NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT  
BOARD MEETING AGENDA  
October 13, 2017  
9:00 AM - 1:00 PM  
Jim West Regional Transit  
Board Room  

CALL TO ORDER:  

1. ROLL CALL  
2. INTRODUCTIONS  
3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE  
4. MOMENT OF SILENCE  
5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA  
6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 28, 2017 and September 8, 2017  
7. PUBLIC COMMENTS  

PRESENTATION ITEMS:  

A. Recognition of Town of Edgewood Councilor Chuck Ring’s Service to the North Central Regional Transit District Board of Directors  
   Sponsor: Daniel Barrone, Chairman of the Board and Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director  

B. Above and Beyond Employee Quarterly Award  
   Sponsor: Daniel Barrone, Chairman of the Board and Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director  

C. Presentation of Employee Years of Service Awards  
   Sponsor: Daniel Barrone, Chairman of the Board and Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director  

ACTION ITEMS:  

D. Discussion and Consideration of Board Direction for the North Central Regional Transit District and City of Santa Fe Transit System Consolidation Study  
   Sponsor: Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director  
   Attachment.
E. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-33 Authorizing Staff to Apply for Federal Funding Through the FFY2017 TIGER Program for a Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Facility  
Sponsor: Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director and Stacy McGuire Planning, Projects & Grants Manager  
Attachment

F. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 2017-34 Adopting an Amended Equal Employment Opportunity Plan  
Sponsor: Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director and Dora Anaya, Human Resources Director  
Attachment

G. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 2017-35 Amending the Records and E-mail Retention Policy  
Sponsor: Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director and Peter Dwyer, Legal Counsel  
Attachment.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

H. Financial Report for August 2017:  
Sponsor: Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director and Pat Lopez, Interim Finance Director  
Attachment.

I. Finance Subcommittee Report:  
Sponsor: Chair Ed Moreno and Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director  
None

J. Tribal Subcommittee Report:  
Sponsor: Chair Charles Dorame and Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director  
None

K. Executive Report and Comments from the Executive Director:  
1) Executive Report for September 2017  
2) Performance Measures for August 2017  
3) Ridership Report for August 2017

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

MISCELLANEOUS

ADJOURN

NEXT BOARD MEETING: November 3, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.

If you are an individual with a disability who is in need of a reader, amplifier, qualified Sign Language interpreter or any other form of auxiliary aid or service to attend or participate in the hearing of the meeting, please contact the NCRTD Executive Assistant at 505-629-4702 at least one week prior to the meeting, or as soon as possible. Public documents, including the agenda and minutes, can be provided in various accessible formats.
CALL TO ORDER:

A special meeting of the North Central Regional Transit District Board was called to order on the above date by Mayor Dan Barrone, Chair, at 9:07 a.m. at the Jim West Regional Transit Center, Española, New Mexico.

1. Roll Call

Ms. Trujillo 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>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos County</td>
<td>Councilor Antonio Maggiore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba County</td>
<td>Commissioner Alex Naranjo</td>
<td></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>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohkay Owingeh</td>
<td>Ms. Christy Van Buren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildephonso Pueblo</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Pueblo</td>
<td>Ms. Lillian Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Fe</td>
<td>Councilor Joseph Maestas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Española | Councilor Tim Salazar
---|---
Town of Tacos | Mayor Dan Barrone
Tesuque Pueblo | Gov. Charles Dorame
Rio Metro | Ms. Elizabeth Carter

**Staff Members Present**
Mr. Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director
Ms. Jackie Trujillo, Executive Assistant
Mr. Pat López, Interim Finance Director
Mr. Peter Dwyer, Legal Counsel
Ms. Stacey McGuire, Development Director
Ms. Delilah Garcia, Transit and Facilities Operations Director
Mr. Jim Nagle, Public Information Officer
Ms. Dora Anaya, HR Director

**Others Present**
Norm Silverman, P.E., TMD
Rosemary Romero, Romero Consulting
Marilyn Wood, Open Initiative
Keith Wilson, Santa Fe Trails
Thomas Del Sorbo, TMD
Ray Matthews, Santa Fe County
Thomas Martinez, Santa Fe Trails
Carl Boaz, Stenographer

2. **INTRODUCTIONS**

Everyone present introduced themselves.

3. **Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

4. **Moment of Silence**

A moment of silence was observed in memory and honor of officers and military forces.

5. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
Commissioner Naranjo moved to approve the Agenda as presented. Councilor Maggiore seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with City of Española, Los Alamos County, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, and Tesuque Pueblo voting in favor and none against.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Chris Armijo, AFSCME union representative, said he addressed the merger when it first came up. He represented a hundred members of AFSCME at Santa Fe Transit, who are protected under the Public Employee Labor Relations Board and they must sit down prior to the merger and bargain to insure whether AFSCME comes over or the RTD Teamsters Union would prevail.

Ms. Monica Lemier with Chain Breakers Collective, a nonprofit organization for economic justice, said she hoped everyone here said the most vulnerable of the population in New Mexico rely heavily on public transportation. We need to understand how transportation affects the most vulnerable people in our community and how we go forward with them. It must make sense in the conversations. We are here to listen and be open minded but want to keep the best interests of our communities in mind.

PRESENTATION ITEMS:

A. Presentation and Discussion of the North Central Regional Transit District and City of Santa Fe Transit System Consolidation Study by Transportation Management and Design, Inc.

Mr. Mortillaro reviewed the history of this transit system consolidation issue, which began in March 2016 when this Board and Santa Fe City Council approved a letter of intent to look for a contractor to study the possible consolidation. In July 2016, the Board approved a contract to conduct the merger consolidation analysis with Transportation Management and Design (TMD) and they have had consultants working with them, specifically, Felsburg, Holt and Ulevig and Rosemary Romero Consulting. At this point, TMD has completed Tasks 2 and 3 and are ready to present here the results of that analysis. At 4:00 pm, they will make a presentation to Santa Fe City Council. At 6:30 is a public meeting presentation for District 1 and 2 and tomorrow evening at District 3 and 4.

Mr. Thomas Del Sorbo and Ms. Rosemary Romero were introduced.

Commissioner Naranjo said he has been on the Board for 1½ years and haven't heard the purpose behind this.

Mr. Mortillaro said it is referenced in the statute and one thing mentioned is looking at providing service throughout the region.

Commissioner Naranjo asked, “service for who?”
Mr. Mortillaro replied that it is everybody in this regional district area - rural community, commuter service, etc. It was designed to reduce duplication, provide services for quality of life, for economic development, to reduce traffic on the roadways, improving the environment, etc.

Ms. Romero shared first the proposed agenda for this two-hour presentation. It has four sections and she would like to ask people to hold questions until after the presentation of each section. She pointed out that no decision is being made today but it is a study session. Each of the public meetings will be recorded including tonight and tomorrow.

Mr. Mortillaro reinforced that there would be no decision made today. This is information only and it will be a discussion item for the October meeting when the Board can provide direction to Staff for moving forward.

Mr. Norm Silverman made the first presentation and explained that this is an analysis for the tasks completed. There are four tasks and they now have task 3 completed. This is an overview of where we are right now.

Task 3 has four elements: financial analysis, physical assets analysis, labor force, fixed and paratransit routes. This is to help policy makers make a decision. It is not a service design study but a management study, with benefits, constraints, etc.

He changed the order to: 1 - routes, 2 - physical assets, 3 - financial and, 4 - labor force.

Mr. Silverman compared the character of the two systems: RTD and Santa Fe Trails (SFT) and contrasted the operations. The service area for the RTD is huge and spread out; SFT is compact and there is a small overlap of service area. SFT is intense and RTD is not. He identified the numbers of routes and pointed out that for RTD, the service is trip-based with limited frequency and designed to longer distance trips. The local service for Taos and Española are more intense than other routes.

He described SFT and listed the fare structure.

This study assumes the routes will remain the same after a merger as they are now.

Vehicles are different. The RTD has 53 gas powered buses; STF has 34 mid-size, 18 paratransit and 16 non-revenue vehicles and almost all use CNG for power. Almost all maintenance for SFT is internal.

Ridership is 268,000 for RTD, growing significantly since inception in 2007. It is 937,000 for SFT, down from over one million in 2014.

Service integration has a limited opportunity for fixed routes with a large disparity in frequency and span of service and differences in fare structure. Integration of service would require a common fare structure and intensity and frequency of routes and changes in connections. Dispatching vehicles is easier to do with SFT than with RTD. It appears there is some opportunity to use SFT maintenance facility to help support RTD maintenance needs.
Lastly, communication of locations and schedules could be done on a single information platform with a merger.

For service planning, RTD has two employees working to optimize and meet changing demands. SFT has no dedicated employees for planning.

Paratransit integration is easier because it is based on geography and not on service frequency for fixed schedules. Both RTD and SFT have call centers and similar procedures for providing the service but operate separately now. A common paratransit fare would need to be uniform in a merger.

Ms. Van Buren asked if he was suggesting a fare structure for RTD.

Mr. Silverman said that is one option to consider.

Ms. Van Buren asked how SFT is funded now. FTA handles us.

Mr. Mortillaro said the impact of fares upon our 5311 grant is a dollar for dollar decrease with fare revenues. It also impacts what paratransit fares can be charged.

Mr. Silverman said the goal of the analysis is not to generate revenue but to provide transit services.

Councilor Maestas said RTD is moving to in-house maintenance and asked if they looked at maintenance overall.

Mr. Silverman said the transition of RTD to CNG would be very expensive. It would require a brand new fleet and a big change to the facility. Hybrid electric and electric is coming in so they didn’t recommend converting to CNG.

B - Physical Assets Analysis

Mr. Silverman said the fleet sizes are comparable in size but different in nature. Service needs are vastly different, requiring different style vehicles.

For fleet replacement/expansion, RTD needs $6 million over 10 years; SFT needs $9 million over 20 years. RTD is looking to expand its service; SFT is not. RTD is planning to expand the maintenance facility. At issue is the use of SFT facility by RTD.

For the Capital Plan, the RTD plan is unfunded and SFT has no plan for fleet growth. The City only funds on a year-to-year basis but RTD funds for future years.

For vehicle technologies and communications, both have location service but on different platforms.

For fare collection to be offered, it would cost RTD $640,000. The 5311 offset is a DOT function.
Councilor Maestas pointed out that SFT must have a 20-year plan.

Mr. Silverman said he was not aware of any LRP plan for SFT.

Chair Barrone asked if physical assets finances would be covered later.

Mr. Silverman said the study did not value the assets.

Commissioner Naranjo asked if fare collection was part of consolidation.

Mr. Silverman said it was not a requirement of consolidation but a separate decision.

Ms. Van Buren was concerned that fares was a reporting nightmare.

Mr. Silverman said they could help make it simple.

Councilor Maggiore asked about fleet replacement and expansion over a ten-year period had options for using vehicles of SFT for RTD.

Mr. Silverman said that remains separate.

