

# 2022-05-28

## Board Meeting

JULIEN BOUQUET: I'll now call the Wednesday, May 28 RTD Board meeting to order. We're convened as of 7:00 PM. I would respectfully ask everyone to remain muted unless you're recognized to speak. Thank you all for joining us this evening. As the Board has moved to in-person meetings for monthly gatherings, please note that committee meetings of the RTD Board of Directors will still be held remotely via Zoom, and will be audio and video recorded.

The meeting recordings, along with the unofficial minutes of the meetings, will be posted as soon as practical on the Board's website. Visit [rtd-denver.com](http://rtd-denver.com). And a livestream of this meeting is also available via RTD's YouTube page. During tonight's meeting, we're also providing communication access real-time translation, also known as CART.

Anyone who would like to access this service should send an email to the RTD Board Office at [rtd.boardoffice@rtd-denver.com](mailto:rtd.boardoffice@rtd-denver.com) and a link will be provided. Additionally, the CART transcript can be automatically translated into Spanish for anyone who would like access to a live transcript of this meeting in Spanish. I'll now ask Secretary Nicholson, could you please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands. One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Secretary. I will now read the land acknowledgment. The RTD Board of Directors acknowledges the land on which our buses and trains operate is their traditional territory of the Ute, Cheyenne, Arapaho, and other contemporary tribal nations that are historically tied to these lands.

We honor our Indigenous elders who have traveled, inhabited, and stewarded these mountains, hills, and plains throughout generations. May this acknowledgment demonstrate a commitment to working to dismantle the ongoing legacies of inequity of the Native and all historically oppressed peoples, and recognize their current and future contributions in the district as we move forward. I'll now call the roll. Treasurer Benker.

KAREN BENKER: Present.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Buzek.

VINCE BUZEK: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Chandler is an excused absence. Director Guissinger.

LYNN GUISSINGER: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Gutschenritter.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: I'm here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: First Vice Chair O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: Here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: Present.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha. Director Ruscha.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Chairman Bouquet, they're not on the Zoom.

JULIEN BOUQUET: OK. Thank you. And Second Vice Chair Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: I'm here.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Awesome. We have 13 present, two absent. Pardon me. Moving on to our retiree awards. There are no retiree awards for this evening. Second quarter retiree awards will be announced at the June 24 Board of Directors meeting. Next is our public participation period, which is open to anyone who would like to address the Board.

As we have both in-person and remote attendees, in-person comments will go first, followed by those who are participating remotely. For those attending in person, please come up to the podium when your name is called. If you have not already signed up to speak and would like to do so, please approach the podium, when I call for any additional speakers.

For those attending virtually, if you wish to speak and have not already done so, please raise your virtual hand or press star 9 on your phone. Staff will unmute you when it is your turn to speak. If you're dialed in, press star 6 to toggle your mute settings. Please bear in mind that by participating in this process, you are being recorded.

If you do not wish to be recorded, then your comments will have to be submitted via writing. If any speaker has documentation or reference materials for the Board, or if any member of the public would like to submit written comments, please email those materials to the Board Office at [rtd.directors@rtd-denver.com](mailto:rtd.directors@rtd-denver.com).

During this time, the Board will not offer any direct comments or responses. However, if you'd like to be contacted regarding your public comment, please email the RTD Board Office at [rtd.directors@rtd-denver.com](mailto:rtd.directors@rtd-denver.com). Speakers should begin their remarks by stating their names and will have up to three minutes to provide their comments. Our first speaker tonight will be Joan Peck, Longmont mayor.

JOAN PECK: Good evening. Chair Bouquet and Director Johnson and Board, thank you so much for letting me address you tonight. I am here representing not only the city of Longmont, but the Front Range Passenger Rail District Board, which I am the secretary of. I want you to know right off the bat that the Board has as many questions about this new draft of IGA that you do.

So we are looking at it, scrutinizing it as well, but are very, very excited about the prospect of being able to work together and see this rail come to completion. I also want to thank this Board for the partnership that we have with our RIDE Longmont. We have exceeded 27,000 rides since December, which far outpaced the parent company of Via in Seattle.

So we're really proud of that, and that is directly because of the partnership we are doing with you. So thank you very much. I am also going to ask for the LX1 to be restored. I get a little frustrated when you use ridership as a reason for not restoring that, because Bustang now, which is at the Firestone hub, is packed. Those buses are packed and that ridership should belong to RTD.

And it makes me sad that that bus was cut and our people now aren't interested that much in RTD because Bustang is taking care of it and getting our money. I also want to let you know that I'm going to-- I'm switching hats here from the FRPR Board as well as city of Longmont. I want you to know that I am very excited about this rail for many reasons.

First of all, it's an economic driver, and it is a huge project that I think that we should take pride in together. And to think about-- I know the cost is huge on both sides, but when we first heard about the cost of the Northwest corridor in about 2017, it was \$1.2 or \$1.4 billion. And now BNSF's value to you, to RTD, is 650 million.

So that is quite a difference, and part of that is due to the fact that the last three cities on the Northwest corridor, Westminster, Broomfield, and Louisville are being taken off of your plate and FRPR is going to operate them. I don't know, as none of us know, how that funding is going to work out. But what I would like to offer and invite the RTD Executive Board.

I think, I believe that when we sit down face to face and work out what it is we think can happen-- because our boards are the ones that are going to decide this, one way or the other. We're the ones that are going to vote. So if you would think about the Executive Committee and the Executive Board or Committee of FRPR and RTD sitting down together and just diving into this IGA and trying to figure out what can we vote for, what will really work for both of us, both districts.

For me, that would be better in being able to see people face to face, emotions, talking and just working through it. Because I never like going through third parties telling us what we should or shouldn't be doing. But I understand that the Joint Service is probably going to happen. How do we want it to happen? And it is our boards that will decide that in the end. So thank you very much, and let's just keep rolling along.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Mayor Peck. Next up, we have Dr. Kay Baumann.

KAY PALMER MARSH: Well, good afternoon. My name is Reverend Dr. Kay Palmer Marsh, and I'm from Longmont, Colorado. And I want to congratulate-- and thank you for having us all here. I really appreciate it. Thank you, Board, for the public participation. I want to thank you for what you've done in the past. You've had courage, vision, and guts to start this FasTracks program.

I mean, I remember when I first moved to Denver 40 years ago, there was no such thing. I came from Chicago. And there was no such thing, and the Board had this vision and you went forward with it. And now there's a little bit of-- I think more than a little bit of hesitation about coming in all the way up to Longmont. Well, I want you to know that Longmont is a wonderful place.

We just don't trust you all that much anymore because we've been paying for all the tax-- been paying taxes since 2005. But we're looking forward to this Board having the courage and the guts and the vision to make this happen for our community and communities down the line that have been paying taxes since 2005 on this. We voted to support this, and we still support it. It's just a little touchy right now. I do want to address equity.

We look at equity in Longmont as how come Highlands Ranch has access to this wonderful rail? How come Boulder has so many buses? And in Longmont, we don't have so many buses. We keep getting cut. And of course, we don't have our rail yet either. And so we look at equity in a different way than you do.

I also know that you have looked at equity in terms of-- in a different way that doesn't really make sense to us when we look at Boulder being very high income and having all their buses and good transportation. Highlands Ranch is another good example of a fairly high income community that has access to passenger rail. We, in Longmont, look for a more-- shall I say, a looser version of the equity argument. Right now it looks like the equity argument is being used so that we won't get it.

On the other hand. I've heard some good things. I'm excited about what could happen. Again, Longmont is still-- we're developing trust, I hope, with the RTD. My neighbors don't particularly trust you. When I was walking around with one petition or another, they didn't want to even let me in the door when I said RTD. So thank you for this opportunity and I strongly support the Northwest Rail and I hope you will too.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Reverend Dr. Madelyn Marsh is our next speaker.

MADELYN MARSH: Thank you, Board members, for allowing us to speak tonight. My name is Madelyn Marsh. I'm also from Longmont, and I voted for FasTracks in my very first election. I was a brand new 18-year-old in 2004, and here we are 21 years later, and we still don't-- instead of a train to Longmont or more dedicated bus services, even, you have cut services to Longmont.

And so it's frustrating to be here asking for more or for what we voted for and what you're legally obligated to provide based on the results of that election. In the 21 years since I voted for that, I ended up living in Chicago for a few years. I enjoyed a robust public transit system. I enjoyed the-- I took the bus, I took trains to work.

I took trains to play. I took trains to the suburbs, to the city. And it was an economic driver for every community that was involved. There's bustling downtowns wherever you go. And like others have said, the people in Longmont are not inclined to trust RTD because the trust has been broken, that we keep getting pushed off and pushed off and pushed off.

And so I would ask that you vote in favor of the Northwest Rail expansion, but also that you don't limit it to three trips every weekday, but that you have the vision to allow us to bring our money to Denver, to other communities for entertainment purposes as well as work purposes. Thank you very much for your time.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Madelyn. I have Connor Shea as our next speaker.

CONNOR SHEA: Good evening, Board. My name is Connor Shea and I live in the Baker neighborhood of Denver. I'm here representing the Baker Historic Neighborhood Association as a member of its board. I live a few blocks from the Alameda station, and I use RTD's bus and rail services pretty frequently.

As you're probably aware, Denver is in the process of considering a women's soccer league stadium at the former Gates Rubber Factory site, just west of the I-25 and Broadway Station. As the stadium will be across from the freight rail tracks-- across the freight rail tracks from the RTD station, transit riders need to cross over the FasTracks to reach the stadium from the various RTD bus and rail stations-- bus and rail connections at the station.

Currently, the only pedestrian access route from the Broadway Station is the Southern Bridge, sometimes referred to as the bridge to nowhere. That path will be about 3/4 of a mile going from the station to the stadium, and then the same distance going back after a soccer game or other event at the venue. As a neighborhood, we intend to push for a North Bridge to the site connecting the station and stadium as directly as possible.

And I'm here to ask for RTD's cooperation on this, since a bridge would require the use of RTD land on the Broadway Station. North Bridge has been in most past plans for development of the site but is considered optional as part of the non-binding agreement between the city and the stadium owners that city council passed a few weeks ago. The North Bridge connection would mean only one quarter mile of walking to go from the RTD station to the stadium.

In total, the bridge would-- a North Bridge would save a full mile of walking, about 20 minutes, when going to the stadium and then back after an event ends. We believe that the shorter distance with the North Pedestrian Bridge would encourage significantly more transit usage when going to events at the stadium. The Broadway Station is accessible from the D, E, and H lines without a transfer, and all other lines with only one transfer. It's also accessible from a variety of bus routes.

That would reduce traffic and emissions coming through our neighborhood and the other neighborhoods adjacent to the stadium. North Bridge would be good for our neighborhood, for the safety of pedestrians and transit users, as they won't have to cross as many streets when accessing the stadium, and would be good for RTD and extra fares and customers from events at the stadium. The extra bridge would provide better connections and redundancy for pedestrians.

It would especially improve accessibility for folks with limited mobility. I'm here to ask for RTD's cooperation and support on getting this included in the stadium project, as we work on negotiating a community benefits agreement with the developer over the next few months. I sent an email to the Board and CEO Johnson about this on Friday and would be happy to receive any emails from the Board or CEO if anyone has any further questions about that. Thank you very much for your time.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you for your comments, sir. I will now move to online participants, Mr. Kroll, does anyone have their virtual hand raised?

JACK KROLL: Yes. At this time, we have a number of folks with their hands raised. The first is former RTD Director Claudia Folska.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Folska.

JACK KROLL: So, Ms. Folska, it looks like you briefly came off mute and then went right back on. You are unmuted.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Whew. This is a huge achievement, guys. Oh, God. I was so thrilled to hear the earlier special session. And kudos to all of you, especially General Manager/CEO Debra Johnson. What a great accomplishment. Lisa Kaufman, Diane. And now I'm forgetting her last name.

But I mean, everybody was really amazing. I would ask the Chair to afford me a little bit more time, as it's customary for former Directors to be granted additional time as they have institutional knowledge to share and inform the Board. Would that be OK with you, Mr. Chair?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Of course.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. So I was reflecting on my early days on the Board, and we were desperately trying to find the money to do the R line, which goes through district B and F, I think. I don't remember. But anyway, and Phil Washington was our Executive Director then, and he had this brilliant motto. He always said, every day, practically, we will build as much as we can as fast as we can, no matter what.

But when it came time to find the money for the R line, he would pick up any nickel under any rock. And you can ask him that. And those are his words. And he opened up a meeting, a luncheon for all business leaders, small and large, to figure out, this is what we have to work with. How can we do it? And it took a series of IGAs to get this thing done. Lots of them.

So we're on the way, we're moving along. Everything is great. And then Bruce Benson, who was the president of the University of Colorado, comes over to the Board and says, hey, hey. No, no, no. We need you to change the alignment of the R line and take it off of Montview Boulevard, right through Anschutz Medical Center campus.

Now, you can imagine-- we're like, what? How is this-- I mean, this was a huge shock, blow to all of us. And what were we going to do? Well, you know what that means? It requires 10 votes. A super majority. And guess what? Those folks in Longmont, in the north, they weren't having it. They were not going to do it.

But it required all of us, each and every one of us, to have those one on one discussions and promise, promise the people in the north, let's just get this one thing done and then we can move on to the north. Now it's their turn. Now it's time to finish the Northwest Rail. And those numbers, the finances and all of that, they'll come out. You guys will figure it out. Everybody is coming together.

All those different entities, and then IGA is so critical to proceed and move forward and do what the voters elected to have done. FasTracks, they elected you to finish it. You may not even like it, but it's not you. It's the people that voted for it. It's the RTD's obligation. And by the way, of the 3.1 million people living in the district, 97% of them don't even use RTD and they're paying for that train.

And now you have this wonderful, exciting, incredible opportunity to finish it and even connect beyond the district into Fort Collins. What a boon for everybody and for the entire state, quite frankly. So I'm like, you

can probably tell I'm so excited and proud of you guys. It's like, whew. About time. Now, the other topic that's on my mind is Access-on-Demand. Your annual operating budget is \$1.32 billion.

And if you're thinking about equity and 20% of the population, roughly, a little more, little less, are people with disabilities, then 20% of that operating budget is closer to \$264 million, and Access-on-Demand isn't anywhere close to that. I don't think either one of these recommendations to the Board makes sense at all, and I would encourage you to look at it again.

I mean, the numbers keep changing, by the way, for the subsidies, \$16 to now \$22 for Access-on-Demand. Now it's 100 for Access-a-Ride. And why not think-- like, Einstein said you can get from point A to B with logic, but you can get everywhere with your imagination. What if you applied the Access-on-Demand model to Access-a-Ride using those vehicles?

You could start with a little pilot and see how it worked. You could even use it to pick up other people. There's no prohibition from other people using those paratransit vehicles, and most of the time they're sitting in a parking lot with a driver sleeping. So of course, I haven't seen that. But I've been told--

JULIEN BOUQUET: Former Director Folska, if you could wrap up your comments. You're about double the time right now.

CLAUDIA FOLSKA: OK. I appreciate it. Thank you. I think that's it. So I would encourage you, sign the IGA. Go forward with that. Vote yes on it. And ask staff to go back and start using their imagination for better Access-on-Demand for everybody. Thank you very much for your time.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Former Director Folska. Mr. Kroll, our next participant.

JACK KROLL: Yes. next We have Former Director Doug Tisdale.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Former Director Tisdale. You're recognized.

DOUG TISDALE: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you this evening. I am Doug Tisdale, Former Director for District H. And I apologize, you're only seeing a picture of me instead of my face in person, but I guess that's the restriction. In any event, I'll try to keep this within the time constraints. The comment was made during public participation earlier. Highlands Ranch has access to rail.

At the risk of being struck by lightning for contesting the testimony of a Reverend, Highlands Ranch does not have access to rail. The Southwest rail extension, what I affectionately refer to as the SWRE is one of the unfinished corridors of FasTracks. My successor, as District H Director, made a reference to that in the special meeting earlier today, many hours ago.

The legislature, at the urging of the governor, only prioritize service for the Northwest Rail, with no reference to the Southwest Rail extension, the SWRE. I must confess that I must have been an inadequate voice on behalf of the SWRE.

I apologize to my former constituents, and can only hope that my successor, as Vice Chair of this Board, will be more impactful. That said, kudos to all of you for proceeding with the steps toward Northwest Rail completion. I can only hope that we find the political will, the political courage to address the SWRE with the same kind of passion. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Former Director Tisdale Mr. Kroll, our next speaker.

JACK KROLL: Yes. Next we have Maitri Lazaroff.

MAITRI LAZAROFF: Hello. I'm Maitri Lazaroff, and I am not here to talk about Northwest Rail. I am an RTD rider, and I was formerly a regular rider of the E line. And the reason I say former is, like many other riders, I was pushed off the light rail a year ago due to the fact that I could no longer rely on it as reliable transportation. And now that issue that caused me to be pushed off of the train is solved.

And I know there's already been a little bit of outreach on this. There's an article on your website, but it is my opinion that RTD needs to be as loud as possible with this. It's a sad fact that the majority of people in the metro don't ride transit, and we need to yell to get news like this out, because it's hard for it to spread with light announcements and word of mouth.

We have lost, as of 2024, 21.6% of E line riders and 31.4% of H line riders. And not only is that a massive hit to the light rail system, but it bleeds to the rest of the system by people not being able to make those transfers. We saw ridership decreases on all three of our rail lines last year. And it's just, Directors making Reddit posts just really isn't enough.

Could we maybe give two weeks of free fares to try and really get eyes back on the system to try and really make an effort to undo this ridership destruction that we've seen on our light rail? And especially on the Southeast corridor. Thank you. That's my time.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Maitri. Mr. Kroll, our next speaker.

JACK KROLL: Yes. Next, we have Richard Bamber.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Richard, you're recognized.

RICHARD BAMBER: Good evening, and thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I'd like to talk about the Title VI changes, which are up for approval tonight. GBT is generally in support of these changes, although we know a yes vote, needs to be carried out against the backdrop that a review of the methodology is needed in the medium term.

Currently, RTD's only reliable data source uses Census data about what sort of populations demographics live in certain neighborhoods. So we make lots of effort to ensure service outside the front doors of equity populations is sufficiently good that they're not left behind when service is improved and they're not unfairly targeted when service has to be cut. However, this approach only assumes equity populations only travel locally within the communities they reside.

A good transit network can level up communities and spread wealth across its entire metro area. There's no point in running 15 minute frequency buses past the doorsteps of a low income or BIPOC community if they then have to transfer onto another bus which runs every 60 minutes and drops you a mile away from that well-paying employer.

The current Title VI process fails to consider how a local transit network either succeeds or fails to service equity populations effectively, and it is because it considers the routes basically in silos. And this is why, while we support the Title VI, we support the agency's efforts, we believe that it could be made a much more effective process if new data sources are considered and the methodology is reviewed. Thank you very much for letting me speak tonight.



JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you for your comments, Richard. Our next speaker, Mr. Kroll?

JACK KROLL: Yes, next is Jo Elizabeth Pinto.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Jo, you are recognized.

JO ELIZABETH PINTO: Am I unmuted?

JACK KROLL: We hear you, Jo.

JO ELIZABETH PINTO: Thank you. I would like to talk quickly about two issues. The first is the Rockies Ride. My family went to the Rockies game last week, and we looked up how to get there on the RTD website, and there's a whole page dedicated to the Rockies Ride. But when we got to the stop, there were no buses, no people, no cars, no nothing.

So we called the RTD, 299-6000, and the woman laughed and said, oh, we haven't had those buses for years. So the RTD needs to take down the Rockies Ride info from its website if it is no longer running those services, and it needs to keep its website updated about the services that are provided because people depend on that website to be accurate.

The other thing that I need to talk about is Access-on-Demand. And my issue is that when you look at the Access-on-Demand and when you are talking about cutting services-- which, again, if we are 20% to 25% of the population that have disabilities, a little more, a little less, like Ms. Folska said, the idea to cut services based on the RTD schedule will leave people with no services on the weekends if the bus doesn't run on weekends to that part of the service area, or at night, or if they live more than 3/4 of a mile from a bus stop.

And that will leave people stranded. And people with disabilities go places after 5 o'clock. They go places on the weekends. They go places. They don't just go to doctors that are open in the daytime. They go to shows, they go to restaurants, they go to malls on the weekends. They go all the same places you do.

And it becomes really difficult when they get stranded in their homes except from 9:00 to 5:00, weekdays. So just take that into consideration when you make these cuts and imagine people who are disabled going to the same places you do, and imagine being stranded at home because you cut so that they can only go from 9:00 to 5:00 on weekdays. Also--

JULIEN BOUQUET: Jo, if you could wrap up your comments. You're about 10 seconds over.

JO ELIZABETH PINTO: OK. Thank you. The other thing is remember that these people with disabilities pay taxes to RTD the same way you do. Thank you. That's all I have to say.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you for your comments, Jo. Our next speaker, Mr. Kroll?

JACK KROLL: Yes. Next we have Tim Keenan.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Tim, you're recognized.

JACK KROLL: Tim? Looks like--

TIM KEENAN: Can you hear me now?

JULIEN BOUQUET: We can hear you, Tim. Thank you.

TIM KEENAN: Alrighty. I'm Tim Keenan. Thanks for listening. I am a totally blind user of Access-a-Ride. I'm sorry. Of Access-- I'm not sure if you caught the beginning of that. I'm Tim Keenan. I'm a totally blind user of Access-on-Demand, and I live in Baker and work a fluctuating schedule out at Amazon in Aurora, which includes night and overnight shifts.

So if you were to follow any of these recommendations, me and people like me, because I know there are a lot of people with disabilities who work out there, would not be able to use Access-on-Demand for at least one leg of their trip. In my case, that would eat into my paycheck by close to a third. And when you look at the numbers here, Access-on-Demand is probably the most efficient of your services.

With fixed routes costing \$19 per boarding, Access-on-Demand at \$16 and Access-a-Ride at \$60. So this is really working well, and to cut it, I think you need to decide whether this is in fact sustainable. I know there was-- the use was just blowing up and people got worried, and so they commissioned this review and all that. But really, it's helping a lot of people, and at 1.13% of your annual budget, it sounds pretty sustainable to me.

Now, all that said, I don't know anyone who wouldn't-- I don't know anybody who would be against paying a fare. So if you add a \$4.50 fare and that's \$2.8 million of savings from the current numbers. That's doing something to put more money back into the system. And we certainly don't mind paying our way.

But to cut the area in hours is going to leave some people who don't even have bus service in their area anymore, but used to, it's going to leave those people totally stranded without any kind of affordable transit option. So my ask would be that you keep the limit at 60 trips a month. This allows full time workers, 40 trips, and then 20 trips to do whatever they want or need to do. Get groceries and participate in the community.

Maintain the current service area and hours so you're not creating transit deserts, and implement pricing that's fair that stays constant at \$4.50 or \$2.25 for RTD live that doesn't punish people for taking more trips like a tiered system would do, and it also doesn't have the added overhead that that system would have. So basically you can keep the program as it is now, add a fare, and keep this program doing what it does best, which is connect people with disabilities with their community.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Tim, if you could wrap up your comments.

TIM KEENAN: All set. Thank you very much.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you for your comments, Tim. For the sake of the record, I'd like to note that Director Ruscha has joined us. Our next speaker, Mr. Kroll.

JACK KROLL: Yes. Next we have Nate Trela.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Nate, you're recognized.

NATE TRELA: Yeah. Hi. This is Nate Trela. Thank you once again for the chance to speak. Hopefully we're down the home stretch here in terms of finding a sustainable path forward for Access-on-Demand that still maintains this robust level of service and utility for the district residents that cannot use a fixed route service independently.

