG TISDALE: He--

NATALIE MENTEN: You're going to cover it. OK.

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, He will. he will. So General Manager, the floor is yours.

DAVE GENOVA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So I'll start with that item. So the Downtown Denver Partnership is having one of their regular kind of awards and update kind of meetings that they do on a pretty regular basis on-- what is the date-- Tuesday, November 13. So this is just part of their--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Tuesday, November 13?

DAVE GENOVA: Tuesday, November 13.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK.
DAVE GENOVA: And you know, they have-- they're probably quarterly kind of having updates, or every other month, they do things. So the Downtown Denver Partnership has an emerging leaders program. It's a one-year long program that people can apply to-- very similar to the chamber's leadership program.

And so they approached us and said, can we have our leadership class do a project where we just kind of look at the Civic Center parcel that's undeveloped and do a group project? And it's really based on a lot of different things. It's not just looking at-- it's not looking at it from a transit perspective or what should RTD do with this space but from a variety of things-- so from a place-making perspective, from a downtown perspective, from a land use perspective. And then also, how does it tie in to transit?

And so we said, you know, we don't mind if you do that for your leadership project. So our planning group has been engaged in this. So it's not a-- it's a leadership class project.

There's nothing in it that's binding by any way, shape, or form. Our planning group in the terms of Bill Sirois and John Hersey, you know, met with them, went through the history of the site, talked to them about the transit district master plan, all of our current operations at the station, and then some ground rules for the vacant parcel, including all of our concerns about maintenance of the space, development of the space, safety, and security because I think the Board knows now right next to the parcel we're talking about is the parcel that's gravel that is right adjacent to the Civic Center Station redevelopment that we did. So it's bounded by Colfax on the south and Lincoln and Broadway and then the Civic Center Station.

And so we had a long term lease on that parcel. And we didn't do anything with development on that parcel because all of our investment went into the transit facility. We had a lot of pressure and a lot of requests to do things like create a park, to landscape it, and everything else.

But we basically said, you know, all of the money we have available is going to the transit infrastructure. And you know, if there's anything done with this parcel, that can be discussed at a later date. So we have control of the parcel. Whatever--

JUDY LUBOW: As a lease?

DAVE GENOVA: We have a long term lease on that parcel. Some of that property we own, about 2/3 of that block. So if we were to go from 16th to-- it's not quite where our transit investment ends.

And so if you can visualize the site, you know, we have the mall turnaround around and then the building or the transitway and the inside base. And then we have that new street that we built to help operations that's got some stops along it. The exact property line of what we own is probably up until where that new street is. And then the rest of that-- the rest of that parcel, we lease.

And we have, like, this extremely long-term lease. I can't think of it off the top of my head, but it's like another 50 years or something like that. So there's a family trust that owns that property.
So we own about 2/3 of that block, and then the rest we lease. And it's under that long term lease. So this is simply a leadership project where, you know, they've done a lot of research.

They've done some survey work. They've talked to people and they're just going to present out their ideas on what they think would be good for that parcel and the surrounding things. So again, it's a completely non-binding thing.

It just satisfies a project that the partnership leadership class is doing. We won't be presenting at that because we don't have anybody that's in that leadership class. But that leadership class has been touching base with our planing staff-- so Bill Sirois, John Hersey, and Chessie Brady from our TOD group. And they're going to be presenting, actually, what they're going to present out on that morning. They're going to be doing that to Chessie soon. So then Chessie will see what they're presenting and see if there's anything of concern. But I just want to assure the Board it's just-- you know, it's simply-- it's a group project like a class project would be.

DOUG TISDALE: Oh, yeah.

DAVE GENOVA: And that's it. And so the partnership is engaged in place making and all those kinds of things and a variety of different things. So that's what the Tuesday event is. And so there were some questions around that because there was an email from the partnership today about this event and it mentioned that.

DOUG TISDALE: Well-- and I'll recognize Director Folska in a second here. It seems to me that what you're describing is essentially a presentation to us to say, hey, RTD, this is what you could do with that project. Here are some ideas that we, at no charge to you and with no direct involvement by you, have come up with for your consideration.

DAVE GENOVA: Well, we'll see the presentation first before it's done in the partnership forum. You know, it's one of their breakfast forums.

DOUG TISDALE: Hm.

DAVE GENOVA: And then it'll just be reported out that this is the project that the leadership class did for DDP. And so as I said, other than having some staff time and some staff engagement on it, you know, we didn't do anything else as far as participating in it. And again, we won't be there at the-- I mean, we'll be at the event, but we will be on stage presenting. It'll be the leadership class that presents what they did. Here are some ideas.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you. Director Folska, you had a comment or a question?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Dave, so this area, it's like they're standing up. People will be there. Is it tented? I mean, are they serving food? And what is exactly the event? And I'd also be interested in having them present to the Board whatever their--

DAVE GENOVA: The presentation is going to be in the Seawell Ballroom. Again, this is one of a series of the Downtown Denver Partnership's morning breakfast networking events that they do
every couple of months. And so the event itself is at the Seawell Ballroom. It's not at the parcel at all.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Right.