Councilor Maggiore asked what the likelihood of one organization applying for grant funding for both is and how it would affect things.

Mr. Silverman didn't think that was likely as there is no economy of scale. The procurements are separate although you could consolidate a grant application. It is possible but is not a significant factor in consolidation.

Mr. Mortillaro clarified that the numbers shown for fleet replacement are just replacement but the revenue to mitigate the cost is in the financial analysis. It is dependent on what the federal government does with funding for transit and it is cloudy right now.

He suggested that Dave Harris, from DOT was present and could possibly speak to it.

Mr. Mortillaro said there are 47 transit agencies in New Mexico. If funded equally, it would not buy one bus each.

C - Finances.

Mr. Del Sorbo compared the budgets: $13.2 million for SFT and $7.8 million for RTD. He mentioned the review of GRT increments and the projected likely deficit in 2020.

The study has three options for fiscal sustainability: 1) consolidation without new revenues or cost savings; 2) nine positions could be consolidated or eliminated; 3) removal of 1/4% MGRT and replaced by
increase in County Regional GRT from 1/8 cent to 1/3 cent.

Scenario assumptions were reviewed and he shared the scenario outcomes for financial sustainability. Scenario 3 has the best impact.

Councilor Maggiore thought the maintenance facility was already at capacity and a new facility would be built on the south side.

Mr. Del Sorbo said one possibility would be a 3rd shift to increase capacity.

Mr. Silverman agreed they would need to do something.

Councilor Maestas asked if they assumed the Santa Fe fare box revenue is included.

Mr. Del Sorbo said yes.

Councilor Maestas liked Scenario 3 the best but was concerned about the higher GRT subsidy. The Study proposed the increase in 2021 but in the scenario, it is 2019.

Mr. Del Sorbo agreed they did move it up but it will be controversial. It might need more time to play out.

Councilor Maestas was concerned with that assumption.

Mr. Del Sorbo said they could include a variety of options. The timing is subject to the policy makers.

Councilor Maestas added that there is a much higher risk in scenario 3. He wondered what the other counties would say about the GRT increase. The $1 million would no longer be transferred, he assumed.

Mr. Del Sorbo thought it would stay in the consolidated agency.

Councilor Maestas asked about the reserve amount.

Mr. Del Sorbo said in New York it is 1%. 8% is very reasonable. But 25% is an extremely limiting factor.

Councilor Maestas opined that lowering the reserve would help sell the GRT.

Mr. Del Sorbo agreed and the large balance might not be palatable. An even lower reserve would make that balance more extreme.

Mr. Mortillaro said one reason we have the high reserve is to give us the luxury of funding capital without going to the federal. It would enable the District to continue during an economic downturn. We've had no layoffs or RIFs. There are good reasons why we kept high reserves.

Councilor Maggiore agreed the Scenario 3-line graph looks the best but you are talking about raising
district-wide GRT by almost a factor of three and tapping the source for a regional provider. He didn’t see that as feasible. Removing the sunset will be a hard election on its own.

Chair Barrone would like to say the consolidation would actually save money and help the footprint on the earth and have no increase in GRT in northern New Mexico. We keep raising taxes on the poor and not increasing the contribution to ride the bus. In our communities, it is a necessity. He was looking for something on which to hang our hat.

Mr. Del Sorbo said Scenario 1 is that.

Commissioner Naranjo wondered if down the road there would be a fare increase?

Mr. Del Sorbo said any fare increase would only be 1 or 2%.

Commissioner Naranjo said Rio Arriba County will consider the GRT soon.

Councilor Maestas thought the saving would be more than a half million. But we won’t know, under the scope of this study, if we cannot quantify it. And that won’t mean much to the public.

D - Labor Force Alternatives

The current Teamsters contract ends June 30, 2019 and calls for increases each year. The SFT contract ended June 30, 2017 and negotiations are in progress now. There was a $0.50 per hour increase in 2014; none for 2015 and 2016.

In the study, they dealt with the need to consolidate union representation.

E. Consolidation of Organizational Structure.

Mr. Del Sorbo said all fixed routes would combine all employees under one umbrella.

Councilor Maestas asked if this assumes status quo for employees.

Mr. Del Sorbo said it certainly does in scenario 1 and 2. They did not assume changes in rates and contributions but those are subject to negotiations.

Councilor Maestas thought the rate structure in SFT would be the norm.

Mr. Del Sorbo said if so, then the scenario future would be worse by at least a half million in salaries and benefits.

Mr. Mortillaro explained that the City contributes more to pension than RTD but health insurance is more with RTD than SFT. What the District found with the Taos merger was that negotiations worked it all
out. It is a negotiation at the end of the day. It won’t set up a false premise. But they have all been favorable to the employee. The Taos employees got more take-home pay and higher increases. He assured the Board that, at the end of the day, no one will be harmed.

Councilor Maestas thought there could be potential FTE reductions.

Mr. Silverman said not on day one. As it progressed, the services will become more comparable and more efficient.

Councilor Maestas asked with the Taos consolidation, if the outcome was higher wages and higher benefits or if it stayed the same.

Mr. Mortillaro said Taos had no union, although they were days away from approving one. So, we didn’t have that difference. No RTD employees were impacted and no Taos employees were negatively impacted. Some chose not to transfer to RTD - a dispatcher and a Part-time driver and a mechanic. The Town of Taos had positions for them. That might be true for SFT too. There were Tier 2 changes were made.

And on route consolidation, we reduced the amount of time for shift changes and reduced overtime. We implemented that in March and it saved the Town over $200,000 in that consolidation. They got to keep their contribution but we gained a maintenance facility/yard and they gave their fleet. We also had a bigger pool of employees for Taos runs.

During the Española consolidation, a lot of them transferred with improved wages and leave rates were better. Those differences have gone away and that is not an issue.

Commissioner Fambro said there was also seniority and bidding for routes and it was worrisome at the time but worked itself out very well.

Mr. Mortillaro agreed. The two issues for unions were that all transferred employees would have a six-month probation period and we needed that test period to experience that employee. If we had access to personnel files, they would only have a 3-month probation period. If not, it was like having a new employee.

The other issue was seniority and we were supportive of bringing their seniority over for bidding. The union disliked that for bidding purposes. We agreed to bring it up in negotiations. We broke them into domiciles and they had seniority within those domiciles. There are creative ways to negotiate them. And we found that common ground.

Chair Barrone recalled accumulated sick and vacation leave was a big one and Town of Taos had to write a check to NCRTD for that.

Councilor Maestas said it appeared that higher GRT is needed for consolidation but that is not true. There is an inherent benefit to the whole district for higher GRT. He didn’t know the full cost of LRP and that is also included in scenario 3.
Mr. Mortillaro agreed. If the District did no consolidate, the LRP had 3 scenarios. 1) didn’t include any funding for LRP like increasing hours or weekends. 2) said to fund them would need a revenue increase. And with no GRT increase, it would reduce the allocations to SFT, Los Alamos Atomic Transit and Rail Runner by a total of $1 million/year. 3) would increase GRT 1/8% or about $100 million over 20 years. That could be flattened somewhat to please the general public.

Commissioner Moreno pointed out that we have 14 members of this Board and this will be a change and require hand-holding. We have a national environment by making things more complicated and uncertain. Our voters in Santa Fe have a couple of votes coming and he was not sure how they will turn out. We will need a lot of hand holding there as we walk down this road. What I’m hearing is that are a lot of opportunities for things to go awry. The sunset clause issue - what will happen if one or two counties don’t pass it. Lots of actors to consider. So I’m interested to attend the presentations this week. It makes me nervous because the environment around it is uncertain. This organization is well run and as I told a reporter, I’m going to support it until it is no longer supportable. If we stay on our toes, it will be okay but it will require a lot of clear language and straight talk.

Councilor Maggiore said he got frustrated when he looked at surveys that are not apples and apples. The sheets on representations are not straight comparisons and when just flipping through, a person might think they are like positions but they are not. We need to be clear with that language of comparison. That is misleading and we need to be honest with that.

There were no other comments or questions.

Chair Barrone said there is a presentation at 4:00.

Ms. Romero said it is at City Council Chambers at 4 pm. She anticipated different questions will come. The report is also online. The meeting following that is at 6:30 for City Districts 1 and 2. Tomorrow for Districts 3 and 4 will be at the Genoveva Chavez Community Center on Rodeo Road. The public is invited to the Council meeting also.

In the contract, we wanted to make sure the questions were recorded accurately. Charmaine Clair will record the public meetings and that will be available verbatim.

Mr. Silverman said for the next steps, they will summarize comments from the governing bodies and the public meetings. Then they will complete task 4 - the final report, addressing study comments. And then the policy makers will determine feasibility of consolidation.

Councilor Maestas asked, if he were a member of the public, which task would give him the “one-stop shop” snapshot of the study.

Mr. Silverman said they could do something for that. All of it will also be on the web site at the City and at the RTD web site.

Ms. Romero said on the web site is a full report and particular sections can be pulled out on the RTD web site and the TMD web site. She didn’t know if that could be done on the City web site.
Mr. Mortillaro added that by the time the Board deals with it in October, we will have the summary of all comments for the Board members to review. We will have a series of policy reports to guide the Board on the direction to go.

Councilor Maestas said he was adamant about putting the cost in scenario 3.

Mr. Mortillaro said that is in the spreadsheets. It might be challenging for people but - at least 1/8 of GRT and 1/3 for operation and LRP. The balance is the displacement of 1.4% of Santa Fe GRT.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

MISCELLANEOUS

There were no miscellaneous items.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Fambro moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Moreno seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

NEXT BOARD MEETING: September 8, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.

Approved by:

Daniel R. Barrone, Chair

Attest:

Dennis Tim Salazar, Secretary

Submitted by:

Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.
CALL TO ORDER:

A special meeting of the North Central Regional Transit District Board was called to order on the above date by Mayor Dan Barrone, Chair, at 9:00 a.m. at the Jim West Regional Transit Center, Española, New Mexico.

1. Roll Call

Ms. Trujillo 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>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos County</td>
<td>Councilor Antonio Maggiore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba County</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Manager Tomás Campos (later)</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>Marcus López (later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohkay Owingeht</td>
<td>Ms. Christy Van Buren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildefonso Pueblo</td>
<td>Ms. Mary Lou Valério</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Pueblo</td>
<td>Ms. Lillian Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Fe</td>
<td>Mr. Keith Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Española</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Taos</td>
<td>Mayor Dan Barrone, Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesuque Pueblo</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Metro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Members Present**
Mr. Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director  
Ms. Jackie Trujillo, Executive Assistant  
Mr. Pat López, Interim Finance Director  
Mr. Peter Dwyer, Legal Counsel  
Ms. Stacey McGuire, Development Director  
Ms. Delilah Garcia, Transit and Facilities Operations Director  
Mr. Jim Nagle, Public Information Officer  
Ms. Dora Anaya, HR Director

**Others Present**
Ray Matthews, Santa Fe County  
Thomas Martínez, Santa Fe Trails  
Austin Fisher, Rio Grande Sun  
Carl Boaz, Stenographer

2. **INTRODUCTIONS**

There were no introductions.