I implore you to recognize a few facts that are in the staff's presentation that you're going to-- the public's going to hear tonight and that was in the agenda packet for this meeting and for the operations meeting a couple weeks ago. And there's some unanswered questions that you may already have as Board members, information that you should definitely, in my opinion, make sure as you're making decisions about the future of this program.

In the agenda packet, it already talks about how the cost of an Access trip is just a fraction of the cost of a traditional access ride service. And I don't know if there has been any effort made to see if it's possible to try to encourage people to use Access-on-Demand instead of Access-a-Ride, if people are fully aware of the capabilities of it, if people are aware of how to use it, converting a few of those access ride trips to Access-on-Demand could yield significant savings in this whole process.

Also, it's worth pointing out that you're more than doubling the number of trips provided to people who cannot use fixed route service with Access-on-Demand, as opposed to Access-a-Ride. That's a success. You're helping people make connections, get around, participate in the workforce, participate in society. As we've heard people talk about, shop, go out and get some entertainment, whether it's movies or music or what have you.

Things have become possible with this program. Some of the answered questions in these proposals is in the tiered fare concept, it talks about needing to hire additional staff. Perhaps this is already going to be discussed later tonight, but it's not clear what that staff would do. And it's hard to fathom what would need to be added to-- what would need to be handled by added staff that couldn't be automated, couldn't be handled with a spreadsheet wizard and a knowledge of how to write some stuff in SQL.

There are ways to gather a lot of different data and process a lot of numbers, analyze the numbers to make that tiered fare approach work. So it'd be good to know what those new hires would need to do. Both proposals call for cutting back, as we've talked about, the service area hours back to match Access-a-Ride. This isn't required as a supplemental premium service.

Access-on-Demand doesn't have to line up with Access-a-Ride. That is a choice that's made. What's the question is, how would Access-a-Ride enforce the restricted hours proposed and contained both these plans because when the National Federation of the Blind of Colorado has spoken with RTD staff before, we've been told that, yes, geofencing to define the boundaries can be done.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Nate, if you could wrap up your comments.

NATE TRELA: Sure. Sure. Just saying that the cutback of the hours is going to be incredibly complex to manage, and it's unclear how you could expect somebody to do that, especially when, again, the point of RTD is to be helping people make connections. Adding these layers of complexity to it does the exact opposite.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Nate. Our next speaker, Mr. Kroll.

JACK KROLL: Yes. Next we have Cody Bair.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Cody, you're recognized.

CODY BAIR: Good evening and thank you RTD Board. I am also here to talk about Access-a-Ride-- Access-on-Demand service, and have spoken about the topic at a few meetings before. Tonight I want to

say that I agree with you what Dr. Folska and Tim Keenan said about this. Access-on-Demand cost is really a fraction of RTD's budget.

At just 1.13% and just north of, I think \$10 million, this is not a huge opportunity for RTD to save significantly on the budget and would be a huge loss of service for many Coloradoans in the RTD district with disabilities. Speaking to the current proposals that are out there. With the tiered proposal, one thing that I would urge the RTD Board to think about and questions to ask would be, how would we actually enforce the fares of the tiered proposal?

This service is offered amongst Uber, Lyft, and a couple of other taxi platforms, neither of which share information or communicate with each other at all. To that point, even in the current system as a user, if I want to see how many trips I've used, I have to open each platform and count the number that have been taken in the month on that platform.

I just don't see an administratively effective way to make the fare thing work without putting that burden on the rider, which would inherently cause issues for people keeping track of it. Second, to follow up on Nate's comments about the hours. You look at somebody who's a full time employee at Amazon like Tim and many others who would be affected by this, that's taking-- by cutting people's ability to use the service, we're taking tax revenue out of the Colorado economy.

I'm not sure that that's something that makes a lot of sense for RTD. And people have built their lives around being able to access this service in its current state and any reduction and change of the service area or hours is a reduction in service, in my mind, and something that I would completely be against. Appreciate your guys' time tonight, and that concludes my comments.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you for your comments, Cody. Mr. Kroll, our next speaker.

JACK KROLL: Yes. The last speaker we have in the queue is Maryann Migliorelli.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Maryann, you're recognized.

MARYANN MIGLIORELLI: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you so much for your time and your attention. Tonight I would like to speak to you briefly about equity and the Access-on-Demand system and in RTD in general. We have been told by RTD members that we cannot have the multiple stop situation because that would not be equitable. We have been told that we can have certain things, but we can't have others.

One of the things that we are now being told is that with this tiered system, we can have inequity in pricing. There is no place in the RTD system where riding more costs more per trip. This does not happen on Access-a-Ride. It does not happen anywhere in the fixed route system, on any light rail, on any bus. As a matter of fact, RTD went out of its way to remove the barriers to regional transit by removing the price barrier.

But with the ideas of this tiered system, we are saying-- and you would be saying if you approve it-- that anybody who does more than 30 trips per month should have to pay more in order to use a system. That, ladies and gentlemen, is inequity. And that is not something that RTD should even have been entertaining that proposal. But you will do what is necessary, and I will thank you for the hard work that is involved in keeping our program alive.

The other thought is in removing and putting the boundaries in that are the same for Access-a-Ride, there are many people who will be affected whose life plans, the places they live, the places they work, the places they choose to do business and entertain will all be affected. People have been provided a service, have been able to make these decisions about their lives because of the service that is provided, and taking service away creates further inequity and transit deficits.

That is not something RTD should be looking for doing, and I sincerely hope that in every way that you can, you find a way to keep the Access-on-Demand program as open as it is right now. I personally do not know anybody who would object to paying the 4.50 or 2.25 fare as proposed. But adding additional fares and cutting service will make transit deficits that should not be considered.

Right now, this program is moving people who have never had a chance to participate in public transit life in the way that we can right now. Please consider this when you're making your decisions. Thank you so much for your time and those who remember me before, if I was there, I would bring you warm chocolate cookies.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you for your comments, Maryann. Are there any members of the public who would like to-- excuse me. Mr. Kroll, any further online participants?

JACK KROLL: No further online participants.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Any members of the public who would like to make comments? Feel free to come up to the podium. Seeing none, were there any emailed comments, Mr. Kroll?

JACK KROLL: There were a number. I am not going to go through all 46 and read the names. However, you received 36 letters with respect to Northwest Rail and the IGA conversation that you held earlier today, five letters with respect to the ETOD policy you will consider later this evening, three letters with respect to Title VI policy or the program update that you all will consider later this evening.

One regarding the National Women's Soccer League proposed stadium that was discussed earlier here in person, and one regarding paratransit AOD program modifications. All will be appended to the transcript of this meeting. And just as a reminder to Directors, a majority of these written public comment comments were submitted to the rtd.directors email group, which you all have access to and can see in real time.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Mr. Kroll. With no other participants in the queue, we will now close public participation at this time. Moving on to our next item, external entities report. We have no external entity reports this month. Moving on to our next item. Discussion items. We have one discussion item on the agenda this evening, which is a holdover from last week's Operation Safety and Security Committee meeting. It is the Access-on-Demand program modifications. I would like to offer the floor to GM/CEO Debra Johnson for some opening remarks before introducing Ms. Vallejos.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon or evening, Board members. Debra Johnson, General Manager and Chief Executive Officer. I am joined by Erin Vallejos, who serves as the Acting Assistant or Deputy Assistant General Manager of Bus Operations. And as indicated in your remarks, sir, we are here referencing the previous agenda item at the Operations Safety and Security Committee that we did not get to and wanted to have this conversation with you all this evening.

The intent of this presentation is to ground all Board members in our paratransit programs. But more specifically, what we are seeking from this body is some guidance relative to Access-on-Demand, which is a supplemental premium service as it relates to paratransit services, not the Americans with Disabilities Act

of 1990 complementary paratransit services. And in doing so, this conversation will help us guide our path forward.

Specifically, I think what's notable for everybody to understand that the current paratransit contracts that we have for Access-on-Demand do sunset at the end of December. We have had conversations relative to modifications. In absence of having some guidance, we run the risk of not having any type of services, and hence why it's so imperative is that we adhere to open and fair competition. In order to do a solicitation relative to services, we have to have some guidance relative to the specifications that would be included in a solicitation for a request for proposal.

So this is not for you to make a decision relative to where we are, but provide guidance, because what we anticipate doing with said guidance and bringing forward these scenarios after meeting with some board members, i.e. Chair Ruscha and Director Chandler, that are both on the Operation Safety and Security Committee, is to seek that direction so we can then go out to the customer segments and garner a better understanding.

While we've heard comments here, we have taken part in a myriad of different public participation engagements and want to ensure that we are being good fiscal stewards, but also ensuring that we are providing the independence and ability for all aspects of our population to be able to travel and move about to and fro. So with that being said, I will yield the floor to Ms. Vallejos to commence with the presentation. If we could have Board Office staff pull that up, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

ERIN VALLEJOS: It's been a while since I've used these microphones. Good evening, everyone. As GM/CEO Johnson said, I'm Erin Vallejos, the Acting Deputy Assistant General Manager for Bus Operations, and we are just going to go over just a quick overview. I think it's a lot of information that you've already seen, so we won't spend too much time on that. Just kind of hit on what the initial recommendation was that we made talk about some revised recommendations, and then again, open it up for discussion to get an idea of some direction.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Vallejos, before, could you speak a little closer to the microphone?

ERIN VALLEJOS: Yes, I can.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you so much.

ERIN VALLEJOS: Of course. OK, so just to highlight on this, again, as GM/CEO Johnson said. Access-a-Ride and Access-on-Demand are the two programs that we have. Access-a-Ride is RTD's federally required ADA complementary paratransit service. It does supplement our fixed route services. There is a fare payment required for these services and customers must meet the criteria set forth by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to be eligible. This is provided with all RTD branded Access-a-Ride vehicles that are all 100% accessible.

And then Access-on-Demand is our supplemental premium paratransit service. It is a curb-to-curb taxi and rideshare service. It is available to current paratransit customers, so they must meet those eligibility criteria to qualify for Access-a-Ride to then use Access-on-Demand. And as it stands today, RTD pays the first \$25 of the trip and the remaining portion is paid by the customer. And again, ability today to take 60 total trips.

So just some quick operating statistics. The annual operating cost in 2024 for Access-a-Ride was just over 53 million, and the customer trips were just over 500,000. And again, these are RTD owned vehicles, and the contractors that operate this service have over 500 drivers, mechanics, and other staff.

And then Access-on-Demand. Last year it was about just over \$15.3 million for the budget. Just over 685,000 trips. And these are all provided by third party vehicles.

So again, as we touched on, you must be eligible for Access-a-Ride to also use Access-on-Demand. There is a process that customers must go through that determines if a customer has a disabling condition that would prevent them from using our regular fixed route service. There's an application process, a medical verification process, and then an in-person assessment that customers must complete.

And there are a couple of different types of eligibility that a customer could receive. Unconditional means you can have access to the full service for up to four years. Temporary. You might have a condition that's going to improve, recovering from surgery or something along those lines. And then conditional would be when there was something-- maybe you're sensitive to extreme hot or extreme cold, so you would be able to use it at those times, but not the full year.

OK. And as we have touched on, this is something that you've probably seen as well. We are continuing to see an increase in Access-on-Demand usage. This is through 2024, but we continue to see that Access-on-Demand trend line going up into the start of this year. And Access-a-Ride, when you look at the trend line, while it is staying a little bit more stable, we are still seeing an increase in usage there as well.

And as we've talked about, average monthly trips per customer. The majority of customers are falling into the category of taking up to 50 trips. That is about 90% of the customers when we last did the analysis, and about 10% of the customers again fall into that 51 to 60 category. So now I'm going to just remind everyone of what our initial recommendations were back in 2024.

As it stands today again, quickly, there's a \$0 base customer fare. The trip cap is 60 per month. Subsidy is up to \$25 per trip. It is available within the entire district and it is available 24/7. Back when we came to you in November of 2024, we had proposed making changes, and this involved having a \$4.50 base customer fare, which would be \$2.25 for our LiVE eligible customers. We proposed a trip cap of \$40 per month.

The subsidy would go to \$20 per trip, and then it was proposed to mirror both the current service area and the service hours. With this recommendation, there were going to be cost savings that the District would realize, and that was going to be about \$5.8 million. So instead of the projected yearly spend being a little bit over 15 million, we would go down to about 9.4.

OK, and as a result of some of the feedback and comments that we've heard, we did put together two additional revised scenarios. So scenario one is what I'm going to touch on first. So this has to do with an increased trip cap approach. So what we were proposing in this scenario is increasing the trip cap to 50 per month from the original 40 that was proposed.

We are proposing as this is, again, as we've said, a premium supplemental service, a fare of \$6.50 per trip, which would be \$3.25 for our LiVE customers. Then the remainder of the proposal does remain the same. We were still proposing a subsidy per trip of \$20, and we are proposing mirroring the current service area and service hours as that of our Access-a-Ride program.

With this program, we did see actually a little bit of the yearly impact would be a cost savings of about 6.1 million, bringing our total spend to about a little over 9.1. With the 50 trips, that does allow for customers to still have-- given there's about 20 week days in a month that does allow for customers to still travel to work, but then does allow for some ancillary trips throughout the month.

And then another scenario that we had put together is the tiered approach that we have discussed. With this approach, we would still maintain a trip cap of up to 60 trips per month, which matches what we have currently. There would be a \$4.50 base customer fare for up to 30 trips, \$5.50 for 31 to 50, and \$6.50 for 51 to 60. And the remainder of the recommendation would remain the same.

With this program, as some people have noted, due to the program structure and some of the manual aspects that exist with monitoring today, there would be a pretty big an increase in staff oversight that would result in additional staff headcount. Again, that had been noted, but as it stands today, the program does require quite a bit of manual intervention.

There is also, as someone mentioned, the customers would need to be keeping a little bit closer track of their trips, and that could lead to confusion. It is something a customer would have to be regularly thinking, all right, where am I at for the month? Have I hit that 30 trips? So they know what to expect for their costs.

With this program, we would see some reductions of just over \$5 million. So it is a little bit less than some of the other recommendations that we've put forth, and it would bring our projected yearly spend to about \$10.28 million a year. Oh, and actually. So proposed next steps. We are here, as GM/CEO Johnson has said, to just garner everyone's feedback and get some guidance on a path forward.

The intent is to do outreach and engagement in June based on some of that guidance and engage with the community. We would be coming back for Board consideration in July with an actual recommended action to the committee, and then provided the committee advanced it at the Board meeting. And we would begin implementation in August with full implementation in October. And with that, I will open it up.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Perfect. Thank you very much for your presentation, Ms. Vallejos. OK. I'm going to open it up for Directors. Second Vice Chair Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: Thank you for the presentation and the ease of absorbing the proposed changes. Erin, looking at the second proposal, the tiered approach, one of our commenters talked about the complications of keeping up with number of trips. Is that something that the new staff would be able to be a clearinghouse, if you will, to where you have one call to RTD instead of calling a taxi and a Lyft and an Uber? That seems to be the most difficult part of that. I'm just curious if you think our staff would be handling that in a way that would be handy for our customers.

ERIN VALLEJOS: It's definitely something I think we could assist with, but I do think there would still be some burden on the customer for having some of that responsibility. Again, as I mentioned, as it stands today, there is just a very manual aspect of the program. And so while we're always looking at things to improve, I do think there would still be some responsibility that would live with the customer.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Thank you. And thank you for a very clear presentation. Although I have one question of clarification. You talk about mirroring the existing service area. One of the things that appealed to me about this service was that I don't think that the customers were restricted to the 3/4 mile within a fixed route. Would that change with this, any of these proposals? Or would it still be over the entire RTD service area?

ERIN VALLEJOS: As the proposals are presented, we are proposing mirroring the 3/4 of a mile boundary that exists today for our Access-a-Ride customers.

PEGGY CATLIN: That presents some problems for me, but we can talk about that later. Thank you.



JULIEN BOUQUET: OK. Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you very much. I think I first want to echo and perhaps be a little bit more direct about what Director Catlin said. We have bus routes in this system that don't qualify for the ADA service, but they're bus routes anyway. They're our commuter routes, and I would not vote personally for a change that would cut off the people who live within 3/4 of a mile of those routes.

So at least for me, you guys want to get this through, you're going to need to change that because it's just a matter of basic equity. Otherwise Peggy has two places in her district that get service, and that's just not reasonable. There are a lot of older folks that live up in those areas. I think the second issue that I have with what's being proposed is that the needs of-- not call it rural, but mountainous Jefferson County, when it comes to AOD, are very different than the needs of central Denver.

I can get to most places that I need to go, in terms of grocery stores, medical, et cetera, in a \$15 Uber. I don't think there's anywhere that you can get to for \$15 in Peggy's district, or yours. Exactly.

But creating a system where the trip cap is \$40 doesn't work for me. Creating a trip cap where it's \$15 doesn't work for the people in her district. It strikes me that the right approach would be to have different levels of financial cap and different levels of trip cap to go along with them and let people pick. You want 60 trips at \$15 per? Great. You want 50 trips at \$20 per? Great. You want 40 trips at \$30 per? Great.

Depends on where you live, depends on the types of trips you're going to be taking. But making people all fit into one size is either going to leave her people paying \$20 for every single trip that they take, or it's going to put people in my district in a reduced number of rides, because very few trips are going to cost \$20 or \$25. Those are my two pieces of feedback. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Secretary. Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So I just wanted to offer a bit of context. And the General Manager, please interrupt me if I'm framing this wrong. But the conversation that we're having tonight is a framework of a potential path forward. And because our OSS meeting went so long, we weren't able to get to the discussion and that also, I think, impacted our ability to have some interim discussions.

So I just want folks to keep an open mind to what staff is saying and definitely share that feedback because we're on a timeline. But also just recognize that-- and please, if I'm saying this wrong, interrupt me. But what is being presented is a concept framework. So we'll get Board feedback, and then of course, staff is going to be working very closely with our existing customers and advocacy organizations to make further refinements and give us some more stuff to look at.

So I hope I didn't speak out of turn, but I just wanted to offer that for context. And I'm also listening and taking notes, and I know staff is. So I would just urge, if anyone has thoughts, one way or another, please share them tonight since we are also on a timeline with our existing partners and those contracts as well. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director. Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: Thank you. I just have a question for Ms. Vallejos. So I seen one of these slides that it says in December of 2024, there were about 2,900 total active customers of Access-on-Demand. So there were 2,900 people, roughly, who used it in all of December? Is that right?

ERIN VALLEJOS: No, that would be for the year, I believe. Let me--

MATT LARSEN: As of. OK. As of. So 2,900 people used this service for the whole year. That's it? And so I guess what I'm trying to just understand is so if we were going to spend, say \$10 million or \$15 million on 2,900 people, what do we think the equivalent is for just our regular riders? Do we have any guess?

I mean, I know people have different ridership. I'm just trying to get-- I mean, if we have a million customers a year and it's the majority of our budget, I'm just trying to get a sense of how the per person spend for a regular rider compares to the per person spend for Access-on-Demand

ERIN VALLEJOS: And I-- go ahead, Debra. Oh.

DEBRA JOHNSON: So if I can, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Director Larsen, for the question. I would not want us to conjecture and speculate. We could double back and give you those numbers. As we talk about, you use the term regular rider. You're talking about those that are using fixed route service. I just want to be clear and intentional with the language we're using going forward.

So we need to assess that, because it's a different level of service. Because with fixed route bus, we're not providing curb to curb service. And so we can double back and share that information with the Board, but I think it wouldn't be fruitful for us to guesstimate because this is critically important. But as we come back and we have some guidance, we could provide that detailed information, if you will. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Any other Directors, comments? Yeah, Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: I am concerned with the aligning with the ADA for the service area. District C is fairly blessed with multiple forms of transit and fixed route where this is not a particular problem, but it is an issue in the suburban areas of the region. And it is highly concerning that we would restrict it so much where people would be left off of the system that live within a quarter mile of a commuter bus, and still not be able to access this.

I also think that as we proceed into the future after the demographer's presentation to the Finance and Planning Committee, a big concern will be our aging population in the region. And somebody said that this is a drop in the bucket for our budget. Maybe right now, but eventually, this is going to catch up with us, which is why we're having this conversation.

And Access-on-Demand and folks that are able to, or out of need, utilize this system need to be considered as humans first and how we serve them, which is our mission. They need connection as well, and not every one of them will be able to jump from a-- jump, roll, walk, shuffle to a fixed route form of transportation to get them to their destinations.

I have a question about the time on this. If it's mirroring regular service provision for the whole region, it kind of makes sense. But I would still be concerned for the reasons that emergencies don't happen on RTD's schedule. And so somebody who already has a specific need for this type of transportation usage might need to go to the doctor. And what do they do if they're unable to drive.

And regular bus service is not something that they can use because the buses aren't running? At 2 o'clock in the morning, emergency room visit is not unheard of and not uncommon in anybody's life. And yet, what do we do to take care of those that are most vulnerable? So for me, I would really want to see some clarity around those two areas. I am frankly less concerned about minimal difference of cost savings.

I mean, we're talking \$5 million. This is not really the top priority for me on that part right now. It will eventually get there because this will likely continue to grow. But I do want to make sure that we are basing ourselves in reality to serve the taxpayers' needs. And this is a need.

This is not a desire, as some of the other services we want to grow and create are. This one is an actual need. And so I want to be clear in my language on that and why I'm depositing these comments within that framework. So that would be my feedback. I'd like to see something a little bit different on those two things, the service area and the time for service. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director. Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Well, thank you, Director Guzman. I'm just going to pretty much replicate everything you just said. I represent Arvada, and Arvada is actually the fastest growing aging population. However I said that, I'm not sure I said it right. And a lot of our service is not in the areas where we have those aging people. So I'd really like to see just the boundary kept the same. I'm also really, again, with Director Guzman, keeping it at a full 24/7.

I have a friend in a wheelchair and I just think about her trying-- like if she didn't live where she lived, if she lived where I lived, she would have such a difficult time getting around her community. And I would just-- especially if the service is outside of that time period, it's just precluding her life. I know we don't all have the same abilities when we're riding a bus, but for a person with disability that's blind or in a wheelchair, I think that we can extend them the grace that they deserve.

I also would like to see the cap stay at 60. I think that, again, I know that less than 10% of the population go above the 50 rides. But I think it's still, we're giving them access to a free and full life. And I think if we are going to go the 6.50, I think that that, to me is fine. But I also think that it would be imperative that we really put out the LiVE program and let those riders know that there is another option.

I was with someone the other day. She lives about 3 miles away from where she works, and she can afford it, but just barely. And she didn't know about the LiVE program. So I think that we're missing an opportunity there specifically with these riders.

And then my last one is just a request. Is it possible to get a map, sort of like a density map, of where AOD is highly being used? To go with that thinking about West Jefferson County versus central Denver, just kind see what that looks like. Obviously, we want to anonymize the data, but I think it just would be interesting for us to know where the hotspots of usage are. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director Harwick. Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yes. Director Harwick, if I understood you correctly, because I'm taking copious notes here, you are in support, for all intents and purposes, of what I hear, modification of scenario one, keeping it at 60 trips with 6.50, and then want information relative to what the current usage is from a geographic vantage point. OK. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you.

IAN HARWICK: Yeah, but I also want to keep the service areas the same as they are today. Yeah.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Excellent. Director Nicholson, then Director Ruscha.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yeah, just a quick follow up onto that. When it comes to-- go to Director Ruscha. My brain-- I lost my train of thought for a second, so.

JULIEN BOUQUET: All right. Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Thank you for the Red Rover. I wasn't prepared. I went back to my notes. OK. So anyway, so some of this feedback I did share with staff and I don't want to be repetitive, but I also just want to be really transparent with my colleagues because we haven't had this public conversation yet.

And just high level, some of the things that I had shared was, first of all, we don't want to put one proposal out before the community and get feedback, like the one that we've had out for several months, and then come back with something else that looks like less than what we originally proposed. And so one of the pain points that I had was just the idea of going up to 6.50 for the initial fare, because that's not what we originally put out there.

