



Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office

GVRTC Minutes for August 24, 2020

Attendees: Bridgett Gutierrez, Dana Brosig, Kathy Young, Sarah Brooks, Dean Bressler, Andy Gingerich, Scott Mai, Judi Derusha, Dana Martinez, Greg Caton, Valdon Lewis, Todd Hollenbeck, Jason Smith, Mike Goolsby, Ken Haley, Trent Prall, Kathy Hall, Mark Rogers, Matt Lemon, Jay Valentine, Janet Hawkinson, Rich Perske, Scott Beilfuss, Gwen Troxell, Karen Jones and other members of the public and media.

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: 3:00 p.m.

Changes to the Agenda: None

Representative Reports: None

Transportation Commissioner Report: Transportation Commission meeting was held last week via Zoom and the statewide 2045 Plan was approved. Also had a discussion of budget cuts necessary because of COVID-19. SB267 projects for this year will go forward. Kathy Hall is now vice chair of Transportation Commission and they have created a Freight, Regional and Interstate Committee to look at moving freight around the state. Discussion of the number of times I-70 has been closed recently through Glenwood Canyon and how expensive it is to make improvements now. Discussion of Transportation Commission Resiliency Committee and this was how Hwy 13 received funding for improvements as a North/South Corridor. Discussion of the need to take the Transportation Commission members on a tour of what the detours are like when I-70 at Glenwood Canyon is closed.

Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Region 3 Update: I-70 in Glenwood Canyon opened this morning at about 6am. It will probably close again due to the weather/rain with potential for debris flows. Discussion of opening Hwy 139 with a pilot car operation. Rob Beck was promoted to Vail area.

Approval of Minutes

1. Adopt the minutes from the June 23, 2020 GVRTC Meeting.
Scott McInnis asked for a motion. Lori Buck so moved and Greg Mikolai submitted a request to 2nd the motion. Vote was 4-0 in favor.

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.

2. Adopting the GVT Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) by approving Resolution #2020-008 and authorizing the Chair to sign– Dana Brosig, RTPO

3. Adopting the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment #2 by approving Resolution 2020-009, an Agreement between the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Grand Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (GVMPO) and authorizing the Chair to sign. – Dean Bressler, RTPO
4. Adopting the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendment #1 for FY 2021 by approving Resolution 2020-010, an Agreement between the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and the Grand Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (GVMPO) and authorizing the Chair to sign. – Dana Brosig, RTPO

Scott McInnis asked for a motion. Greg Mikolai so moved and Lori Buck submitted a request to 2nd the motion. Vote was 4-0 in favor.

Individual Consideration Item(s)

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

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.

5. GVT Rebranding presentation – Sarah Brooks, RTPO and Bridgett Gutierrez, Ryan Swayer Marketing Over the last 6 months looking at rebranding and trying to improve the image with GVT and part of that was a contract with Ryan Sawyer Marketing and looking at new logos. See powerpoint presentation.

What stage are we at? Narrowing down the logos and revision to logos if needed would be recommended next steps.

Isn't the DASH separate from GVT even though it uses a GVT bus? Isn't it funded by the local partners and not part of GVT? No. The Dash is part of GVT. It is part of Route 1 and funded locally by those local partners but the match comes from the FTA funding for GVT, and it is operated by GVT. DASH partners developed and paid for DASH logo and wraps. What was the reason to change the logo? Goals is to change the image of GVT. Perception is that it's out of date and not efficient. It's time to celebrate transit and that it's a great mode of transportation. Have we done any promotions to advertise the bus? Yes from TV ads, ads in the Daily Sentinel, Instagram, radio ads, Palisade Chamber of Commerce joint promotion, free-ride promotions, etc.

Have you done any focus groups outside to work on these logos? Outside perspective from other than internal staff? No focus groups. Social media online voting is an option. Why are we changing the logo when we are focusing on more of what GVT does? Logo doesn't change people's minds. We have done a lot of research and a lot with the development of the 2045 RTP transit chapter. The DASH bus is the same bus as a GVT bus but people don't realize that. Great time to do it with 20 year anniversary and recognition of DASH service.

Staff need to assign numbers to different logos and then we can get a consensus of the public. Are we driving ridership with a new logo? Is a cleaner bus better, more important? You don't change a

logo for free. What's the cost? The plan is to do a slow rollout as we get new buses. Continue to reach out to the various groups. So essentially, you'll have three logos, DASH logo, old GVT logo, and new GVT logo. Contract with Ryan Sawyer is \$5,800. Have Mobile Mesa County, Instagram, TAC, etc for community input.