3. **Pledge of Allegiance**

4. **Moment of Silence**

5. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Mortillaro announced there would be no presentations under agenda item A.

Commissioner Fambro moved to approve the Agenda as amended, deleting item A from the agenda. Commissioner Moreno seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (8-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Ohkay Owingeh, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara.
Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against. Nambé Pueblo and Rio Arriba County were not present for the vote.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES — August 4, 2017

Ms. Van Buren requested a change to the minutes on page 12, where MOU should be MOA.

Commissioner Fambro moved to approve the minutes of August 4, 2017 as amended. Councilor Maggiore seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (8-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Ohkay Owingeh, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against. Nambé Pueblo and Rio Arriba County were not present for the vote.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

PRESENTATION ITEMS:

A. Recognition of Town of Edgewood Councilor Chuck Ring’s Service to the North Central Regional Transit District Board of Directors

This item was removed from the agenda.

B. Recognition of Veterans Service Plaque

Mr. Nagle gave the recognition of Veterans Service under a program implemented by FTA to reach out to younger veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan for an opportunity of jobs and education. They discovered a need for access to the VA Hospital in Albuquerque. The District put up notices and provided a call center for it to meet that need. At the summit, two weeks ago, the RTD was recognized with a plaque which he read. It was signed by Secretary Fox.

Mr. Nagle presented the plaque to Chair Barrone.

Chair Barrone thanked Mr. Nagle for his efforts on this.

C. Jicarilla Apache Nation Route Schedule and September 29, Route Launch Event in Dulce

Mr. Mortillaro reminded the Board that it was two years ago when we first talked about seeking funds and a year ago, got an award and started planning the routes. Everyone kept their commitment to meet the time frame deadline. He presented the official schedule and announced the launch on September 29th.
Ms. McGuire said the ceremony in Dulce would be at 11 a.m. Dulce has never had bus service and sometimes that is a deterrent so we will have a bus there and the whole crew and encourage all Board members to attend it. The route service starts the following Monday on October 2.

Mr. Mortillaro added that Senator Udall and Representative Luján will have a staff representative there also.

Ms. Van Buren congratulated Staff on a good job. She said the Jicarilla Transportation Department cannot be there because they will be at a transportation conference in Tucson on that day.

Ms. García said they will have a four-wheel drive bus coming in with chains available.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

There were no public hearings.

ACTION ITEMS:

D. Discussion and Consideration of 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 said this MOA is done annually for Santa Fe County's contribution to the Mountain Trail Route expenses. It is $25,072 with minor adjustments to reflect the year-round service and when winter service commences. We have commitments from all other partners: City of Santa Fe is $25,000; Rio Metro is $15,000 and new 5307 funding (small urban) will be used. They are still in discussions with the Santa Fe Ski Area. Last year, they contributed $15,000 and a $5 lift ticket discount which meant a total of $22,000 last year. For sure they will do the $5 coupon but a cash contribution is still unknown. The District is starting recruitment for a driver now.

Rio Arriba County Manager Campos arrived at 9:26.

Chair Barrone asked if the route can be run without that contribution. Mr. Mortillaro agreed.

Mr. Wilson moved to approve the MOA with Santa Fe County for funding of the Mountain Trail Route. Commissioner Fambro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (9-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against. Nambé Pueblo was not present for the vote.

E. Discussion and Consideration of Award of Bid for Phase III ADA Bus Stop and Shelter
Ms. McGuire reported the TAP funding was awarded to the District; then the ADA transition plan was completed and one round of construction occurred. She recently sent a request out for a bid to construct four bus stops. Bids came in at a level to construct all four to match the bus stop in front of this building.

Stephen Luján from Wilson & Company, who did the planning and design, will lead the construction management. Mr. Luján read the results of the four bids. H & R Company had the lowest bid. He described their experience and standing. The request is for $193,575, excluding GRT.

Ms. McGuire referred the Board to page 33 which showed the bid tabulation.

Marcus López, Nambé Pueblo, arrived at 9:31 a.m.

Ms. McGuire went through financial details. The overall budget is $360,000 and the award is $360,000 less the amount spent for planning and design. The award was contingent from Transit and Rail (DOT) and they gave us the go ahead.

Chair Barrone didn’t like change orders and noticed four of them.

Mr. Mortillaro said this requires two motions: one to authorize to let the contract and the second motion to approve the overall project budget.

Commissioner Fambro said it would be $312,560.

Mgr. Campos moved to authorize execution of the contract with H&O Company. Commissioner Fambro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against.

Mgr. Campos moved to approve the contract budget of $312,573.50 for the Phase III ADA Bus Stop and Shelter. Councillor Maggiore seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against.

Mgr. Campos asked if a "No Panhandling" sign could be posted on the shelter across the street.

Mr. Mortillaro didn't know and asked Ms. Garcia about it.

Ms. Garcia said no one has complained about it from there.

Mr. Mortillaro asked Mr. Dwyer to respond if complaints were received. He added that campaign posters are not allowed at bus stops.
F. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 2017-28 to Supersede Resolutions 2017-10, 2016-08, 2016-03, and 2015-27 and to Provide for Continuation of the Adopted Fare Structure as it Relates to Fixed Route Service, Premium Service, Flex Service (Up to ¾ mile from a Fixed Route)

Ms. McGuire said this comes back periodically. This is not to change any fare structure but to capture the fare options for ADA passengers, veterans, and capture the definition of premium services. Flex is an option as described in the packet on page 43, and the premium routes far is on page 44.

Ms. Van Buren understood the District just needs a resolution to continue doing what we are doing now.

Ms. McGuire agreed.

Mr. Mortillaro said the policy is reviewed by the Board every two years.

Ms. Van Buren said she is a big supporter of fare free.

Ms. Valério moved approval of Resolution 2017-28 to Supersede Resolutions 2017-10, 2016-08, 2016-03, and 2015-27 and to Provide for Continuation of the Adopted Fare Structure as it Relates to Fixed Route Service, Premium Service, Flex Service Commissioner Moreno seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against.

G. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-29 Amending the Drug and Alcohol Policy

Mr. Mortillaro said this updates the existing policy and is more aligned with current FDA regulations. He asked Mr. Dwyer to address changes in the policy vs. the prior policy.

Mr. Dwyer said the first policy was adopted in 2008 and the policy adopted in 2011 is the current policy. He provided a red line version that showed the changes. It was submitted to us in May with a proposal to meet certain changed federal guidelines. When he started editing it, he discovered the format needed to reflect the realities for operators of our vehicles or those who could affect vehicle operation, and the process became very complicated. So he used the FTA web site tool for making policy and its form generator. It is current and he used it, inserting the NCRTD as the RTD name. Page 48-59 is the new policy and most is just federal language that is mandated. Bolded is what was added or inserted. So it is FTA compliant and has mandatory pre-employment testing and post-accident and random testing. It also continues zero tolerance. The District practice is to terminate those who are tested drug positive.

There is nothing surprising but significant changes are shown on page 53 in bold such as what to do with those who refuse to test after testing positive. The District tries to make arrangements for transporting them and not allow them to get behind the wheel but if they decide on their own to drive, the District can't
stop them. But we can report them to the police. The rest is standard federal language.

He briefly described the complication on prescription policy with the legal issue on medical marijuana. With a zero tolerance, it is difficult to deal with and the federal law doesn’t always trump state law. The District must comply with both.

Mr. Mortillaro said if an employee comes to tell us of the problem before be notified of a random drug test, we will work with them and refer them to a counseling service.

Mgr. Campos moved to approve Resolution No. 2017-29 Amending the Drug and Alcohol Policy. Ms. Valério seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owinge, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against.

H. Discussion and Consideration of FY 2018 Bus Purchases

Mr. Mortillaro explained this is the annual request for authorization to proceed with bus purchases which are already in the budget.

Mr. López reviewed the details of the purchase as shown in the packet on page 82 with DOT funds of $900,900 of grant money for capital and match money involved. The buses are equipped with camera, bike rack, destination - two-way radios, etc. from Creative Bus Sales on the statewide price agreement and equipment being installed by District Staff. He added that the 5311B federal grant for the Tesuque Route has not been received yet but he is asking for Board approval in case it is received. Page 82 showed which buses would be replaced. This includes the request to purchase the 2015 40-passenger from Santa Clara Pueblo for what Santa Clara Pueblo paid for it, less depreciation. He said the Tesuque bus purchase is a little over budget but the District can cover it from cash reserves. The Jicarilla bus and the Santa Clara bus have already been approved by the Board. The total budget cost is $1,025,000. The District has already been notified of the award for everything except the 5531c money.

Councilor Maggiore moved to approve the FY 2018 bus Purchases as reported. Ms. Van Buren seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owinge, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against.

I. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-30 Authorizing NCRTD Staff to Apply for Federal Funding through the FFY2017 Section 5339(b) Bus and Bus Facilities Infrastructure Investment Program for a Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Station

Ms. McGuire explained that this is another opportunity for getting the maintenance facility. She submitted an application for it before but from a different funding source. The application was due on August 25 but it was submitted as part of statewide application. So Staff submitted the application and now
requests Board support tied to the local match. The FIR for this request was shown on page 85. The local match for this application of $1.2 million is 20%. The resolution was on page 86 and the federal notice was on page 87.

Councilor Maggiore asked if this would restrict the District to the design presented at the previous meeting. Ms. McGuire said it does not and an RFP for the design would be issued if the application is successful.

Mgr. Campos moved to approve Resolution No. 2017-30 Authorizing NCRTD Staff to Apply for Federal Funding through the FFY2017 Section 5339(b) Bus and Bus Facilities Infrastructure Investment Program for a Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Station. Commissioner Fambro seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against.

J. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-31 Demonstrating the NCRTD’s Commitment to Provide its Local Share for §5311 Federal Funding Award in Federal Fiscal Year 2019 (FFY19)

Ms. McGuire said they are moving ahead with 5311 funds and expect to be able to provide the local match for it.

Commissioner Fambro moved to approve Resolution No. 2017-31 Demonstrating the NCRTD’s Commitment to Provide its Local Share for §5311 Federal Funding Award in Federal Fiscal Year 2019 (FFY19) Councilor Maggiore seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Nambé Pueblo, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against.

K. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-32 Annual Route Assessment Report

Mr. Mortillaro clarified that annually, Staff reviews all routes and prepares an assessment of which ones should be modified. The minor ones won't be discussed but Ms. McGuire will discuss more substantive routes.

Ms. McGuire explained that the assessment is a critical component for safe, efficient public transit. This year, the specialist rode all routes and talked with drivers and passengers about service needs or where we could consider eliminating some services. This year, the IT system data was included which was not previously available. It provides another tool for even better services.