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: So what are they doing at the parcel?

DOUG TISDALE: They're not doing anything physically at the parcel. It's just a-- their leadership project--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Oh, they're just reporting on it.

DOUG TISDALE: It's reporting on-- yeah, so nothing's physically happening to the parcel. There's nothing taking place there.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Oh.

DAVE GENOVA: It's just going to be their ideas based on their group project for the year of ideas on how the site could maybe be developed or used for place making and things like that.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Well, I don't see that that's a big deal at all.

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: And why you'd want to put that in question is beyond me. I mean, you could look at any property in--

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah, yeah. And it's-- yeah, it's not like it's-- they could have done it without our permission and involvement.

DOUG TISDALE: Right.

DAVE GENOVA: So--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Yeah, OK, well--

JUDY LUBOW: It might be nice to see it.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: But I do think it would be great for them to present it to a Board meeting at some point or a committee meeting just so we can see what they're thinking kind of like the 16th Street Mall.

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah.
BARBARA MCMANUS: Or we poll for them to go to the event, for the Directors to go to the event.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: There's of stuff that goes on--

DOUG TISDALE: Let me--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: --that a lot of members can't get to.

DOUG TISDALE: I'm sorry. Director Folska, if I can.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Sorry.

DOUG TISDALE: Let me just-- sorry, I'm just an umpire here, you know, calling balls and strikes. I'm going to keep one person at a time. So if you're not-- because I wanted to go to Vice Chair Menten because she wanted to hear about this, too, and I wanted to see if she had any questions. But Director Folska, do you have anything else?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Well, I mean, the reason I suggested they present to the Board, in like a Planning/FasTracks, whatever that committee is that we have, that they could come in here and present to the Board because it's more convenient for the Board. We have so many events to do. The holidays are coming up. Us going there in the morning-- I mean, it's time out of our day. So I'm working people. So that's why I recommend them coming to us instead of us coming to them. It's more likely they'll have more attention from the Board on what they're doing.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much. Let me go to Director Menten and then to Director Lubow.

NATALIE MENTEN: I would be fine with just a PowerPoint [INAUDIBLE] base their findings. To me, we didn't ask them to do this.

DAVE GENOVA: No.

NATALIE MENTEN: Whatever they say is not binding. It is not something we requested of them. Don't know that I want to listen to, frankly, 45 minutes or a half hour on it. A PowerPoint for me would be fine.

My question relates to our capital deferred projects where we haven't noted-- yeah, of course, I didn't earmark it-- $15 million with a Civic Center acquisition. I'm wondering with this property, since that's up for discussion, what that is on deferred capital-- $15 million Civic Center Station property acquisition. What is that? Remind me please.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

DAVE GENOVA: It's on the-- so it's on the deferred list. Yeah, I would-- based on this description, I would say this is probably a placeholder project for being able to purchase that
remaining parcel. So then we would control that whole block because part of our transit investments is on the leased parcel.

So it has been something we've been talking to the trust that owns the property. But I think it's more than one family that owns that, that has that trust. And so the discussions have been one's interested in maybe doing something, the other is not.

And we have a very, very good lease on that property. So another thing we don't want to risk is reopening negotiations on that lease and paying much more for the lease than what we're paying today we have a very-- I don't know off the top of my head. I just know we've got a very good standing on it. But we are interested, if we were ever able to put it into our financial plan, to acquire the rest of that block just because some of our investment is on that parcel. And then there might be something we could do with that parcel at a future date.

Some of the problems with that parcel in terms of development is because it is bounded by Colfax, Broadway, and Lincoln and then our station that we access. So if you were to do some kind of a development on their motor vehicle access for, you know, just access to a building and parking and everything else, it's just not-- very challenging. And then there's also height restrictions on the capitol view. So there's--

NATALIE MENTEN: Interesting.

DAVE GENOVA: --that view plane, there's a--

NATALIE MENTEN: What is that? Do you know?

DAVE GENOVA: I'm sorry?

NATALIE MENTEN: What is that height restriction? Do you know?

DAVE GENOVA: I don't know what it is, but there's the-- and I can get the Board information on this.

DOUG TISDALE: The mountain view ordinance is what that is.

DAVE GENOVA: We've had it in our Civic Center plans that the Board's seen before, but we can-- I'll refresh that and get it to the board. But there's a view plane in there that you can't obstructed the view of the capitol. So that building can only be so high.

So then that also is a challenge for development because you can't get enough square footage, say, for, you know, a hotel or maybe an office building that really pencils out. We've also done an exercise on it, not that it's a project for us. But we've looked at it is will that parcel be suitable for us to do a building on.

And so for example, if we wanted to move to one campus, could we get enough square footage there and move everybody there instead of having this building and then to lease the Civic
Center? And we're just looking at it to see what it might pencil in and look like. But that looks even challenging to get enough square footage in there for us because of the height restriction on the building.