So one of the things that I urge is that if we put an offer on the table, so to speak, we don't take it back. That's our baseline now. And another piece of feedback I had is that where something is not-- for every change we make, which essentially results in a reduction of a service of some kind or an increase in price, we really have to justify that line by line.

So, for example, if we decide that we are going to strictly align with service hours, then we have to justify it. It doesn't cost us any more money. It's not going to save us a penny if somebody uses on-Demand 15 or 20 minutes or an hour before fixed route starts. Likewise, it's not costing us, that I could see, a lot of money, if any, for us to offer service outside of our general service area. I know that was flagged in the peer review.

Because this idea has been on the table for so many months, I also want to caution us about the service area idea, because if we restrict this service, that means there are people who currently are using AOD and they're going to lose it. I mean, that was just a kind of high level theme that I had in the feedback.

And also, I going back to the initial affair, we also want to be really careful about what we think is inexpensive, because it's really relative. So for some folks using this service and they have a fixed income or very limited income, if we even do 4.50, which would be parity with Access-a-Ride-- and I think I could accept that. But say we go up to 6.50 or we do this tiered system, then for some folks they are not going to be able to ride or they're going to be choosing, do I get to the doctor or do I buy food for tonight.

So I just wanted to put that out there. And finally-- well, actually, I'll stop there. I concurred with what a lot of other Directors said in terms of keeping the program as-is as much as we can, But I also just want to commend staff, because we are at a much different place than where we were several months ago. This was a totally different conversation.

We're talking about really slashing this program, and staff did a lot of work and we spent several months. We almost voted on this a few months ago, and they listened to us as Directors and they listened to community because, as you know, we've had hundreds of public comments over several months on this.

And they said, OK, we can take a timeout, we can reassess, we can get some different data. We can present a new paradigm. So again, what's before us today is a sketch of ideas. The feedback is good, but I really do want to commend staff for listening and working with us in partnership. So thank you and thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director Ruscha. Director Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you. Is there any step during enrollment of AAR and AOD where we ask people if they are enrolled in the LiVE program and ask them, hey, we're taking 14 other pieces of documentation from you? I mean, AOD or AAR is remarkably complicated to sign up for. Is there any part of that process where we try to enroll them in the LiVE program as well? And then I have a quick follow up.

ERIN VALLEJOS: I will have to find out about that as part of the process, and we will confirm if that is how that is handled as part of the process.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yeah. So yeah, as a first thing, I would say that since we're going to be updating this to offer the LiVE discount and not make it free, it should be required as part of the process if you're going through to sign up for AOD or AAR, some point in that process, to ask someone to affirm that they are either already signed up or haven't signed up or whatever. And then give them the opportunity.

Make it super easy because we only have 15,000 people signed up for LiVE right now, and we have 180 something thousand boardings every day. And I think only about half the people in AOD are currently signed up for-- or AAR are currently signed up for LiVE. So definitely something I'd like to see there. The second thing. I want to echo what Director Ruscha said about the effect on people who are low income to having these fares.

But I want to take it from the other side, which is if you don't have a lot of money and you need to get around to a lot of places, then 40 trips may be, or whatever the number ends up being, not nearly enough in a way that someone who makes more money can probably have some discretionary to be like, oh, I've run out of trips. I can afford to take an extra three or five or whatever. So I'm not sure that needs to be fit into the policy here. I'm wary about trying to do too much too quickly.

But I do think we need to get a report from you after, I don't know, six months, a year, that looks at how many trips are people on LiVE using. Are they maxing out? Or are we seeing the same curve from LiVE users as we do from regular users right now? And that might inform us to take action a year from now to try to offer the right service for people who need it. Some LiVE people make decent incomes, some of them are literally broke. And we need to recognize that those two groups of people have very different lived experiences.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Secretary. Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yes, thank you very much, Director Nicholson. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Director Nicholson, for the comments. And what I will say in reference to your request. It appeared to be a directive, but I would just offer this up to you.

That once we collectively agree upon the path forward and this Board acts, we can then assess what might be most prudent, because at this point in time, we don't know what we don't know. And relative to what you just asked, I can't commit to that without knowing what we intend to do. So I just had to say that for the record, because it seems as if Ms. Vallejos was getting direction, and I don't think that's appropriate at this juncture. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: Thank you. I was just kind of doing some stuff on my calculator. So if we only have 3,000 people who use Access-on-Demand, I mean, it seems like the disabled population might be 300,000 people

in Denver or something. Much, much larger. How confident are we of our projection that it will stay at around, I mean, or however much we think it will increase? I mean, what do we think the total number of active users might become? And why won't it become many multiples more than 3,000 or so?

DEBRA JOHNSON: First, if I may. Just for everyone's edification, probably you have heard this over the course of several months in the public comment discussions. When we talk about Access-on-Demand, currently as it's configured, recognizing that we're using private entities, transportation network companies in particular, not all of the vehicles are outfitted to be wheelchair accessible.

So that's a critical element when we're talking about the population, because there's different disabilities that individuals have. Some may have cognitive. Somebody may be using a mobility device which can't be accommodated going forward. So I just wanted to provide that context prior to Ms. Vallejos answering the question, because that has not been factored in to this conversation this evening, and I believe it's a germane point.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director.

ERIN VALLEJOS: And I don't think I need to add anything. That was really exactly what I was going to say. Not everyone is able to use the Access-on-Demand service that is eligible for Access-a-Ride. There is a difference there.

MATT LARSEN: Can I just follow up? But I mean, surely many more people than 3,000 in the metro area would be eligible, though. I mean.

ERIN VALLEJOS: Well, and again, we have continued to see substantial growth in the number of customers that are beginning to use the service. Again, the trips that we are seeing continue to grow even into this year. So we are seeing quite significant growth still.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you.

MATT LARSEN: Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Any further questions, comments? Ms. Johnson and Ms. Vallejos, thank you very much for the presentation. I hope this was helpful feedback for going forward. So thank you.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This was in the sense that we do have some guidance. Now we know what we need to do as we do further outreach. So thank you all very much for the opportunity. And when we come back in July with a recommended action, hopefully we can all rally around that, recognizing the public comments that we heard and the direction in which you provided. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Will that recommended action be going through Operation Safety and Security.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. And thank you, Director "Guz-min--" Guzman, I apologize, for the question. Most definitely, we will go through the committee procedure. The only reason why this didn't happen because it's time sensitive. So thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you very much. All right. Well, thank you again, Ms. Vallejos. All right, moving on. Thank you, Directors, for the questions and conversations. We're going to be moving to our committee reports. Not to be the time police or anything. We are at 8:31 PM and we've been going at this since 3:30. If committee reports could be less than a minute, that'd be greatly appreciated. Audit Committee Chair Buzek. What would you like to share?

VINCE BUZEK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We did not meet in April or May. Our next meeting is June 12, 2025. That concludes my report. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you very much. Finance and Planning Committee report. Committee Chair Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Finance Planning Committee met Tuesday, May 13, discussed a handful of items, received a report from our state demographer, which was really awesome. Directors are reminded to email the Board Office if you had any follow up questions or things specific to your sub district, so we can send that all at once to receive an answer to the whole Board.

Received an update from Doti for the East Colfax BRT, and three items came out of committee which will be before us tonight. Just want to thank the committee for all of the hard work. And the next meeting for the Finance and Planning Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, June 10 at 10:25-- or sorry, at 5:30 PM. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director . Committee Chair Ruscha or Committee Chair Harwick, what would you like to share for OSS?

JOYANN RUSCHA: I'll take it, sir. Thank you. So we met remotely on Wednesday, May 14. We gaveled in at 5:34 PM and wrapped up at 9:44 PM. We had extensive public comments, the most I've ever seen at any OSS meeting. That was great. Come visit us anytime. It's always nice to know that people are listening to our podcast, and by that I mean our YouTube channel.

But two major items that went on the consent calendar for tonight's meeting. Is the 2025, 2028 Title VI program update. Just ensuring that we stay in compliance with federal law, Civil Rights protections, and meet the needs of our customers, as well as the Allied Universal Security Services Contract Extension.

F&P authorized a budget transfer which had no financial impact. It was just moving from one department to another. And then we followed that up with a vote to extend that contract for another year, with the cost of up to just a little over 22 million. And we did have four discussion items, two of which were heard. So we had the Vision Zero update from GM CEO Johnson. As you might recall, we passed a Vision Zero resolution last year and so that planning process is underway.

We had a customer communications update. Stuart Summers led an excellent presentation discussing how we handle communications, some tech updates, customer service aspects. It was real-time information and service alerts and things like that. Unfortunately, we did hit our four hour mark before we could finish our agenda items. And even though the Nuggets weren't playing, folks wanted to go and we were tired.

So we moved the on-Demand item to tonight's meeting, which we just heard. And then we'll be hearing paratransit legacy customer protections proposal next month. So for those of you who have been tracking what we're doing with paratransit, I strongly encourage you to come visit us at OSS next month and weigh in so we get your feedback before we come back with something more final. Our next meeting is Wednesday, June 11 at 5:30. Same time, same place, online or on the phone. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Committee Chair. Now to for Performance Committee Chair Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: I got it. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Performance committee met Monday, May 12, 2025. I, the Committee Chair, presented a draft proposal that I had worked on previously with Vice Chair Gutschenritter for the 2025 General Manager/CEO performance assessment form and process that needed to be updated to seek input from the committee and other Directors to find a way forward for the rest of the year based on the current 2025 General Manager/CEO short term goals and the respective adjustments made to the scoring points based on our votes in January.

I've received some feedback. I continue to invite Directors to submit their feedback. If you have not reviewed that meeting, please do so, and any questions you may have, please email me or call me. I am happy to engage in that conversation. Of course, we are doing that with participation and a lot of communication with the General Manager/CEO, Debra Johnson.

The next meeting of the Performance Committee is scheduled for June 2, 2025 at 8:30 AM. I really want to encourage all of you Directors to please participate in that meeting. Two reasons. One, we are going to receive-- I hope I don't get this wrong because I don't have my work plan in front of me, but the employee survey results in the beginning of that meeting, and then we will adjourn into executive session for the second quarterly one-on-one opportunity with our General Manager/CEO.

And that is part of our contracted agreement with the General Manager/CEO to receive information from her and provide feedback regarding personnel matters. Additionally, the Performance Committee is set to have a second meeting in June because of that quarterly check-in. The second meeting is planned, I believe, for June 23 at 8:30 AM, and that is in order to do a deep dive into our community and customer surveys, which align with our community value and customer excellence strategic initiatives.

And I would again encourage all Directors to participate in that meeting as well, which is the overview of the current status of the agency's surveys and where we're at with regard to public. It will inform the process for setting goals and priorities for the 2026 year which we are also doing all at the same time. So prioritizing what is important for our customers, the survey reports are a great opportunity to engage with direct feedback from our constituents in all areas of the agency.

And I do believe a little birdie has told me on one of the buses that these should be really positive discussions. So if you need more than that invitation, please signal tonight and I will call you and email you and hound you to be on these meetings, because I think they're really important for all of us. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Committee Chair Guzman. All right, moving on. We're going to do the approval of Board meeting minutes and committee reports. The Board and committee meeting minutes were included in the Board packet. Are there any corrections from the Board for the minutes to be approved this evening? Any corrections?

All right. Unless there's objection to considering the minutes all at the same time, may I please have a motion to approve the minutes for the following meetings? The April 9, 2025 Operation Safety and Security Committee. The April 29, 2025 Board meeting. The May 12, 2025 Performance Committee. The May 13, 2025 Finance and Planning Committee. May 14, 2025 Operation Safety and Security Committee. And then May 22, 2025 Executive Committee.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: So moved. Guzman.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Mover, Guzman.



JOYANN RUSCHA: Second.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Second.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I'm going to give it to Gutschenritter. So I heard Director Guzman as the mover and Director Gutschenritter as the second. Is there any discussion on this motion? OK. Seeing none, I'll now call the vote. Are there any no votes on this action? It'll pass 14, 0, and 1 absent. Excellent. All right.

Moving on. It will be our Chair's report. Due to the late hour, I will be quoting my principal and saying, I am giving you all the gift of time. And all I can say with my Chair's report is we will have a Board retreat on June 7 talking about our 2026 priorities for the agency. Again, Directors, hopefully you all can make that. It'll be a very healthy discussion, a very hearty discussion, I guarantee, but please make sure you have that marked down in your calendars. Thank you.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Did you want to remind everybody about the survey we sent you?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Of course. Thank you. And of course, Directors, you'll see in my weekly biweekly update. There was a survey that might have been passed to you, and if you've not filled out that survey, please do so. Thank you for the Directors who did fill it in. So that's OK. If we could get that in by Monday morning, that would be excellent. I'll include that in my weekly update, though. Thank you. I'll give it now over to you, GM/CEO Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. And to recognize the lateness of the hour, I just have a couple elements that I'll share with you that are in alignment with our activities and strategic endeavors since our last Board meeting on Tuesday, April 29. One notable aspect is the legislative conference held by the American Public Transportation Association from May 18th to the 20th in Washington, DC.

Just for everyone's edification, this annual conference is an opportunity for Public Transportation industry professionals across the nation to visit Washington, DC and connect with policymakers, implementers, and their staffs. The conference helps educate and inform APTA members on important federal legislation and policy initiatives, and affords an unparalleled opportunity to shape the industry's positions in federal advocacy agenda.

I, along with Directors O'Keefe, Chandler, and Gutschenritter, and Government Relations Officer Michael Davies, attended conference sessions and meetings with members of Colorado's congressional delegation and their staffs. While chairing an APTA committee meeting on Sunday, May 8, I personally engaged with Tariq Bokhari, who is the acting administrator of the Federal Transit Administration, who shared his views and inputs as it relates to public transit, as well as the importance of federal and local partnerships.

Just yesterday, Tuesday, May 27, I, along with members of my team, met with individuals representing the alliance to transform transportation. As you may be aware, it's a coalition of groups on transit related matters in Colorado. Alliance representatives in attendance included executive Director of the Colorado Public Interest Research Group, Danny Katz, or CPIRG, as we refer to it. Jill Cantor, Executive Director of the Denver Streets Partnership.

Portia Prescott, Present of the Rocky Mountain NAACP branch of the State Conference representing Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming. Dennis Hawkins, representing the Amalgamated Transit Union 1001. Matt Fromer, representing transportation and land use. Well, he is the Transportation and Land Use Policy Manager from the Southwest Energy Efficiency Project. The meeting really was focused on alliance's vision for transit in the Denver region.

As you know, they have been very vocal in which they're seeking to increase funding for transit in the Denver region by \$420 million per year to bolster the frequency and availability of transit services in the metro area. From RTD's perspective, questions were posed relative to how that \$420 million figure was derived, and they explained how that came about with the work they had done with the third party entity. Very bare bones relative to providing some information.

And then we talked about the agency's focus, which all of you are very well aware that we are laser focused on asset renewal, state of good repair, and rightsizing transit service in alignment with RTD's branded comprehensive operational analysis being the System Optimization Plan. Related to personal security. As was recently reported, RTD experienced a 60% reduction in security related calls for service, as well as a three year decrease in reports of criminal activities between 2022 and 2025 at Denver Union Station.

The decrease is representative of concerted efforts to restore and maintain a welcoming transit environment within the critical multi-modal transit hub and following a collaborative and multifaceted strategy aimed at enhancing personal safety and security through crime prevention through environmental design methodologies. This effort would have not have been a success without the commitment of numerous agency employees, as well as support from the City and County of Denver, its police department, the Downtown Denver Partnership, Sage Hospitality, the Lower Denver Neighborhood Association, as well as several local businesses in downtown Denver residents.

Fare enforcement has also increased in recent months, which is the result of RTD's growing ranks of sworn police officers having been trained to perform this function alongside the contracted team that we have in security with Allied Universal personnel who had primarily been responsible for this responsibility. I look forward to sharing additional details regarding the impacts of these efforts during the June Performance Committee, which you heard committee Chair Guzman reference when I, along with staff, will present data related to annual customer, community, and employee surveys that have recently concluded.

On a related note, the agency has proactively increased its transit police officer presence at Denver Union Station and across the agency's downtown Denver sector to support the personal safety and security of customers and visitors attending major events and activity. Notably, while we're no longer in the hockey playoffs and NBA, but people had a welcoming experience in and around our facilities, and RTD PD had increased patrols at Denver Union Station and bus stops and rail stations before the high profile events, which included the playoff games I just referenced.

And this coincides with increasing Denver Police patrols throughout the Downtown area. And RTD and DPD are working closely to collaborate to support enhanced safety for the traveling public. And moreover, data and metrics related to personal safety and Security are now conveniently located on the recently created security related metrics page, and we've actually showcased that on other social media channels as well.

As it relates to our customer excellence in relation to the strategic priorities of customer excellence and employee ownership, I shared yesterday with the Board the last of the 31 light rail speed restrictions put into place last year on the D, H, and E and R lines was lifted as of yesterday morning. I want to give a special shout out to our Maintenance of Way teams that have done yeoman's work. The final speed restriction, which was approximately 400 feet in the southbound segment north of Southmoor Station, was removed after crews completed those repairs.

Keeping in mind those rigorous restrictions were put into place due to the fact that we enhanced our inspections of track back in May 2024 as an enhanced focus on maintaining the agency's assets in a state

of good repair. At the time, crews found several minor issues and track imperfections. So, as I said before, I thank and congratulate all the agency employees who work tire-- I'm tired-- tirelessly over the course of these 11 months.

And like I said, a special shout out to MOW. I would be remiss if I didn't state that while this is a cause to celebrate, I shared previously, as we look at our infrastructure and it continues to age, this will be par for the course. But since we're ahead of where we were before, we will see less of an impact, I'm certain. And last, but certainly not least, I'm pleased to welcome RTD's new Chief Financial Officer, Kelly Mackey, who's in the audience. She's giving a wave.

Who began her tenure on May 12. And this is her first in-person Board meeting. While we introduced her at the Finance and Planning Committee, you guys are real people, not figments of our imagination, so I wanted to ensure I did that here. So with that, I will yield the floor so we can move on to the rest of the matters that we have before us. So thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, GM/CEO Johnson. Any comments or questions for GM/CEO Johnson?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Just [INAUDIBLE].

JULIEN BOUQUET: Yeah. Very exciting. And Kelly, welcome to the team. Thank you. All right. Moving on. We're going to move on to unanimous consent. There are three items on the unanimous consent agenda listed under Section 16, actions A through C. Those items are the security operations budget transfer, the 2025-2028 Title VI program update, and the Allied Universal security services contract extension for one year.

I do understand that Director Benker would like to offer some amendments to item B, the 2025-2028 Title VI program update. And such, I will move that our a recommended actions. Excuse me. If anyone else has a change to discussion on or questions about any of the remaining unanimous consent items, please feel free to advise the Chair at this time and I will, of course, be happy to pull the item from unanimous consent for consideration under recommended action. Director Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: The Allied Universal security contract. Please pull that.

JULIEN BOUQUET: OK. So item B will be removed and placed into recommended action Excuse me. Former item C, as I look in real time here, the Allied Universal security. So are we OK with security operations budget transfer?

TROY WHITMORE: I would move to approve the remainder of the unanimous consent agenda.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Second.

JULIEN BOUQUET: OK. I have Whitmore and then Ruscha as a second. Are there-- OK. So this is item A for the Board of Directors to approve a budget transfer of \$3,845,437.10 between operating expenses lines for transit security services. Is there any no votes on that? OK. Seeing none, that item will pass 14-0-1. All right. Now we're moving on to our recommended action items. And we're going to have first on our list the Allied Universal security services contract extension for one year. Is there a motion?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: So moved.

JULIEN BOUQUET: OK, Nicholson. And a second. And Ruscha. All right. Any discussion? Director Nicholson?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yeah. So I just have a quick question about this one that came from a constituent. How many people do we have working on our security side from allied? And how many do we have from RTD PD right now? Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yes, I will yield the floor to Chief Martingano, who can address that question. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Chief Martingano.

STEVE MARTINGANO: I am trying to figure out. Oh, there we go. Turned green. Chair, for me?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Yes.

STEVE MARTINGANO: Yeah, so technically, in regards to how many Allied personnel, it's an hourly contract. So you'd have to take the amount of the hours and obviously divide it by 40. It roughly equates to the recommended action for next year. I think it's about 9,100 hours. So it roughly equates about 180 security officers. Right now, we currently have 87 on our staff in regards to post-certified police officers. We have a couple in training and one in the academy. We should be probably about 90 by the end of next month.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Secretary.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: This is for GM/CEO Johnson. Are there any plans in place or-- and please feel free to not answer this if you can't. But I know there's been a drawdown over the last few years in our reliance on Allied Security. Is there anything in this contract or in your planning around this contract or anything that can give us guidance on whether we expect that to continue after authorizing this, or are we expecting to stay at 90 something hundred or 180 people over the next few years?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you very much for the question. As Chief indicated, this is a contract extension and there's hours that are specified, hence in reference to the dollar amount that we have here. I would have to come back to the Board as it relates to any type of authorization as we're doing now currently with this contract extension, if that were to be modified.

So on this point in time, it would stay the same. Unless there's some extenuating circumstances whereby we go out for a solicitation and we're not able to ensure that we're meeting the timeline before, since that's why we're here now with the contract extension. Quite naturally, in doing so, we have to ensure that we have the appropriate staffing levels. So I'm talking around and around in circles right now, but the answer would be no at this point in time.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary. Perfect. Second Vice Chair Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: So, Chief, jog my memory on our goal for the end of the year for sworn officers. It's not 90, right? It's continuing to grow.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Chief Martingano.

STEVE MARTINGANO: Yeah. So we are budgeted for 150. We're still in the process of growing to those numbers. So obviously with applications, background checks, everything else, we're heading positively toward that. We're putting eight more in the academy here in June. We continue to get lateral transfers. I'm sorry, lateral applications from other agencies, officers with experience. So we're hoping to hit 150 goal by the end of the year.

TROY WHITMORE: All right. Thank you very much. I did have the right memory up here. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Absolutely. Any other-- well, any further questions or discussions on this? Yeah, Director Ruscha?

JOYANN RUSCHA: Thank you, sir. So I just wanted to note, in the past, upon request, the agency has provided a breakdown of how many-- just our security personnel from RTD to contracted and even break down in terms of with our contracted Allied force, like the ones that are authorized to have firearms versus not and our mental health staff and stuff.

So that's something that I think the agency-- I'm sure the agency would be happy to provide that breakdown chart. I think it's been a little over a year since we've had one, so I just wanted to offer that to those who are interested and just to piggyback on Secretary Nicholson's comments. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director. Any further comments or questions? OK. Seeing none. So I did have-- thank you, Chief. I did have Nicholson as the mover and Ruscha as the second. Are there any no votes on this item?

OK. Seeing none, the item will pass 14-0-1 absent. We are hitting our two hour mark, so we are going to take a break for our CART employee. Let's shoot to be back here 9 o'clock. Would that be enough time? Nope? OK. OK. Let's do 9:05, then.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. We'll be back at 9:05.

All right. Thank you, everyone, for your patience. We are now moving on to our next recommended action for tonight. And that is going to be the recommended action of the 2025-2028 Title VI program update to comply with federal laws, regulations, and guidelines related Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Do we have a motion?

PEGGY CATLIN: So moved.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I have Caitlin as the mover.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Second, Guzman.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Guzman as the second. I do understand that Director Benker has two amendments she would like to offer on this item. Director Benker, we'll take your amendments one at a time. What is your first amendment, Director Benker?

KAREN BENKER: Thank you very much. And I'm glad everybody is now second wind and we're ready to go on to our, I don't know, six or seventh hour of meeting. Actually, I will tell you, I have three. We'll see how things go. They're short. The first one-- well, let me give you a little bit of background.