Ms. McGuire reviewed the matrix on page 96 of the Board packet that had a FIR for individual routes and page 99 for the route analysis. As she went through each route, she described the changes that were proposed from the feedback received. Some were reductions in service based on reduced ridership, some
were changes in stops, and others were schedule changes to better accommodate riders.

Commissioner Fambro said the Taos change was to accommodate doctor visits and things like that for the Wednesday trip.

Commissioner Moreno said the cost for the added stop at the fire station is almost a wash but is good if it brings more people.

Ms. Valério asked on the Santa Clara Route what the changes are for Tesuque.

Ms. McGuire said going into Santa Fe, there are more bus stop out on Cerrillos to the Indian hospital and Santa Fe Trails bus stop. Red Lightning has no ridership. There is road work to be finalized by DOT at Ohkay Owingeh’s property. It is a tight area but they couldn’t find a bus stop location because the DOT project interferes.

Ms. Van Buren said on highway 74, DOT has no right of way to the tribal road so it will be on hold forever.

Ms. Valério asked if the bus stop by Savers is okay.

Ms. McGuire agreed - and also for South Capitol and Cities of Gold.

Commissioner Moreno asked if she had received interest from Rancho Viejo.

Ms. McGuire said no.

Commissioner Moreno thought there might be an opportunity there. Santa Fe Turquoise Trail to Madrid is a two-mile in and out route.

Mr. Wilson said inside Indian Hospital is ADA compliant. There are no curb ramps if you drop them off. Santa Fe Trails has a route to Rancho Viejo and we should figure out how to coordinate that. He asked if there is a public comment process involved in this.

Ms. McGuire said right now is the opportunity for public comment. On a couple of them, we would post within vehicles to notify passengers for the opportunity to comment.

For this analysis, there are several Board options. The first is to direct staff to implement these changes.

Mgr. Campos moved to approve Resolution No. 2017-32 Annual Route Assessment Report with Option 1 to implement the changes as recommended. Councilor Maggiore seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (8-0) roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, San Ildefonso Pueblo, City of Santa Fe, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos voting in favor and none against. Nambé Pueblo and Santa Clara Pueblo were no in the room for the vote.
DISCUSSION ITEMS:

L. Financial Report for June 2017 and July 2017

Mr. Mortillaro clarified that June 30 is end of the fiscal year but GRT was not yet reported and now all those revenues have been received.

Mr. López provided the report which was also shown on page 101. He reviewed the budget comparisons in the following pages of the packet and pointed out that only $136,726 was used from the cash balance to complete the year. The revenue generated was about 95.6% of budget. He compared that with previous years. Page 103 presented the GRT revenue and then commented on the GRT for each of the four counties which, overall, was a little lower than 2016. But federal grant revenue was much more in 2017 compared with 2016.

He then reviewed the month of July, the first month of the present fiscal year, and went through each category in the budget. He explained that the insurance premium for the year is paid in July each year.

There were no questions on the financial reports.

M. Finance Subcommittee Report

Commissioner Moreno said the subcommittee was introduced to the new auditor, Mr. Len Baldwin and had an opportunity to talk with him and had recommended approving the appointment at the last meeting.

N. Tribal Subcommittee Report

Mr. Mortillaro announced the next meeting of the Tribal Subcommittee was scheduled for September 18th.

O. Executive Report and Comments from the Executive Director

1. Executive Report for August 2017

Mr. Mortillaro referred the Board to his executive report in the packet.

2. Performance Measures for July 2017

Ms. Garcia presented the performance report and reviewed the factors that were shown in the pages starting on page 138 and gave brief comments on performance measures.
3. Ridership Report for July 2017

Ms. Garcia recited some of the portions of the ridership report for July 2017.

4. NMML Suit against TRD – Peter Dwyer, Legal Counsel

Mr. Dwyer said Councilor Maestas had asked if we might join in the suit against NMTRD. The Town of Jal filed mandamus action to compel TRD to open their books to show what their revenues are. It is before Judge Singleton who is about to retire but she will be held on to finish with this case. The District could join it. It is mostly towns and they are fighting over two issues: the increased administration fee of 3% to 3¼% and claimed that TRD didn’t do it the proper way (on the back of an appropriations bill). So significant money is being held. The other is the claw back issue. When TRD gets requests for a refund, they follow their own ad hoc process and takes away money for local GRT recipients.

Mr. Dwyer said there is discussion about consolidating a class action suit so all GRT recipients would be part of it. He talked to General Counsel for the Municipal League about it. We both have concerns about fighting the State of New Mexico and that could have negative repercussions and the State could take legislative action later.

His recommendation is for the District to stay out of it because we don’t know how removal of the sunset would be affected. We may be asked to talk with TRD about the sunset provision and it would be difficult if we have a lawsuit against them.

TRD has been very strong to not provide revenue details and they could become adversarial. The District can wait and watch and probably it will not be settled any time soon. If there is a class consolidation we could consider it or perhaps file an amicus brief.

Mr. Mortillaro said the Staff will keep monitoring it and may come back to ask the Board’s concurrence later.

Mgr. Campos said we have no business getting involved here.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Councilor Maggiore commented regarding the consolidation study that if the Board wants to pursue it, it would be important to have the Santa Fe Trails performance report either added to our charts or reported separately to help determine what we want to take on.

Mr. Mortillaro agreed to bring to the October meeting a discussion item regarding consolidation. Task 2 did include some comparative costs for routes and included some Santa Fe information for the prior year. It is not current year information and he couldn’t speak for Santa Fe.
Mr. Wilson clarified that Santa Fe Trails does provide information to the Transit Advisory Board each month but need to have performance measures reported so we could compare apples to apples. He agreed to work on that.

Mr. Mortillaro said there will be verbatim transcripts of the public meetings. The matter will go to Public Works in October, then to Finance and finally, to Council.

MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. McGuire said she will be asking for Tiger support letters for our facility project.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Moreno moved to adjourn the meeting. Councilor Maggiore seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 11:16 a.m.

NEXT BOARD MEETING: October 13, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.

Approved by:

__________________________
Daniel R. Barrone, Chair

Attest:

__________________________
Dennis Tim Salazar, Secretary

Submitted by:

__________________________
Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.
Title: Discussion and Direction regarding the North Central Regional Transit District and City of Santa Fe Transit System Consolidation Study

Prepared By: Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director

Background: On February 11, 2016 the Board was informed that the Santa Fe City Manager and Finance Director had reached out to the District due to its ongoing budget challenges to discuss the following issues:

1. Whether there might be an interest in the District to consider the consolidation of the Santa Fe transit system.
2. Whether the District might be able to assist the City during a time when they have key vacancies in their management team; the City had just received the resignation of Jon Bulthuis, Transportation Director, who would be leaving as of March 14 to join Los Alamos County as Deputy Public Works Director they also have a vacancy in their Assistant Transportation Director.
3. Approximately a week later Santa Fe City Councilor Joe Maestas contacted the NCRTD Executive Director to explore on a very preliminary basis whether there might be an opportunity for the two entities to have a discussion regarding consolidation. The Executive Director indicated that NCRTD would be willing to dialogue on this topic but the Board would need to eventually have a discussion about this topic at its next meeting in March 2016 and provide further direction.

The City of Santa Fe was desirous of exploring opportunities for cost savings, long term financial stability, efficiencies and realignment of their organization and staffing, service delivery priorities, and short and long-term capital needs and infrastructure maintenance in light of fiscal challenges and current transit department vacancies.

At the March 4, 2016 NCRTD Board (Board) meeting the Board approved a Letter of Intent regarding the exploration (study) of the Santa Fe Trails Transit System (City) consolidation into the North Central Regional Transit District (District). The City of Santa Fe ratified that letter at their April 13, 2016 council meeting.
The underlying basis for entering into the Letter of Intent was supported by numerous documents providing a basis for these discussions or suggestions for exploration of transit collaboration and/or consolidation:

1. Intergovernmental Contract (IGC) Appendix “D” entered into by the City and District provides for a number of initiatives and in particular the following:

   a. In the interest of a coordinated, expanded regional public transit service network, the District will pursue management of the following transit programs, project and services:
      i. Coordinated, integrated, consolidated and expanded local bus service wherever possible;
      ii. Plan for the operation, coordination, and expansion of regional and local public transit services within the boundaries of the District.

2. The Regional Transit Act adopted in 2003 encourages the following:

   a. Governmental units to contract with one another to provide any function, service or facility lawfully authorized to each and provide for the joint exercise of the function, service or facility including the establishment of a separate legal entity to do so;

   b. Serve the public by providing for the creation of regional networks of safe and efficient public transit services.

3. The Santa Fe Metropolitan Public Transit Master Plan adopted on June 25, 2015 by the Santa Fe MPO Transportation Policy Board provided for the following among other goals and objectives:

   a. Overarching Goal 3: increase the cost effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery;
   b. Goal 1: Have all services function as one overall seamless transit network.

In July 2016, the Board awarded the contract to conduct the Transit System Merger/Consolidation Analysis to Transportation Management & Design (TMD). The subconsultants working with TMD are Felsburg, Holt, and Ullevig (FHU) and Rosemary Romero Consulting.

On August 28, 2017, a presentation was made to the Board and then later in the afternoon a similar presentation was provided to the Santa Fe City Council. Two (2) public presentations were also conducted on August 28 and 29 in Santa Fe.

TMD has completed the following:
- Task 1, Study Consensus Building and Pre-Study External stake holder engagement.
- Task 2, Evaluation of Current Operations which was inclusive of a financial, physical asset, labor force, service and para transit, dial-a-ride and demand response system evaluations.
- Task 3, Development and Evaluation of proposed consolidation options which was inclusive of financial, physical asset, labor force and service comparisons.
- Task 4, guidance and implementation document and will include the final consolidation assessment plan.
- Public meeting input has also been provided.
The study does not consider any route specific changes in current service levels or travel path for either currently separate operation, but rather is a management analysis of the various issues surrounding a potential transit consolidation to be operated as an expansion of NCRTD. TMD developed several consolidation options for each of the key areas of study and assessed the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of each option as well as obstacles, including an analysis of financial and labor implications, sharing and/or use of existing and future physical assets, as well as overall service performance and integration.

**Summary:** Based upon the study, public input and comments from the Board and Council meetings, staff presents the following assessment regarding the merger/consolidation of the NCRTD and Santa Fe Trails:

1. Consolidation is a viable option, but more so if it occurred under Scenario 2 or some other reiteration of this scenario. The eventual substitution of funding the consolidated entity with a county wide GRT to displace all or a portion of the SF MGRT could be a long range option that could be contemplated at a future date.

2. No scenarios provide any direct benefit in cost savings to the NCRTD. However, they do provide opportunities for operational efficiencies related to fleet maintenance, pooling of labor force and streamlining of services and expansion of services. These opportunities would need to be more fully explored in order to assign a monetary value and would need to be the subject of further analysis.

