CALL TO ORDER:

A regular meeting of the North Central Regional Transit District Board was called to order on the above date by Mayor Dan Barrone, Chair, at 9:06 a.m. at the Jim West Regional Transit Center, Española, New Mexico.

1. Roll Call

Mr. Dahlquist called the roll and it indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>ELECTED MEMBERS</th>
<th>ALTERNATE DELEGATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Edgewood</td>
<td>Councilor Linda Holle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Philo Shelton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba County</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Tomás Campos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe County</td>
<td>Commissioner Ed Moreno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos County</td>
<td>Commissioner Jim Fambro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambé Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Marcus López</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohkay Owingeh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Christy Van Buren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Jeff Montoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildefonso Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Mary Lou Valério</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. **INTRODUCTIONS**

No introductions were made.

3. **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

4. **Moment of Silence**

A moment of silence was observed for the safe keeping of all communities and those who serve to keep them safe.
5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilor Salazar moved to approve the Agenda as presented, Commissioner Fambro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (12-0) roll call vote with Tesuque Pueblo, Village of Chama, Town of Edgewood, City of Española, Ohkay Owingeh, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Taos County, and Town of Taos voting in favor and none against. Rio Arriba County and Pojoaque Pueblo were not present for the vote.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES — November 2, 2018

Councilor Salazar's name was incorrectly stated as Danny and should have been Dennis.

Councilor Salazar moved to approve the minutes of November 2, 2018 as amended. Mr. Escudero seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (12-0) roll call vote with the Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo, Town of Edgewood, Village of Chama, City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County and Taos County voting in favor and none against. City of Santa Fe and Rio Arriba County were not present for the vote.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

PRESENTATION ITEMS

There were no Presentation items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no Public Hearings.

ACTION ITEMS

A. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-33 Adding the Village of Taos Ski Valley (Village) as a New Member of the North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD)

Mr. Mortillaro explained that the Village Administrator had requested information on the process to become a district member in August and he had provided the information. He was invited by the Village of Taos Ski Valley to attend their Village Council meeting when they considered the resolution to join the
The resolution was passed last month and is before the NCRTD Board to consider adopting a resolution to make the Village of Taos Ski Valley a member.

Mr. Mortillaro advised the Board the resolution required two-thirds of the voting units of the Board of Directors to approve the Village of Taos Ski Valley as a member. Approval also required 1) The execution of an amended IGC, which includes an amendment of the voting analysis on page 25 of the Board packet, shown by a redline. 2) In addition, 69 people would be taken out of Taos County's total population and the percentages recalculated and would decrease Taos County by 69 people.

The percentages would be slightly changed. The total number of Board members and the total voting units would increase by one and quorum and voting requirements would increase slightly.

He noted that the Village of Taos Ski Valley was invited to attend but were not able to do so.

The resolution would go into effect January 2019 if approved by the Board.

Commissioner Fambro moved to approve Resolution 2018-33 to add the Village of Taos Ski Valley as a district member. Mr. Shelton seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (12-0) roll call vote with Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo, Village of Chama, Town of Edgewood, City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, voting in favor and none against. City of Santa Fe and Rio Arriba County were not present for the vote.

B. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-34 Open Meetings for 2019

Mr. Mortillaro indicated the Board is required to adopt an Open Meetings Act Resolution annually which also sets the dates for the meetings for the year. The resolution is similar to last year's and again Staff proposed not having a meeting in July for 2019. The dates of the meetings are listed in the Board book on page 60 and fall on the first Friday of the month except January (on the 11th) and June (on the 14th).

Councilor Romero-Wirth noted an error on page 60 stating the meetings are for 2017 and should be 2019.