So the background is I met with my four cities back in February and March. And of course, you meet with them and you say hi and you say, OK, what are your needs? What are your wants? I met with all of them, and they all gave me a list of basically trying to restore service that was removed during the pandemic.

And so of course, as is my job as Director, I'm trying to work with our staff to try to get that service restored. And so one of my questions or issues is I am guessing that when the RTD Board had to make the hard decisions of how to cut service almost in half because of this highly unusual pandemic, perhaps some of these cuts were not done equally across all 15 districts.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Benker, I'm sorry to interrupt. Just so that we keep an order, could we get a second on-- could you read the motion and then we get a second?

KAREN BENKER: The motion is change the threshold for disproportionate burden and disparate impact from 10% to 20% as it relates to major service changes and consistent with the FTA circular 4702.1b. And I believe the version that will be voted on is actually the version that Mr. Kroll put up for us.

JULIEN BOUQUET: So that's the language right there. The first motion is to move to amend the 2025-2028 Title VI program update, such that the threshold for triggering either disproportionate burden-- or disparities in-- disparate impact finding-- late night-- finding arising from a major service change from 10% to 20%. Do I have a second?

BRETT PAGLIERI: Second, Paglieri.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Paglieri is the second. Thank you.

KAREN BENKER: So just to continue a little bit more background, and then we can start, I guess the debate here. I'm just trying to get service restored that was eliminated during the pandemic. And there have been a couple of times now when I have requested and the answer that I have gotten several times is, well, it's going to depend on how the equity analysis calculations come out.

And so I'm just trying to find ways where we can perhaps start to restore some of the service that had been eliminated during the pandemic and perhaps do it a little bit quicker and also try to make it not quite so difficult. So then what happened, of course, is everyone received about a week, 10 days ago, a letter from the City and County of Broomfield. And their transportation staff went through our items quite closely, and they sent us all a letter with recommended changes.

So I've gone through with their changes, and that's where I've come up with the three amendments that I'd like to at least talk to the Board, see what your thoughts are. Hopefully it'll pass, but we'll see what happens. But it's just basically what City and County of Broomfield had found when they did their research is that the RTD is using some very conservative calculations compared to some of the other large transit agencies.

And so I did send you also a copy of the City and County of Broomfield's letter, just to refresh your memory. And so I would like to put forth that the first amendment would be changing the threshold from 10% to 20%.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Treasurer Benker. So again, the discussion right now is on the motion, this first motion, the first amendment. Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to ask GM/CEO Johnson. I heard from someone-- I don't remember now because it's getting late. But someone said that some of those assumptions made by City and County of Broomfield were incorrect.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson. Yes thank you very much relative to the comments that were made-- and thank you very much, Director Catlin-- as it relates to the transit agencies that were mentioned, being MARTA, the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority, King County Metro, which is in greater Seattle, and the Chicago Transit Authority.

That information, especially coming from LA Metro as the former Chief Operations Officer there, this is not correct relative to where we sit. And more specifically, I do know our Director of Civil Rights, when we were going through this, quite naturally in the role that he is in, he and his team did a desk audit and worked with colleagues at different transit agencies. So that's the communiqué that I did disseminate yesterday upon receiving this information. So, Mr. Green, if you want to just expound succinctly and briefly.

CARL GREEN: Yes. Thank you so much, General Manager and CEO Johnson. To expand upon the response, I just also want to ground us and first state that it is our collective responsibility to make federally compliant and equitable decisions, especially as it relates to service changes. And in doing that audit, we looked at 22-- rather, 23 different organizations, which includes the four, MARTA, LA Metro, King County, and the Chicago Transit Authority.

And I would say the way to look at the disparate impact or disproportionate burden, the framing of it is how sensitive or less sensitive versus more sensitive, right? And ours is stacked in the middle. So I want to give you some numbers here. So for the four that I just mentioned, MARTA has 10%, LA Metro has 5%, King County has 10%, CTA or Chicago Transit Authority has 15%.

And then when we rack and stack, look at those 22 different organizations, 6 out of that 23 have 5% or less. Two have 8%. Six, which includes us, or seven including us, is at 10%. Three at 15%. And then three at 20%. And in my over eight years of doing this work, I'll just say that when you are setting your policy, you don't want to do a disservice to the spirit and the letter of what we're ultimately trying to achieve specifically with Title VI.

Title VI is not a stopping mechanism of bringing back or restoring service. There are a lot of different variables, as I mentioned before, with respect to our service development guidelines, our operators resources, so on and so forth. This is just a mechanism for the agencies such as RTD and the Board of Directors so we don't get too far over our skis without discounting populations that are more likely to be transit reliant. So again, it's not a stopping mechanism, but this is just more so to make sure that we are taking into consideration all of our customers.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I have Director Ruscha next.

JOYANN RUSCHA: OK. I did have a question, but also Treasurer Benker had her hand up, and it was her motion, so I'm happy to wait if that was in response.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Treasurer Benker?

KAREN BENKER: I feel that we are in an extremely unique situation because of the pandemic. So how can we restore, let's say 40% of the service that had been cut several years ago? How can we get back to 2019 when my district, other districts had that service? And so now we're being told that we can't get that service

back because of this conservative calculation that we're doing, but we used to have it. And so how do we get from where we are now to bringing service back to pre-pandemic levels?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yes, thank you very much. Director Benker, that question is better suited for me. Relative to the service delivery framework that we have, while Title VI plays a role relative to major service changes as we talk about how we deploy services based upon a myriad of different factors relative to our revenue service hours. But more specifically, at how we use our comprehensive operational analysis specifically as we talk about the SOP.

When I came into this organization, it was decided that we were going to look at 85% of what service levels were-- 85% of what service levels were in 2019. We were in a different time relative to the commuting patterns, relative to how people were working going forward. What I will share is that we are being very diligent and judicious in how we're applying service, because we do want to ensure there is equity.

I'm going to speak a little bit out of school here because I shared this with you yesterday, but I'll say it in this context as well. As we talk about Longmont and we talk about service, we are looking at that for the fall service change. That is up to the Board, quite naturally.

But I did want to put that forward because with the restoration of service, keeping in mind that all transit agencies across the US were in these precarious positions and the Federal Transit Administration more or less provided waivers, waivers from the sense of how we were decreasing service due to the fact that we didn't have enough people power. Also, we currently are still working under a waiver as it relates to our spare ratio.

What I mean by that is when you deploy service in the mornings and in the afternoons with the peak, you have a certain pullout rate and you're only supposed to have a 20% spare ratio. We've deviated from that and have a waiver, and we're rightsizing the fleet as we move forward. So while you're bringing up these points, as you indicated, we are in uncharted territory, or were, and we're coming back from that.

We are looking at where there are needs relative to the entire area, from an origin and destination vantage point, just by virtue of how our service area is going forward. So I'm not providing this to say I don't understand what you're trying to do, and as I share it with you, I do clearly, and we want to work within the framework that we have.

But a wholesale of restoration of what was happening in 2019, that wouldn't be fiscally responsible. And I say it from the vantage point of we had a lot of service that was out on the street, maybe that yielded one passenger boarding per hour, but that was out on the street. Does that really yield the return on investment going forward? Hence that's why there were modifications relative to reallocation of services going forward.

KAREN BENKER: OK. But if I can--

JULIEN BOUQUET: Treasurer, yeah.

KAREN BENKER: Some of the issues that you just raised are important. There's no doubt. However, I don't believe it goes to the equity calculation. What I think is important to hear from staff-- and I know we're going to be talking about this at our retreat, which I'm looking forward to that-- is if it's possible for us to go back to over 100 million riders in three years. What barriers are we facing to try to do that so that we can go from



65 million to 100, 106, 110, and start quickly-- or not quickly, but faster than what we're doing now to get back up to higher service levels?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Thank you. There's a couple of external factors that play into that quite naturally. When we look at the central business district and the occupancy rate in the lack of people commuting in, it's important to keep in mind that there was-- I'm forgetting the name, but the City and County of Denver did the report relative to the usage rate in looking at the occupancy levels.

But more specifically, what's important to note is that there hasn't been the level of bounce back relative to the central business district. I believe the last time I looked at stats, City and County of Denver was in the bottom three out of 50 major cities. And then as we know, the state of Colorado is the number-- is the third state relative to remote work and then city of Boulder is number one. While I factor that in, we don't have the same operating environment that we did in 2019 or prior to the pandemic.

How do we get back to the transit usage that we had before? I think there's so many extenuating factors going forward relative to how we're delivering the service, but also having the vehicle capacity, the people power, and the reliability aspect, which bring us full circle to state of good repair, and the other aspects that have caused people to shy away from utilizing our network because we were sacrificing one element for something else relative to delivery.

And I bring that up because as we talk about the people power, we clearly saw that our operating workforce was decreasing in 2016 as it was across the country, but more specifically, having other ancillary services that were readily available were people whereby were working extra shifts, and then we didn't have enough people for daily pull out on those other routes. And so I'm providing that context to say, to get back, there are certain things that the agency can surely do. But to get back to those numbers within the period of time that you specify would be very challenging, just because of the different operating characteristics that have been altered by factors that are no fault of this agency's.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Thank you, sir. So I have a question for legal. So recognizing this has to be submitted shortly, I-- I'm going to be careful with my words. Can we make significant changes at this juncture after all of the public comment process? Or is that something that we-- I guess I don't know if it's a yes, no, or a gray area, and I wanted to get a bit of feedback on that. Not to disparage the motion. I just also want to understand the potential legal implications.

DEBRA JOHNSON: I will address that question and then I'll ask Mr. Green to expound. I think if anything, as we talk about public engagement and talk about the agencies, the perception of the agency being trustworthy, going forward and getting public engagement quite naturally and then not leveraging it for the betterment of the constituencies that we serve, I think, pose a risk as it relates to the agency in reference to the public perception. There is leeway relative to the circular in light of what can be done.

We are sitting here on May 28, recognizing that we have a new administration and that we do need to have a Title VI program that's submitted, and we have been engaged on this topic since January. That's not to negate any amendments or anything like that. I am just trying to answer the question. But more specifically, Mr. Green, since you are very well versed in 4702.1b, would yield the floor to you. And that's the citation for the FTA circular that we're talking about.

CARL GREEN: Yes. Thank you so much, GM/CEO Johnson. Oh. Apologies. Apologies.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Sensitive microphone.

CARL GREEN: Yes. Apologies. But to piggyback off of what GM/CEO Johnson has noted, I would couch that as the bigger risk is when we think about establishing policy as it relates to 4702.1b, the FTA Title VI circular, it does call upon the agency to do a lot of outreach and public involvement to ensure that we are collecting that feedback to inform decisions. So at the ground level, if we think about public involvement in Title VI, it's part and parcel of what the Title VI program stands for, ensuring that folks in the community are able to inform the decision, such as the policy.

But with respect to the circular, we can, i.e. the Board of Directors could adopt a different threshold. So, for example, the one that Director Benker has put forth. Although we received a lot of feedback indicating the 25% threshold and 36 month cumulative change, et cetera, all that's packaged in within the proposed update, there is an exception to that within the circular where it states where the Board is ultimately approving the policy.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Director Ruscha? OK. Director Guissinger and then Director Larsen. Oh, perfect. Director Larsen. And then Harwick.

MATT LARSEN: Thank you. I guess my question is, I looked through a lot of the Title VI updates that were for service changes, this Title VI analyses that were in the Board packet. And it seemed like most of the time-- sometimes there was a little bit of disparate impact on one route or the other, but mostly it sort of ended up that, in the aggregate, there wasn't really much, and there were legitimate justifications for what there was on an individual basis.

I guess my basic question is with regard to this update and the changes that we're proposing. I mean, is there really a problem here? Are we just making this harder for ourselves? Because it doesn't seem like we're trying to generally start out making service changes with an intention of causing disparate impact, one place or the other.

We make them, I guess, for a variety of reasons, and on balance they don't really seem to, under our current setup, ever, ever look like they were somehow some bad intent or just inattention to who we are serving. It seems we do a lot of analysis and then basically do what we would have done anyways. So why put a greater burden, regulate ourselves more than we have to?

And why not just give us the freedom to operate as we would as much as we can, given that we don't-- it doesn't necessarily seem like it's been a problem for a long time? At least from what I could see. I mean, there weren't that many Title VI complaints in the information that was provided. I don't know. My basic question is, why would we make things harder for ourselves? Thanks.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Thank you very much. The one thing I would share, Director Larsen, is we look at the modification that's been put forward for your consideration, like a 36 month period as we're adding back service. There could be unforeseen consequences as we do them in a segmented fashion. And so that's one element as a whole.

Because if we're making modifications going forward, there could be an adverse impact. And so that's what I would showcase there. Keeping in mind to the point that you raised. When we talk about the aspects of

DIDB, it's what can we do as an agency to help mitigate that to your point going forward. But it's just to ensure that we have a program whereby we are not causing undue harm to certain population segments.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: But it just seems like, when I was reading the documents, that there's always a legitimate justification for everything we want to do or there's always this will have a disparate impact but we have a legitimate justification for doing this so we're just going to do it. I mean, how many times in the last however many years has it been that we did this analysis, we looked at all the service changes we wanted to do, and we were like, OK, no, we're not going to do this list of service changes.

We're going to cross out these ones because the aggregate impact is too much. I mean, does that happen? I just didn't-- from what I read in the packet, I don't know if I caught everything, but it didn't seem like there were a lot of those. Or is this happening at an earlier stage where when Bob and service says, let's just send a bunch of buses to Cherry Hills Village, somebody says, no, no, that's not going to work out, before it even gets to this point. You know?

DEBRA JOHNSON: I'm sorry. Thank you for the question. For me, I've only been here for five years, and I came in the height of the pandemic, and we've been adding back service and not. So that's difficult for me to answer just because we have not been in a situation whereby it's been the opposite. Carl, do you have anything to add?

CARL GREEN: Yeah, I would just highlight, Chairman, if I may. Since January 2023, there was about 270 service change recommendations that have been implemented, and roughly 24-26 of those 276 were considered major service changes. And out of that 26, to Director Larsen's point, there has been 13 potential disparate impacts. And to your point, there was a substantial legitimate justification.

I wouldn't necessarily couch it as an exercise, but I would say we work, the Transit Equity Office within the Civil Rights Division, works hand in glove with Jessie Carter and his team, Service Development. And as we are having those conversations after the service change recommendation are put forth and we analyze it, if there is a potential disparate impact, more often than not, to your point and to my earlier earlier point, that Title VI is not a stopping mechanism.

And I wouldn't necessarily state that it's burdensome because it's one of our responsibilities to make sure that we are equitably distributing services across our service area. But more often than not, there is a legitimate justification to put forth the service recommendation as it is presented to the Board.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Director? OK. I had Director Harwick. And just as a reminder, we're currently in discussion regarding this first motion. Just want to make sure that-- first amendment, excuse me. First amendment. So make sure comments are around that. Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Mine will be comments about this but also moving forward as well, because I am in support of this Title VI. Not the amendment, just a straight Title VI. I don't think moving from 10% to 20% is going to increase ridership. I think that right now it allows our staff the ability to really center equity and effectively protect our communities.

And while I get that Broomfield feels like they want more service, I don't think this is going to get it there. I think this is the 11th hour, and I think that it's really imperative that our staff has worked extremely hard on this. They've had to jump through a whole variety of hoops for a bunch of different Board members. And I think that we're here, they've done an incredible job.

And I think that this is-- they are the subject matter experts, and it's our opportunity here to put our trust in them, our belief in them. And I think that we owe them that. And we have been talking about this since January, so we're well into four months. And I think that it is key that we support this Title VI as is, and we allow them to move forward and we allow them to start handing this off to the feds and we can move forward. That's where I'm at. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director. Any further conversation on this amendment? Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: So this is for our deputy General Counsel. If we were to pass this tonight, what's the legal risk to the agency when it comes to our federal Title VI approval as a result of this change? Is this going to have any-- would this have any legal repercussions or could we just feel pretty comfortable that we could do this and not have the federal government take issue with it?

JULIEN BOUQUET: In regards to the amendment, Secretary?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yeah.

JULIEN BOUQUET: OK. Deputy Counsel.

MELANIE SNYDER: There we go. Excuse me. Thank you, Director Nicholson. I don't have concerns.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: That is all.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Yeah, Treasurer Benker.

KAREN BENKER: Here is where I do not understand. In 2019, we had the service. My area, my district, as many others, have grown. For example, the town of Erie just a few years ago was 20,000. Now it's 40,000 two, three years later.

And when I met with Erie, they said, hey, we're planning on going to 80,000 in just the next couple of years. I also read in the Denver Post that the town of Erie is the 15th fastest city in the country in terms of population growth. So my question is if we had this service prior to the pandemic and it was serving all of these communities, why is it so difficult to get that restored?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson.

DEBRA JOHNSON: So thank you, Director Benker. What I'm going to say goes back to the previous comments that I had before, recognizing that RTD is a regional service, and the way the service was outlined, for all intents and purposes, was bringing individuals into the central business district. That level of ridership isn't there.

And that's not to negate that there is some elements centered on a need to move people to and fro. Hence, that's why there was the advent of the partnership program and one of the reasons why Erie basically wanted to join the district, because they were looking to put forward an application for the partnership program.

And I know you're just using that as an example, but just wanted to further iterate that, because for all intents and purposes, as we're looking to provide mobility options, the intent behind the partnership program was more or less like a pilot in the sense that let's see how many people are utilizing this means of connection prior to putting out a 40 foot or 60 foot R tick that costs more money per revenue hour and doesn't yield the same return on investment relative to the cost per boarding. Does that help or did I complicate it more? No? OK.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Director Guzman and then Director Guissinger.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: So I would urge us to cleanly pass this through tonight, getting back to the motion before us, I would like to ask one question, which is the 10% to 20% is still not going to prevent us from adding services. It is simply a filter through which to look, if I understand this correctly, that we are not unintentionally harming community with protected status under the Title VI legislation, or those that might be disproportionately burdened or impacted by their financial and economic status within the region.

The only purpose we need to pass this is because it is due, because it is the law, and it is how we ensure that we are able to receive our federal funding, which is approximately 25% of our total budget. So I just want to make sure I understand. What has been presented here does not tell the Board, no, we cannot provide transit service.

It is simply a way to look at it and say, we may have an issue if it reaches a certain threshold that we need to be aware of in order to be able to approve changes in service, fare changes, or other changes that would create a potential burden on specific communities as defined within the Title VI language. Is that correct, or am I completely lost in this conversation?

CARL GREEN: Chair, OK for me?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Absolutely, Mr. Green.

CARL GREEN: If I'm tracking Director Guzman, I'll try to answer the question from what I hear, and if you have any double back, then I'll respond to it. So the current 10%, so if we think about different thresholds for DIDB and we are in-- based off of the desk audit, we're in the middle tier of having a threshold that allows us as an agency, which ultimately each service equity analyses is approved by the Board of Directors, where it allows us-- again, to your point, when we're thinking about BIPOC or Black, Indigenous, people of color for disparate impact or low income communities for disproportionate burden, it allows us to make a well-informed, eyes-wide-open decision of better understanding of who's more likely to receive more of the impact.

And when we're thinking about service increases, we're thinking about the fair share of benefits where if there is a service reduction, we're looking at who's more likely to receive more of the burden. So to your point, Director Guzman, it allows us to just get a better understanding of the level of impact that we can have on a particular community. It does not prevent us from moving forward.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Thank you. I would just urge a no vote, and let's move on to the policy.

JULIEN BOUQUET: All right. Director Guissinger, I'm going to have you as our final comment on this specific amendment.

LYNN GUISSINGER: I'll be super quick. That last explanation that Mr. Green gave helped me in terms of just giving us a better holistic view. But I shared Director Larsen's view of, are we just making this harder for ourselves, creating more work? Is that not right?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Mr. Green.

CARL GREEN: Yeah, that's a great follow up question. I wouldn't say it's making it harder because when we think about what we're ultimately trying to achieve and a percentage that's mathematically consistent relative to the populations that we serve.

So in doing this work, given my background, and doing an assessment of whether if we-- and that's why we didn't want to make any modifications of increasing or decreasing the major service change, we just wanted to keep it consistent, is with doing this work or even doing an analysis of previous run boards or equity analyzes, 20% is something where you wouldn't see anything. And that's a disservice when we think about our populations within our service area, specifically, as we look at our Census data, where 38.1% is BIPOC, 13.1%-- or 14.1%, rather for low income. Right?

And then if we look the onboard survey, 56% are considered BIPOC. And so I say all that to say, just to wrap it up, is that 10% threshold for DIDB allows us to make an informed decision that is backed by not only our desk audit, but the years of experience and knowing, having a better understanding of ultimately what we're trying to achieve.

LYNN GUISSINGER: Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. All right, let's do a roll call vote. As a reminder, it is the first amendment being introduced, as you all can see on that screen, with Director Benker as the mover and Director Paglieri as the second. Again, we're voting on this first amendment. Treasurer Benker.

KAREN BENKER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Buzek is gone. Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guissinger.

LYNN GUISSINGER: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Gutschenritter.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: First Vice Chair O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I'm a yes, but the motion will fail. And we have 3 to 10. OK. Moving on. Yes, Director?

KAREN BENKER: I would like to withdraw the next two amendments.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Next two amendments?

KAREN BENKER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: OK. The next two amendments have been withdrawn.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: They were never introduced, so they're not really withdrawn. But now you would return back to the debate on the main motion, which is to approve the Title VI program update.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Excellent. Back to the main motion at hand. Director O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: So I contemplated a no vote out of principle on this action. There's a few things going on. First of all, it should never get to the last minute. The Board should never be asked to pass things because it's due in two days. And I know there's a lot of things that go into the delay. But that's just not the right-- that's not the right urgency to place on the Board to act.

Secondly, I don't know very much about this topic, and I have sat in on two operations committee meetings. I've talked to a bunch of people. I've done my own research. And I still am looking for a succinct description of the program. I would note that there was a wonderful book written by Robert Caro. It's called The Power Broker. I'm sure a lot of people in this room know it. Talks a lot about bad policy decisions on disadvantaged communities and how those decisions were made and the harmful outcome of those decisions.

It is 15 pages shorter than our packet tonight. He won the Pulitzer Prize for a 1,200 page treatise on impact by public infrastructure. I would request that when we're passing along documents as part of a packet, it needs to have a point, and it should be summarized from the committee for the rest of the Board. Simply passing things along for us does not help me understand this better.

I'm probably a yes vote tonight, but I was a no vote until about an hour and a half ago. And so just, when you are putting together packets on complex questions for the Board, giving us reams of paper does not help us get to a better decision. So that's something, a request for the two, three-ish Committee Chairs as you're putting together topics like this, and that would be very helpful for me to make better decisions. Thanks.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director O'Keefe. Any further comments or questions on the main motion? Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: I would just like to mention that the Denver City Council unanimously submitted a proclamation for RTD on May 19, 2025. It is in the director's emails. It was sent over by City Council, that they wholeheartedly support the 2025-2028 Title VI program to include the proposed updates to major service change, disparate impact, and fare equity policies, as well as updates to RTD's public participation plan and language access plan, which we are voting on now, and that the clerk and recorder of the City and County of Denver did affix the seal, making it official.

I believe that that is necessary. There's a whole proclamation. You can read through it. But former Board Director Lewis-- sorry, We had two Lewises and I wanted to make sure I said it right. Did work with city council member Serena Gutierrez Gonzalez. And the unanimity of that vote is remarkable from our city council. So they stand behind this as well with us to move this forward. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director Guzman. Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: I'm going to be a no vote, I think it's kind of, like I said, we're constraining our freedom to operate. We're spending a lot of energy and effort to track this. And I know the intentions behind that are good, but I think, just as a matter of principle, we shouldn't be trying to over-- regulating ourselves more.

