



Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office

GVRTC Minutes for October 23, 2017

Attendees: Todd Hollenbeck, Biz Collins, Kathy Young, Trent Prall, Ken Haley, Emma Belmont, James Gamez, Frank Watt, Scott Mai, Dan Caris, Dana Brosig, Jason Smith, Lydia Reynolds, Rob Beck, Matt Casey, Mr. Gregory

Roll Call: Penny Prinster, Chair – Town of Palisade, called the meeting to order. Phyllis Norris in for Bennett Boeschstein– City of Grand Junction, Scott McInnis – Mesa County, and David Karisny – City of Fruita are present.

Call Meeting to Order: 3:00 p.m.

Member Representative Remarks: Fruita received results of their community survey and they were discussed. <http://www.fruita.org/hr/page/2017-community-survey>

Transportation Commissioner Update: None

Approval of Minutes

1. Adopt the minutes from the August 28, 2017 GVRTC Meeting.
Continued as there is not a quorum for those in attendance at the August meeting.

Consent Item(s)

The Consent Agenda is intended to allow the Committee to spend its time on more complex items. These items are generally perceived as non-controversial and can be approved by a single motion. The public or Committee Members may ask that an item be removed from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration.

None

Consideration Item(s)

2. Adopting the 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2 by approving Resolution 2017-004, an Agreement between the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Grand Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (GVMPO) and authorizing the Chair to sign.
– Todd Hollenbeck, RTPO

- **Attachment**

On page 22 of GVRTC packet, highlights the project that is being discussed. Hwy 141 bridge work. \$2.3 million project. Had a good discussion at the TAC meeting regarding this project.

Where is the change to the Kokopelli project local funding reflected? This will be within TIP Amendment #3.

Penny Prinster asked for a motion. David Karisny so moved and Penny Prinster 2nd the motion. Vote was 4-0 in favor.

Briefing Item(s)

Briefing items are intended to allow the Committee to give Staff guidance in the day-to-day operations of the Regional Transportation Planning Office, or to hear general presentations from others.

3. Grand Valley Transit (GVT) Strategic Plan Scenario Presentation – Emma Belmont, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU) and James Gamez, Nelson Nygaard

- **Attachment**

- <http://gvtstrategicplan.com/>

See powerpoint presentation. They have been working on this project since March of this year. Three possible scenarios were presented: status quo, reduction or expansion of service. Is scenarios based on population? These scenarios are based on existing funding levels. If funding were to continue, no longer able to maintain existing level of service with the local funding we are at. How can we maximize the efficiency of service with level of funding? The goal and vision feed into these scenarios. Let's make sure we are still serving the transit dependent population and this is what the scenarios are focusing on. Did look at existing densities of population groups.

Staff doesn't necessarily agree with everything that is being proposed but it gives us lots of opportunities to consider. Are we headed in the right direction? It's expanding service by routes with 30 minute headways but still maintaining existing service. Why was it necessary to bring in a consultant? Wanted to bring in an outside perspective to help identify best practices. We have the staff expertise in-house but don't have the necessary time to be able to accomplish the task at this time.

GVT has had 30 minute routes in the past. Looking at Route 5 & 9 and some of 10 and combining Route 5 & 9 to 30 minute headways. They do currently share about 1 ½ miles on North Ave. A lot of riders come in from Clifton because they don't have vehicles and rely on transit. If cut out Clifton, will that make it more difficult for those in Clifton? The route differences will still serve Clifton with a one seat ride to downtown. This could eliminate the need for transfers for those in Clifton. Is the data about where riders get on taken into consideration? This was reviewed and found that major destinations are still the same. Clifton has limited pedestrian access with limited sidewalks and is a concern of staff. Public participation is key to this and getting that feedback from riders. There are phasing options for these route modifications.

Is the balance in reducing fare, with improved efficiency? How many riders would it take to make up the lost revenue from day pass to \$3 from \$3.75?

Neither Sunday service option would completely pay for adding Sunday service. Employment, shopping is what most would utilize Sunday service. Sunday is usually 80% of what Saturday service is. Sunday service has been the most requested service but when implemented, very limited use. Sunday service is for when additional funding is available since this is a 10 year plan.