Chair Barrone moved to adopt Resolution 2018-34 with the meeting dates for 2019, as amended. Councilor Salazar seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (13-0) roll call vote with Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo, Village of Chama, Town of Edgewood, City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fe and Santa Fe County voting in favor and none against. Rio Arriba County was not present for the vote.
C. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-30 Adopting Revised Board Meeting Procedures

Mr. Mortillaro reported this item had been on the agenda in October and discussed and a couple of the items regarding abstentions, motions to postpone and tie votes had to be taken back before the Finance Committee and they discussed the matters in their November meeting.

Mr. Mortillaro asked Mr. Dwyer to walk the Board through the procedures.

Mr. Dwyer provided a handout.

Manager Campos arrived at 9:20 for Rio Arriba County.

Mr. Dwyer noted that three issues were unresolved at the last meeting: the rules on abstention, postponement and the resolution of postponements in the case of a tie vote. Two of the issues were easily resolved and a redlined edition is in the packet.

The first was what to do in a tie vote. The current rules state in the event of tie, a motion to reconsider could only be made by someone who voted on the majority side, but there is no majority in the case of a tie. He resolved the issue by adding language stating “on the prevailing side” where the motion would fail and those in opposition "prevail."

Councilor Romero-Wirth asked if others have language like on the prevailing side or would that be unique to NCRTD.

Mr. Dwyer explained he reviewed Robert’s Rules of Order and Wikipedia on motions to reconsider (published on pages 99-100 of the packet) and that was what was suggested.

Councilor Romero-Wirth noted if the language was changed but was not a common practice with other entities and jurisdictions, it would just add to the confusion, because a tie means nobody wins.

Mr. Dwyer stated they could leave the current rule as stated, that the person has to be on the majority side and at that point no one could raise the motion. A tie only becomes an issue if the Board is very divided.

Councilor Romero-Wirth thought the current rule more typical and a tie would mean the motion is dead and would have to be brought back in a different way for reconsideration. She asked if the issue was really a problem and in “fixing” the problem are they making the rule more complicated. She thought this was an anomaly that would cause confusion.

Mr. Dwyer responded that the Board’s rules work well now because every vote is unanimous and would only be an issue if the Board was divided.

Mr. Dwyer continued with the second rule on the motion to postpone and he included on pages 99-100 different rules on motions to postpone. The standard practice is to liberally allow reconsideration, but in his
experience most of the cities/counties he has worked for have had strict rules on reconsideration. There is no definitive answer.

Mr. Dwyer noted that the revised draft included the Finance Committee’s suggestion that a motion could be reconsidered up to two months after the motion was made. That also includes language for the prevailing side, but the language could be changed.

Manager Campos noted many of the members are local governments and once they pass a resolution, they do not usually want to hear it again. He questioned if the changes were necessary.

Mr. Dwyer pointed out the rules could remain the way they are, but to change the rule he would defer to Ed on what the Finance Committee wanted. The Finance Committee suggested to allow up to two months to reconsider after the motion. He thought the Finance Committee wanted to allow some time if the issue was contentious and with time some might change their minds or their votes.

Councilor Romero-Wirth thought that was well-intentioned but would be a problem because if they proceed and Staff was required to make commitments legally and financially, etc. there could be unintended consequences if the Board then decided it was not a good idea. She noted nothing says the issue could not be reintroduced and brought back for a vote, but two months was a lot.

Commissioner Moreno indicated the Committee had discussed the issue in depth and there were pros and cons. There are times when a lot of people are not able to participate and this rule would provide an opportunity for those who had missed the vote.

Chair Barrone added that another reason was that the Board only met once a month.

Councilor Romero-Wirth noted in that instance the Board could call a special meeting.

Mr. Dwyer continued his presentation noting his memo on abstentions on pages 89-98 of what others do in regard to abstentions. He noted that the Finance Committee had been confused by the complexity and asked him to develop a graphic. (Handout).

He explained according to legal experts and authors, abstentions are massively misunderstood and they state that Roberts Rules is incorrect. People generally think when they abstain that they are being neutral but the authors said that is incorrect.