NATALIE MENTEN: And does that mean that it-- it could be either or. But mainly based upon the ordinance you just quoted, blocking the view of the capitol or blocking the capitol's view of the mountains? Because you just called it--

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, and I apologize because I thought it might-- I know the Denver mountain view ordinance restricts development around City Park, around the state capitol, and around Cheesman Park as I recall if my memory serves. And it is a very strict height limitation on buildings around there. There may also be-- and I'm not familiar with, but there may also be a capitol view ordinance that would restrict construction that would impair view of the capitol from various places. But I think it may relate to the mountain view ordinance, but I just don't know and I don't want to misdirect on that.

NATALIE MENTEN: OK

DOUG TISDALE: Let me just-- before we go on and I've got Director Lubow in the queue-- and I'll let you finish, but I just want to say for the record. I've got Director Lubow in the queue and Director Walker in the queue. And also the page, for Second Vice Chair Deadwyler's benefit, the page that Vice Chair Menten was referring to on deferred projects is page 97 of the packet.

Just-- I don't assume you have that in front of you, Barbara, but I just wanted you to know what we're talking about. It's page 97. And about the sixth line down is Civic Center Station property acquisition, $15 million deferred projects. All right, Vice Chair Menten, please go on.

NATALIE MENTEN: Just one last item, then. So the gravel area is leased. We lease that right now. Am I--

DAVE GENOVA: Correct.

NATALIE MENTEN: --correct, OK. That is all the questions that I have.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you. Director Lubow.

JUDY LUBOW: Thank you. I just wanted to say that I thought it would be useful for the Board to see the report or a PowerPoint [INAUDIBLE] report then not necessarily have them report to us time-wise.

DAVE GENOVA: OK, certainly.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you. And then I'll go to-- actually, before I go to you, Director Walker, if you don't mind, I'm going to ask Second Vice Chair Deadwyler if she has any questions or comments on this topic.
BARBARA MCMANUS: No, I don't. Thank you for asking.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much. All right. Mr. Genova, you may proceed.

DAVE GENOVA: OK, thank--

DOUG TISDALE: Oh, I'm sorry, wait. I cut off Direct Walker. He was going to say something and I cut him off. I apologize.

JEFF WALKER: It's-- the Denver ordinance is view to the mountains from the state capitol. I don't remember what it was. I was trying to find it real quick, but it's somewhere around five to eight stories. The Webb building was built I think in 2000, 2001, breaks the view plane.

They had to get a variance for that building to be built as it is. So it's somewhere between five and eight stories. Let's say eight stories--

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you.

JEFF WALKER: --ish.

DOUG TISDALE: I appreciate that. OK.

DAVE GENOVA: And I will clarify that and send it out to the board. I don't know if I'll have it in the Friday memo or it might take until next week. But I'll send out that.

DOUG TISDALE: And I made sure that we brought this on this morning because Director Williams did get the email about this presentation and asked the question, are we engaged and involved? It's very useful for us to hear this information. And I assure you, we will also separately respond to Director Williams to explain what the General Manager has explained to us now about this project. Vice Chair Menten.

NATALIE MENTEN: I said this kind of jokingly. But could we call that like cell phone corner, and then we just charge the tents that are non-stop selling people cell phone plans?

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah, OK.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: I don't-- do they pay us? They don't pay us anything [INAUDIBLE].

DAVE GENOVA: Well, they're not on our-- they're not on our parcel.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: But I'm just joking because I just-- I'm completely amazed at the traffic that they get--

DOUG TISDALE: Yes.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: --there across the street.
DAVE GENOVA: Director Menten, Director Folska is referring to there's a lot of cell phone providers, and they pop up these little tents. It's usually on the sidewalk on the capitol side--

NATALIE MENTEN: Oh.

DAVE GENOVA: --next to the park. And they're, I don't know, selling cell phones for next to nothing or something. But it does generate a lot of activity.

NATALIE MENTEN: Do they have permits for that?

DAVE GENOVA: If they were doing it on our space, they'd have to have a permit. But they're not doing it on our space. They're doing it in a public right of way-- the city sidewalk.

DOUG TISDALE: And I believe those are commonly referred to as burner phones.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

DOUG TISDALE: Burner phones.

DAVE GENOVA: That's up to the city.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: I mean, they were just-- you know, just to say kids selling lemonade this summer didn't have a permit. And city council had to say, OK, little kids don't need to get a permit to sell lemonade in the summer. But somebody made a big fuss about that.

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Yeah.

DOUG TISDALE: All right, well, now that we've exhausted that topic-- and that was a good conversation. Thank you, General Manager. I'm sure you have have many more things to share with us.

DAVE GENOVA: I have a couple of ideas, Mr. Chair, that I think would be good opportunity to talk to the Executive Committee about. And so you saw my notice yesterday regarding Denver Transit Partners (DTP). And as we briefed the Board, they filed the lawsuit after they did not accept our what I think was very reasonable offer at mediation.

And they did not counter our offer. And I thought we were very close, but that's another story. But anyway, the very next day, as we briefed the Board, they did file their claim in county court, Denver County Court. And so we have until--

DOUG TISDALE: District court.