3. The City of Santa Fe under scenarios 2 and 3 would be the beneficiary of substantial cost savings as follows:
   a. Scenario 2, the City could save approximately $900,000 in administrative overhead and with a net savings to Santa Fe Trails of approximately $400,000 per year in addition to the City of Santa Fe repurposing $300,000 in Lodger’s Tax funds. This approximate net $700,000 per year would total approximately $14,000,000 over a twenty-year period.
   b. Scenario 3, the City could save approximately $900,000 in administrative overhead and with a net savings to Santa Fe Trails of approximately $400,000 per year in addition to the City of Santa Fe repurposing $300,000 in Lodger’s Tax funds and $7.4 million in MGRT. The MGRT could be supplanted by a 5/16ths County Transit GRT. Therefore, it would mitigate the current tax burden of a Santa Fe City resident but would increase the tax burden to the residents of Santa Fe County, Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County and Taos County by an additional 3/16ths (18.75 cents per $100). The supplanting of the current ½ MGRT would allow the City of Santa Fe the opportunity to determine whether they would relieve their citizenry of this tax by all or a portion. It would also allow the City of Santa Fe to redirect some of these tax dollars to other critically needed infrastructure or service within the City, which based on the current amount of dollars generated, it would represent approximately $162 million over a twenty-year period (inclusive of the administrative overhead and lodger’s tax fund savings).

4. The consolidation/merger study does provide an opportunity for both entities to consider conducting a joint service analysis. The City of SF has budgeted for a service study of their routes in late FY 2018. The District in FY 2019 is contemplating the updating of its Five-Year Service Plan. Therefore, a review of both systems routes could be beneficial in enhancing potential connectivity and some service opportunities.

**Recommended Action:**

The following recommendations are submitted for the Boards deliberation and direction to staff:
1. The District’s Board reconfirms its main priorities at this time based upon the Board’s adopted Long Range Strategic Plan as:
   a. Removal of the County Transit GRT Sunset. The removal of this sunset is critically important for transit services to continue to be provided to the District’s constituents in the 4-county area and to the funding of transit services to Los Alamos County (Atomic City Transit), City of Santa Fe (Santa Fe Trails) and the Rio Metro Regional Transit District (Rail Runner).
   b. Funding and construction of the Phase I Maintenance Facility.
   c. Future funding and implementation of the service improvements and expansions enumerated in the NCRTD adopted Long Range Strategic Plan.
2. Consolidation pursuant to Scenario 3 will not be considered by the District.
3. Consolidation pursuant to Scenario 2 can be analyzed further to ascertain benefits to the District provided the City of Santa Fe committed to further exploration and serious consideration.
4. Amendment of the Governing Documents and Voting Strengths will not be considered under any form of consolidation. The current formula allocates appropriate weight to a member’s population.
5. Further opportunities to enhance service connectivity between the NCRTD and Santa Fe Trails transit is supported by the Board of Directors.
6. Future examination of consolidation/merger can be considered in future years, after the District resolves the GRT sunset election, if the parties believe there is merit to a new exploration.

Options/Alternatives:

- Board acceptance of the Study and adopt the recommended actions; or
- Board acceptance of the Study and modify the recommended actions; or
- Do not adopt the recommended actions and provide further direction to the staff.

Fiscal Impact: See financial analysis included in Task 3.

Attachments:
- Consolidation/Merger Study Public Comment Record
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats Chart
NCRTD and SFT Consolidation/Merger Analysis

**S - Strengths**

(SF) - Potential Annual Financial Savings for City & SFT of $700,000
(SF) - Potential reduction of CoSF MGRT tax burden on citizens
(BOTH) - Single Regional Transit Agency serving all 4 counties and cities therein
(BOTH) - Integrated and Coordinated Transit Services and Routes
(BOTH) - Regional Transit Service Planning without borders
(BOTH) - Increased mobility for better access for transit dependent populations
(BOTH) - Consolidated procurement, payroll and accounts payable
(BOTH) - Larger pool of employees to address staffing issues
(BOTH) - Consolidated dispatch function

**W - Weaknesses**

(RTD) - Savings to NCRTD operations due to consolidation unknown
(RTD) - Costs associated with a common technology platform are unknown
(RTD) - Consolidation could require the displacement of one source of GRT with a regional GRT (Scenario 3)
(SF) - Lack of definitive long term funding commitment by CoSF to capital
(BOTH) - Willingness of both parties to continue to explore consolidation
(BOTH) - Resolution of Collective Bargaining Representation

**O - Opportunities**

(RTD) - Flexibility and improvement in Vehicle Management and Maintenance
(RTD) - Potential funding of NCRTD Long Range Strategic Plan initiatives
(SF) - Reduction of overhead
(BOTH) - Increased specialized skill set staff
(BOTH) - Enhanced opportunity to explore creativity in service delivery
(BOTH) - Integrated technology to improve customer communication, system performance and operating costs
(BOTH) - Mobility Management
(BOTH) - Service integration and optimal service design efficiencies to enhance ridership
(BOTH) - Paratransit optimization and expansion to areas currently not served
(BOTH) - Employee compensation and benefits parity

**T - Threats**

(RTD) - Sunset of NCRTD GRT outcome unknown
(RTD) - Regional Tax to replace existing SF MGRT and existing NCRTD GRT
(RTD) - Fares a threat to current NCRTD customers
(RTD) - Increased tax burden on district residents residing outside CoSF due to transit tax shift
(RTD) - Pre-study bias against regionalization
(RTD) - SF City Council interest in changing governance structure
(SF) - Federal Funding projections don't occur and capital spending may need to be placed on hold
(SF) - Reallocation of NCRTD GRT
North Central Regional Transit District and
City of Santa Fe Transit

System Consolidation Study

Appendix A
Task 4 NCRTD Presentation Minutes - Draft
CALL TO ORDER:

A special meeting of the North Central Regional Transit District Board was called to order on the above date by Mayor Dan Barrone, Chair, at 9:07 a.m. at the Jim West Regional Transit Center, Española, New Mexico.

1. Roll Call

Ms. Trujillo 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>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos County</td>
<td>Councilor Antonio Maggiore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Arriba County</td>
<td>Commissioner Alex Naranjo</td>
<td></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>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohkay Owingeh</td>
<td>Ms. Christy Van Buren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildefonso Pueblo</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Pueblo</td>
<td>Ms. Lillian Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Fe</td>
<td>Councilor Joseph Maestas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Española</td>
<td>Councilor Tim Salazar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Taos</td>
<td>Mayor Dan Barrone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesuque Pueblo</td>
<td>Gov. Charles Dorame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Metro</td>
<td>Ms. Elizabeth Carter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Members Present**
Mr. Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director
Ms. Jackie Trujillo, Executive Assistant
Mr. Pat López, Interim Finance Director
Mr. Peter Dwyer, Legal Counsel
Ms. Stacey McGuire, Development Director
Ms. Delilah Garcia, Transit and Facilities Operations Director
Mr. Jim Nagle, Public Information Officer
Ms. Dora Anaya, HR Director

**Others Present**
Norm Silverman, P.E., TMD
Thomas Del Sorbo, TMD
Rosemary Romero, Romero Consulting
Marilyn Wood, Open Initiative
Keith Wilson, Santa Fe Trails
Ray Matthews, Santa Fe County
Thomas Martínez, Santa Fe Trails
Carl Boaz, Stenographer

2. **INTRODUCTIONS**

Everyone present introduced themselves.

3. **Pledge of Allegiance**

4. **Moment of Silence**

5. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Commissioner Naranjo moved to approve the Agenda as presented. Councilor Maggiore seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous (10-0) roll call vote with City of Española, Los Alamos County, Ohkay Owingeh, Rio Arriba County, City of Santa Fe, Santa Clara Pueblo, Santa Fe County, Taos County, Town of Taos, and Tesuque Pueblo voting in favor and none against.
6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Chris Armijo, AFSCME union representative, said he addressed the merger when it first came up. He represented a hundred members of AFSCME at Santa Fe Transit, who are protected under the Public Employee Labor Relations Board and they must sit down prior to the merger and bargain to insure whether AFSCME comes over or the RTD Teamsters Union would prevail.

Ms. Monica Lemier with Chambers Collective, a nonprofit organization for economic justice, said she hoped everyone here said the most vulnerable of the population in New Mexico rely heavily on public transportation. We need to understand how transportation affects the most vulnerable people in our community and how we go forward with them. It must make sense in the conversations. We are here to listen and be open minded but want to keep the best interests of our communities in mind.

PRESENTATION ITEMS:

A. Presentation and Discussion of the North Central Regional Transit District and City of Santa Fe Transit System Consolidation Study by Transportation Management and Design, Inc.

Mr. Mortillaro reviewed the history of this transit system consolidation issue, which began in March 2016 when this Board and Santa Fe City Council approved a letter of intent to look for a contractor to study the possible consolidation. In July 2016, the Board approved a contract to conduct the merger consolidation analysis with Transportation Management and Design (TMD) and they have had consultants working with them, specifically, Felsburg, Holt and Ullevig and Rosemary Romero Consulting. At this point, TMD has completed Tasks 2 and 3 and are ready to present here the results of that analysis. At 4:00 pm, they will make a presentation to Santa Fe City Council. At 6:30 is a public meeting presentation for Districts 1 and 2 and tomorrow evening for Districts 3 and 4.

Mr. Norman Silverman, Mr. Thomas Del Sorbo and Ms. Rosemary Romero were introduced.

Commissioner Naranjo said he has been on the Board for 1½ years and haven’t heard the purpose behind this.

Mr. Mortillaro said it is comprehensive in the statute and one thing mentioned is looking at providing service throughout the region.

Commissioner Naranjo asked, "service for who?"

Mr. Mortillaro replied that it is everybody in this regional district area - rural community, commuter service, etc. It was designed to reduce duplication, provide services for quality of life, for economic development, to reduce traffic on the roadways, improving the environment, etc.

Ms. Romero shared first the proposed agenda for this two-hour presentation. It has four sections and she would like to ask people to hold questions until after the presentation of each section. She pointed out that no decision is being made today but it is a study session. Each of the public meetings will be recorded including tonight and tomorrow.
Mr. Mortillaro reinforced that there would be no decision made today. This is information only and it will be a discussion item for the October meeting when the Board can provide direction to Staff for moving forward.

Mr. Norm Silverman made the first presentation and explained that this is an analysis for the tasks completed. There are four tasks and they now have task 3 completed. This is an overview of where we are right now.

Task 3 has four elements: financial analysis, physical assets analysis, labor force, fixed and paratransit routes. This is to help policy makers make a decision. It is not a service design study but a management study, with benefits, constraints, etc.

He changed the presentation order to: 1 - routes, 2 - physical assets, 3 - financial and, 4 - labor force.