Mr. Dwyer used the vote on the Village of Taos Ski Valley as an example where approval would require a two-thirds vote - 10 out of the 15 votes. He noted the second diagram showing the Ski Valley would not be approved as a member because the vote required is a super majority and only 9 people voted in favor and 6 voted against, so they were one vote short.

He provided an example whereby board members discuss the matter at length and three of the members on the pro side and three of the members against decide to abstain. The assumption would be that the Ski Valley would not be approved as a member, but that would be incorrect. He provided the math explaining that the 3 abstentions would be counted as two-thirds in favor of the proposition because the
new tally would be 6 to 3 and the abstentions actually made it easier to achieve a goal to approve.

Mr. Dwyer mentioned this example had been cited in Wisconsin and Texas and the abstentions allowed the 3 on the pro side that abstained to win, leaving the 3 that abstained that were against the proposal feeling duped. A super majority requires two-thirds and abstaining is counted as a vote in favor of the proposition- two thirds in favor and one third against.

Mr. Dwyer noted two other concepts frequently introduced that change abstention policies – the simple majority votes and absolute majority votes. A simple majority vote subtracts those who are not eligible to vote, those who are not present and those who abstain. An absolute majority would not take them out of the member body. With a board of 15 members 8 would be the majority and all 8 would need to vote in favor of the motion or it would fail. In an absolute majority abstentions always count as a no vote.

He noted some statutes imply that an absolute majority is required for certain votes such as the issuance of bonds or the purchase of land, but abstention is not a big problem in an absolute majority.

Mr. Dwyer indicated he had raised issues at the end of his memo because the Finance Committee had declined to make a recommendation. He has asked how the Board wants to handle conflicts of interest or impermissible bias and provided examples of the different approaches used to handle the issues.

He noted that the City of Santa Fe has one rule regarding resolutions and ordinances (page 5) and another rule for a general motion; and Santa Fe County has a hybrid.

Mr. Dwyer said the last issue is if any of the Board’s votes should be subject to an absolute majority requirement.

Councilor Romero-Wirth offered alternative points of view noting that Mr. Dwyer stated that “Roberts Rules is incorrect”. She clarified that Roberts Rules, or Mason’s is the standard. She explained when writing a law review the author tries to be provocative and challenge conventional thinking and their articles sometimes finds its way into the mainstream and gets adopted. She cautioned against leaning on a law review article, because it does not mean that is best practice, model legislation.

Mr. Dwyer thought the quote in his memo on page 97 was correct and read, “Indeed the American Bible of parliamentary procedure, Roberts Rules of Order gives a mistaken advice about the effect of abstentions in some of the most significant decisions that may be made under the rules.”

Councilor Romero-Wirth pointed out that was according to the authors.

Mr. Dwyer replied that it is supported by the math.

Councilor Romero-Wirth pointed out at the last meeting that Taos Pueblo had stated they are sometimes told by their government officials to abstain to avoid weighing in on one side or the other. The argument could be made that the effect of them doing that is a no vote according to the math, or a yes vote. They could also argue that they did not participate in the vote and whatever happened after they stepped out, they had not weighed in one way or another.
Mr. Dwyer stated the problem is they meant not to weigh in one way or the other but are actually voting two-thirds in favor of the proposition.

Councilor Romero-Wirth noted they could also argue that the effect of them not participating is leaning one way or the other. She cautioned members to be careful in how they vote and they should have the flexibility and freedom to use the vote as they see fit.

Councilor Romero-Wirth added regarding some people having felt tricked; there is no question the rules are sometimes used to get to a particular outcome but nothing is wrong with that. That is why members should know the rules.

She suggested the Board may want to disallow abstentions in circumstances like conflicts of interest or a super majority in the purchase of bonds or land because of the importance that everyone should vote.

Mr. Dwyer stated that Staff had no recommendation and the Finance Committee could not come to a conclusion and Leandro Cordova, as a non-elected official, felt it inappropriate for him to make a recommendation.