DAVE GENOVA: Denver District Court, thank you. We have until close of business today to file our response to the lawsuit. And so that response is prepared, and it will go in. And basically,
our response is that essentially, as we've talked to the board throughout various sessions that DTP is claiming a change in law.

They're claiming a breach of contract, which is really a stretch, and then that we're not negotiating in good faith-- the three kind of main pieces of their claim. So we'll be filing our counterclaim today. And then also, as we briefed the board and I said in the email that came to the Board yesterday, that this really put us in a situation that to protect RTD's commercial position contractually, since they filed their suit-- and that actually broke off the negotiation period because we had a tolling agreement in place that even now we hadn't moved the default date of June 2-- we had not moved that date-- but we had agreed that we would suspend it until we were through with our negotiations and hopefully reached a settlement.

But since we didn't reach a settlement agreement, the tolling agreement expired, we did not extend the default date. And so we need to present-- we need to protect the RTD interests and our stakeholders and the taxpayers. So according to the concession agreement, we filed a very brief letter with Denver Transit Partners according to the contract of-- that this was a-- a notice of a termination event because they have not met the delivery date for the Gold Line of June 2.

So we filed that letter with them earlier this week through our contractual process. And then we will be filing the answer to the lawsuit today. So you probably saw a lot of media coverage last night and this morning.

The key messages are that this is, as you all know, because you've been eating, living, and breathing this P3 agreement since before 2010, right? And we started these discussions in about 2008. The contract was awarded in 2010.

There is-- and I didn't want to get into great detail in the email. There are so many requirements about what this means. And so the key messages are it does not-- it does not impact the revenue service of the University of Colorado A Line and the B Line. DTP has to continue to deliver the service under the concession agreement.

They also have to work towards delivering the G Line. So this will not-- the commercial issue and the commercial dispute will not impact the completion of the progress towards the G Line. Now we're working through all of our technical issues and our regulatory issues.

And I'll be giving a more detailed report in tomorrow's memo because I have some good information on where we are with the grade crossings as far as the progress towards verification on that. So that is the message we're putting out. It's a very brief message. And our legal counsel and our outside counsel has advised us not to get into any more dialogue other than that with the media because whatever we say can be used in the suit.

And so we've been just very brief. I'm also going to put a message out to employees as soon as I get out of this meeting today too because we've been getting questions from employees about what does this mean. But some of the coverage that I've seen and some of the articles that I've read I think have been a fair-- I mean, if you stick with the whole article or if you stick with the whole coverage in the media, they're basically covering the main points. They're saying stay in
service and that we're-- you know, it's not going to impact our ability to continue towards revenue service of the G Line. So let me pause there and see if you have any questions.

DOUG TISDALE: All right, and Director Folska, you first.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you. So Dave, so we have our contract with the people who are building it, with Denver Transit Partners. Then we have an agreement with Denver Transit Operators, DTO. Is it the case that these parallel issues are happening because-- I mean, technically, it's DTO that's doing the operations of the service. And then we'll continue with the build, and DTP and RTD will work out their legal issues on another track.

DAVE GENOVA: Mr. Chair?

DOUG TISDALE: Please, go.

DAVE GENOVA: Director Folska, if I can clarify, we have one contract, and that contract is with the Denver Transit Partners.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK.

DAVE GENOVA: And then under the Denver Transit Partners, they have different organizational groups. And one of those is Denver Transit Operators--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Right.

DAVE GENOVA: --or DTO. They also have DTC, which is Denver Transit Constructors. They have DTS, which is Denver Transit Systems. And so, you know-- and so they're all different companies and they're all tied together in these different contracts in very many complex ways.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Uh-huh.

DAVE GENOVA: So we have one contractual arrangement with Denver Transit Partners, or DTP. They're responsible for fulfilling all of the requirements of the concession agreement. So when we sit down to negotiate to try to reach a settlement, it's with Denver Transit Partners. Now is represented by a handful of companies because they're all engaged. But our legal and our contract arrangement is with DTP. And they're also responsible for meeting all of the performance requirements of the contracts as well. So I hope that clarifies.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: That's perfect. Thank you. And nothing is stopping.

DAVE GENOVA: Correct.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: We're moving forward on service providing and building and finishing.
DAVE GENOVA: That's correct. And even if we were to get to a point where the contract would terminate, there's all kinds of requirements about transition plans and hand over and what that would look like. And the fact that we're-- the fact that DTP has filed a claim in court, their response to us-- so you may have seen the media coverage-- and I didn't get into this much detail in the email because there's just lots of different requirements-- that there's a 20-day period or there's a 30-day period that they could choose to respond in depending on however they want to respond.

And we fully expect that they're going to respond and say, hey, we're in court. And until that claim is satisfied, then-- because they're going to say, we a change in law. So this has got to get resolved before you can say we're in a default or a termination event. Does that make sense?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Mm-hm. Thank you very much.

DAVE GENOVA: So-- so this could be-- this could go on a long time. Now, that said, there's still going to be plenty of opportunity to settle. And in fact, Chair, I was thinking of reaching out to David Rushton, who's the chair of DTP, and just saying hello and just saying, what are you thinking?