We should be thinking, there's not really a lot of evidence that we have disparately or ever had any recent plans to expand service or decrease service in a way that causes a disparate impact on these populations. And I honestly believe that if we focused 100% just on increasing ridership, which is what I think we should be doing, and not trying to expand our purview about when maybe we shouldn't increase ridership. I don't know.

If it's legitimate, we'll do it anyways. I really think if we were focusing strictly on increasing ridership, we would actually-- it would all be disparately impacted in favor of all the communities we're worried about, just based on the way population is distributed in the area. And I would like for us to move towards a paradigm of focusing much, much more on increasing ridership across the board and less on finding possible reasons to not increase ridership. So I'll be a no vote. Thanks.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director Larsen. Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: So I sat through two committee meetings, a study session, and a town hall, all on this topic. And I should say expertly facilitated by our co-chairs and by our Chair of Finance and our staff. And I feel like I'm just starting to get a decent understanding of it. I came into this knowing nothing about this, and I was an absolute no when we first started.



And my public remarks made that very clear. But I want to commend staff and our Board leadership who were willing to indulge because I came to understand it. I came to understand what it was for. I came to understand how it works. And I don't necessarily agree with all of it and I think we could use more data in addition to the data we have now to determine this.

But if we don't pass this, we lose federal funding. So there's a good reason to pass it even if you don't like it. But on top of that, I just think our staff did their jobs. They have demonstrated to me this is the right thing to do, despite my skepticism. And so I'm definitely voting for it tonight.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Any further comments on the main motion? OK. Seeing none, we had Catlin as the mover and Guzman as the second. There is indication that there will be no votes so I will be doing a roll call vote on this. Treasure Benker.

KAREN BENKER: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guissinger.

LYNN GUISSINGER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Gutschenritter.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: I'm in.

JULIEN BOUQUET: First Vice Chair O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Yep.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Second Vice Chair Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I'm also a yes. So the motion, the main motion will pass 11, 2, and 2 absent. Yes. That math adds up. OK. Moving on. We're going to be moving to our next recommended action, which is the budget transfer articulated buses supporting Colfax Bus Rapid Transit or BRT service. Do I have a mover?

MICHAEL GUZMAN: So moved, Guzman.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Guzman is the mover. Do I have a second?

TROY WHITMORE: Second.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I have--

JOYANN RUSCHA: Wait. Sir.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Yeah?

JOYANN RUSCHA: Oh, wait. Well, I could be wrong. I'm sorry, I forgot we started late. I thought we hit our four hour mark. Please ignore me.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Oh.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Sorry.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Guzman is the mover. Whitmore is the second. Any discussion on it? Yeah, Director Paglieri?

BRETT PAGLIERI: I just wanted to say a few quick words about why I will not be voting for this. I was not necessarily sure how this would further the clean energy and zero emission goals of the State of Colorado and therefore will just be voting no. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Any further conversation? Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yeah, so I understand the importance of what we're doing here. I think that these buses in particular-- in my religion, there's a thing. Why is this night different from all other nights? Why are these buses different from all other buses? These are going to be the flagship of our flagship BRT line, and if these suck, it will kill BRT.

And if they are not comfortable, if they are not just awesome in every way possible-- you can make a lot of choices when you buy a bus about how nice it's going to be in the same way can make a lot of choices about how when you buy a car, about how nice it's going to be. And so I just want to lean in here, and I do have one question to say that we need to pull the stops out.

We need to make sure we're giving you enough money, GM/CEO Johnson, to make sure we're buying top of the line, to make sure that these are things that when they run through my district, people go, wow, I want to get on that. Not, wow, that doesn't look very nice. And so my question for you is, how do you know that the amount of money that we're authorizing today is enough to get top of the line? And how many bites at the apple are we going to get to make sure that you are buying the right buses for this incredibly important project?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Johnson, is 51 million enough to make them not suck?

DEBRA JOHNSON: Yeah. So thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the question.

JULIEN BOUQUET: My apologies. That was unprofessional.

DEBRA JOHNSON: Keep it in mind, this is a budget transfer. And full transparency, Director Nicholson emailed me about this because I think there was some confusion about where we are. There is yet to be a solicitation. There's yet to be specifications. So these monies that are being transferred or needed for all intents and purposes so we can start a procurement.

Now, keeping in mind there's a couple of elements. These buses have to be dedicated because this is designated as a bus rapid transit project as defined by the Federal Transit Administration. There are certain criteria that we have to ensure that we adhere to. This will be a dedicated fleet just by virtue of the configuration of BRT, with it being a center running platform.

So when you talk about it being top of the line, that's yet to be seen in reference to what we had before us, because there's only two original equipment manufacturers in the United States, there's only so many suppliers, there are certain seats, and there is a national task force on which I sit, where we're talking about doing away with customization, because that increases prices. I bet you don't know how many shades of white there is with new flyer industries.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: 24.

DEBRA JOHNSON: How many?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: 24.

DEBRA JOHNSON: 23. I think I told you that earlier. So the point of the matter is, as we talk about this, we're going to do our due diligence and we're going to ensure it's a competitive solicitation. And we do understand the aspects, because that's what separates bus rapid transit from general fixed route service. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: I really appreciate it and I look forward to you coming back often to update us on how the purchase is going.

SPEAKER: Yes. And what white.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Just really quickly. With regards to this, moving this money from the unrestricted fund is simply to begin the procurement process. And although it's not part of the 2025 budget, we do need to get started on it.

However, I would suggest that as we go forward, these buses are meant to be purchased in finality by 2027 to begin this service, and that is work that we will dutifully do on Finance and Planning to ensure that it is included in all necessary documents that come before this Board for approval. And I am certain that our new CFO is up to the task on that. So rest assured, Directors, we're not wantonly spending money. But we do need to authorize this for the procurement of the buses at this point. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director. Any further discussion on this item? All right. There is a no-- oh, no. Sounds good. All right, it was indicated there will be a no vote, so I will do a roll call vote. Again, this is the budget transfer articulated buses supporting Colfax BRT service. Treasurer Benker.

KAREN BENKER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guissinger.

LYNN GUISSINGER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Gutschenritter.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Yep.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Nicholson go brr.

PEGGY CATLIN: What?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Sorry that was a bad internet ref-- yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Nicholson is a yes. Director O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director O'Keefe is a yes. Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Paglieri is a no. Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: OK. So that passes 12, 1, and 2. All right. Thank you, folks. So we have one--

JACK KROLL: Chairman Bouquet, could you remind us over here? We missed who the mover and the seconder were on that.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I had Guzman and Whitmore.

JACK KROLL: OK. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. OK. Excellent. Thank you all again for your patience. We do have one more item, and that is the equitable transit oriented development policy amendment. So for the Board of Directors to approve the amendment to resolution number two, series of 2021, which created the equitable transit oriented development policy that permits and encourages the development of affordable housing on RTD real property in order to include guidelines for disposing of RTD real property below fair market value or rent. Do we have a motion?

MICHAEL GUZMAN: So moved, Guzman.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Guzman is the mover. Do we have a second?

IAN HARWICK: Second.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I have Harwick as the second. I do understand that on this item, we have some proposed amendments from Director Nicholson and Director Ruscha. Since Director Nicholson's amendment was circulated to the Board first, we will start there. Director Nicholson, please now make your motion to amend.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yes. I'd like to move to amend the ETOD policy. And I'm hoping that GM/CEO-- not GM/CEO. That Mr. Kroll can put up that language on the screen.

SPEAKER: It's there.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Great. May I?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Would you like to read the motion and then we'll get a second?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you. Yeah. So move to amend the policy such that Section 5 of the equitable transit oriented development policy regarding negotiated land price be updated as follows. To raise the

maximum negotiated land price discount to 75% from 50% and add the following additional factors to favorably consider projects which include more accessible units than required by law, limit residential parking, are deeply affordable, emphasize priority groups as identified by the Colorado Housing and Finance Authority, and incorporate smaller footprint retail, including below market rate units-- below market rate retail, excuse me, that prioritizes local businesses and entrepreneurs.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Excellent.

JACK KROLL: Do we have a second?

JULIEN BOUQUET: And do we have a second on that?

IAN HARWICK: Second.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Harwick is the second. Secretary, would you like to discuss further?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you. Yes. Before I get into my remarks, I'd like to ask Executive Manager Kroll to briefly describe the five pieces of written public comment that we received on this recommended action from some of our local public officials.

JACK KROLL: Yes. So four of the written public comment items were submitted by individuals specifically supportive of the change Director Nicholson is offering. And those four individuals were the mayor of Boulder, a city council member from Boulder, a city council member from Westminster, and the Colorado Cross Disability Coalition. And then the fifth letter was submitted by SWEEP in joint with Conservation Colorado and Denver Streets Partnership, which spoke more broadly to the overall changes being offered this evening.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Perfect. Secretary.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Executive Manager Kroll. So here at RTD, we make lives better through connections. Tonight as a Board, we have an opportunity to do that in a particularly powerful way. Our rider surveys tell a clear story. Over half of our passengers live below 200% of the federal poverty level, and they are far less likely to own a car.

Our riders with disabilities use RTD at disproportionately high rates, as do other vulnerable populations in our community. Yet only a fraction of affordable housing developed near our stations truly meets the needs of our most dedicated riders. Communities in our state have struggled to create housing targeted at our ridership. Inclusionary zoning has mostly led to housing at 60% AMI, about \$51,000 a year in earnings. This housing is necessary, but priced well out of reach for someone making only \$31,000, which is 200% of the federal poverty line.

This amendment empowers RTD to deepen our land discount offerings up to 75% to incentivize projects specifically tailored to the actual economic realities of our riders. Here's how that can work in practice. Just this month, Denver Health donated the land to create Tapestry, a deeply affordable, accessible, transit-oriented housing project. It supports a range of affordability from 30% to 80% as well as far more three bedroom and even four bedroom units than most affordable projects being built today.

It targets accessibility because distance to transit is a major barrier for people with disabilities to use transit. This holds for all types of disabilities, and unfortunately, painfully few class A fully accessible units exist in the RTD service area. By creating greater incentives for developers, we can do a lot to play our part in fixing

that. It's late, so I won't go through the argument for reduced parking and service of CFHA's priority populations. You all have an email from me with that data.

But I do want Director Harwick to speak after me to address the language, he added on smaller footprint and below market retail. Community is about more than housing, and I enthusiastically added his language for the reasons he'll highlight. This framework recognizes that we are not the housing policy experts.

It increases the scope of our tools and trusts our staff to use them effectively to bring us thoughtful projects, projects that align with our strategic priority of community value and enable us to grow ridership by putting the people who most need transit where they can best be served by it. I ask your support for this amendment.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Yeah. So I wanted to make sure that when we're talking about TOD, that we're really thinking also about mixed use TOD. And I'm wildly in favor of anything that we can do to bring more housing, let alone affordable housing, to our park and rides. I do think it's really key that we also think about what are the businesses that we are bringing in there.

And having spent a lot of time working at Starbucks and a good friend of mine works at Starbucks, I'm also really in favor of coffee shops like Prodigy and smaller shops. But also thinking about when I've traveled to travel to other communities throughout the world, there oftentimes are smaller retail shops that give young entrepreneurs that opportunity to start a business and not be burdened by a larger footprint that some of our larger restaurants or larger retail shops can.

They can cover those costs. So this, to me, was a way to encourage local businesses to start up or expand give them the opportunity in a place that we all-- when we go to a park and ride and there's not something there to grab that quick bite to eat, I want to give them that opportunity, everyone that opportunity. One to shop there and sell there.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director Harwick. Any further discussion on this amendment? Director Ruscha?

JOYANN RUSCHA: Mr. Chair, maybe you can help me here. So I had a comment, but I had a comment on the main motion. But we moved to amendments. But recognizing that Secretary Nicholson's language can't exist without the motion language or the way it's drafted. May I just make a general comment? Does that make sense? It would apply to both, but I don't know if I would be called out of order. And I'm tired. I will do what you say.

JULIEN BOUQUET: You know what? Why not? Let's give it a try.

JOYANN RUSCHA: OK, thanks. I'm doing my best. So this morning, we got an email from staff that addressed some outstanding questions that I still had, just so I knew what I was voting on. And the issue-- I have heartburn over just the main motion because the way it's written. We, as a Board, are not just expanding the bounds of what a policy is.

We're also signing away 30 plus years of precedent of having this guardrail that says, before you go dispense a real property, get our preliminary authorization. So I am already a little bit uncomfortable. And also the policy says that if a developer, as it relates to housing, cannot meet our 50% standard, they could still get a major discount and it could be millions and millions of dollars.

And so those two combined and just recognizing that these deals take a long, long time. They're not summer projects. In some, it means that all of that is going to happen. And then it's going to come back to the Board when all of those decisions have been made.

So for that, because I'm struggling with the original proposal, but I can accept it for now, is why I can't vote yes on Secretary Nicholson's amendment, because we don't have guardrails that I would prefer. So I hope that was not out of order. And if it was, thanks for not calling me out of order.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you. Thank you, Director Ruscha. Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: So ETOD has been discussed a number of times in the committee, and this is my concern. Although I am with you in spirit-- deeply affordable housing is really important-- I'm not sure that giving an additional 25% discount in our policy is wise for a number of reasons. I do believe, however-- and maybe Madam CEO or Ms. Chessy Brady might be able to speak to this. I'm not sure. What we were asked for in this policy was to give guidelines to begin negotiation that would eventually come back to this Board.

Let's say a developer comes to us and just brings us an amazing proposal that includes everything that you could want in a development and more. I don't see why they wouldn't necessarily come back to us and say, hey, they're willing to do all of these things-- they being staff-- and asking for an additional amount of up to whatever amount makes sense to give that discount from the Board that we would consider properly and then be able to authorize in that moment.

But in order to begin the process, we were simply asked to give authorization for them to work within a parameter. That way, there was no confusion that they would be able to do a 30% to 50% discount as was written in the original policy. Beyond that, the Board would still have authority, as I understand it, if we were asked to offer an additional discount for more.

I don't know that we need to lock that into policy, and it does the one thing that I was trained by former Directors and members that are currently here not to do, which is bind future boards in a way that creates difficulty for us to do our job as the fiduciaries of the agency. And so I would like to ask that question. Is there anything that would prevent you from coming back to us if we were to receive such an excellent proposal that prevents you from saying, can we receive an additional discount to offer a developer, Board, and would you approve this so we can make a project work?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Brady. First off, thank you for your patience and greatly appreciate you sticking around tonight.

CHESSY BRADY: Of course.

JULIEN BOUQUET: You're recognized.

CHESSY BRADY: Thank you. No, there is nothing that would stop us from doing that. As you say, the point of the policy is to create guardrails and certainty within those guardrails. We would use the opinions of the Board to guide developers towards what we think the Board would be interested in, as we're negotiating with them, and we come back to the Board for approval of any given project.

KAREN BENKER: Thank you. One more quick thing. And Director Benker, Treasurer Benker, the sales and the lease income from our real estate properties are put into a specific account. Can you guess which one? Because when we deeply discount things beyond where we should, we are saying no to the potential income that we could use for operations and maintenance and service provision elsewhere in the agency.



So on balance, real estate and real property are a finite resource and dollars can be stretched thin. But how we use the opportunity to either receive money to prolong and serve the public further is a huge consideration in this. So although I am with you in spirit, I would be voting no on the amendment as it is right now.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director. Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: Thank you. I'll be brief. I really like the language that highlights these things that I deeply agree with. I am a little bit concerned about two things. The first is the language deeply affordable. It's a little bit ambiguous, if I'm saying that right. And I think using language like that can-- what's to say they discounted \$100? To some, that's a deep discount. To others, that's nothing.

So I'd recommend removing that word and just maybe also deeply affordable unless you can define it elsewhere. But I do want to leave this language. And the other thing is I just have a hard time giving a 75% discount even with these things that I want. And perhaps that this is a really limited circumstance that we'd give 75% But this is our property, and I really would like to see it sold for the highest value to benefit all. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director. Treasurer Benker.

KAREN BENKER: Just a quick question. Some of the surplus properties that we're talking about, we are not including our current park and rides. Correct? Would be excess land, perhaps around a park and ride, but not one of our park and rides. Just clarification.

CHESSY BRADY: Thank you. So this policy is aimed at transit oriented development. So property that RTD owns at transit stations or near high frequency transit. Excess property and surplus property are definable terms that perhaps Michelle could help us with. But those are distinctive properties that the Board has named to be excess and surplus.

And so I just want to separate that from a park and ride. A park and ride is certainly not excess or surplus. It may have underutilized land. It may have a large drainage area that is part of the park and ride, but not every development that we would consider on a park and ride would remove parking, if that's getting more to your question.

KAREN BENKER: OK.

CHESSY BRADY: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: I actually have some questions for Ms. Brady. So first off, Director Paglieri raised the concern about the term deep affordability. I think you and I know what that means, but maybe the rest of the Board doesn't, given it's a term of art. Can you elaborate on what that's referring to?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Brady.

CHESSY BRADY: Sure, yes. Deep affordability is a term in the affordable housing network that means generally 30% to 40% of AMI. It is squishy, I think still, but generally it's understood to mean 30% to 40%.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: So second question. I've heard a couple of concerns about 75% as a discount. I was hoping maybe you could speak to the-- because I mentioned it a little bit. But as someone who's an expert in the space, and I will say you and I worked pretty closely together on this language and went back and forth. You did a meeting with me. So this isn't just something that I wrote myself. This is something that got vetted pretty heavily by staff.

What impact does a greater discount have on the types of projects that, in the affordable housing space, you tend to see people able to build? At least from where I sit, the reason for doing this is that when it comes to those deeply affordable, which are deeply subsidized units, when it comes to things like units that are fully accessible, those are expensive. They cost developers money, which is why, when you don't have those subsidies, those units don't get built.

I think it's about half the projects that are in the CHFA Database have zero units at 30% AMI, and very few of them have anything with regard to accessibility. So I'm hoping you can maybe elaborate on-- you're the one who would be using this tool at the end of the day. How do you see it coming in handy with regard to what you're able to do? And then I have one last follow up.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Brady.

CHESSY BRADY: Thank you. So affordable housing projects are notoriously difficult to finance. And I think if you use the example earlier of Tapestry and Denver Health. Denver Health, as you stated, as I assume it's correct, donated the land for Tapestry. I can assure you that development was still very difficult to finance. So even if we were giving the land at 100% discount, the projects would still not pencil, in many cases.

And so our ability to discount the land to 75% as the Board prefers, in many cases, could get us over the hump from a project not being built to a project being built, and to that project having more affordable units as opposed to a higher, more of a middle income range. And that's the difference that the land discount makes. And that's the certainty that this policy helps me bring to conversations with developers.

Gets them in the mindset of we're going to get some help here from RTD. We can focus on deeper affordability units. We can make bigger promises to CHFA or other financing entities that host in Denver. And it helps us keep the projects moving. And I'll be frank with you. As I said, Tapestry, even with 100% discount, it's still hard to do. This is not a silver bullet. But it moves the needle and it helps us actually keep projects afloat and get to the finish line.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Ms. Brady. We're going to wrap up with Director O'Keefe and then Director Larsen.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: Oh, I thought I got last word. So I support this amendment. I think it is a reasonable step toward developing communities that are very likely to use our services. I think increasing ridership is something we all agree on. This is a concrete way to do that. It also takes land not just for our benefit in ridership, but also puts improvements on it that helps the tax base.

And I think the communities that we serve would rather see a housing project end up on that property where it becomes improved versus somewhere else. We're not the only game in town. There's a lot of discounts out there. And so we're not necessarily in a tight buyer's market. There's a lot of projects that can go forward.

And I think we need to put our best deal, and at least give Chessy and the rest of the team the tools to bring the deal forward. I do want to put one plug-in. We talked about it. I don't think ground leases are the best tool in Colorado.

First of all, it's not as common as other places in the world. And the other thing is, toward the end of your ground lease, no matter how long you make it, the property will fall into disrepair. They are not going to put money into physical facilities that are going to roll off their books. So for that reason, the discount's great and I love a sale versus a ground lease. And I know you'll keep that in mind as we go forward. And anyway, that's another argument in favor of that tactic.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: Thank you. I'm going to be a no vote on this. I don't agree with our transit oriented development policy as it is right now. I don't agree with the goal of trying to provide affordable housing or encourage it, incentivize it.

I think we should be focused on trying to increase ridership. If we want to provide discounts on our land, we should provide them with the goal in mind of increasing the number of people that can live on the property, whatever is developed, and the amount of traffic that is on the property. So I'm a no on this.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director Larsen. All right. With the indication there is a no vote, I am going to do a roll call vote. As a reminder, we are voting on Director Nicholson's amendment. He was the mover and Director Harwick is the second Treasurer Benker.

KAREN BENKER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guissinger.

LYNN GUISSINGER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Gutschenritter.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: First Vice Chair O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Sorry, no.

JULIEN BOUQUET: And finally, Second Vice Chair Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: And I am a yes. That amendment will pass 10, 2-- excuse me. 10, 3, and 2. Yes. 10 yes, 3 no, 2 absent. That is the math. OK. Moving on. We are going to do our second amendment, which was brought forward by Director Ruscha. And Director Ruscha, would you like to introduce the language of the amendment?

JOYANN RUSCHA: It's being brought forth by Directors Ruscha and Guzman, and I--

MICHAEL GUZMAN: I can make the motion. Sorry.

JOYANN RUSCHA: I think he has the language in front of him.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We would like to make a motion to add the language to the end of this policy that says, additionally, no project will be eligible for any discounts unless it complies with the greater of the following. 5% of all units are accessible to persons with mobility disabilities, and an additional 2% of all units are accessible to persons with hearing or visual disabilities, or two, current US Department of Housing Urban Development accessibility requirements. Do we have a second? We have Ruscha as the second. Mr. Kroll, I'm sorry.

JACK KROLL: Just to clarify, Director Guzman, as I understood you reading that into the record, the highlighted portion above would be deleted. And is not included in your motion. Correct?

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Correct.

JULIEN BOUQUET: So the language we see, this would substitute the language? OK, perfect.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Simplifying it to the bare minimum to get this done.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: I was happy to speak to the motion, but I wasn't sure if we were-- I'm tired. Is that OK?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Mhm.

JOYANN RUSCHA: OK.

JULIEN BOUQUET: We got Guzman as the mover and Ruscha as the second, and we're up for conversation.

JOYANN RUSCHA: OK.

JULIEN BOUQUET: You're up, Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Thank you sir. OK. So just for everyone's edification, we struck the first sentence. It was a two sentence amendment. Just recognizing that we didn't have full staff concurrence on the first sentence, which would have applied this accessibility minimum to market rate housing. And sometimes you shoot for the stars and land on the moon. The second sentence, which just applies to the HUD requirement to affordable housing, we did get staff concurrence.

That was the context behind that. I sent out like a Q&A, frequently asked questions in anticipation of some questions. So I'm happy to entertain any or we can address them. I will say that we worked for three weeks and some change on this with housing advocates and folks who had worked in the space, and people had worked at CHFA and at the state level on similar policy and advocacy organizations and then staff and legal.

So, I mean, just-- I'm sorry. I am tired. In case anybody has any questions about what this is, I think it just simplify it and say that HUD has a current minimum accessibility requirement for funding. And it's 5% of units are accessible to persons with mobility disabilities. Additional 2% of units are accessible to persons with hearing or visual disabilities.

And so a lot of times in these projects, that HUD requirement is going to kick in. But not all projects are going to have HUD dollars. So just recognizing that a lot of jurisdictions take that HUD standard, which is-- maybe Ms. Brady can correct me, but I think it's 20 plus years, 30 plus years old now. And they also incorporate that into their policies or their code or statute. We did the same. Good for goose, good for gander. I will stop there unless anyone else has further questions or comments.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Questions or comments on this amendment? Director Catlin, then Secretary Nicholson.