Councilor Romero-Wirth suggested because the matter is complex, and the memo was extraordinarily lengthy there could be an ad hoc group formed to pursue the issue. This difficult to discuss without a recommendation and there was nothing that necessitated changing the rules today.

Mr. Dwyer agreed nothing required a change to the rules, it was just that they had not been updated for years.

Mr. Mortillaro suggested changing just the red line items on which there were no disagreements and keep the others discussed as is until Staff is directed to bring those back.

Councilor Romero-Wirth suggested if they do that the Board should look at the section covering public comment (page 78 with the main rule on page 81 and page 88 (or page 11) in the memo.

She read language from the memo that would be added: “Public input shall be allowed at the beginning and end of each meeting. Public input shall also be permitted at the chair’s discretion on individual agenda items.” She asked to confirm that would change and the Board would no longer allow public comment at every agenda item. She indicated that the paragraphs that followed stated that the rules outlined help make meetings publicly friendly. She pointed out that the language referred to allowing public comment at every agenda item.

She continued reading: “In addition, and particularly for the chair, it is wise to refer to three special rules that apply to each agenda item: 1) Tell the public what the board will be doing, 2) keep the public informed while the Board is doing their work and 3) when the Board has acted, tell the public exactly what the Board did.”
Councilor Romero-Wirth continued reading that public input is essential to a healthy democracy and community participation is an important element. The challenge for the chair of a public meeting is to accommodate public input in a timely and time sensitive way while maintaining steady progress through the agenda items. She read, “The rules here for conducting a Board meeting are offered as tools for effective leadership and as a means for developing a sound policy.”

Councilor Romero-Wirth said that was all written with the idea that there should be public comment at every agenda item.

Mr. Dwyer agreed and deferred to Milo. He noted the NCRTD rules were cookie-cutter copies from Los Alamos. Their County Commission meetings follow those rules and everyone could talk about every item.

Mr. Dwyer noted there were 4 people in the audience which is typical for NCRTD and in most of their meetings no one wanted to make a public comment.

Councilor Romero-Wirth argued then why this should be changed. It has not been a problem and people want more ability to comment, not less. She added she would vote not to approve the “noncontroversial pieces of the rule changes on this.

Mr. Shelton proposed an alternate motion to remand Resolution 2018-30 to a subcommittee to review in detail and recommend an action. Councilor Romero-Wirth seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (14-0) roll call vote with Rio Arriba County, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo, Village of Chama, Town of Edgewood, City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo and the City of Santa Fe voting in favor and none against.

Councilor Romero-Wirth volunteered to be on the committee and hoped others would join.

Chair Barrone asked that others contact Mr. Mortillaro and they would put a committee together.

D. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2018-35 Demonstrating North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) Board Support of NCRTD-member Tribal Communities’ Concerns Regarding the Federal tribal Technical Assistance Program, its Current Administration and Recent Changes in Delivery

Ms. McGuire stated she would summarize quickly and allow Ms. Van Buren to discuss the details. She noted she has been working with Governor Dorame who brought up the discussion of the impacts to the TTPCC and the trickle-down effect on transit. She asked Ms. Van Buren to provide the details.

Ms. Van Buren presented a PowerPoint presentation.

She stated the Service Transportation Bill (Fast Act) affects not only roadways but the transit systems of the tribes. She has been working with Governor Dorame who had asked her to review the Tribal Transportation Coordinating Committee and how this would affect them.
NCRTD operates and manages most of their member tribes transportation and she operates their transit program through FTA and NMDOT. (Handout from Tribal Transportation Program Coordinating Committee -TTPCC). Ms. Van Buren noted she would talk about the leadership/membership of the TTPCC and their work issues and their formal review to the Department of Interior.