Just keeping the door opened. So-- and I envision-- and Rolf, I had a long conversation with Rolf this morning. And Rolf thinks that probably the judge's first step is going to be to order us to go back to the table.

DOUG TISDALE: Right.

DAVE GENOVA: And that's fully what we suspect may happen. Now I don't know how long it's going to take to get the court process going. But I have to tell you that the interaction between the teams at the project level, we're all fully committed to deliver the project.

I meet every week with Henry, myself, Joe Christy. We meet every Friday morning with John Thompson, Anne Herzenberg. So John Thompson kind of heads up DTP.

Anne Herzenberg heads up DTL. And then Peter Strange, who is doing all the systems work for DTP, we meet every Friday. And then the project team as a whole meets every Tuesday. So we-- at a high level.

So our main objective is the direction we've received, is to get the project done and keep service rolling. And that's where we're headed. And I know it seems strange, but we really can't park this commercial issue and deal with it on one path and then keep making progress on delivering our great service on the other one. And you know, we're over 97% on-time performance and-- you know, so that part is going well.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: And may I add to that? And then I'll recognize Director Lubow. And I want to ask Second Vice Chair Deadwyler if she has any questions. But I'll get to that in just a second,
Barbara. John Thompson was quoted-- bless you-- in the Denver Business Journal this morning and said exactly what General Manager Genova just said-- that none of this is impairing or impeding the process on the Gold Line and the operations of the University of Colorado A Line and the B Line. So let me go first to director Lubow and then ask Second Vice Chair Deadwyler if she has any thoughts.

JUDY LUBOW: Thank you. I just wanted to comment that it seems like the lawsuit is about money but not about finishing the contract. The contract is tootling along very nicely, but you guys are fighting, we're all fighting, over money.

DAVE GENOVA: May I, Mr. Chair?

DOUG TISDALE: Please.

DAVE GENOVA: Money and a bit of risk, which also translates into money in the long run, right?

DOUG TISDALE: Right.

DAVE GENOVA: So if I may, we-- the settlement discussions we were having was around a financial component and then around some of the remaining pieces of the project-- the constant warning time to deliver quiet zones and a couple other issues in regards to the grade crossings on the change in law. So it wasn't just a discussion about this is how much money it'll take to settle it. It was, this is how much money it'll take to settle it, and we want relief from this.

JUDY LUBOW: Mm-hm.

DAVE GENOVA: And so we said, no, that relief you own. You signed-- that risk you signed up for, you own. And unless it's proven otherwise that it is a change in law, it's yours. And we will not-- we said, we will not take that risk on. We think that that is too big of an exposure for the district. And of course it all translates to--

JUDY LUBOW: Money.

DAVE GENOVA: --money.

JUDY LUBOW: Thank you for that correction. I just wanted to frame it in a way that showed to the public that working on the contract is one thing, and that's continuing, not at all impacted. And then there's this other argument that's going to be handled in court.

DOUG TISDALE: Yep.

DAVE GENOVA: And I will say that so today, once we file our response, the media will have access to that. And there will be more coverage that will be telling-- because it's our chance now to tell our side of the story, our side of the claim. And so there will be more expansive coverage
by the media on this topic, but our message with the media will just continue to be we're staying in service and we will not jeopardize the progress on the G Line.

JUDY LUBOW: OK, thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, and we appreciate your affirmation of that because I think that is exactly the message that our administration is seeking to get out to the public so that there is a confidence that this doesn't in any way impact service, safety, and security. Now Second Vice Chair Deadwyler, I wanted to recognize you if you had any questions or comments on this point that General Manager Genova--

BARRAH DEADWYLER: I do have a comment, you know, and maybe a question. I don't know. But I remember when this whole thing started. And the agency was so optimistic that we wouldn't get to this point where we would be going to court or being sued.

We thought this could be settled. And it did a 180 degree turn, and now we're being sued. And even though I hear what General Manager Genova is saying, that this is not going to affect revenue service or shut down any of our lines. However, the way things are going, I just can't help but wonder if it's continued to turn and they back out of the contract and say, no, we don't want to do this anymore and we are stuck.

Are we preparing for that type of scenario also, or just going to court? Because it could happen. I'm mean, I'm really surprised and shocked that we had this turn of events. And I just want to know what kind of preparation are we making just in case it turns again. I don't like being so optimistic.

DOUG TISDALE: Well, a fair question, Madam Second Vice Chair. So thank you. So General Manager, your thoughts.

DAVE GENOVA: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Director Deadwyler. It's a great question. And the way the concession agreement is-- the short answer is, yes, we are prepared. Because there's a lot of protective language in the concession agreement, it would be incredibly costly for the concessionaire to walk away. So for them to just say, we're done, we're going to walk away, number one, they can't legally just do that.

There's a lot of requirements about even if we were to terminate the contract or even if they want to terminate the contract, there's transition periods and planning and handover requirements. There would be lots of money involved.

