



Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office

GVRTC Minutes for May 27, 2020

Attendees: Dana Brosig, Kathy Young, Valdon Lewis, Todd Hollenbeck, Andy Gingerich, Ken Haley, James Sylvester (via phone), Janet Hawkinson, Judi DeRusha, Don Bramer, Jason Smith, Greg Caton,

Roll Call: Scott McInnis, Chair – Mesa County, called the meeting to order. Phyllis Norris – City of Grand Junction, Lori Buck – City of Fruita, and Greg Mikolai – Town of Palisade are present.

Call Meeting to Order: 10:02 a.m.

Changes to the Agenda: None

Director Reports: None

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

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.

1. CARES Act Funding- Discussion of GVT long-term needs and best use of the CARES Act funding -Dana Brosig, RTPPO

See presentation. Discussion of what the CARES Act funding is. Staff developed a model looking at different scenarios to expend the CARES Act funding and there are many assumptions. Discussion of DASH service and suspending service. Hope to relaunch in the fall when CMU is back in session and travelers are utilizing the airport, but will be coordinated with partners.

Model assumes board will approve moving MMOF funds from operations to capital. Fleet Maintenance Facility assumption discussion and the need related to late preventative maintenance, increase of paratransit ridership, and limited maintenance bays for GVT buses. Exploring if this is the direction we need to go with City Fleet. Fleet need (buses) projections based on TAM plan over next five years. Discussion of improvements to bench and shelters and/or replacement. Possibly increase advertising revenue. CWOA contracts ends in February 2021. CWOA maintains the bus stops in exchange for 10% revenue to GVT. Proposing to split next contract between advertising and maintenance. Discussion of new exterior bus advertising contract. Discussion of issues with existing benches and people sleeping on them, the need to repaint the existing shelters and possibly utilizing local artists to use the existing frame and make them community assets instead of eyesores. Discussion of grant recently applied for in collaboration with Central Library. DDA has grants available and art stored that may be useful.

Has a cost analysis been done regarding maintenance of bus shelters and benches by the respective jurisdictions? Maybe each representative entity could take over maintenance of benches & shelters. Currently the Grand Junction Regional Center staff and clients pick up trash at stops that are not maintained by CWOA. Who maintains the shelter at Fruita Monument High School? Need to find this out. Staff now working on new RFPs for maintenance and advertising contracts.

Opportunities for electric charging stations grants at an 80/20 match at transfer facilities. Discussion of how much they would be utilized and someone utilizing it all day. Concern with government competing against private sector. This is not part of the modeled scenarios.

IGA discussion and finding alternate sources of funding, ie ballot initiative. Is there interest in pursuing this? Have looked at having a separate authority in the past for GVT. Should the ballot initiative be combined with multimodal projects? No interest in pursuing this at this time. This can be looked at in the future.

Many assumptions are made in the model on how COVID-19 will impact GVT. If there are regulations that require more social distancing and ridership increases, the cost of shadow buses will also increase. This also applies if there is additional PPE needs.

Is DASH paid for by GVT funding? DASH is funded by City of Grand Junction separately by the partners of DDA, CMU, Horizon Business Improvement District and Grand Junction Regional Airport. Currently DASH service is suspended until further notice. Model reflects DASH local costs from Aug-Dec 2020 if it's relaunched. DASH is not funded by Fruita, Palisade, or Mesa County. There is a 50% federal match on these costs.

Scenario 1 discussion. All operations expenses would use CARES Act funding except the MM grant as this is a separate grant at an 80/20 match and CIP bus grants. See presentation graphs. IGA amounts discussed.

Scenario 2 discussion. Utilize CARES act funding for 50/50 expenses only and 5307/5310/local funds for 80/20 expenses. IGA amounts discussed. Most efficient use of funding and this is staff's preferred scenario.

Scenario 3 discussion. Utilize CARES act funding for transit operations and 5307 and 5310 grants for all other expenses. This spreads out the funding more so that there is less of an increase in 2022. IGA amounts needs discussed.