Ms. Van Buren provided background on the program noting she represents 25 tribes in the Southwest on the National Committee in New Mexico. The committee was established by federal regulations to provide input and recommendations to BIA (The Bureau of Indian Affairs) & FHWA (Federal Highway Association). They also provide recommendations and revisions of the Stewardship Plan, tribal transportation regulations and policies, eligible activities, the transit policy and the management systems.

On September 13, 2018 they presented their Annual Report in Washington DC and part of the 25 CFR part 170 is the Tribal Transportation Assistance Program (TTAP), similar to LTAP. There had been six TTAP programs throughout the country with a regional center located in Phoenix and the program provided one-on-one training.

Two years ago the Federal Highway placed the program out of Denver and all six centers were consolidated and relocated in Virginia in a two-year pilot project. The virtual training is not working and has received nationally a lot of negative feedback.

This resolution seeks NCRTD’s support to restructure the program and potentially get back a regional office. She will also seek this month the support from the Eight Northern Indian Pueblo Councils (ENIPC) Board of Governors.

The next TTPCC meeting is January 15, 2019 at Isleta and her hope is to get the resolutions to the BIA in time to stop the two-year pilot before it enters another $3 million training program contract that does not work.

Ms. Van Buren listed other issues that are problematic at the national level with the administration of their 25 CFR part 170 but they do not affect transit.

Chair Barrone asked Ms. Van Buren if she is in direct contact with NMDOT because he sits on the Transition Committee with the incoming Governor. They have discussed making sure the tribes are represented in the issues. He indicated he would like to give her name and number to the Governor.

Ms. Van Buren explained two tribal members have been selected, one being the current Governor Peter Garcia from Ohkay Owingeh and someone from one of the northern pueblos. This is at the national level and affects all of their local roads at a state level because they are owned by BIA.

She stated she was appalled by the lack of knowledge of the State legislative body of BIA. During her presentation at the Indian Affairs Legislative Committee at Santa Clara she was asked by legislators why tribes were complaining. They said they give the tribes a lot of money and she explained tribes get no money from NMDOT for road improvements and jump through hoops to get projects on the STIF. She said District 5 received absolutely no money.
Even when her Tribal Council was told to come up with some money and do an RSA and an initial design-they did that and DOT told them they had no money and to try again in four or five years.

Chair Barrone moved to approve Resolution 2018-35. Commissioner Fambro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (14-0) roll call vote with City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo, Village of Chama, Town of Edgewood, City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambe Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Rio Arriba County, and Santa Clara Pueblo voting in favor and none against.

E. Discussion and Consideration of a Resolution No. 2018-36 For Adoption of an Amended North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) Public Records Request Policy

Mr. Dwyer explained this is before the Board because he has looked at the current fee schedule for public requests. In light of three Court decisions made in the last year he thought the Board’s fee schedule should be corrected.

He explained one was court case against UNM for charging per page for an electronic document which was found illegal and that there should be no charge at all for electronic documents. The Board document includes a charge.

Mr. Dwyer cited another decision regarding penalties for IPRA (Inspection of Public Records Act) requests that can result in a fine of up to $100 per day. He feels the Board in light of that needs clear and safe IPRA rules. He pointed out substantial changes he made to the policy but noted the NCRTD does not have a lot of requests and most record requests are given without charge.

The fee schedule is noted on pages 114 and 115 contains a paragraph regarding a charge for staff time etc., which was deleted.

Mr. Dwyer reviewed other updates to the policy:

- Charges are allowed for accessing the database.

- Personal information can be protected, and the last 4 digits of SSN can be disclosed but the rest redacted.

- Information was cut and pasted for the most part from the statute.

- The fees regarding maps, drawings, CDs, etc. were directly off of the Attorney General’s website.