Mr. Silverman compared the character of the two systems: RTD and Santa Fe Trails (SFT) and contrasted the operations. The service area for the RTD is huge and spread out; SFT is compact and there is a small overlap of service area. SFT is intense and RTD is not. He identified the numbers of routes and pointed out that for RTD, the service is trip-based with limited frequency and designed to serve longer distance trips. The local service for Taos and Española are more intense than other routes.

He described SFT and listed the fare structure.

This study assumes the routes will remain the same after a merger as they are now.

Vehicles are different. The RTD has 53 gas powered buses; STF has 34 mid-size, 18 paratransit and 16 non-revenue vehicles and almost all use CNG for power. Almost all maintenance for SFT is internal.

Ridership is 268,000 for RTD, growing significantly since inception in 2007. It is 937,000 for SFT, down from over one million in 2014.

Service integration has a limited opportunity for fixed routes with a large disparity in frequency and span of service and differences in fare structure. Integration of service would require a common fare structure and intensity and frequency of routes and changes in connections. Dispatching vehicles is easier to do with SFT than with RTD. It appears there is some opportunity to use SFT maintenance facility to help support RTD maintenance needs.

Lastly, communication of locations and schedules could be done on a single information platform with a merger.

For service planning, RTD has two employees working to optimize and meet changing demands. SFT has no dedicated employees for planning.

Paratransit integration is easier because it is based on geography and not on service frequency for fixed schedules. Both RTD and SFT have call centers and similar procedures for providing the service but operate separately now. A uniform paratransit fare would need to be in place to foster paratransit service economies in a merger.
Ms. Van Buren asked if he was suggesting a fare structure for RTD.

Mr. Silverman said that is one option to consider.

Ms. Van Buren asked how SFT is funded now. FTA handles us.

Mr. Mortillaro said the impact of fares upon our 5311 grant is a dollar for dollar decrease with fare revenues. It also impacts what paratransit fares can be charged.

Mr. Silverman said the goal of a common fare is not to generate revenue but to provide uniform transit services.

Councilor Maestas said RTD is moving to in-house maintenance and asked if they looked at maintenance overall.

Mr. Silverman said the transition of RTD to CNG would be very expensive. It would require a brand new fleet and a big change to a pending new facility. Hybrid electric and electric technology are evolving so they didn’t recommend initially converting to CNG.

B - Physical Assets Analysis

Mr. Silverman said the fleet sizes are comparable in size but different in nature. Service needs are vastly different, requiring different style vehicles.

For fleet replacement/expansion, RTD needs $6 million over 10 years; SFT needs $9 million over 10 years. RTD is looking to expand its service; SFT is not. RTD is planning to expand the maintenance facility. At issue is the use of SFT facility by RTD.

For the Capital Plan, SFT has no plans for fleet growth. The City only funds on a year-to-year basis but RTD funds for future years.

For vehicle technologies and communications, both have location service but on different platforms.

For fare collection equipment to be installed on RTD’s fleet, it would cost RTD $640,000.

Councilor Maestas pointed out that SFT must have a 20-year plan.

Mr. Silverman said he was not aware of any LRSP plan for SFT.

Chair Barrone asked if physical assets finances would be covered later.

Mr. Silverman said the study did not value the assets.

Commissioner Naranjo asked if fare collection was part of consolidation.

Mr. Silverman said it was not a requirement of consolidation but a separate decision.
Ms. Van Buren was concerned that fares was a reporting nightmare.

Mr. Silverman said they could help make it simple with modern technology.

Councilor Maggiore asked about fleet replacement and expansion over a ten-year period had options for using vehicles of SFT for RTD.

Mr. Silverman said that is a much longer term issue.

Councilor Maggiore asked what the likelihood of one organization applying for grant funding for both is and how it would affect things.

Mr. Silverman said that consolidation would not affect grant application.

Mr. Mortillaro clarified that the numbers shown for fleet replacement are just replacement but the revenue to mitigate the cost is in the financial analysis. It is dependent on what the federal government does with funding for transit and it is cloudy right now.

He suggested that Dave Harris, from NMDOT was present and could possibly speak to it.

Mr. Mortillaro said there are 47 transit agencies in New Mexico. If funded equally, it would not buy one bus each.

C - Finances.

Mr. Del Sorbo compared the budgets: $13.2 million for SFT and $7.8 million for RTD. He mentioned the review of GRT increments and the projected likely deficit in 2020.

The study has three scenarios for fiscal sustainability: 1) consolidation without new revenues or cost savings; 2) the removal of the Lodger’s Tax and an increase in nine NCRTD positions at lower cost whose functions are currently performed for SFT by other City agencies; 3) assumptions from scenario 2 plus removal of 1/4% MGRT and replaced by increase in County Regional GRT from 1/8 cent to 1/3 cent.

Scenario assumptions were reviewed and he shared the scenario outcomes for financial sustainability. Scenario 3 has the best impact.

Councilor Maggiore thought the maintenance facility was already at capacity and a new facility would be built on the south side.

Mr. Del Sorbo said one possibility for use of the SFT maintenance would be a 3rd shift to increase capacity.

Councilor Maestas asked if they assumed the Santa Fe fare box revenue is included.

Mr. Del Sorbo said yes.
Councilor Maestas liked Scenario 3 the best but was concerned about the higher GRT subsidy. He proposed the increase in 2021 but in the study scenario, it is 2019.

Mr. Del Sorbo agreed they did move it up but it will be controversial. It might need more time to play out.

Councilor Maestas was concerned with that assumption.

Mr. Del Sorbo said they could include a variety of options. The timing is subject to the policy makers.

Councilor Maestas added that there is a much higher risk in scenario 3. He wondered what the other counties would say about the GRT increase. The $1 million would no longer be transferred, he assumed.

Mr. Del Sorbo thought it would stay in the consolidated agency.

Councilor Maestas asked about the reserve amount.

Mr. Del Sorbo said in New York it is 1%. 8% is very reasonable; but 25% is an extremely limiting factor.

Councilor Maestas opined that lowering the reserve would help sell the GRT.

Mr. Del Sorbo agreed and the large balance might not be palatable. An even lower reserve would make that balance more extreme.

Mr. Mortillaro said one reason we have the high reserve is to give us the luxury of funding capital without going to the federal. It would enable the District to continue during an economic downturn. We've had no layoffs or RIFs. There are good reasons why we kept high reserves.

Councilor Maggiore agreed the Scenario 3 line graph looks the best but you are talking about raising district-wide GRT by almost a factor of three and tapping the source for a regional provider. He didn't see that as feasible. Removing the sunset will be a hard election on its own.

Chair Barrone would like to say the consolidation would actually save money and help the footprint on the earth and have no increase in GRT in northern New Mexico. We keep raising taxes on the poor and not increasing the contribution to ride the bus. In our communities, it is a necessity. He was looking for something on which to hang our hat.

Mr. Del Sorbo said Scenario 1 has no increase in the GRT.

Commissioner Naranjo wondered if down the road there would be a fare increase/

Mr. Del Sorbo said that there were no fare increase included in any of the scenarios.

Commissioner Naranjo said Rio Arriba County will consider the GRT soon.

Councilor Maestas thought the saving would be more than a half million. But we won't know, under the
scope of this study, if we cannot quantify it. And that won't mean much to the public.

D - Labor Force Alternatives

The current Teamsters contract ends June 30, 2019 and calls for increases each year. The SFT contract ended June 30, 2017 and negotiations are in progress now. There was a $0.50 per hour increase in 2014; none for 2015 and 2016.

In the study, they dealt with the need to consolidate union representation.

E. Consolidation of Organizational Structure.

Mr. Del Sorbo said in a consolidation, all of the operating employees from both fixed route and paratransit would be under one management umbrella.

Councilor Maestas asked if this assumes status quo for employees in all three scenarios.

Mr. Del Sorbo said it does all three scenarios. They did not assume changes in rates and contributions but those are subject to negotiations.

Councilor Maestas thought the rate structure in SFT would be the norm.

Mr. Mortillaro explained that the City contributes more to pension than RTD but health insurance is more with RTD than SFT. What the District found with the Taos merger was that negotiations worked it all out. It is a negotiation at the end of the day. It won't set up a false premise. But they have all been favorable to the employee. The Taos employees got more take-home pay and higher increases. He assured the Board that, at the end of the day, no one will be harmed.

Councilor Maestas thought there could be potential FTE reductions.

Mr. Silverman said not on day one. As it progressed, the potential for reduction would exist, depending upon interchangeability of employees.

Councilor Maestas asked with the Taos consolidation, if the outcome was higher wages and higher benefits or if it stayed the same.

Mr. Mortillaro said Taos had no union, although they were days away from approving one. So, we didn't have that difference. No RTD employees were impacted and no Taos employees were negatively impacted. Some chose not to transfer to RTD - a dispatcher and a Part-time driver and a mechanic. The Town of Taos had positions for them. That might be true for SFT too. There were Tier 2 changes were made.

And on route consolidation, we reduced the amount of time for shift changes and reduced overtime. We implemented that in March and it saved the Town over $200,000 in that consolidation. They got to keep their contribution but we gained a maintenance facility/yard and they gave their fleet. We also had a
bigger pool of employees for Taos runs.

During the Española consolidation, a lot of them transferred with improved wages and pool rates were better. Those differences have gone away and that is not an issue.

Commissioner Fambro said there was also seniority and bidding for routes and it was worrisome at the time but worked itself out very well.

Mr. Mortillaro agreed. The two issues for unions were that all transferred employees would have a six-month probation period and we needed that test period to experience that employee. If we had access to personnel files, they would only have a 3-month probation period. If not, it was like having a new employee.

The other issue was seniority and we were supportive of bringing their seniority over for bidding. The union disliked that for bidding purposes. We agreed to bring it up in negotiations. We broke them into domiciles and they had seniority within those domiciles. There are creative ways to negotiate them. And we found that common ground.

Chair Barrone recalled accumulated sick and vacation leave was a big one and Town of Taos had to write a check to NCRTD for that.

Councilor Maestas said it appeared that higher GRT is needed for consolidation but that is not true. There is an inherent benefit to the whole district for higher GRT. He didn’t know the full cost of LRP and that is also included in scenario 3.

Mr. Mortillaro agreed. If the District did no consolidation, the LRP had 3 scenarios. 1) didn’t include any funding for LRP like increasing hours or weekends. 2) said to fund them would need a revenue increase. And with no GRT increase, it would reduce the allocations to SFT, Los Alamos Atomic Transit and Rail Runner by a total of $1 million. 3) would increase GRT 1/8% or about $100 million. That could be flattened somewhat to please the general public.