Not sure how much this is going to change the view of GVT or ridership. Will have a mismatch of logos for a while. Is that important? Should have some public input on it.

Did the previous board ask for this logo change or did this come out of the office? This came out of our communication with the public and need to change the image and was discussed with the previous board at the time and had their support. DASH did make an impression when board members first saw it, and it stood out from the other GVT buses. This is something important. In favor of the logo change especially adding new buses. Kathy Hall stated that she was part of starting GVT and picked the colors of the current logo. Likes the bright colors and modern look and thinks that it is time for a new logo.

Is the brand, etc already established? Yes. Show the public we are so much more than where we started. Help to launch a public campaign. Had positive feedback about the advertising on the buses but nothing regarding the logo.

Update your logo and your message, then may have people more willing to ride.

Put out a poll for the logos to be voted on. Board needs to know the plan, what are the next steps? Put something together that is a timeline and what the next steps are. What has been spent and what will be spent? What is the costs of logo for new bus purchases? Flow chart of how to measure results.

Did meet with the City of Grand Junction, Greg Caton. It's not just the logo, it's a total rebrand. Visit Grand Junction is currently collecting online data through social listening tools. RTPO staff is waiting to receive data from Visit GJ.

6. GVT Fleet Maintenance Update – Dana Brosig, RTPO

- Attachment

We did not receive the grant from FTA for three expansion paratransit buses or the two lowfloor buses. Will apply through CDOT for these buses in Fall 2020.

Things have improved for June and July. August has been a little rough. Circumstances beyond our control and should finish this year in good shape for Preventative Maintenance.

Why didn't we get those buses through the FTA grant? Largely due to other transit agencies already having buses that have reached their useful life.

Do we need to look for local funding for buses? Plan is to apply through CDOT for buses and continue to use MMOF for local match. Could use 5307 grant funds if needed. If don't receive CDOT grant, then will need to look at local funding and 5307 grant.

Board requested a document showing where we started, where we are, and what our needs are regarding bus. The way we receive buses is through a competitive grant process. The Transit Asset

Management Plan has performance targets for a specified number of our buses that are beyond their useful life. GVT continues to apply for grants for new buses to try to meet these targets. Board would like some kind of indication/status of where GVT is at regarding buses, purchases and grant funds.

With ridership being down, why increase in late PM's? This is related to COVID, mechanic out due to quarantining, resignations of mechanics. City Fleet did make additional effort by working on a weekend. Staff is receiving daily updates of where buses are at regarding maintenance needs. Also, will be able to access FASTER software program when the City of GJ upgrades to a cloud-based software. Parts are being delayed as well. The board would like to be provided with an example of the daily update staff is receiving.

7. GVT Operations Report for July 2020 – Valdon Lewis, GVT

- Attachment

Ridership continues to be down due to COVID 19. There was a glitch with the on time performance report for July and working with contractor to correct report.

Driver safety focus meeting for July was held via phone. Topics covered were active looking and heat stress. Still have COVID-19 protocols in place with mask requirement of drivers and passengers.

Do we have any PPE needs that we haven't been able to receive? Masks, gloves, and hand sanitizer has been sourced. Have had what we've needed. We have the Protexus electrostatic sanitizing equipment and chemicals are available. Have provided masks to riders as well.

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 expressed her continued concerns regarding the COVID 19 pandemic and GVT workforce being protected. Discussed petition presented to the GVRTC for safety equipment on the buses and providing only the bare essentials is a dereliction of duty. Hazard pay has been provided to others in the community.

Scott Beilfuss stated he has already spoken to the Board of County Commissioner twice about GVT drivers. Has talked to GVT employees and reviewed the Transdev contract he received through a CORA request. CARES Act funding is not being used to protect the drivers. Discussion of what Crested Butte transit system has in place. There are not any protections for the drivers and they are essential workers. Discussion of wages paid to drivers.

Dana Martinez is an employee of GVT. Discussed how she asked what is our plan, how are we going to protect ourselves? Drivers started making their own masks and face shields, and came up with the idea of the shower curtains barriers by the driver seats. Half of our workforce is over 60 years old. It took 2 months to even get the masks mandatory on the buses. I've never seen such uncaring people as I do now. There would be no GVT without our drivers and all those comments that passengers say about us is true. We care about these people. We are a big part of this community and we should be treated as such. Give us the tools that will protect us. We did receive masks from Transdev and we appreciate that.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:40 p.m.: Minutes submitted by Kathy Young.