Mr. Nagle was asked to add anything notable regarding charges for records requests. Mr. Nagle was not aware of any situation where Staff collected money. The policy is to acknowledge a request within 3 days and meet the request and provide information within 15 days.
Mr. Escudero moved to accept the changes as presented to the fee policy. Commissioner Moreno seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (14-0) roll call vote with Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fe and Santa Fe County Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo, Village of Chama, Town of Edgewood, City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh, Pojoaque Pueblo, and Rio Arriba County voting in favor and none against.

F. Discussion and Possible Action on a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Santa Fe County (County) and the North Central Regional Transit District (District) for Funding of the Mountain Trail Route.

Mr. Mortillaro explained the MOA is annually regarding the contribution to the Mountain Trail route for $25,172 from Santa Fe County and the District. A similar contribution is received from the City of Santa Fe. Rio Metro contributes $15k, NCRTD contributes $128k of the regional transit GRT including the vehicles and funding from the small urban funds (5307). Ski Santa Fe contributes a $5 token for food or a lift ticket and in the past have made a cash donation at the end of the season.

Councilor Romero-Wirth asked the level of the cash donation from Ski Santa Fe. She was told it has been $15k normally.

Commissioner Moreno moved to approve the Memorandum of Agreement between the County of Santa Fe and the NCRTD as presented. Commissioner Fambro seconded the motion and it passed by majority (13-0-1) roll call vote with Rio Arriba County, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, Village of Chama City, Town of Edgewood, City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh and Pojoaque Pueblo voting in favor. Tesuque Pueblo abstained.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

J. Review of July 2018 Financial Summary

Mr. Mortillaro explained that Mr. Ordonez was absent due to a death in his family. He noted that the Financial Report provided everything and nothing was unusual. Trending is where it should be and revenues were above normal.

Mr. Mortillaro stood for questions.

Ms. Van Buren left the meeting at 10:28.

K. Finance Subcommittee Report

Commissioner Moreno reported the subcommittee met a week ago and had an exit meeting with the audit Management Partner for Axiom. The outcome was good.
L. Tribal Subcommittee Report

Ms. McGuire reported that a meeting is planned in January.

M. Executive Report and Comments from the Executive Director

1. Executive Report for August 2018

Mr. Mortillaro stated the contract with Securitas for security had been finalized and they started a level 3 (armed) service on the buses. Securitas will also dispense Narcan if needed.

The new Maintenance Facility costs were updated and have increased about 8% ($500k). The new estimate is $6.7 million instead of $6.1 million.

In regard to that they met with NMFA to start the process for bond financing for the facility, subject to any capital outlay or additional grants received. At the time there was a gap of $3.1 million but as of yesterday a press release from Senator Udall, Congressman Lujan and Senator Heinrich indicates the district received a grant of $1.2 million. Coupled with the federal grant they now have almost $4.9 million, or about 80% of the original project price before the increase of 500k dollars.

They currently are looking for about $1.7 million instead of $2.5 million and will continue to meet with legislative representatives to discuss state capital outlay funds. If successful, they could borrow an amount much lower.

Mr. Mortillaro said they are enthusiastic and delighted. He thanked Ms. McGuire for her hard work.

They are finalizing the RFQ for the project and hope to issue that at the end of the year and bring the contract before the Board possibly in March or April.

All of the ADA bus stop assessments is complete and will be presented to the Board in January. Also, they are in the final stages of the Asset/Maintenance Software proposal and anticipate issuing the proposal by the end of December.

Regarding the Short-Range Service Plan update estimated around $150,000, Staff met with DOT who will allocate $100,000 to the plan with federal funding picking up 66% of the cost.

Mr. Mortillaro mentioned he and Chair Barrone will meet next week with two commissioners from Mora County who contacted them about transit options for their community.

He also wanted the Board to be aware as an informational item of how sometimes the NCRTO services are needed in communities that have no resources. Emergency transportation services were provided by NCRTD for the Dulce Dialysis Clinic on Thursday. They had a water outage that impacted their facility and
although the service was unusual, given the nature of the request and the medical necessity they transported six individuals with three of their aides to the Cuba clinic.