Commissioner Moreno pointed out that we have 14 members of this Board and this will be a change and require hand-holding. We have a national environment by making things more complicated and uncertain. Our voters in Santa Fe have a couple of votes coming and he was not sure how they will turn out. We will need a lot of hand holding there as we walk down this road. What I’m hearing is that are a lot of opportunities for things to go awry. The sunset clause issue - what will happen if one or two counties don’t pass it. Lots of actors to consider. So I’m interested to attend the presentations this week. It makes me nervous because the environment around it is uncertain. This organization is well run and as I told a reporter, I’m going to support it until it is no longer supportable. If we stay on our toes, it will be okay but it will require a lot of clear language and straight talk.

Councilor Maggiore said he got frustrated when he looked at surveys that are not apples and apples. The sheets on representations are not straight comparisons and when just flipping through, a person might think they are like positions but they are not. We need to be clear with that language of comparison. That is misleading and we need to be honest with that.

There were no other comments or questions.
Chair Barrone said there is a presentation at 4:00.

Ms. Romero said it is at City Council Chambers at 4 pm. She anticipated different questions will come. The report is also online. The meeting following that is at 6:30 for City Districts 1 and 2. Tomorrow for Districts 3 and 4 will be at the Genoveva Chavez Community Center on Rodeo Road. The public is invited to the Council meeting also.

In the contract, we wanted to make sure the questions were recorded accurately. Charmaine Clair will record the public meetings and that will be available verbatim.

Mr. Silverman said for the next steps, they will summarize comments from the governing bodies and the public meetings. Then they will complete task 4 - the final report, addressing study comments. And then the policy makers will determine feasibility of consolidation.

Councilor Maestas asked, if he were a member of the public, which task would give him the “one-stop shop” snapshot of the study.

Mr. Silverman said Task 4 will do that.

Ms. Romero said on the web site is a full report and particular sections can be pulled out on the RTD web site. She didn’t know if that could be done on the City web site.

Mr. Mortillaro added that by the time the Board deals with it in October, we will have the summary of all comments for the Board members to review. We will have a series of policy reports to guide the Board on the direction to go.

Councilor Maestas said he was adamant about putting the cost in scenario 3.

Mr. Mortillaro said that is in the spreadsheets. It might be challenging for people but - at least 1/8 of GRT and 1/3 for operation and LRP. The balance is the displacement of 1.4% of Santa Fe GRT.

MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

There were no matters from the Board.

MISCELLANEOUS

There were no miscellaneous items.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Fambro moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Moreno seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.
NEXT BOARD MEETING: September 8, 2017 at 9:00 a.m.

Approved by:

__________________________
Daniel R. Barrone, Chair

Attest:

__________________________
Dennis Tim Salazar, Secretary

Submitted by:

__________________________
Carl Boaz for Carl G. Boaz, Inc.
North Central Regional Transit District and
City of Santa Fe Transit
System Consolidation Study
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Task 4 Santa Fe City Council Presentation Minutes -
Draft
MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
GOVERNING BODY
Santa Fe, New Mexico
August 28, 2017

AFTERNOON SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

A special meeting of the Governing Body of the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico, was called to order by Mayor Javier M. Gonzales, on Monday, August 29, 2017, at approximately 5:00 p.m., in the City Hall Council Chambers. Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum, as follows:

Members Present
Mayor Javier M. Gonzales
Councilor Signe I. Lindell, Mayor Pro-Tem
Councilor Carmichael A. Dominguez
Councilor Mike Harris
Councilor Peter N. Ives
Councilor Joseph M. Maestas
Councilor Christopher M. Rivera
Councilor Ronald S. Trujillo
Councilor Renee D. Villarreal

Others Attending
Brian K. Snyder, City Manager
Marcos Martinez, Assistant City Attorney
Melissa Byers, Assistant City Clerk
Melissia Heiberg, Council Stenographer
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Councilor Ives moved, seconded by Councilor Rivera, to approve the agenda, as presented.

VOTE: The motion was approved on a voice vote with Mayor Gonzales and Councilors Dominguez, Harris, Ives, Lindell, Maestas, Rivera, Trujillo and Villarreal voting in favor of the motion and none voting against.

4. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT/CITY OF SANTA FE TRANSIT SYSTEM CONSOLIDATION STUDY. (KEITH WILSON AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AND DESIGN, INC.)

A packet of information, including a copy of a power point presentation Transit System Consolidation Analysis, a Press Release, a Transit Consolidation Study Fact Sheet, Task 2 Report, and a Task 3 Report, is incorporated herewith to these minutes as Exhibit “1.”

Keith Wilson, Transit Division, said in April 2016, the City Council adopted Resolution 2016-29, which approved moving forward with a study of potential consolidation between the North Central RTD and the City of Santa Fe Transit Division, noting the North Central RTD received FTA funding toward the City. The City and the NCRTD split the 20% required match for the funds – $120,000 FTA funds, and $15,000 each from the City and the NCRTD. He said a scope of work was developed, and staff of both entities reviewed the RFP’s and unanimously chose Transportation Management and Design, Inc., with their subs. The Study kicked off last year, and the consultant worked hard to put together the analysis to be presented this evening.

Former Councilor Rosemary Romero said she is a subconsultant and part of the Transportation Management & Design, TMD team. She said the Study was presented to the RTD this morning. Two public meetings will be held, one following this meeting tonight at the Santa Fe Community Convention Center, in the Ortiz Room, 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 focused on Districts 1 and 2, and one tomorrow night at Genoveva Chavez Community Center, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.. She noted the public is encouraged to attend these meetings and she expects good attendance for both meetings. She said the study is broken into two sections, each section will be presented, and then they will stand for questions and answers for each of the sections. She said there will be an opportunity at the end for more questions.
Norman Silverman, and Thomas del Sorbo, Transportation Management & Design ("TMD", presented information via power point. Please Exhibit "1," for specifics of this presentation.

*The Governing Body commented and asked questions as follows:*

Councilor Dominguez said he has a lot of questions, but thinks he will wait until the ending, noting most of his questions are philosophical and not on the details.

Councilor Lindell asked, what would prevent the regional opportunities from occurring without consolidation.

Mr. Silverman said because they are run totally, separately, with different unions, scheduling protocols, different fare structures. The services are different, noting the NCRTD might offer 3-4 trips a day, and a Santa Fe route paralleling or overlapping it might offer service every 30-50 minutes.

Councilor Harris said, regarding the Service Integration Constraints, they don’t list 2 unions, which is a real constraint he thinks should have been listed. He encouraged Mr. Silverman to move quickly through the presentation, because the Governing Body got full reports on Tasks 2 and 3 from Mr. Wilson. They also received the power point. He said our time is better served if he will hit the high points, and then they can ask questions.

Mr. Silverman said they will speak to the labor issue as well.

Councilor Lindell asked, regarding Paratransit, if a cost estimate has been generated within the NCRTD service territory in integrating with the City.

Mr. Silverman said no they haven’t quantified the savings because he thinks we will discuss that later on – finance, labor rates, labor constraints.

Councilor Rivera said the City currently adds paratransit services and it’s pretty busy, and asked how integration would impact how the City provides paratransit services.

Mr. Silverman said you have NCRTD and City vehicles available in both instances to provide a paratransit trip. So there will be better opportunities, a bigger pool of labor and available vehicles, which, hopefully, would reduce the cost somewhat. However, that has not been quantified, but there is an opportunity for some savings.
Councilor Rivera said then it would be a savings instead of balancing out. Mr. Silverman said, “I said it’s a savings, a net potential savings.”

Councilor Rivera asked the amount of the savings.

Mr. Silverman said, “I said we have not quantified that savings, because the detail is well beyond the scope of the preliminary study and would require an understanding of an acceptance of the different wage rates, settling all of that in consolidation. When we talk to labor, you’ll understand a little more about that.”

Councilor Dominguez said he is confused, saying it hasn’t been quantified yet, but Mr. Silverman is confident enough to say that there will be savings, and Mr. Silverman said yes.

Councilor Harris said the Report says, regarding Santa Fe Trails, “The budget of comprehensive service evaluation effort should start later this year.” He asked the reason the City wouldn’t do this first before taking further steps toward consolidation.

Mr. Silverman said, “You will have to ask the City of Santa Fe, the question.

Councilor Harris said, “I think you’re looking at the City of Santa Fe.”

Mr. Silverman said he can’t comment on the timing of the two studies, because he wasn’t involved in that process.

Councilor Lindell said on packet page 33, it talks about the sunset in 2023, and asked what is required to remove the sunset.

Mr. Del Sorbo said it is a Legislative process. There will be a vote in the 4 counties.

Peter Dwyer, Attorney, North Central Regional Transit District (“NCRTD”), said they already have initiated the process. They have two sets of Ordinances, the first they hope to get to the Santa Fe County Commission and 3 other counties in the next few months, asking them to change dates. Right now, it can be done only late in the process in 2022 and therefore. They are trying to move the dates to have an election on the sunset at the 2018 General Election. There are a second set of substantive ordinances amending the sunset provision, which will be, hopefully, on the General Election ballot in November 2018. However, they wanted to do advance work to see what the constituents think, how they feel about that and they want to hire consultants and really assess it before putting it to a vote. So the earliest case scenario would 2018.
Mr. Dwyer continued, saying it is very unlikely they would do it at a special election because of the cost. So it would be either 2020 or 2022 after that. He said the RTD Board in its strategic planning has decided it wants that "3 bites at the apple." If the GRT for the NCRTD were to sunset, we would have to dissolve as an organization because that is the majority of its funding.

Councilor Lindell said in Scenario 3, we would need an increase from 1/8 cent to 1/3 cent.

Mr. Dwyer said yes. He said, "In Scenario 3, what we would really be talking about is it comes in 1/16 ¢ increments, and up to 8/16 ¢ is allowed under the GRT laws for regional transit. Right now, that is 1/8 ¢, so that is 2/16 ¢, and we would be talking about doing probably 5/16 ¢. However, the 5/16 ¢ scenario would increase regional taxes throughout the 4 County regions, Santa Fe, Taos, Los Alamos and Rio Arriba, and it would generate the additional revenue they showed you on the screen. It is enough revenue to fund "our long term strategic plans, but to cushion the blow to the City of Santa Fe."

Councilor Lindell asked if it didn't pass in any one of the 4 counties what would happen, and Mr. Dwyer said it is a region-wide vote.

Councilor Lindell said then it is a consolidation of the 4 counties.

Mr. Dwyer said, "Right. So 51% of the total 235,000 people would do it, although when the RTD imposed the tax initially, it did pass by majority in all 4 counties, which made things a lot better."

Councilor Lindell said there have been news articles about a non-profit winning a contract for Los Alamos, and asked if he knows anything about that.

Mr. Dwyer said Mr. Mortillaro can answer that question much better, noting he is the former County Manager for Los Alamos and this acquisition.

Councilor Lindell would like to know the impacts would be on service levels.