The service hours were reduced some time ago. Ridership tends to adjust but we will lose some. When significant changes have been made in the past, we see about a 10% change right up front, but riders will come back once they adjust to it. In Denver, they have more routes during some times of the day and less during other times of the day. Have we ever done that? Will lose a lot more riders by doing that. Amount of savings reflected doesn't include maintenance cost reductions as well. Data on ridership as it corresponds to time of day. That information is available. There is a ripple effect with some of the decision we might make based on the way our systems is made up. Reliability is huge for our system.

Are we headed in the right direction or are we way off base? We want to maximize our service and be more efficient. Have a lot of capability in house because of the personnel we have. What are we getting here, innovation? Public meetings-this helps the whole population, the actual population served is very small. We know in the immediate future, we are looking at maintaining or decreasing level of service.

This is a 10 year plan and we don't know what's going to happen. The increase service could be presented at year 5. Don't think the public will be able to look 10 years out, more concerned with immediate. GVRTC is looking at innovation such as what we got from the fareboxes. Discussed Remix software program and if proposed routes will work. Want to be realistic on expectations. TABOR discussion came up as well. Will frame expansion questions more carefully. All recommendations are based on best practices nationwide. Next step will be looking at policy discussions.

4. US 6 Clifton Corridor Update – Rob Beck & Matt Casey, CDOT

- **Attachment & handouts**

- <https://www.codot.gov/projects/us-6-clifton-improvements>

This project was a great partnership with City & County and is appreciated. Update on current status on the design efforts. Improvements from I-70B to just east of Clifton Elementary. Took PEL results and reduced them down with one alternative and did some refinements. Least amount of ROW impact and still maintain level of service by implementing roundabouts. Still produce the same amount of volume. Preliminary cost estimate at \$8.25 million. Includes utility relocation and ROW. Try and underground the utilities. Drainage issues along corridor. There was a lot of public outreach with business and stakeholder meetings. There is really positive support for this project. Construction wouldn't start for at least another three years unless unexpected funding becomes available. No construction funding currently identified. Looking at off site options for drainage as well as vaults. Design will continue for another 2 years. Will have additional outreach at 30% design and again at 90% design.

5. Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) Update Discussion – Todd Hollenbeck, RTPO

- **Attachment**

This has been a study that has been in place for 15 years and each entity has fees in place that long as well. We have an opportunity to complete an update and have some federal funding available. What we are asking for is approval to update this study and work with consultant who completed it originally, which will save about \$50,000. Move ahead to get a realistic view of where we are today. There would be public participation and stakeholders would be part of this update. There have been increases based on the CPI over the years. Future changes could follow the CPI or Construction Cost Index from CDOT. Mesa County, Fruita, and Palisade were all in agreement with moving ahead with an update. Grand Junction representative had to leave meeting prior to this discussion.

6. Update to GVRTC Policy 3.0 – Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act Draft – Elizabeth Collins, RTPO

- **Attachment**

This policy needs to be updated based on our FTA Triennial review. Any text in blue are changes that are being made. Two items that are being changed are oversight of contractor and clarifying no-show and late cancellation for paratransit passengers. Public outreach will include information posted on GVT's website, notices on buses, email sent to the LCC and an ad in the Daily Sentinel. Secret Riders is of concern. These riders need to know the requirements. Don't do any more than what we absolutely have to. Need to run these changes by County Attorney's Office. This wouldn't be presented to GVRTC for adoption until December 2017. Staff is working with FTA to make sure meeting the requirements. Discussion about service animals and how our process is improving.

7. GVT Update(s)

a. GVT General Manager – Todd Hollenbeck, RTPO

Dan Thao has submitted his letter of resignation. We are bringing our previous General Manager, Valdon Lewis, back and he will be starting on 11/6/17.

b. Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) Facility – Todd Hollenbeck, RTPO

CNG facility is up and running. Working through the hiccups. Give thanks to City staff and all their assistance with this project.

c. Operations Report for September 2017 – Elizabeth Collins, RTPO

- **Attachment**

Fixed Route ridership is down 4 ½ %. Increase in revenue for pass purchases. Have done two travel trainings with the last one in Fruita this past weekend. There were 13 people in attendance and have had 49 people total for the year. Have another training scheduled for this year with more to come in 2018.

Other Business:

Town of Palisade would like to rent the GVT buses and drivers for the Blue Grass Festival next year and possible other events. GVRTC would need to implement a Charter policy and could be a potential revenue generator for GVT.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:56 p.m.: Minutes submitted by Kathy Young.