Mr. Mortillaro said last when looking back at 2018, it has been a great year for the district. They had a successful GRT election, received the FTA Administrator's Award and an award for their CAFR and brought in about $3.6 million for the maintenance facility with the additional $1.2 million. All as a result of Staff's efforts and the support of the Board.

Mr. Mortillaro wished everyone a safe holiday and a prosperous New Year and said he looked forward to seeing them next year.

2. Paratransit Performance Measures, October 2018

Ms. Garcia presented the report and started on page 143:

Paratransit Performance Measures:

- Total ridership was at 1598 trips. There has been an increase in ridership in schools and the demand service piloted for Taos has increased and will continue to be marketed.
- The ADA paratransit for persons with disabilities increased to 551 trips.
- Monthly Demand Response and ADA Paratransit Operational Costs = $21,465 for 7,298 trips.

3. Performance Measures for October 2018

- Operational costs per mile is $2.20, a slight decrease
- Operating costs for paratransit is $13.25.
- There were a total of 382 cancellations, 120 were late cancellations and 118 no shows.
- 96% of the time they arrived early or on time and arrived late about 2% of the time.
- Average trip length was 21 minutes at 7.2 miles on board
- There were no commendations, complaints or customer incidents.

4. Ridership Report for October 2018

- October ridership totaled 24,360 trips not including seasonal services or Mountain Trail and an annual total of 98,792.
- Administrative/Operating costs was $493,200.
- Cost per vehicle mile was $2.54, a slight decrease and total operating costs per trip $12.64.
- The average vehicle age in miles 88,262. 100% preventative maintenance was completed.
- There were no major or minor accidents in October or accidents on board for the three month period August, September and October.
- There were no commendations, but there were multiple complaints and incidents.
CLOSED EXECUTIVE SESSION

Pursuant to NMSA 1978 Section 10-15-1 (H)(7) for the limited purpose of discussing threatened or pending litigation

Commissioner Moreno moved to go into executive session at 10:44 AM, seconded by Councilor Romero-Wirth and the motion passed by unanimous (14-0) roll call vote with City of Española, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh, Pojoaque Pueblo, Rio Arriba, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo and Village of Chama and the Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against.

Councilor Salazar left the meeting at 11:29

Commissioner Fambro moved to come out of executive session at 11:28 a.m. seconded by Manager Campos and the motion passed by unanimous (13-0) roll call vote with Pojoaque Pueblo, Rio Arriba County, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo and Village of Chama and the Town of Edgewood, Los Alamos County, and Nambé Pueblo, voting in favor and none against. The City of Española, and Pueblo of Okay Owingeh were not present for the vote.

Mr. Dwyer asked for the record to reflect that the matters discussed in executive session were limited to matters on the agenda and no actions had been taken.

Commissioner Fambro moved to accept the report, seconded by Manager Campos and the motion passed by unanimous (12-0) roll call vote with Pojoaque Pueblo, Rio Arriba, Santa Clara Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, Tesuque Pueblo and Village of Chama and the Town of Edgewood, Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, voting in favor and none against. Pueblo of Ohkay Owingeh and the City of Española were not present for the vote.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Councilor Flurry commented on a letter from Cathy Baer, a school administrator and a dedicated rider from the start. Ms. Bayer stated in her letter that she rides the bus on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays but a number of school staff have to carpool to the school in Chama. She contends if the bus would do a local circuit in Dulce five days a week ridership would increase and thought service was inconsistent.

Ms. McGuire indicated she is aware of Ms. Baer’s concerns and agreed she there are some valid points. The service has been in place a little over a year and has seen a split of those who want to go to Chama and those wanting to go to Farmington. The surveys also show that and are the direction they used to create their routes.
After operating the route for a year there has been feedback, especially from the driver, where there may be opportunities to tweak the service. Ms. Bayer had suggested considering doing the loop in Dulce 5 days a week. NCRTD is considering the feedback and looking at adjusting the Tuesday, Thursday trip to Farmington that could allow more running time.