And even if it were to come to that kind of a scorched earth, I'll tell the Board that we once had a bus-- it's a little different scale, but we once had a private contractor on the bus side where they were not performing. And this was a company called TTC, and I'm going to say this was about 15 years ago or so. And when we terminated their contract, we basically went in the door, took over the facility. We set up desks and chairs. We interviewed people. We hired their workforce
and we kept service running. And you know, I am confident that-- and I don't-- we wouldn't even get to this point.

But you know, that's the scorched earth scenario is that we own all these assets. We would-- if they come to a point where they're just going to say they'll walk away, we're going to go over there, take the keys, hire their people, and continue to operate. And I think their people would love to work for us.

JUDY LUBOW: Mmm.

DOUG TISDALE: Mm-hm. True.

DAVE GENOVA: And keep in mind, too, that we're working on standing up our own division on North Metro. So-- and this really would be the scorched earth scenario. And even though we have a disagreement and we're in court, they are professionals, and you know, they simply wouldn't just walk away. Their whole reputation nationally and internationally would be at risk.

DOUG TISDALE: And let me just state for the sake of the record, this entire discussion is speculation and conjectural. And we are merely laying out information for the benefit of the Executive Committee and the full board and, for that matter, the general public that may view these discussions so that they are all aware that we are prepared for every contingency. But as commercially reasonable parties, we anticipate that resolutions will be achieved and that in the meanwhile, service, safety, and security are in no way being compromised.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: OK, so now can I ask another quick question?

DOUG TISDALE: Yes, ma'am.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: And Dave, you said earlier that if we go into-- you don't know when we're going to get a court date and this can take a long time. What do you anticipate when you say long time? Could it be years? And if it does, does that benefit DTP if they tangle us up in court for a number of years?

DAVE GENOVA: Mr. Chair, so Director Deadwyler, I think it would probably at a minimum take the court at least a month or two to probably-- at a very minimum. I think it's going to be longer. But to review all the information and all the submittals and to try to formulate where the judge would like to go-- so at a minimum, it's months to prep to even get started.

It could go into a year or two year time frame. But what I envision, though, is once we get the G Line open and once we get everything for the quiet zones in place for University of Colorado A Line and the G Line, some of that big risk piece that DTP wants to transfer to us essentially goes away. And then it turns into more of just a financial-- largely a financial discussion about DTP saying, these are the damages we believe we've had.

And then, you know-- and then it could be a simpler negotiation. Now I'm simplifying this a bit, but I anticipate that that could be an avenue. And then the second part regarding time is other
than what we would spend on legal fees, which we're very cognizant of, time is on our side because if you look at DTP, they've already expended all of this money on the flaggers and the grade crossing attendants and all the other things.

They've have deductions from their availability payments on the University of Colorado A Line and the B Line. They're not getting their availability payment on the G Line. So you know, in terms of financial situation, they have experienced and will continue to experience a great deal of financial pain until there's a resolution. And you know, I think it was very interesting that the DTP was represented in the audience Tuesday night when we talked about the RRP (Regional Rail Partners) claim and how we talked about-- you know, we've reached a reasonable settlement with RRP.

And I was thinking about DTP being in the room and they could have been on the agenda the same night. And so we don't want it-- let me be clear. We do not want it to go out long. My intent would be to try to get back and sit down and settle this thing.

We don't want it to be drawn out. We don't want, you know, the negative connotations of a lawsuit and a court case. We just want to get it resolved and do our daily business.

DOUG TISDALE: Any-- anything further? Second Director, yes.

BARBARA DEADWYLER: Doesn't sound like DTP has that same philosophy of they want to get it settled, get it done as quickly. You know, and I'm just wondering-- you know, I guess they won't benefit for having this long, drawn-out thing. But again, like I said, I'm kind of a pessimist, and I don't trust them.

DOUG TISDALE: If I may, just before I let General Manager respond to that, too, as we have pointed out before, DTP has a very different structure than us. We speak as one body, as a unified voice. They are a coalition. It's a partnership, a joint venture.

They're a coalition of different interests. And sometimes, as you know, getting those people to pull in the same direction can be a challenge. General Manager, your thoughts.

DAVE GENOVA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That's exactly along the lines that I was just going to say is that there's probably 8 to 10, maybe 12 principal firms that have to come together for them to reach an agreement. So what we sit down and when we're doing negotiations, you know, the RTD team, there's one team.

The other, the DTP team, is made up of 8 to 10 to 12 companies, and they all have varying interests. Whether they're the finance people, whether they're the builders, whether they're the operators, they all have different risks and exposures. And for them to be able to come together is incredibly challenging. And that's my belief why we haven't been able to reach a reasonable settlement with them.

DOUG TISDALE: It--
BARBARA DEADWYLER: [INAUDIBLE]

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Second Vice Chair. We appreciate that. Now, Vice Chair Menten.

NATALIE MENTEN: Quickly, so the three claims issues-- change of law, not negotiating in good faith, and what was the second one?

DAVE GENOVA: Breach of contract.

NATALIE MENTEN: Breach of contract. And then my comment-- can I get a copy? I think I may have one in an old file. Can I get a copy of the contract please?