PEGGY CATLIN: I appreciate the thought going into this, but I believe that the first amendment that we passed does give a lot of latitude towards Chessy and her staff to negotiate, and I fear that this one might be a little bit too regulatory and prescriptive. And if that's the HUD requirement and somebody is applying for a HUD grant, then this would be taken care of automatically. So right now, I'm willing to listen to other discussions, but I fear that it would not give Ms. Brady and her staff the maximum flexibility to look at the comprehensive merits of a proposal.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Yeah, Ms. Brady.

CHESSY BRADY: Would you like me to comment? So this is a bare minimum requirement that Denver already requires, for example, and the Colorado Department of Housing is already considering a higher

threshold of requirement. So I have no concerns about incorporating this. I think it's already going to be taken care of in most cases.

PEGGY CATLIN: If I might? That's kind of my point. It seems a little bit redundant.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: I'd like to offer an amendment, if that's all right.

JULIEN BOUQUET: To the Amendment?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Just to clarify, that was a question. You would like to offer an amendment to the amendment?

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yes. Sub-amendment.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Mr. Kroll?

JACK KROLL: Technically, the initial motion on the table is to amend the ETOD policy, and this is an amendment to that amendment. And at this point would be amending an amendment to an amendment, which is not allowed under Robert's Rules. So you would need to tackle this amendment as it's being presented. And then, if you feel so inclined, offer an amendment to whatever or whatever state the policy is in at that point.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Rock on. Secretary.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yeah. So at that point, I would say I'd have to be a no for the very simple reason. Where it says no project will be eligible, we're talking about an equitable TOD policy here, which is specifically focused on using our land to facilitate the-- literally the policy is about giving discounts.

I can't see putting something like this in there unless it is related to said discount. So I'd be fine if it said, additionally, no project receiving a discount will be eligible for any discounts, et cetera, unless it complies with. But I don't necessarily think it makes sense to do market rate policy in an ETOD policy.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Secretary. Treasurer Benker and then Director Ruscha.

KAREN BENKER: Just real quick. Have you perhaps considered something more positive, saying something along the lines, greater consideration would be given a project if these items were attained? As opposed to make it mandatory.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha or Director Guzman.

KAREN BENKER: Again, sort of an amendment, but just a thought.

JOYANN RUSCHA: So I just want to address what Secretary Nicholson said. I might have missed part of the closed captioning, but I think you said you don't think we should be applying accessibility minimums to market rate. OK. That's exactly. We don't.

So this amendment doesn't do that. And the second piece. The reason why it doesn't say it doesn't reference discounts is because-- so this goes at the end of the policy, which is all-- the way it's nested under the paragraph, this is talking about when discounts apply, if that makes sense. It does what you said you wanted it to do. It's just late.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Thank you. And then I guess the only question I have for-- and this is actually for Ms. Brady, if that's OK. Because you mentioned that Denver has a policy that supersedes or that matches this, and the state currently is considering a policy that would supersede it, but currently does not. Under what circumstances would this have any effect at all? In what circumstances can you imagine in your professional capacity do you see this being something that would matter?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Brady.

CHESSY BRADY: Yes. In a jurisdiction that doesn't currently require accessible units-- and Director Ruscha has mentioned some. I'm not aware of them, but this is not my area of expertise. But in a jurisdiction that does not already have those requirements, that is not accepting HUD money, and, if Colorado Department of Housing changes their rules, does not accept department of housing money, then that project would then be subject to this policy requirement.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Ms. Brady. Secretary.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yeah. Just, I guess for Director Ruscha or Director Guzman. Are there any jurisdictions in the RDD service area that don't have that same requirement that Denver does?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Either Directors.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Yeah. I think I'm pretty smart, but I'm not qualified to talk about 53 separate jurisdictions. So I'm just going to have to lean into this is ETOD and the E in it is equitable. We spent a lot of time talking about equity today, including spending a significant amount of time talking about people with disabilities.

And so just, again, recognizing that the HUD requirement is about equity and not excluding people on the basis of disability from accessing affordable housing, because the Fair Housing Act, the ADA, and other areas of anti-discrimination law, including state law, don't effectively cover that aspect. Sorry, that was more than what you asked. But no, I can't answer your question, just like you probably couldn't answer my question about every single jurisdiction in the RTD region that has something regarding parking minimums. It's a broad concept.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Director Ruscha. Any further conversation on this amendment. Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: I will offer this last thing, and then we probably should go to a vote. But very simply put, we need to make sure that we are protecting the vulnerable. Providing access to these housing units, even in the City and County of Denver's building codes, is not clear. It's as clear as mud.

There is reference to this if certain dollars are used, but stacking in the way that developers work, it's not necessarily required. We aspire to a certain ICAA rule, but it's not clear if that means that they have to do

this or not in order to get licensed. And so, to be fair to ourselves and to ensure that we are taking care of the ADA community and providing those accessible units, I would like to see this in the policy.

I would be fine, by the way, to adjust language on this, to say we would consider giving additional discount, but I don't want any project to go forward that doesn't meet a bare minimum requirement that's established. And although it is established in other places, it is not established in our policy. And we are the government of this region and we should take it seriously that we have a due diligence and responsibility to those members of our community that would need this. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: I always have to follow you, Director Guzman. But obviously, I'm very in support. Any time that we can be supportive of our communities most in need, those suffering from a whole variety of disabilities, I want to be able to put our best foot forward there. And while we can't call out specific jurisdictions, if there is that chance that there is a jurisdiction that isn't meeting this requirement, then we should make sure we're getting there.

And if in the process the state comes up with something better or something in the future, that's OK. But I think that this is like a safety net in my mind about how to really get there for this community. And I think that also, as we're tying-- as these developments spur up around our transit, that's also giving them better access to the resources and giving them that the life that they want and the freedom of movement that we so cherish. So I'm highly in support of this. Thank you.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary, less than 30 seconds.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: This question is for Chessy. My understanding with this language is that it applies to buildings with elevators in it. And so with single stair buildings, that there are different policies around equitable access because of the challenges, obviously in a single stair building, of getting people into the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth floor. You're probably the biggest expert on this in the room. Do you see any concerns with this language when it comes to buildings with stairs only versus elevators?

JULIEN BOUQUET: Ms. Brady.

CHESSY BRADY: I am not the biggest expert on this in the room, but I would say that equitable-- I do know that equitable access and accessible units are different things and have different requirements. And so we're talking specifically about accessible units. We're tending to be talking about larger buildings because we do want them to be dense at stations, so I think they're typically going to be elevator buildings. But yeah, I don't have any concerns about that.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Thank you, Ms. Brady. Let's do the roll call vote. Again, this is the amendment offered by Director Guzman and Director Ruscha. Treasurer Benker. Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guissinger.

LYNN GUISSINGER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Gutschenritter.



CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Yep.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I'm also a yes. So that'll pass. 1, 2, 3, 4. I think I got 10 yeses, 3 nos, and 2 absent. OK.

JACK KROLL: There are 4 nos.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Excuse me, four nos. Thank you.

JACK KROLL: So 9, 4, and 2.

JULIEN BOUQUET: 9, 4 and 2. My apologies. We'll save that for the record. OK. Now moving on back to the main motion as amended. Do we have any further discussion on the main motion? OK. I will do a roll call vote for the main motion, as amended. Treasurer Benker.

KAREN BENKER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Catlin.

PEGGY CATLIN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guissinger.

LYNN GUISSINGER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Gutschenritter.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Harwick.

IAN HARWICK: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Larsen.

MATT LARSEN: No.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director O'Keefe.

PATRICK O'KEEFE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Paglieri.

BRETT PAGLIERI: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Ruscha.

JOYANN RUSCHA: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Whitmore.

TROY WHITMORE: Yes.

JULIEN BOUQUET: I am also a yes. It will pass. 12 yes, 1 no, 2 absent. Thank you. All right. Moving on. That was all our recommended actions. Board of Director activities. I think you're all good on that. Other matters?

SPEAKER: Amen, buddy.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Director Guzman.

MICHAEL GUZMAN: I got one quick. Sorry. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for approving the travel consideration for lodging and assistance to go to the NTI Public Engagement course in Florida. Really packed, but came in really handy because as soon as I returned, we held the town hall to do exactly what I was sent to go learn about. So I appreciate that. And I was grateful for the assistance from staff and from Director Ruscha to be able to host that town hall. Thanks.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Secretary-- thank you, Director Guzman. Secretary Nicholson.

CHRIS NICHOLSON: I just wanted to flag that this weekend is the reopening of Downtown Celebration on Saturday and Sunday. So if you like RTD, please come take it to downtown and enjoy our lovely food and all the other cool stuff. Most of the mall is back and running and we're very excited about it, so.

JULIEN BOUQUET: Any other matters? OK. I got a quick one. It's only going to take 19 minutes. Just joking. My only other matter is please make sure that you Directors fill out that form that was due last week, extended to Monday morning. Please make sure you guys take care of that. The survey. Thank you. With that being said, do I have a motion to adjourn? Director Ruscha.

CHRIS GUTSCHENRITTER: Second.

JULIEN BOUQUET: And a second from Gutschenritter. You guys all have a lovely night. Thank you all for your patience.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**  
**05/28/2025**  
**RTD Board Meeting**



## CITY OF LONGMONT | Transportation Advisory Board

May 22, 2025

Julien Bouquet, Chair  
Board of Directors  
Regional Transportation District  
1660 Blake Street  
Denver, CO 80202

Re: Improved Transit Service for Longmont, Colorado

Dear Chair Bouquet and RTD Board members,

At its May 12, 2025 meeting, the seven-member City of Longmont Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) unanimously authorized me, as the TAB Chairperson, to contact the RTD Board of Directors to request improvements in the transit services RTD provides to Longmont. Our request addresses five issues of importance to Longmont residents.

### Northwest Rail

Since 2004, Longmont residents have paid over \$100 million in FasTracks sales taxes to bring rail transit to Longmont. There is no such rail service, and at TAB's April 2025 meeting, RTD staff indicated that it will take another 25 years to implement Northwest Rail. Longmont deserves better! More importantly, beginning in 2004 the residents of the Northwest Rail communities in Broomfield and Boulder counties have paid a combined total of \$625 million in FasTracks taxes. The other five FasTracks lines in Metro Denver are operational. Only Northwest Rail remains unbuilt. It is our understanding that \$650 million will be required to build Northwest Rail, but only approximately \$190 million remains in the FasTracks Internal Savings Account (FISA). This massive transfer of monies by RTD is unconscionable. Build Northwest Rail! Longmont wants it and deserves it.

### Longmont - Denver Service

Longmont lost its J and LX routes during the COVID 19 pandemic, and they have not been restored. LD service to/from Denver is limited to a few peak-hour round trips on weekdays. Enhancing Longmont – Denver service will help to make RTD truly “regional” for Longmont transit riders and reduce traffic congestion.

### Local Service and Ride Longmont

A large area of southeastern Longmont has no RTD bus service at all. Additionally, service on Longmont's four 300-series local bus routes end at 8 PM at the latest on weekdays and 6:30 PM at the latest on weekends. The local routes operate on 30-minute headways at best on weekdays and 60-minute headways on weekends. Ridership on these routes is not likely to increase until service improves. Our understanding is that RTD will not modify the 300-series routes until the CO 119 BRT is operational. In the interim, we request an

increase in RTD funding for the Ride Longmont microtransit service, the popularity of which has resulted in steadily increasing wait times. Ride Longmont is showing exciting potential and deserves to be expanded.

#### SkyRide

Longmont residents want a one-seat RTD ride to Denver International Airport. We believe that sufficient demand for SkyRide service between DIA and Longmont/Lafayette/ Louisville exists, which could be demonstrated by survey efforts to identify the number of people from those communities parking overnight at RTD Park 'n' Ride facilities that have SkyRide service. We encourage RTD to undertake such surveys.

#### Events Service

RTD bus service to and from Broncos and Rockies games in Denver has been popular in the past. We urge RTD to reestablish such special-events service. It would recruit new RTD riders, reduce traffic congestion at game times, and provide the traffic safety benefit of keeping event participants who have celebrated a bit too much from getting behind the wheel.

Thank you for considering these long-standing requests from the TAB and citizens of Longmont. We will look forward to closely monitoring critical upcoming votes by the RTD Board on these issues that greatly affect the way we travel in the future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SL', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Steve Laner, Chair  
Longmont Transportation Advisory Board

cc: Director Karen Benker  
Director Lynn Guissinger



Baker Historic Neighborhood  
Association  
P.O. Box 9071  
Denver, CO 80209  
board@bakerneighborhood.org  
www.bakerneighborhood.org

## **Officers**

*President*

**Beth Fluto**

*Vice-President*

**Paul Bireta**

*Secretary*

**Alex Clement**

*Treasurer*

**Kathleen Morris**

*Members-at-Large*

**Brenda Steele**

**Olivia Kunevicius**

**Connor Shea**

Dear RTD CEO Debra Johnson and RTD Board,

We are reaching out as a registered neighborhood organization of the City of Denver, regarding the National Women's Soccer League Stadium potentially coming to Denver.

Our neighborhood includes the I-25 & Broadway light rail station. As you may be aware, Denver City Council is in the process of purchasing land for the new Denver NWSL stadium, just west of the I-25 & Broadway Station. As the stadium will be across the freight rail tracks from the RTD station, transit riders will need to cross over the tracks to reach the stadium from RTD's rail station.

Presently, the only pedestrian access route from the I-25 & Broadway station is the southern bridge at Tennessee & Bannock (sometimes called the "Bridge to Nowhere"). The current plans for the stadium project are still in flux, but we would like to ask RTD's position on a north bridge connecting the RTD station more directly to the future stadium grounds.

We believe this would help reduce the impact of the stadium on traffic and parking in our neighborhood and others nearby it, as a more direct connection would reduce the walking distance for transit riders considerably and make visitors more likely to use RTD's services to access the stadium.

Thank you for your time,  
Baker Historic Neighborhood Association

---

**From:** Val Strahl  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 10:03 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont passenger rail

Dear RTD,

Where is our passenger rail?

Thank you for delivering on this. We need you.

Sincerely,  
Valerie Strahl  
Longmont resident



---

**From:** Christina Edstrom  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 10:07 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Please bring lightrail to Longmont

Dear Directors,

Hello! I would like to implore you to commit funds to bring light rail to Longmont. I am in my 40s now and remember voting for lightrail that included service to Longmont when I was 19. This is long overdue. We've subsidized other communities' light rail systems with our tax dollars and now is the time to keep the promise to Longmont.

Thank you very much!!

Warmly,  
Christina

---

**From:** Liz Marr  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 10:20 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** NW Rail Line is Past Due

To the RTD Board,

I have been a resident of Boulder County since 1984. My family and I have been paying the 0.4% Fastracks sales/use tax since its 2004 inception. And we are TIRED of receiving only consolation bus and commuter lane prizes instead of the NW rail line.

All six metro rail lines are now built except the line from Denver to Longmont passing through the cities of Broomfield, Boulder, and Louisville and ending in Longmont. So far, taxpayers along the proposed line have paid RTD \$625 million under this approved tax and this revenue has gone to build the other 6 rail lines.

If the rail line were completed, people of Boulder County could more easily travel to Denver where they would contribute to the economy by attending sports and cultural events, visiting museums, staying in hotels and dining at restaurants.

It's past time to build the NW Rail Line. Please don't use the excuse that you haven't heard from Boulder County residents. We're here and we've been complaining loudly for many years, so I can only wonder if hearing aids are in order.

Sincerely waiting,

Liz Marr

Liz Marr, MS, RDN, FAND

## Jillian Knapp-Rhodes

---

**From:** Christina Eisert  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 10:32 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Bring NW Rail Project to Longmont and Boulder

Dear RTD Board of Directors,

I am a resident of Boulder County. When I was a graduate student at CU, I worked on a project that gathered some data on whether Boulder County residents would be willing to tax themselves to improve the environment. The results were an overwhelming yes, and they were pointed to as residents voted to join our Front Range neighbors in taxing ourselves to pay for light rail.

But for Boulder County residents, the taxes were implemented but the train stations never came. For more than 20 years we have paid into this system that we cannot use. We have watched our streets fill to the brim. Our traffic is now legendary, and commuting between Boulder County cities like Longmont, Louisville, and Boulder is an exercise in frustration. Our bicycle community, which is such an important asset to both the county and to Colorado as a whole, is endangered to the breaking point. There is construction practically everywhere.

We cannot safely drive like this. Busses are slow and inefficient for most people's commuter needs. This is a 21st century community with 21st century infrastructure needs, and quite frankly we have been paying into the system for far too long without receiving what we've paid for.

I would also like to know that the work I did in grad school was not for naught. In the time since then I have raised three children, one has gotten married, and now has a baby of her own on the way.

That's how long we've been paying into this and waiting for commuter rail in Boulder, Longmont, and the rest of Boulder County. Long enough for two new generations of my family to be born.

Please make this right. If not for my, for my grandson.

Thank you,  
Christina Eisert

---

Christina Eisert, M.A.  
University of Colorado, Boulder  
Program for Writing and Rhetoric,  
PWR Library Team.

---

**From:** Clare Fowler  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 12:43 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors; Clare Fowler  
**Subject:** RTD Rail Service

My husband and I just moved here a year ago , so we were not here for the vote for the RTD railroad. But being seniors who are still able to get around, the completion of the RTD system would greatly enhance our chances of being more mobile. Don and Clare Fowler, new Longmont residents

---

**From:** Margaret Halsey  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 2:07 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Rail for Longmont!

As a taxpayer who voted for RTD plans for rail, and who has paid taxes for such rail for years, I am frustrated to see that Longmont has no rail.

Buses are not the solution or a substitute for what rail can bring.

Please turn your attention to providing rail for Longmont!

Thank you.

--

Margaret Halsey

---

**From:** ann morales  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 3:49 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont rail

Longmont rail, will it be built in my lifetime?please hurry.

Ann Morales

---

**From:** Mary Headley  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 3:52 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Please honor your promise to provide FastTracks to Longmont!

Hello,

I write to urge you to commit the funds to make the long overdue FastTracks rail line to Longmont happen.

I recall how excited I was to vote for a sales and use tax increase way back in 2004 for RTD, given the promise that RTD would soon build a rail line into Denver from Longmont. This would make it so much easier for Longmont workers to commute to Denver and its travelers to get to and from DIA, making our transportation system much more clean and modern, and helping to alleviate our ever-worsening air pollution problems.

How bitterly disappointing it has been to watch us end up paying some \$100,000,000 over the ensuing 21 years without RTD building anything in Longmont, all our money going instead to build other lines around Denver.

Now is the time for you to end this shameful travesty and honor your promise to build FastTracks into Longmont. Governor Polis and the State Legislature have provided needed funds to build the line, so it's incumbent upon you to honorably keep your promise to build this line without any further delay!

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,  
Mary Headley

---

**From:** Anne Fiore  
**Sent:** Saturday, May 24, 2025 5:59 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Bring RAIL TO LONGMONT!

Hello RTD Directors:

I did vote for the NW Rail Project and as a long time resident of Longmont and Boulder County, I would like to see this project back on the agenda.

The Governor and the State Legislature have provided additional funds to build the line, and now we need RTDs commitment!

As a senior, I would utilize the line to visit museums in Denver. Right now I drive there but would prefer public transit.

Anne Fiore  
Longmont, CO



---

**From:** Mitzi Nicoletti  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 25, 2025 6:36 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** NW Rail

*Good evening.*

*I am contacting you regarding the NW rail project. I live in Longmont and have been paying into this project for over 20 years. I am asking you approve the NW rail project with a vote planned for this summer. Our community would greatly benefit from this mode of transportation.*

*Thank you,*

*Mitzi Nicoletti*

---

**From:** Gilljuan  
**Sent:** Monday, May 26, 2025 9:13 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Rail to Longmont

I would like to make sure you vote to move forward the rail link to Longmont. This needs to be completed as soon as possible

I voted for it in 2004, and the residents have been paying for it ever since. We deserve to have the service completed

In addition, Longmont has grown during this time, and to keep access to a vibrant community up and down the front range we need to have a rail service that connects all the towns

Thanks you  
Gillian Ivers-Read

---

**From:** Catherine FinkJohnson  
**Sent:** Monday, May 26, 2025 10:12 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Bring NW Rail to Longmont NOW!

Hello Board Members,

I am a teacher, mother of three, environmental lawyer, and longtime resident of Longmont (1990-2003, 2016-present). Over that time, I have seen traffic congestion rise, pedestrian and biker deaths increase, and air quality decrease dramatically ([Boulder County gets an F according to the American Lung Assoc.](#)). We desperately need passenger rail in order to reduce pollution, traffic congestion, and to make our streets safer for pedestrians and bikers.

Also, as LoCo residents, my family and I have been paying for rail we've never seen for--Longmonsters have paid \$100,000,000 over the past 21 years, without getting a return on our massive investment.

**RTD needs to listen to LoCo residents, show respect for the taxes we have paid, and bring rail to Longmont.**

Thank you for registering this demand.

Sincerely,  
Catherine FinkJohnson  
80501

---

**From:** delliot  
**Sent:** Monday, May 26, 2025 10:17 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont light rail

To whom it may concern,

I moved to Longmont to follow a job in 2011 , with promise of a light rail system into Denver !  
Coming from the Tech center area , we used the light rail every weekend so we could enjoy concerts and lunch in Denver without the hassle of parking .  
Now it's 2025 and if I want to go to Denver to enjoy the day , it takes nearly 2 hours on 2 buses !!  
Drive to park n ride , Bus to Boulder !  
Then Bus to Denver , if you time it right you have only 5 minutes to get the next bus or wait 15 mins . Depending on the time of day, otherwise you have an hour to wait !

My husband drives 45 mins to Westminster park n ride for a 15 minute train ride to Union station !  
Last weekend we couldn't even park at the park n ride garage , it was closed !

In this day and age it's ridiculous!  
Driving is stressful on the interstate, too many cars , this problem would be solved with a Light rail system!!! People would use it !! And enjoy it !! Everyone Needs this !! But I fear I won't see it and be able to enjoy it anytime soon !!

Very sad !!  
We need it !!

D . Elliott

Not satisfied with public transportation in Colorado !  
Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** Laura Creager  
**Sent:** Monday, May 26, 2025 11:05 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** LONGMONT wants to be HEARD!

We have invested in and long awaited for train/light rail transit in Longmont. Most of the reason that I do not attend events is due to traffic, parking and overall congestion which ultimately means stress.

I would like to adamantly request that Longmont residents are heard and that we have already paid for this investment and would sincerely appreciate movement, literally and figuratively.

Please, make it a point to move forward with our requests.

Thank you.

**Laura Creager**  
**Longmont, CO**

---

**From:** lil bert's mom  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 6:20 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** RTD Passenger Rail to Longmont

Hello,

Is it true that you think Longmont residents don't want a rail line? Well, that couldn't be further from the truth. We VOTED for it, over 20 years ago, we have PAID for it, for 20 years. And VERY shortly after this bill was passed, you, or whoever responsible at the time, backed out on the deal with us.

I'm still mad about it, I will not lie. It felt like a bait and switch to me (still does). Get me to pay for rail for Denver and give me nothing. I imagine a LOT of people who have been here since before that bill, and who voted for it, and who have been paying for it, are also mad.

Please, stop pretending we don't want it so you don't have to build it. You know we want it.

Respectfully (maybe not exactly),

Danica Conway

---

**From:** Kathy Partridge  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 9:41 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Build the NW Rail Project

Dear RTD Directors,

I write to you today as a long time Longmont resident who voted for the NW Rail Project in 2004! I have been pay for this for over twenty years! It is now time for me, and others here, to get our money's worth.

The NW Rail Project will make a huge positive impact on my life, as a senior citizen.

Let's see some action now!