Has staff worked with the City Managers? Need to have more meetings with them and so they in turn can provide input on this to their respective GVRTC board members. GVRTC Chair first requested the input of the board and then the board can discuss this with their managers. Managers should be advising GVRTC representatives of the budget. Staff has had discussions with Grand Junction and Mesa County. Could these decisions be made late summer after more sales tax revenue is in? Currently, CARES Act funding is being used to cover expenses since April. IGA partners have not been billed for 2nd quarter. Need a decision before end of June. Discussion of needing to get our fleet up to par.

The representatives could come up with a different scenario as well. Discussion of when the partners will feel the impact the most within next two years. Could utilize scenario 1 in 2020 and a different scenario in 2021.

Discussion of exact IGA amounts for each scenario, how to maximize the funding and addressing preventative maintenance issues. Possibly adding a 3rd mechanic for GVT but not a space for them to work currently. Discussion of the existing Whitewater maintenance facility.

Discussion of how fleet is replaced based on useful life mileage. Discussion of how much preventative maintenance is required in addition to the breakdowns. Discussion of bus needs in 2020 regarding awarded grants vs. pending grants. Discussion of remaining MMOF is available for transit. Staff have already completed a notice of intent for projects for this remaining \$359,812 in MMOF funding.

Another scenario is to suspend the IGA dues for the rest of the year. If that is the case, then MMOF will be needed for the CIP local funds to cover bus grants. This would take away from other MMOF potential projects.

There is another GVRTC meeting currently set for end of June. Could have further discussion at that time or could push this out to July meeting.

Representative Mikolai and City of Grand Junction Manager suggested a Scenario 4 that included a modification to Scenario 2 that would give greater benefit to partners in 2020 with less relief in 2021 and an increase in 2022. Immediate help now would be beneficial to Grand Junction. Mikolai proposed a decrease of 63% in 2020, 47% decrease in 2021 and 5% increase in 2022. This scenario will be modelled and the results sent to both the GVRTC Board Members as well as the City Manager of Grand Junction, Fruita and Palisade, Mesa County Administrator, and City of Grand Junction Attorney.

Mesa County Community Development Director expressed concern that once GVT IGA gets lowered, it's very difficult to get funding back up. Scenario 2 with the modification addresses the concerns of Mesa County. How are fares being accounted for? There are savings even with the shadow buses and cleaning of buses. This may be an opportunity to look at paratransit applications and in the future, we may need to also look at a doomsday scenario regarding service reductions.

Plan an earlier June meeting with a new Scenario 4 related to modification to Scenario 2.

Individual Consideration Item(s)

Please limit public comment to a maximum of five (5) minutes per speaker (unless otherwise restricted by the Chair).

2. MMOF Funds- On February 24, 2020 the GVRTC approved a list of Multi Modal Option Fund (MMOF) projects that included \$93,000 for GVT Operations. We would like to discuss moving those funds to GVT Capital program - Dana Brosig, RTPO

Discussion of how this could impact CARES Act funding. Requesting that \$93,000 be moved from GVT Operations to Capital

- \$30,000 for 2020 fleet grants
- \$30,000 for 2021 fleet grants
- \$33,000 to be matched with \$33,000 CARES Funds for bus bench and shelter upgrades

Scott McInnis asked for a motion. Greg Mikolai moved to have the \$93,000 moved from GVT Operations to GVT Capital. Lori Buck seconded the motion. Vote was 3-1 in favor. Phyllis Norris voted against the motion.

Unscheduled Business:

The Unscheduled Business portion of the agenda provides the public to speak about issues that were not on the main agenda. Please limit public comment to a maximum of five (5) minutes per speaker (unless otherwise restricted by the Chair). Testimony relating to scheduled agenda items will not be allowed during Unscheduled Business.

Judi DeRusha-President of the local ATU. Discussed the concern of the health and financial wellbeing of the essential workers to maintain the service of GVT. The workers are putting themselves and their families

at risk. Requesting hazard pay, pandemic leave, safety barriers and UV filtrations systems that will kill the virus that can live in our filters. The ATU has made the request to make these funds available. The board rejected an amendment that addressed some of these needs. Use the CARES Act funds as they were intended.

Meeting Adjourned: 11:56 a.m.: Minutes submitted by Kathy Young.