DAVE GENOVA: The concession agreement?

NATALIE MENTEN: Yeah, preferably electronic.

DAVE GENOVA: Let me see what I can do there. It's a massive document. And we can-- we'll see how we made that available to-- I think we've made that available to the Board before. I'm looking over at Barbara McManus. And so let us put our heads together on what's the best format to get them to the Board in.

BARBARA MCMANUS: We may have given out thumb drives.

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah, because it's--

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: I think it was thumb drives.

DAVE GENOVA: It's massive.

JUDY LUBOW: Yeah.

DOUG TISDALE: And the point is, it's probably available in some kind of Dropbox or Google Drive that--

DAVE GENOVA: I believe it might even be available on our web site. So we'll be back in touch with you on that.

NATALIE MENTEN: All right, then one last item, then. An item came up during a closed meeting, but I think it was only-- it wasn't one of the main topics. And so I'm going to-- I am going to just ask about it now-- the potential of running a limited service with horns going.

And this relates to the Gold Line. So you know, if there's anything confidential-- but I don't see why there wouldn't be. I think that's-- so I want to make sure of that.
Is that a topic that we are open to discuss? And this is something that's coming out of, well, the A Line. Obviously they're all ready, but the gold Line, G Line.

DAVE GENOVA: Mr Chair, so--

NATALIE MENTEN: We asked for-- I think there was mention of perhaps filing some kind of request from the FTA (Federal Transit Administration) or FRA (Federal Railroad Administration) to do that.

DAVE GENOVA: So the G Line and the quiet zones in our environmental impact statement-- it says that when we go into revenue on the G Line that we need the quiet zones in place because there's a different environmental impacts on the G Line than on the A Line. So that-- it wasn't that specific in the environmental document on the A Line.

NATALIE MENTEN: Mm-hm.

DAVE GENOVA: So essentially, we've just opened the conversation with the FTA. So since we're talking the environmental impact statements and the record of decision and all that, that's all FTA driven.

NATALIE MENTEN: Mm-hm.

DAVE GENOVA: And so we've just opened the conversation with them to see if that's even a possibility. And so we're in very early conversation on that. And of course, the other things we would need to look at is if that would be a viable option, the consideration of our stakeholders, and then the consideration of the Board of Directors and what would be-- what the Board would rather do if we would want to open on a more limited schedule without quiet zones that would be very similar to what we're doing with testing now or whether we would want to wait until we get the quiet zones. My suggestion there would be we're just about through the comment period on the University of Colorado A Line waiver for constant warning time.

I believe the 19th of October is the end of the comment period. And we will have to file a separate waiver application for the G Line. And so there will be-- I just was talking to the FRA this morning.

There will be-- we'll have to file another waiver application. We'll have to be noticed in the Federal Register. The FRA said, you know, we might be able to consider a shorter notice period and at the same time, you know, do the technical review so that when the notice period is over, you know, we'd be ready to make a decision on it.

But it is going to be a separate application on that. So I think that we need to be a little bit better informed about what that schedule might look like before we would even advance that conversation any further right now. So what I'm tasking the team with again is, you know, what are all the things remaining to done, what's a reasonable time frame to get all those things done, and have-- you know, and when I talked to the FRA regional administrator about this morning was, can we do as many things in parallel as we possibly can to help the schedule?
Because they are motivated as well. They want to get through this project. But because it is a new technology and because of the operating waiver, they just have to make sure that their due diligence is done and done properly because we know that-- so Wabtec, the designer of our system, they design a lot of the other PTC (positive train control) systems and railroad signal systems across the United States.

And they're just waiting for these approvals. And then they'll be-- this is where the industry wants to go with the wireless crossing like our design. So the FRA just wants to make sure they are completely done with their due diligence and they've done it correctly before they advance this. So it's a long answer to your question, but I think as we gain a little more time and we can get our arms around a little bit better about what the schedule looks like, then we can have that conversation. But if it looks like it's going to be a really long delay for the quiet zones, then I think we would come back to the Board and talk to all of you about is that even an option you want us to consider.

NATALIE MENTEN: All right, that answers for me thank you.

DAVE GENOVA: OK

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you. And let me just, if I may, footnote your response to Vice Chair Menten's question about the claims. I think when you restated it, you said lack of good faith negotiations.

Actually, the claim is a breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, which is a little different because I don't want it to be on any record or understood by anyone that there is even a hint of an allegation that we did not negotiate in good faith. Rather, every contract in Colorado has an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. That means that the court says whether you say so in the contract or not, it is understood that you have to act in good faith, and you must be dealing fairly with the other party. They, DTP, have alleged that we violated the covenant of good faith and fair dealing as relates to these other claims about the fact that, well, there was a change in law, and yet you took the position there was not.

So you throw that in as that's a breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing that is implied in the contract. So that's just my little add-on, emphasizing that I'm not acting as a lawyer for the agency and that I just wanted to share that information. All right, any other questions on DTP and that situation for General Manager? And we'll get to other matters that the committee members have too [INAUDIBLE], but I want to let the General Manager finish his report.