That has been included in their service plan update which recently received funding from DOT and is under consideration and Ms. Baer's points would be included in their discussion for the update.

Chair Barrone asked if costs for the route would be increased.

Ms. McGuire answered it could be potentially, but they have received feedback about adjusting the Farmington trips. There are three roundtrips being done that could be reduced to two with the same level of service but at a decrease in operation cost. Once the service plan has commenced that would come before the Board and would take about a year.

Manager Campos thought honoring Dulce’s largest request would not be possible because they want a Pagosa route, which is out of RTD's territory.

Mr. Dwyer stated they have discussed crossing the Colorado line in Staff meetings, but he strongly discourages that without a change in the marijuana laws. Drivers could be put in jeopardy.

Councilor Romero-Wirth asked the purpose of those who travel the Farmington route.

Ms. McGuire explained the majority was access to food and medical and some employment, also some recreational aspect of connectivity.

Councilor Romero-Wirth noted the flexibility.

Ms. McGuire agreed, and stated timing the trip has been discussed with possibly taking a break in Farmington and there is flexibility.

She said the Farmington route was originally funded through the Tribal Transportation Discretionary Funds (FTA) and ridership was amazing. Through the 5311 funding they have been able to continue the route beyond the pilot.

Mr. Mortillaro added they had received $25k with 10% contributed to the acquisition of the bus within IGC.

Chair Barrone addressed Councilor Flurry and suggested he let his constituent know they are working on the issue but it might be a year.

Councilor Flurry replied he would report back to Ms. Baer.

He commended the special bus that made the run to the local dialysis center and said that was wonderful and huge for the community. He suggested there be a press release because it should be
publicized for going beyond the call of duty. It was certainly much appreciated.

Chair Barrone agreed.

Mr. Escudero stated he had given Ms. McGuire a letter from the Tribal Council of Tesuque of their desire to consider modification of stops in Tesuque due to developments.

Ms. McGuire agreed that would be addressed in the service plan update and thought they could work something out.

Mr. Escudero explained the changes are being requested because Camel Rock had closed and new stops are needed at the Valero Station and the new casino.

Mr. Nagle announced the Española Light Parade tomorrow. He said drivers have worked hard to decorate their buses.

He also reported on the route to Taos Ski Valley with their first night time bus service that will be launched to provide evening service from the Town of Taos to the Ski Valley. They have worked closely with the Chamber of Commerce and the town to get the word out.

Ms. Elizabeth Carter noted that Route 202 into Santo Domingo and Cochiti has a bus shelter now and patrons no longer have to cross the four-lane highway. Also, based on ridership in December last year, they have added Route 208 from Belen to Albuquerque. Their first year provided 5,160 trips. They are also implementing a Demand Response for Isleta and ridership has been low but is still being marketed.

She added that they learned from a rider last week that their contract with Yellow Cab was just acquired by another company that does micro transit in other states. The company has expressed interest in expanding service to Santa Fe and other areas, so they are looking forward to working with the manager, as part of a national fixed route contract.

Chair Barrone reminded everyone there is a new commercial flight out of Taos to Dallas and Austin three times a week. The nighttime bus service will enhance interest in their community and the service is not just for tourists but locals as well.

Chair Barrone wished everyone a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year and reminded them about the great Taos pig roast on the Plaza on New Year’s Eve. The event is alcohol and drug free with a lot of music and the fireworks are starting at 10 pm. Everyone was invited.

Mr. Montoya invited everyone to the Pojoaque Feast Day on the 12th of December.

MISCELLANEOUS

None.
ADJOURN

Upon motion by Commissioner Fambro and second by Councilor Holle, the meeting was adjourned at 11:48 am.

NEXT BOARD MEETING: Friday, January 11, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.
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