--  
Kathy Partridge

(she, they)

## Jillian Knapp-Rhodes

---

**From:** alex carpenter <alex4123@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 11:40 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Rail to Longmont

We have been paying for this rail route for over twenty years. When I voted for it, I had hope that I would soon enjoy using it. I am in my eighties now and need it more than ever.

What do we have to do to make it happen? And why has every other route been built but not ours?

I am tired of promises....

Marilyn Carpenter

Get [Outlook for Android](#)



**Submitted as Public Comment to the RTD Special Board Meeting, May 28th, 2025**

May 28th, 2025

Julian Bouquet, RTD Board Chair  
Regional Transportation District  
1660 Blake Street  
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Chair Bouquet,

**“Yes” on the Joint Service Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) for Northwest Rail**

GDT urges a “yes” vote on the upcoming Joint Service motion to keep critical collaborative tasks between RTD and CDOT moving on Northwest Rail with confidence that further approval from the RTD Board will still be required when (a) costs are presented after the Joint Service study is complete and (b) a track access agreement with the line’s owner (the BNSF Railway) is on the table.

It is vital that RTD be seen as doing everything it possibly can to deliver on the promises of FasTracks, and at this stage, there is only one path on the table with new funding, and this involves a partnership with the State of Colorado, under whose authority RTD was created at the consent of voters.

**Consequences and Lessons from the 2004 FasTracks Ballot Measure 4A**

The 41-mile Northwest Rail Line connecting Denver to Boulder and Longmont was promised in the RTD FasTracks sales tax vote in 2004. The original plan was to pay BNSF, who owns the tracks from Westminster to Longmont via Boulder, to double-track and electrify the line with an overhead catenary system (OCS) to be compatible with RTD’s other heavy rail lines. While the double-tracking wasn’t such a big deal for a large Class I railroad, the electrification was asking BNSF to do something in which it had practically zero construction and operating experience, in return for no benefit to freight train operations - which would remain diesel powered.

The result was that the quoted costs to complete Northwest Rail ballooned from the \$461m original estimate in 2003 (before the FasTracks vote) to \$1.5bn in 2018. With polling showing that voters were unlikely to approve further sales tax increases, RTD projected that they wouldn’t have funds to complete the line until 2042 (now revised to 2044). These dates are clearly unpalatable for politicians and residents of Boulder and Longmont, who point out that their communities have now been paying their fair share of FasTracks sales taxes for twenty years with little progress on the rail line to show for it.

The mistake made over twenty years ago was to promise the voters a project with quoted costs and then have to walk that back after negotiations with BNSF revealed vastly differing figures. It is imperative that this mistake must not be repeated a second time.

These promises are remembered, the higher sales tax is felt, and the “Ghost Train” is almost inseparable from political discussions about RTD. Any appearance of shirking these promises will have grave political consequences for transit. There should be no doubt that the uncompleted FasTracks corridors, especially Northwest Rail to Boulder and Longmont, is weighing heavily on public confidence in RTD and transit generally. While it is critical that RTD return to a ridership growth trajectory, a trajectory which must be supported by multiple highly-needed capital projects in the future, we at GDT are convinced that RTD will be unsuccessful in raising any major new funds at the ballot until there is a clear path to deliver service on the corridors that were promised fast, frequent, reliable, and accessible rail services.

In recent years, RTD has shed the expertise in the form of headcount that would be needed to complete capital projects to deliver most of these corridors by itself, and so the State has stepped up to help push these projects toward the finish line, and this presents a unique opportunity for the agency.

### **Capital Investment Split**

GDT proposes that RTD be responsible for half the construction costs after Federal grants (e.g. CRISI) are applied, of any infrastructure required for joint service between Denver and Longmont. In the event a Federal grant spans an area outside of the Denver - Longmont section, the grant amount applied should be proportional to the track miles or infrastructure otherwise funded.

### **Front Range Passenger Rail Full Buildout Considerations**

A requirement for RTD to approve any infrastructure investment should be the presentation of a comprehensive incremental plan by the State of Colorado which details how the northwest corridor would be built out to a fully independent, double-track passenger rail right-of-way. Such a plan would guide infrastructure decisions and prevent costly mistakes where infrastructure is unable to be easily upgraded in the future.

While such thinking may seem unattainable in 2025, GDT cautions that a similar lack of an ambitious plan in the 1970s and 1980s resulted in key development decisions being mishandled at the old Stapleton Airport because no one anticipated tens of millions of passengers would want to fly in and out of Denver. The result was the costly provision of a new airport that is located in a far less convenient location relative to the city.

### **Operational Cost Split**

It is anticipated that the Joint Service Executive Oversight Committee (JSEOC) will appoint an operator for the Northwest Corridor Joint Service.

GDT proposes that RTD be responsible for half the operational costs of any train miles operated between Denver and Longmont. In the event trains are operated beyond the limits of the joint service area, a proportion of operating costs divided in half relative to train miles operated inside the joint service area should be assessed. For ‘fixed’ operational costs such as train fleet maintenance, the same train miles formula should be used to assess RTD’s share of costs.

## JSEOC Representation

GDT notes that RTD's membership of the JSEOC ensures the agency's input will be considered, however we have concerns that some decisions made on a '50% plus one' basis could result in RTD being severely outnumbered on a vote while ultimately being responsible for 40-50% of the financial consequences of said vote. We urge the agency to negotiate for a larger weighted share of the vote or a veto in such cases, to avoid a scenario where the other JSEOC members functionally have full control over allocation of RTD's funds.

GDT recommends that the RTD Board vote to appropriate funding with final approval conditional on costs agreed with BNSF and confirmation that the State of Colorado will fund their agreed share of the capital investment and operational costs for as long as the joint service agreement is in place.

Thanks for all you do,



James Flattum



Richard Bamber



Emma Griffin



Joe Meyer

CC: RTD Board of Directors  
Debra Johnson, RTD General Manager & CEO  
Angel Peña, RTD Deputy CEO

**Submitted as Public Comment to the RTD Board Meeting, May 28th, 2025**

May 28th, 2025

Julian Bouquet, RTD Board Chair  
Regional Transportation District  
1660 Blake Street  
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Chair Bouquet,

**Title VI Program Update**

Please see attached letter, sent to Dani McLean at the Transit Equity Office, for our public comment on this topic.

Thanks for all you do,



James Flattum



Richard Bamber



Emma Griffin



Joe Meyer

CC: RTD Board of Directors  
Debra Johnson, RTD General Manager & CEO  
Angel Peña, RTD Deputy CEO

May 14th, 2025

Dani McLean, Transit Equity Specialist  
Regional Transportation District  
1660 Blake Street  
Denver, CO 80202

### **RTD Title VI Program Update**

Dear Ms. McLean,

Greater Denver Transit (GDT) supports the updates to the Title VI policy that expand the criteria through which equity in service changes is considered. GDT believes understanding the impacts of a broader set of “major” service changes and expanding the “low income” definition to better account for residents that are likely to be transit-dependent is important and beneficial. In addition, GDT welcomes the updates to the Public Participation Plan and Language Access Plan (LAP).

In recent years, GDT has written raising concerns about the application of equity analysis on specific bus routes. We will continue to watch the implementation of Title VI feedback on RTD service planning decisions, and are hopeful that the changes proposed continue to improve the entire transit network in an equitable way.

In addition to this implemented Title VI program update, we recommend RTD:

1. Considers simplification of the signup process for the LiVE Program. This includes blanket acceptance of documents (e.g. Medicaid, SNAP), validation from trusted parties (e.g. community service providers) and a temporary self-certification option for those unable to produce documents quickly and easily.
2. Evaluates additional sources of data (e.g. ridership demographics, access to higher income employment) as inputs to the equity analysis process.
3. Recognizes the potential for expanded transit access to spread wealth around by connecting different neighborhoods and locations across the metro area (e.g. service between low-income communities and well-paying employers).
4. Analyzes the equity impacts of prolonged poor service performance (e.g. delays / disruptions / cancellations of transit service) that are not otherwise accounted for as “service changes”.

GDT thanks you for considering this feedback and your continued work to provide a transit network that serves everyone.



James Flattum



Richard Bamber



Emma Griffin



Joe Meyer

CC: RTD Board of Directors  
Debra Johnson, RTD General Manager & CEO  
Angel Peña, RTD Deputy CEO

---

**From:** Ruth Przybeck  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 4:11 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Vote yes

RTD Directors,

We Longmonsters have waited long enough and contributed money for years. We want what you promised us.  
Expand service that includes Longmont.

Ruth Przybeck  
Longmont , CO

---

**From:** Maddie McKean  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 4:12 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont

Hello the Board,

My name is Maddie and I've lived in Longmont for over 30 years. My whole life, the city has talked about the train in the terms one might use for a beloved pet who has let you down. "Sure, we'll get the train line someday" comes in the same voice as "Mittens is doing great-- only went potty in the house once this week!"

You have the opportunity to bring the Northwest Rail project into being. Longmont has paid over \$635 million to RTD since 2004. What do we have to show for that? Family members who have moved away from the area still scoff to hear me talk about my hopes for the train. They tell me the train will never come to Longmont, and that for the past 30 years, everyone has been saying there will be movement on it soon, but there never is. I feel like a poor rural farmer in the old west, hoping the railroad will come to town and bring riches with it. Unlike the fictional farmer, I don't need the railroad to bring riches. If the train comes to me, I can travel to the riches (the Denver area in this case) myself.

I am not good at writing appeals, but I hope my passion is clear. I want the Longmont rail line. There have been six other regional rail lines built. Longmont deserves this rail line, Longmont has paid for this rail line, and the people of Longmont deserve this rail line.

This summer you will vote on whether to move forward with the Northwest Rail project. I am very strongly urging you to vote in favor.

Thanks,  
Maddie McKean



---

**From:** Meri Gibb  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 4:22 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont needs rail transit

With the population growing and the traffic getting worse we need the rail transit that we voted for 20 years ago. I understand there is an opportunity to make this happen now and we want it to become a reality. When my husband and I campaigned for the rail line between Longmont and Denver via Boulder we had no idea that the project would be stalled for twenty years. It's time to make it happen.

Merion Gibb  
Longmont

---

**From:** Paul Gibb  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 5:10 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Boulder and Longmont deserve rail service

Dear RTD directors,

Longmont has paid \$625 million towards getting commuter rail and I believe Boulder has paid even more. It's time we got something back for all that financial support!!!

I'm a former BNSF employee and know every detail of the line.

I don't believe BNSF really needs this line. Some sections of it are very poorly engineered (they were built strictly as branch lines to reach grain mills etc.) and BNSF has another route between Wyoming and Denver and has far fewer coal trains than it once had, and even though that line (through Scottsbluff, Sterling, and Fort Morgan) is 40 or 50 miles longer, it is infinitely better engineered and also signaled, and actually would take BNSF's high priority trains 30 or 40 minutes less time than going through Longmont and Boulder!! Since coal traffic is reduced, it would make perfect sense to run BNSF's two or three priority freight trains via the other route!!

I understand that local freight customers along the line would still need service, but much of that could be accomplished by extending some of the Great Western lines back into the area and, in a few cases, an additional track might need to be added along the passenger lines for local freight trains (or a shared line with movable platforms at some stations).

I think considering these changes might significantly reduce the cost of purchasing the line from BNSF and improving it.

But if we have to have a joint line that will run long-distance freights, we still need to go ahead. Traffic is horrible along the highways in this area and we deserve to be treated the way other communities around Denver have been treated.

And of course, coal traffic has been significantly reduced going south of Denver all the way down to Trinidad. And that line already has two tracks and is mostly quite well engineered.

I'll be at the meeting tomorrow (Wednesday the 28th) if anyone wants to talk with me.

--Paul Gibb

---

**From:** Suzanne Walker  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 5:22 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Train to Longmont

I have resided in Longmont since 1988. I usually drive to Denver, as connecting with buses can be difficult. I did ride the express bus from Longmont to Denver on a number of occasions.

I heartily supported the RTD proposal to connect our communities via train and light rail. I voted in favor of it and encouraged my friends to also. We deserve what we were promised. Extend train service to Longmont.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Walker

Longmont 80504

Sent from my iPhone

To: RTD Board of Directors

Subject: Support for RTD's proposed Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Policy

We, the undersigned organizations, are writing to support RTD's proposed Equitable Transit-Oriented Development (ETOD) policy to allow the agency to lower land costs and unlock more affordable housing development near transit. This is a critical strategy to improve access to RTD's transit system while addressing the region's housing affordability crisis by converting underutilized urban land into much-needed housing.

While there are a handful of successful TOD examples along the Front Range, most rail stations and bus corridors still lack the housing density needed to support frequent transit and generate high ridership. As a general rule, areas around transit stations need a minimum of [15 homes per acre](#) to support service where buses and trains arrive every 15 minutes or more frequently. For RTD, just [8% of rail station areas and 15% of frequent bus corridors](#) meet this threshold – a major reason the system is underperforming and underutilized. RTD's ridership and efficiency lag behind peer agencies in Minneapolis, Portland, and Seattle, which move two to four times more people per service mile. One reason is that these metro areas have planned their communities so that the majority of residents can easily walk to train stations and bus stops.

RTD currently owns and operates roughly 30,000 parking spaces, yet 80% of them – around 24,000 spaces – sit empty. This represents a massive waste of valuable urban land. As RTD considers the financial impact of this policy, it should weigh the potential revenue from redevelopment – even with discounted land costs – against the near-zero revenue generated by most of its parking facilities. The opportunity cost of not discounting land to enable development is significant.

We also know that low-income households are far more likely to rely on transit than market-rate households, in part because car ownership is so expensive. [A 2020 RTD study](#) found that 61% of low-income households lack access to a car, compared to just 7% of market-rate households. RTD can fill the buses and trains it already runs by actively encouraging more affordable housing around its network. This could generate additional farebox revenue for the agency, helping to offset the revenue forgone through discounted land agreements.

In addition to the housing and transportation affordability benefits, expanding TOD is essential for climate and air quality. Transportation is the largest source of pollution in Colorado. According to [U.S. Census data](#), households in neighborhoods with 40 homes per acre drive 40% less than the average Colorado household – demonstrating the significant greenhouse gas reduction potential of TOD, in part from replacing car trips with transit, but also from more walkability and shorter driving trips.

Lastly, the [Denver Regional Council of Governments' recent Housing Needs Assessment](#) found that the region must build 216,000 new homes over the next decade to close the current housing shortage and accommodate future growth. Over half of that need is for households earning less than 50% of the area median income (AMI). One of the biggest barriers to new housing is the cost and scarcity of land. RTD's revised ETOD policy has tremendous potential to deliver more affordable housing in strategic locations, creating more opportunities for people to live in high-demand areas within walking distance of high-quality transit. This comes at a time when high interest rates have significantly reduced new housing starts, contributing to an [82% decline in new](#)

[apartment permits](#) in Denver in recent years. Many projects that were once financially feasible are no longer viable in our current economic climate. Policymakers must find ways to reduce the cost of building new affordable housing – and this policy does exactly that.

We, the undersigned, strongly support the proposed amendments to reduce land prices for affordable housing projects. If anything, RTD should consider removing the 50% discount cap and allow staff to negotiate directly with affordable housing builders to align the discount with the project's financing gap and maximize the housing yield on RTD-owned land. RTD's TOD staff understand development dynamics and financial "stacks" well enough to represent the agency's best interests and set appropriate pricing for its assets. Delivering projects with over 50% of units affordable at or below 60% AMI is extremely challenging, and RTD should retain the flexibility needed to help make these projects feasible.

Lastly, we support the ETOD proposal's goal of fully utilizing the maximum allowable zoning. However, we also recognize that affordable housing tax credits and other public funding sources used to subsidize these units are limited and in high demand. We want to avoid a situation where a developer constructs a smaller building near transit – meaning fewer homes with high transit access – simply because they were unable to secure enough Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs) to build to the full zoning potential.

Where this funding constraint can be clearly demonstrated through a standardized process and submitted to RTD staff, we recommend allowing some discretion and flexibility in meeting the 50% affordability requirement. Again, our concern is to avoid scenarios where local zoning permits a six-story building next to a rail station, but only a three-story building is constructed due to insufficient LIHTC availability.

This policy is a win-win for RTD and the region. It transforms underutilized parking lots into much-needed affordable housing while improving access to RTD's core product: transit.

Sincerely,

Matt Frommer, Transportation and Land Use Policy Manager, Southwest Energy Efficiency Project (SWEET)

Jill Locantore, Executive Director, Denver Streets Partnership

Renee Larrarte, Climate & Transportation Manager, Conservation Colorado

---

**From:** Carey, Jesse - CC City Council Aide Senior <Jesse.Carey@denvergov.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 9:27 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Cc:** Lewis, Shontel M. - CC Member District 8 Denver City Council  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Title VI Changes  
**Attachments:** 25-0709\_Signed.pdf

Good morning,

My name is Jesse Carey and I am the Senior Council Aide to Denver City Councilwoman Shontel M. Lewis. I am reaching out on her behalf to submit public comment in favor of RTD's Title VI changes.

Councilwoman Lewis and her colleagues on City Council [considered and passed a proclamation in favor of the proposed changes on May 19, 2025](#). This proclamation represents the official support of the Denver City Council, and was co-sponsored by every member of the body. I have attached a copy of the signed proclamation to this email. The full text of the Proclamation reads:

**Proclamation No. 25-0709**  
**Our Commitment to Ensuring Equitable RTD Policies and Standards**

**WHEREAS**, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stands as a cornerstone of civil rights, ensuring that all individuals, regardless of their background, have equal access in any program, service or activity receiving federal financial assistance; and **WHEREAS**, The Regional Transportation District (RTD), a recipient of federal financial assistance, provides critical services to the residents of the City and County of Denver by ensuring that mobility is not a barrier to accessing places of employment, education, or healthcare; and

**WHEREAS**, Upholding the values and goals of Title VI is an iterative process that requires proactive stewardship, on-going action and periodic review to support implementing Title VI regulatory directives to the highest standards; and

**WHEREAS**, RTD must ensure equal access, uphold nondiscrimination requirements and demonstrate compliance with federal regulatory requirements as put forth by the Federal Transit Administration by submitting its Title VI Program every three years; and **WHEREAS**, RTD's proposed 2025-2028 Title VI Program is comprised of a collection of policies, plans and other initiatives that promote fair, accessible and equitable public transportation for all customers; and

**WHEREAS**, RTD's proposed policy updates will proactively identify and mitigate potential inequities before implementing fare or service changes by expanding the definition of major service changes to better capture cumulative impacts, add clarity to the types of major service changes, clarify what counts as a fare change and raise the income threshold to more accurately reflect Denver's cost of living; and

**WHEREAS**, RTD's updated 2025-2028 Language Access Plan will ensure meaningful access to linguistically diverse customers by strengthening partnerships with community organizations that serve newcomer communities, exploring opportunities to help frontline staff overcome language barriers through training and resources and improving accessibility through the implementation of website and mobile app language tools.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED BY THE DENVER CITY COUNCIL:**

**Section 1.** That the Denver City Council wholeheartedly supports the 2025-2028 Title VI Program to include proposed updates to the major service change, disparate impact, and fare equity policies as well as updates to RTD’s Public Participation Plan and Language Access Plan.

**Section 2.** That the Clerk and Recorder of the City and County of Denver shall affix the seal of the City and County of Denver to this proclamation and that copies be transmitted to RTD Board Members John McKay and Carl Green.

In Service,

--



**Jesse Carey (He/his)**

Councilwoman Shontel M. Lewis

Senior Council Aide – Policy & Legislative Services

720-337-8888 | [district8@denvergov.org](mailto:district8@denvergov.org)

720-337-8881 | [Jesse.Carey@denvergov.org](mailto:Jesse.Carey@denvergov.org)

# DENVER CITY COUNCIL



## Proclamation No. 25-0709

### Our Commitment to Ensuring Equitable RTD Policies and Standards

**WHEREAS**, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stands as a cornerstone of civil rights, ensuring that all individuals, regardless of their background, have equal access in any program, service or activity receiving federal financial assistance; and

**WHEREAS**, The Regional Transportation District (RTD), a recipient of federal financial assistance, provides critical services to the residents of the City and County of Denver by ensuring that mobility is not a barrier to accessing places of employment, education, or healthcare; and

**WHEREAS**, Upholding the values and goals of Title VI is an iterative process that requires proactive stewardship, on-going action and periodic review to support implementing Title VI regulatory directives to the highest standards; and

**WHEREAS**, RTD must ensure equal access, uphold nondiscrimination requirements and demonstrate compliance with federal regulatory requirements as put forth by the Federal Transit Administration by submitting its Title VI Program every three years; and

**WHEREAS**, RTD's proposed 2025-2028 Title VI Program is comprised of a collection of policies, plans and other initiatives that promote fair, accessible and equitable public transportation for all customers; and

**WHEREAS**, RTD's proposed policy updates will proactively identify and mitigate potential inequities before implementing fare or service changes by expanding the definition of major service changes to better capture cumulative impacts, add clarity to the types of major service changes, clarify what counts as a fare change and raise the income threshold to more accurately reflect Denver's cost of living; and

**WHEREAS**, RTD's updated 2025-2028 Language Access Plan will ensure meaningful access to linguistically diverse customers by strengthening partnerships with community organizations that serve newcomer communities, exploring opportunities to help frontline staff overcome language barriers through training and resources and improving accessibility through the implementation of website and mobile app language tools.

### NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED BY THE DENVER CITY COUNCIL:

**Section 1.** That the Denver City Council wholeheartedly supports the 2025-2028 Title VI Program to include proposed updates to the major service change, disparate impact, and fare equity policies as well as updates to RTD's Public Participation Plan and Language Access Plan.

**Section 2.** That the Clerk and Recorder of the City and County of Denver shall affix the seal of the City and County of Denver to this proclamation and that copies be transmitted to RTD Board Members John McKay and Carl Green.

PASSED BY THE COUNCIL May 19, 2025

*Amursh P. Sandbrook*

PRESIDENT





---

**From:** Kelly McReynolds  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 8:41 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont Light Rail

Hello,

I'm sending a quick email to urge RTD to follow through on the light rail that Longmont has been paying for for decades.

I am a Longmont resident that visits downtown Denver frequently for Nuggets games and other special events. Currently I either drive to Boulder to catch the FF from Table Mesa PNR or I drive to Thornton to catch the N Line light rail.

I'd love to see service brought to Longmont and I'm sure others would as well.

Thank you,

Kelly McReynolds

Longmont

---

**From:** Abby Driscoll  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 6:47 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** support for rail in Longmont

Dear RTD Commissioners,

I am in support of RTD joining the NW Rail Project and taking additional action steps to bring rail transit to Longmont. This is a long-awaited project by the people of Longmont. This is not just about the people of Longmont, who have been paying taxes on this awaited rail project for years. We're a fast-growing city, and with the growth in the general Front Range, the rail system will be an engine for economic growth in the region.

I urge you to support RTD's role in this project and move our regional transit goals towards further progress.

Sincerely,  
Abby Driscoll

(720) 491-9065

---

**From:** J Howard  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 4:10 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Northwest Rail Now

I voted in favor of a tax increase nearly 20 years ago to bring a rail line to Boulder County. RTD has betrayed us and given our tax dollars to Denver. It is criminal. I would prefer RTD be replaced by a better company altogether. I have personally paid my taxes and demand you follow through on your promise to bring a rail line to Boulder before I retire. I should have been commuting by train for almost ten years now. BUILD THE NORTHWEST LINE NOW!!!

J. Howard  
Sent from my iPhone

---

**From:** Kristen Baltrum  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 22, 2025 4:44 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Urgent Need for Rail Service Expansion to Longmont from Denver

Dear RTD Directors,

As a Longmont resident, I strongly urge you to prioritize expanding rail service from Denver to Longmont. This extension would address critical transportation needs and provide significant benefits to our region.