DAVE GENOVA: Just one final matter I want to let the Executive Committee know, and this is in regard to RRP, Regional Rail Partners, and the North Metro Line. And so just this morning right before this meeting, Henry Stopplecamp, myself, and Pranaya Shrestha, who's a high level project director within our Capital Programs group-- so our leadership team met with the leadership team from RRP-- so that's a representative from Graham and a representative from Balfour-- with the sole purpose of, you know, now that we've reached this agreement, you know,
how do we keep this project moving forward, high priority? How do we get our teams working together in a good manner and stay project first focused?

So we set in motion a series of-- we'll be having an executive level call every two weeks and we'll meet face to face once a month. We're also going to go out and do some partnering sessions with both teams next week. We're going to meet with the teams together and relay our expectations and set the model that we're here to work together and get the project done. And whatever disagreements we had before and whatever commercial disputes we had before are done, and it's all about getting the project done and getting it done well.

DOUG TISDALE: Perfect. Thank you.

DAVE GENOVA: Yeah.

DOUG TISDALE: And before I recognize Director Folska, did you have any other matters you were--

DAVE GENOVA: No, that's it for me, Mr. Chair.

DOUG TISDALE: Director Folska.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you, Chair. Are they going to be the A team and give us their A game?

DAVE GENOVA: That's what they've committed to, to-- the leadership is committed. They said if we've got people that aren't delivering, we will take them off the project and bring in somebody else.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK.

DAVE GENOVA: They've made that-- they've made that commitment to us.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: OK, well said. Well said. All right, nothing further from General Manager, then.

Now, other matters-- any committee member-- and I'll get to Director Walker too if he has anything. But any committee members with other matters? Let me begin, if I may, with Second Vice Chair Deadwyler on the telephone. Do you have any other matters you'd like to bring before the Executive Committee?

BARBARA DEADWYLER: No, I don't. Thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much. We appreciate that, Madam Second Vice Chair. Madam Vice Chair, anything to bring before the committee?
NATALIE MENTEN: No.

DOUG TISDALE: All right. And Director Lubow.

JUDY LUBOW: No.

DOUG TISDALE: Anything? Director Folska, anything?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: No, thank you.

DOUG TISDALE: And Executive Manager, anything from you that you need to bring before us now? OK. Director Walker, did you have anything you wanted to bring before the committee?

JEFF WALKER: Yeah, just quickly because it took-- because it seemed to be an important topic early on about the design competition, the design effort at Civic Center Park. Those get done all the time. See Denver's, their graduate program.

I'm sure every station in our system has been analyzed twice. And some of the bus stops also. ULI does it.

They don't often get back to the Board. Sometimes Board members might find out about it, but I've never been involved in a presentation to the Board from one of those capstone-type projects. They're always fun to watch and fun to participate in.

I've answered questions for several of them. But there seemed to be a lot of discussion about it, and my thought at the time-- I didn't ask-- was some Board members might or Executive Committee members might see that as unusual. But it's not. It happens all the time for, like-- it's been like that for years since we announced FasTracks So that's all.

DOUG TISDALE: All right, thank you. And Director Folska.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Well, I mean, to Jeff Walker's point, my dissertation is grounded in analyzing the stations, and I didn't present live-- kind of presented some things early on. But I mean, I think-- and I also anticipated with the culture of architecture and planning, graduate capstone projects. And I know that they had often asked me if they could have a chance to present their findings or their ideas here.

Now it's-- I'm not suggesting that it's a requirement or anything, but I think it's nice to have that open line of communication with our different universities. I'm going to keep taking six senior MIT-- or not MIT-- School of Mines engineering students on a tour looking at different things with transit, first/last mile, smart city design. They don't know what they're going to be doing yet, but I'm taking them, and you're all welcome. It's 10 o'clock on the 21st.

I meet them at the Terminal-- Terminal Bar in front of there at Union Station and just to explore. So that is another school that looks at what we're doing here. And I think if they come up with
something-- and in fact, [INAUDIBLE] put them in touch with Samara, the woman [INAUDIBLE].

DOUG TISDALE: Oh, good. OK.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: I forget her last name, but you know, she's all kind of smart cities stuff in Montreal or something. So--

DOUG TISDALE: Yeah. Oh, yes.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Yeah, and maybe there's a synergy there in sharing technologies and whatever. So we are tasked as a city in general, I think, with finding better ways to move people and to maybe cool the place off a bit [INAUDIBLE].

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much, Director Folska. We appreciate that and we appreciate your engagement in those various projects too. That's very helpful to the agency and to the Board.

If there is no other further business to come before this committee, then I'll entertain a motion to adjourn. I have a motion to adjourn. Is there a second on that motion?

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Second.

DOUG TISDALE: Second on that motion. Any discussion on that motion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Aye. Are there any opposed? There are none. That passes unanimously and we stand adjourned at 1:15

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Well done.

JUDY LUBOW: Sold!

BARBARA MCMANUS: Good afternoon, Director Deadwyler.

DOUG TISDALE: Good afternoon, Madam Second Vice Chair.

it--