Longmont's population has grown rapidly, yet public transit options to Denver remain limited. The existing bus services, while helpful, are often delayed by traffic on I-25, making them unreliable for commuters. A rail connection would offer a faster, more consistent alternative, reducing travel times and encouraging sustainable transportation.

Expanding rail service would also boost economic growth. Improved access to Denver's job market would attract businesses and residents to Longmont, while supporting tourism and local commerce. Additionally, it would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by decreasing reliance on single-occupancy vehicles, aligning with Colorado's environmental goals.

The FasTracks Northwest Rail Line, promised to voters in 2004, remains incomplete. Longmont residents deserve equitable access to the regional transit network we've supported through taxes. I respectfully request that RTD prioritize funding and planning to extend rail service to Longmont, ensuring our community is connected to the Denver metro area.

Thank you for considering this critical investment. I look forward to updates on RTD's plans to advance this project.

Sincerely,  
Kristen Baltrum  
Longmont, CO Resident

--

**Kristen Baltrum** (she/her)  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

---

**From:** McKenna Bernard  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 12:35 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Support of NW rail line

Hello RTD Board of Directors,

My name is McKenna and I live in Longmont. I wanted to let you know how much I have been wanting better public transportation options to Denver, Boulder, and Fort Collins. I implore you to seriously consider this option and the improvements this would bring to the Longmont community. I have been incredibly disappointed the last few times the various projects have fallen off the radar for Longmont. We can do better than this!

Thank you!

McKenna

---

**From:** Kristen Anderson  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 12:36 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont rail service

I love Longmont. We've called it our home for over a dozen years, and every year we've hoped to hear that \*this\* would be the year commuter rail became a reality.

Our community has paid into this project in good faith for too long without progress. Please do your part to help ease traffic congestion, clean our front range air and bring Longmont the service it has paid for and deserves.

Thank you!

Kristen Anderson

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Lizzie H  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 12:55 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** On the RTD rail to Longmont

Hello,

I heard there may finally be a rail line between Longmont and Denver. I would like to let you know that a train from Longmont to Denver would be very convenient for me and many others as well. I don't have a car, and I would love to be able to travel to visit my Denver friends. I was in fourth grade when this project was announced, and now I'm 29! So it would be wonderful to see this realized before my middle age.

Thank you for your consideration.

-Lizzie

---

**From:** Maureen Hearty  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 1:01 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** passenger rail to Longmont!!

Hello RTD Directors,

I am very much looking forward to the implementation of your commitment to create a passenger rail line from Denver to Longmont!

My family will use it regularly to visit family and friends in Denver as well as attend Denver events. Plus, maybe my parents, who don't drive, will come up and visit us!

Thanks,

--

Maureen Hearty

she / her

[www.mauxheart.com](http://www.mauxheart.com)

[DEI supporter](#)



---

**From:** KJ Kroetch  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 1:05 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** NW Rail Project - Longmont

Hello,

I am a resident of Longmont who lives near Main Street and loves public transportation. The NW Rail Project caught my eye prior to moving to Longmont and has been something I have looked forward to for years. I have lived in regions with major rail systems and they provide an increased quality of life for residents and visitors alike. I understand that you "haven't heard from Longmont" in regards to this project - so here I am, reaching out to share how important funding this rail project is to this Longmont Resident.

Thank you.

KJ

--

KJ Kroetch

Triathlon and Swim Coach

---

**From:** katie torres  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 1:07 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Longmont train service

Please support Longmont train service. We need the NW Rail Project.

We have contributed. Now is the time.

Yours,

Jonna Kate Torres  
Longmont, CO

---

**From:** Marisa Dirks  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 1:42 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** BRING RAIL TO LONGMONT, PLEEEEEEEZE!

Dear RTD Board of Directors,  
You want to know what really hurts? It's hard not to take this personally.

When I used to take the RTD Express bus from Longmont to the Capitol years ago, I remember thinking, "This works for today, but it's only a quick fix. Someday, Longmont will have light rail..." I've taken the L(elevated train) all through the suburbs of Chicago, I've ridden BART, I've used the Metro in DC, I navigated through the Underground in London. Clean, efficient, super easy to understand in all cases for a stranger to town like I was.

And I knew light rail for Longmont was still years into the future, but because I also knew Longmont voters had agreed to the tax, and those funds were being collected for one decade, then another... and even as I heard about rail stop after rail stop being completed in Denver — I was SURE Longmont would be next...at some point.

Because I-25 traffic going south to Denver has only gotten worse, and more dangerous, taking more time than ever if you don't hit it right, or if there's an accident...or construction...or a not so dependable car...or frustrated drivers, because it's taking so long. I kept thinking about daily commuters from Longmont. How did they do it without getting killed? I won't even start about I-25 north to Fort Collins, where my sister lives.

Then even that Longmont Denver express bus service was cut — do you know how ridiculous it is to drive to Boulder, to get to Denver, when I-25, dangerous as it is, is a straight shot?

I went to the Women's March in Denver in 2017, where 200,000 people showed up. Impossible parking. A group of us were happy that the train could be taken from Westminster. Drove from Longmont to Westminster, only to find it was packed, so...

"We might as well drive..." And we did. BUT THEN WHAT IS RTD FOR? I know the intent was not to throw Longmont "crumbs" with bus service to "tide us over", or hopes that we'd "forget"... but \$100,000,000 and 21 years later, that's what it feels like.

And please know this. Lots and lots of Longmont folks feel let down by RTD. You're hearing from me today, but I guarantee you there are more.

They've just given up expecting anything.

I hope you can change that.  
Thanks,  
Marisa Dirks  
Longmont

---

**From:** Karen Kochanski  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 2:38 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Rail

We've been paying for rail that was promised over 20 years ago. Either get it done, or send us a big fat rebate check. Both Longmont and Boulder have planned and built mixed use developments around proposed rail stations and there are still no commuter trains. We're just as deserving as all of the other rail corridors the have been built in the RTD region.

Karen Kochanski  
Longmont

---

**From:** Patricia Davis  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 2:48 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Northwest Rail Line

Dear RTD Board:

I am an 83 year old widow who lives in Longmont.

Twenty years ago, I and other citizens in Boulder and Broomfield counties agreed in good faith to pay an additional 0.4% sales tax each year to help fund the Denver Metro Area Fastracks project. Our commitment was based on the understanding, and the promise by RTD, that the project would include a link, identified as the Northwest Rail Line, which would run through some of our cities connecting us to the greater Denver metro area.

As of now, the other rail lines in this project have been completed and are in operation. RTD has done nothing to build our section. Additionally, I am hearing that RTD is waffling, and may decide not to build this line at all.

Over the years our district has provided at least \$625 million to support the Fastracks project. If RTD reneges on their commitment to build the Northwest Rail Line, I believe that it is our right to shut off the ongoing yearly sales tax payments immediately. And, in my opinion, our district should be reimbursed some dollar amount for RTD's failure to deliver.

Patricia Davis

Longmont, CO.

Dear RTD Board of Directors,

Fair, accessible, and nondiscriminatory access to transit services is essential to ensuring everyone in the Denver Metro Area can get where they need to go. We, the undersigned, urge you to approve the draft updates to the Title VI Program for 2025-2028 so RTD can continue to protect historically underserved communities in providing the region's transit service. In particular, we support the following updates:

- **Using U.S. Census data in equity analyses:** Federal guidelines recommend using demographic data for Title VI equity analyses, with U.S. Census data cited as a primary source, unless an agency has a robust and reliable source of ridership demographics, which RTD does not. RTD's passenger counters track boardings and exits but not demographics. MyRide data is limited by privacy rules, and the LiVE income-based discount program reaches only a fraction of low-income customers. Because of these deficiencies in data, the U.S. Census is still RTD's most reliable data in analysing equity impacts. Additionally, census-based geographic data also helps address long-standing inequities caused by discriminatory redlining, which denied BIPOC and low-income neighborhoods access to quality transit and other public services. U.S. Census data allows RTD to identify where these populations live in order to improve transit in these areas. Without this, RTD risks overlooking entire neighborhoods simply because their residents are underrepresented among current riders or use less frequented routes. RTD cannot base decisions solely on who is riding today; its obligation is to the service area as a whole.
- **Incorporating additional metrics to catch inequitable cumulative impacts as a result of service changes:** The updated Title VI policy maintains the 25% threshold of equity impacts in considering service changes but adds metrics like route miles, frequency, and service time span to capture cumulative changes over 36 months, and includes changes like implementing, eliminating, or discontinuing routes. Cumulative impacts to communities from small service changes over 36 months that total the 25% threshold need to be scrutinized; limiting examination to changes made over only 12 months could lead to significant impacts escaping notice. The update includes policies to modify service change proposals to minimize or mitigate impacts if they are found.
- **Raising the low-income definition from 150% to 200% of the federal poverty level:** While low-income status isn't a protected class under Title VI, assessing whether fare or service changes disproportionately burden low-income populations is critical for environmental justice. Raising the threshold for RTD better reflects the high cost of living in the Denver region, more closely aligns with RTD's LiVE program, and ensures more inclusive representation of low-income households when determining whether a fare or major service change will disproportionately impact these communities in its equity analyses.

We urge the Board to adopt the Title VI Program Update and to stay true to the spirit of Title VI—by protecting not only current riders but also those who rely on improved, equitable transit to access opportunity.

Sincerely,

*Organizations*

Towards Justice  
Colorado Cross Disability Coalition  
The Arc of Aurora  
Center for People with Disabilities  
RTD Riders Alliance  
AdvocacyDenver  
Womxn From The Mountain  
Champagne Tiger

*Individuals*

Isabel Cruz, Lakewood City Councilor, Ward 2  
Sophia Mayott-Guerrero, Lakewood City Councilor  
Amy Robertson  
Tim Johnson  
Nick Stuth  
Tamara Jarrett  
Jordan Dinsmore  
Brett Chacon  
Melissa Barber  
Mark Meeks  
Eliot Baskin  
Elena Martin Hernandez  
Clayton Dewey  
Osiris Mancera  
Marisa Louri  
Brit Pimentel

---

**From:** Winer, Tara <WinerT@bouldercolorado.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 2:49 PM  
**To:** Jack Kroll  
**Subject:** Chris Nicholson Amendment

Hello Mr. Kroll,

My name is Tara Winer and I am currently serving on the Boulder City Council.

I am in support of RTD Board Member Chris Nicholson's amendment expand on your policy to offer deeper discounts to projects that meet the housing needs of our region's most needy and vulnerable people.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tara Winer  
Boulder City Council.



## Jillian Knapp-Rhodes

---

**From:** Ezeadi, Obi <oezeadi@westminsterco.gov>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 25, 2025 11:13 PM  
**To:** Jack Kroll  
**Subject:** Support for eTOD Amendment

Dear RTD Board,

I strongly support the proposed amendment to deepen affordability in RTD's equitable TOD policy. RTD riders are disproportionately low-income, and aligning land pricing incentives with projects that serve them is smart policy. Prioritizing deeply affordable, accessible, family-ready housing near transit advances equity, climate goals, and regional stability. Please adopt this amendment.

Obi Ezeadi (He/Him)

Councillor, Westminster City Council

### Connect with me:

- **Cell:** [720-447-5606](tel:720-447-5606)
- **Search for me** on all social media platforms (except Twitter)
- **Attend my open office hours:** Every Monday at 4:30PM at Westminster City Hall, prior to a scheduled City Council meeting.

NOTE: Westminster is governed by the Colorado Open Records Act (CORA). This means that public records, such as this email, will be subject to inspection by anyone in the state.

## Jillian Knapp-Rhodes

---

**From:** Brockett, Aaron <BrockettA@bouldercolorado.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 27, 2025 12:32 PM  
**To:** Jack Kroll  
**Subject:** Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Policy Amendment

**WARNING:** This email originated from outside of the RTD organization. The sender could not be validated and may not match the person in the "From" field. Use caution with any information or links contained in this email.

Hello Jack. I'm reaching out with a quick note to let you know that I support the Equitable Transit-Oriented Development Policy Amendment that the RTD board will be discussing tomorrow. Thank you for the consideration.

Best,  
**Aaron Brockett**



**City of Boulder  
Mayor**

C: 720-984-1863  
[brocketta@bouldercolorado.gov](mailto:brocketta@bouldercolorado.gov)

---

**From:** Jillaire McMillan  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 4:30 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Rail to Longmont

Hello,

I'm a resident of unincorporated Longmont. I live in Weld County, but with a Longmont address and am close enough to downtown that I do most of my shopping and community connecting there. Last year, I ran for the state legislature. As I spent hours and hours knocking doors and meeting Longmont voters, so many of them said that they wish we had better public transportation in our area. The Bustang stop along I-25 opened this fall, but it is about ten miles from downtown Longmont, and is not accessible by other area public transit. We need better options for the people who live in this part of the Front Range to access Denver and other areas already serviced by light rail.

Voters are also frustrated that their twenty years' of taxes have not gone to building the promised rail to Longmont. Please restore our trust in RTD and fulfill the commitment made long ago to put tax dollars into this project. It would be a great advantage to the residents of Longmont, not to mention how it would reduce traffic congestion and air pollution to transition automobile drivers to rail riders.

Please expand passenger rail into the northwest!

sincerely,

Jillaire McMillan

---

**From:** Jack Kroll  
**Sent:** Friday, May 23, 2025 4:14 PM  
**Cc:** Debra Johnson; Angel Peña; Michelle Merz-Hutchinson; Kelly Mackey; John McKay; Greg Smith; Erin Vallejos  
**Subject:** AOD Letter from CCDC  
**Attachments:** RE: AOD

Directors—

Please see the letter below from CCDC, which was forwarded to the Board Office by former Director Jaime Lewis. The letter is the CCDC's input on the proposed Access-on-Demand modifications. Earlier this month, former Director Lewis reached out to me and requested the publicly available slide deck from the OSS meeting packet, and I provided him with an excerpt from the OSS committee meeting packet containing the published presentation. I have attached our correspondence here.

DATE: May 22, 2025

TO: Regional Transportation District Board of Directors

FROM: Colorado Cross Disability Coalition

The Colorado Cross Disability Coalition, a statewide non-profit supporting the rights of people with disabilities. We are providing concerns and observations referencing the Access-on-demand paratransit program.

CCDC obtained the slide deck that was scheduled to be presented to the Operations and Safety Committee scheduled for May 14th. Due to time constraints, the discussion item was tabled to the full board meeting scheduled for May 28th, 2025

The slide deck has been shared with over 30 stakeholders and members of CCDC.

**Concerns:**

Lack of Peer Review recommendation

The Peer Review recommended that a new mission statement should be in place in order to address the customer needs and operational efficiency. Currently, RTD is approaching each of the programs separately. There is a need to treat paratransit as one unit in order to provide the best service to its users.

Pricing principle

The Tier pricing recommended by RTD is inequitable with other pay practices used by RTD. The Tier program will make PWD users pay more as they use more of the system while bus and train users get a benefit when they ride the system more. For example, if a train/bus user buys a monthly pass they are not penalized if they use the system frequently. PWD pays more as they use the system under current recommendations. A monthly pass for paratransit should be considered

**Observations:**

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance is just that. The spirit of the Americans With Disabilities Act is to provide a service for paratransit that is consistent with regular transit services efficiencies and cost. RTD has an opportunity to create a paratransit system that will set the standard for the rest of the nation. This would be consistent with the rich history that that RTD has with the disability community in the region to make changes and create policies that have provided a transit system that is envied by others. Let's create a system that other transit agencies around the nation can emulate.

Page 7 of the RTD slide deck shows a graph indicating growth of AOD. If one looks closely, news users for AOD are flattening. This is an indication that growth will flatten in 2025 to around 5%. We hope directors take this in consideration not to make drastic changes or cut to the operational budget for paratransit.

## **Recommendation Reviews:**

### **Original Rate Recommendation (late 2024)**

Charge \$4.50 (up from 0)  
Monthly Trips 40 (down from 60)  
Trips Subsidy \$20 (down from 25)  
Geographic Coverage Same as current system  
Hours of operation Same as current system

A majority of our community conceded that a \$4.50 charge would be an equitable charge considering our Access-a-Ride riders are charged that amount.

After a year and a half of testimony, it is clear that 40 trips is not a number that the community can agree upon. Without a multi-ride option (that has not been reinstated after multiple requests from the community) riders would have about 2 weeks of coverage. The example that most users presented in testimony, was dropping children off at school as a user goes to a workplace. As soon as they would drop their child off, the trip would reset. This would result in them using 4 trips in one day.

The average user uses around \$17.50 per trip.

We do not see any data that would enable RTD to make an assessment that geographic coverage is an issue. How far are people using the system out of the geographic area? Is it two blocks or 2 miles? It would be difficult to make an assessment of this issue without appropriate data.

There does not appear to be any savings to restricting riders from using the system after hours. Considering the majority of trips are operated by the third party, i.e. Uber and Lyft, there does not appear to be any savings for RTD.

### **Scenario I**

Charge 6.50  
Monthly trips 50 (down from 60)  
Trips Subsidy \$20 (down from 25)  
Geographic Coverage Same as current system  
Hours of Operation Same as current system

Though it is encouraging to see the trip count increased to 50, the charge of \$6.50 is not consistent with traditional paratransit charges. Charges should not be twice of the base fare (FTA) This would cap the fare at \$5.50. As mentioned earlier, penalizing users because they use the system consistently is not consistent with historical pricing policies. This would require that a user pay 13.00 dollars to use the system on a round trip.

## Scenario II

### Charge Tiered

30 trips = 4.50

31-50 = 5.50

51-60 = 6.50

### Trips subsidy 20

Geographic Coverage same as current system

Hours of Operations same as current system

The monthly usage graph (page 8) provided by RTD, indicated there are only 290 users who use 51-60 or more trips per month. Charging \$6.50 would provide little income to RTD versus the financial burden this would place on such a small number of users.

Respectfully Submitted

Jaime Lewis

CCDC Transit Advisor

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

---

**From:** Jack Kroll  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 4:40 PM  
**To:** Jillian Knapp-Rhodes  
**Subject:** Public Comment on eTOD

For Public Comment

---

**From:** Jaime Lewis **Sent:** Monday, May 26, 2025 10:55 AM **To:** Jack Kroll **Subject:** Fwd:

**WARNING:** This email originated from outside of the RTD organization. The sender could not be validated and may not match the person in the "From" field. Use caution with any information or links contained in this email.

Jack, please forward this statement from Julie Reiskin to the board.

Jaime

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Julie Reiskin** <  
**Date:** Mon, May 26, 2025 at 10:39 AM  
**Subject:** Re:  
**To:** Jammie Lewis <

Yes

Julie Reiskin Co Executive Director CCDC

On Mon, May 26, 2025, 10:18 AM Jaime Lewis wrote:

Chris wants me to send this to the board. Are you Ok with that?

CCDC supports any effort to increase affordable and accessible housing. Affordability should include both the "missing middle" 30-80% AMI and those under 30% AMI.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.



The information transmitted is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, re-transmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer.

---

**From:** Sue Kruise  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 5:14 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Rail to Longmont

This message says that the board feels like they haven't heard from Longmont residences. Would that be hard to understand? We have had our hopes up so many times only to have them dashed. I personally feel naive to think that this will come to fruition. Too many promises and no results. I definitely feel that allowing us access to the rail would be a tremendous help. The highways cannot accommodate the current traffic, We need some alternatives. I realize this will be years before it's accomplished, but if it's never begun, it will never be accomplished.

Sue Kruise  
Longmont resident

---

**From:** Marcia Minke  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 5:36 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Cc:** commissioners@bouldercounty.gov  
**Subject:** Longmont Has Paid Its Fair Share

To: RTD Board

RE: RTD concerns.

After about 5 years of noting a maximum of 2 passengers on a large buses, especially after 6P, am very concerned that this is an inefficient use of tax dollars, a toll on local roads and major contributor to poor air quality. Please take a look at all your routes again and address this. Smaller vans might be an option.

Please also support the Longmont light rail initiative, which is overdue. Since 2004, over \$625 million went to RTD to help fund a regional rail line that was promised. Six other lines were built. Ours never was.

Another concern is that you are too large to change and would like to see leadership address how to be more responsive to public needs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Marcia Minke  
Boulder, CO 80301

## Tai-Shrae Parish

---

**From:** Suzanne Kloster  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 7:36 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Light Rail to Longmont

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I was one of the voters who supported RTD and light rail development along the front range. However, we still haven't seen light rail reach Longmont, even though we have been supporting RTD with taxes. I am hoping the RTD board is finally going to rectify this and bring light rail to Longmont. It is way past due!  
Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

## Tai-Shrae Parish

---

**From:** tkeenan  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2025 8:57 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Access On Demand

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Greetings, Board Members,

I provided public comment at the May 28 meeting, but I wanted to expand on it a bit.

I'm a totally blind user of Access On Demand. I live in Baker and work a changing schedule at Amazon in Aurora, which includes night and overnight shifts. At least one leg of my transportation would fall outside the ADA service hours and thus would not be eligible for Access on Demand under these recommendations. That would eat up close to a third of my weekly paycheck, and I know this would apply to several other people with disabilities who also work at Amazon, as well as anyone else who works overnight shifts.

Let's talk numbers. This program costs \$15.3 million annually from RTD's \$1.32 billion budget - that's 1.16%. Staff is proposing to cut a program that makes nearly 700,000 trips per year; that's 36% more trips than Access-a-Ride at a 71% lower cost per trip. It costs around \$16 per trip, versus Access-a-Ride at \$60 and the fixed route service at \$19 per boarding. Far from being unsustainable, this is probably the most efficient service RTD operates."

I'm not asking you to ignore fiscal responsibility. I think all of us support implementing a \$4.50 fare - the same as Access-a-Ride - which alone would generate \$2.8 million in annual savings. If you must cut further, reducing the subsidy to \$20 would save another \$932,000. Together, that's \$3.7 million - nearly 25% savings - without cutting the number of trips or the service area and hours. This would seem to be a win-win.

I urge you to reject the service area and hours restrictions. For those outside ADA boundaries, this isn't a premium service - it's their only option. Revoking their access to this program would save RTD a little money, but it will also strand disabled people in their homes. Is it worth it?

"I'm asking for three things:

- \* Keep the 60-trip monthly limit so people can work full-time jobs and still do things like pick up groceries and participate in the community – thereby putting more sales tax into RTD's coffers.
- \* Maintain the current service area so we don't create transit deserts.
- \* Implement fair pricing that generates revenue without punishing people who need to take more trips.

RTD's mission is making lives better through connections, and Access on Demand is doing exactly that. Let's make it more sustainable while avoiding cuts that would cause unnecessary rider hardship.

Thanks for all you do.

Cheers,  
Tim

## Tai-Shrae Parish

---

**From:** maura daniels  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 29, 2025 6:00 AM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** LONGMONT TAX RTD

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hey. You need to follow through on completing light rail service to the Longmont corridor that you committed to in 2004. Apparently you "haven't heard from Longmont". Don't be robber barons. Either follow through or return the money.

Maura Daniels  
Longmont

## Tai-Shrae Parish

---

**From:** The Stone-Ehrhardts  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 29, 2025 12:42 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** Please: We Need Light Rail

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Dear Directors:

I hope it's not too late. Please green light the Longmont rail stop light rail project. I would use it every week.

Make our lives better, calmer and more efficient.

Thank you,

EJ Stone-Ehrhardt  
Longmont

## Tai-Shrae Parish

---

**From:** Lori Hewitt  
**Sent:** Friday, May 30, 2025 4:40 PM  
**To:** RTD.Directors  
**Subject:** NW Rail Project

As a resident of Longmont, I voted many years ago to increase my tax payments for rail service in our area. I do believe it's time for RTD to make that happen. I urge you to approve the NW Rail Project.

*Lori Hewitt*