Tony Mortillaro, Executive Director, NCRTD, said they looked at that issue in the event that Los Alamos National Laboratories went non-profit and what the impact would be to our tax collections there. And they estimated they would lose about lose $1 million annually. He said it is important to keep mind that, if they lost $1 million, it will affect everyone. It will affect how much money comes to Santa Fe Trails, to the Rail Runner, to Los Alamos Transit, and the Board would have to look how it would redistribute those revenues based on service needs in the NCRTD.
Councilor Lindell asked how realistic is that fleet replacement costs would be covered by 80% from FTA funding.

Mr. Mortillaro said that is what the current formula is and in this Study, they utilize that possible projection, but basically they have to go on a year-by-year basis, noting there isn’t clarity or long range commitment to funding transit or even transportation issues throughout the nation. And it is an issue that still is being discussed in Congress. He said the F.A.S.T. Act is providing roughly an extra $1 million annually to the State over the next 5 years. He said there are 47 transit agencies in the State, and if they each got an equal share it would be about $20,000 apiece. He said most transit agencies use the 8/20 in its planning and long range projections, but you can’t take it as a given in any one year, noting it is a competitive process.

Councilor Harris said the transfers out from the region-wide GRT is shown at $4.6 million, and documented that $2.2 million goes to the Rail Runner, $1.362 million to Atomic City Transit and $953,000 goes to Santa Fe Trails. He asked how the split is determined, and the reason the City of Santa Fe gets a far smaller amount than anybody else.

Mr. Dwyer said, “I have been with the organization forever, and worked on its founding when I was in Los Alamos, so I know the whole history, but I’m going to try to keep it succinct for you, because it is a long history. Fundamentally, what happened was that the Regional Transit Tax was being proposed at a time when the City of Santa Fe and Santa Fe County also had taxes that they wanted to impose, and there was contentiousness over the subject of whether or not the RTD should move forward with its tax because it was competing with other taxes. As a consequence of that, certain agreements were made. One of the agreements was that a certain portion of the taxes within ½ of all the taxes generated in Santa Fe County go to the Rail Runner, because the Rail Runner was going to impose a competing tax, so that tax was never imposed, but at the price of taking a chunk of the GRT that was for regional transit in Santa Fe County and just directly sending that to the Rail Runner.”

Mr. Dwyer continued, “And then the other portions of tax, there were arguments and discussions about how to fairly allocate a regional tax on a regional basis. And it became quite difficult for the Board. The Board had a lot of trouble at that time, but in the end, there was a decision to figure out what was truly regional and to allocate the tax across the regional entities based on some kind of fair share process, but it wasn’t a direct, dollar-for-dollar, this much comes out of Santa Fe County, so that much must go into Santa Fe County, this much comes in from etc., etc. So Atomic City and Santa Fe Trails both got big allocations as a Board process through the NCRTD Board is what happened. And so that’s been resolved for several years now. Our Board has 14 members – 4 counties, 6
Pueblos, 4 municipalities, and it's been running quite well. There hasn't been a lot of contention since that time."

Councilor Harris said so it's fixed for now, and it isn't an annual adjustment. Mr. Dwyer said it is set as policy.

Councilor Harris said, under Scenario 3 which he thinks is the only one close to being viable to eliminate the Municipal GRT and Lodgers' Tax, is noted as approximately $167 million through 2035, and offset by $265 million through the new regional GRT. He asked how much of the $265 million is generated by economic activities within the City of Santa Fe.

He said he wants to know if we would end up with more or less than the $167 million anticipated in the current tax structure.

Mr. Mortillaro said he would have to have the consultant speak to the later question. In terms of GRT tax generation by County, $4.2 million from Santa Fe County, $1.4 million from Los Alamos County. He said with LANB's spending decreasing, it's dropped quite a bit. He said Rio Arriba County generates about $500,000, and Taos close to $900,000.

Councilor Harris said to be specific, what he is most interested in is the County Act Tax Rate versus the City Tax Rate. He said action was taken recently, and another is proposed, that affects the City's GRT rate. He asked, within the Santa Fe County number Mr. Mortillaro cites, how much is generated by City of Santa Fe economic activities, versus the County.

Mr. Mortillaro said they didn't track that information, they just track the number overall from the County.

Councilor Dominguez said he is on the same wave-length as Councilor Harris. He noted Slide #33 says that the Regional Transit including Santa Fe Trails, receives approximately $1 million. He asked of that $1 million received from the regional rate, how much is generated from economic development. He said the ratios don't make sense to him.

Mr. Del Sorbo said the City is getting $1 million of the $4.6 millions, and the other goes to the Rail Runner and to Los Alamos Transit.

Councilor Dominguez said there is a total revenue into the RTD of $12.4 million.
Mr. Del Sorbo said that includes things like federal grants. He said if you go back to the pie chart you can see the different categories. It is most federal operating and capital grants, and some of it is from the cash balance.

Councilor Dominguez asked, in any of the scenarios, if they considered the federal grants received by the City of Santa Fe.

Mr. Del Sorbo said, “They are incorporated in for a consolidated agency based on Santa Fe Trails providing an estimate of a proposed set of capital projects through 2035. For instance, every year, the plan has 2 buses being replaced at $900,000. So the Santa Fe Trails Capital Plan was rolled out, but as Tony said, and you at the podium, it is a year-to-year battle to guarantee. He said 80-20 has been the conventional split for most of the funding, with 20% being the local match. He said when you do a scenario, you have to start somewhere in terms of your assumption.”

Councilor Dominguez asked, in all 3 scenarios, if they considered federal grant for the City of Santa Fe in its revenue.

Mr. Del Sorbo said yes.

Councilor Dominguez said in one of the scenarios, you talk about losing some Lodgers’ Tax.

Mr. Del Sorbo said yes, starting with Scenario 2, commenting in the study it is valued about $300,000 annually.

Councilor Dominguez said if he is hearing correctly, the residents of this City would be at the mercy of other counties, the Board and such, of some of these things happening by Ordinance at these other counties.

Mr. Dwyer said, “The City yes, in the sense that the Ordinances are passed at the county level and they have to be identical ordinances from all 4 counties, so the City wouldn’t really be involved in that, really it’s a District-wide election. It would be the 235,000 or 255,000, whatever it is, people in the north who make a decision for the Region. So it really is at that scale. But if you’re talking about representation and control, we have weighted voting at the Board level so that Councilor Maestas is the Vice-Chair of the Board, but he also represents 6 or 7 voting units, which is the largest single voting unit from a member. So, politically, the Board is already controlled largely by Santa Fe, City and County, because of demographics.”
Councilor Dominguez asked what it would take to change that.

Mr. Dwyer said, "You have to change what is called the Intergovernmental Agreement, which you or may not have seen come through your desk as members get added on. Basically, every member gets one vote for the purpose of being a quorum, and then weighted votes based on the census data for their influence of their vote. So it's kind of a mixed voting scenario. And there is an Intergovernmental Contract between all 14 entities which you, the counties and the other cities and the pueblos all sign."

Councilor Dominguez asked what about the actual sunset. Mr. Dwyer said, "The sunset itself is a voter decision."

Councilor Dominguez asked, "What voters."

Mr. Dwyer said, "It is the voters in the whole region. And so, like I said earlier it is 51% of everybody in the 4 counties. We were lucky the first time it came through, because it got a majority in each of the 4 counties, so county felt like its constituents disagreed with it, but it conceivable that it wouldn't be that way."

Councilor Dominguez said, "I guess my point is the City of Santa Fe residents would be, and I hate to use the term 'at the mercy of,' but we wold be at the mercy of those voters."

Mr. Dwyer said, "Sort of excepted of course since you have the population, they would probably make the decision really."

Councilor Dominguez said, "We can look at population and voter turnout, a favorite subject of mine."

Mr. Dwyer said, "Right. I actually have the results from the previous election, and I could compile them..."

Councilor Dominguez said, "But those are two different things."

Mr. Dwyer said, "It's just I don't know how many of the 255,000 voting are in Santa Fe County, but I'm guessing it's 120,000 to 130,000, so almost half of the votes are coming from here. The City is not 120,000 or 130,000, but I'm talking of the total region."

Councilor Dominguez said, "So, my point is that there are really a lot of variables that contribute to really determining our own scenario."

City of Santa Fe Special Council Meeting: August 28, 2017
Mr. Dwyer said, "Absolutely. I think the consultants can talk about those other variables that are in play for both you and us alike. You have identified some of them, such as the fluctuation in the GRT. I know you have that issue, we do too. The taxability of the Lab, the availability of federal funds to pay for both of our capital programs at an 80-20 rate. Those are all day-to-day, year-to-year variables that we have to live with. As far as the GRT itself goes, our Board's strategic plan is to first confront and address the sunset issue. That was never put to a vote by the voters. It was just something that was included in the language of the Ordinances at the request of the bodies at the time. Because, keep in mind that when the tax was passed, the NCRTD was a 4-5 person operation, so there was no proven track record to demonstrate to the taxpayers that would actually result in some good use of their tax dollars. Now we have a track record. I think it's a good one, and a history, and I think we probably will be able to persuade the voters that we provide an essential service and that we will continue to exist, but really, that is up to them."

Councilor Dominguez said he didn't quite understand the remark that Rio Arriba generates $500,000, and asked the source of that revenue. He said, "It's really the question that Councilor Harris asked, but I didn't get all of the information. Where did that...."

Mr. Mortillaro said, "Those are the unit tax receipts we receive from those counties, so that's what comes in from, that is collected, paid to DFA and then that is what is transferred to our District from each of those counties."

Councilor Dominguez asked if that is separate from the 1/8 GRT.

Mr. Mortillaro said, "That is our 1/8 GRT. That's what it generates from each of those counties."

Councilor Dominguez said, "But it says 60% of these receipts are distributed to other Regional Transit providers, including Santa Fe Trails, which receives approximately $1 million."

Mr. Mortillaro said, "So, out of the $7 million plus that we collect annually, $4.6 million of it goes to those 3 entities. It's about 60% of the tax. Yes. The revenues that we receive go out for what we call Regional Services. And the only services that, for example Santa Fe Trails or Los Alamos County can fund with that money are those that are deemed to be regional in nature. So that is why, when you pass your Resolution that comes to the RTD Board, you have specific routes that indicate where you are utilizing those funds, because those routes are deemed to be regional in nature. It meets the definition that we all agreed to, in terms of what could be eligible for that funding."

City of Santa Fe Special Council Meeting: August 26, 2017
Councilor Rivera said someone said that if any of the 4 counties did not agree to sunset, then the NCRTD would cease to exist, but then he heard...

Mr. Dwyer said, "Not if any of the four counties didn’t agree. Let me go back and try to say what our strategic plan is. We have a Board which consists of you and others, and they set a strategic plan for how to deal with this. We are in the process of executing that, we’ve been doing it for about 9 months now I’d say, and we’re still working with the counties on it right now. And the plan is to allow an election to remove the sunset 3 times. So we’ll have a shot in 2018, 2020 and 2022. If, after 3 strikes, we’re out... keep in mind that we’ve already merged with Taos, so we run the Taos Chile Line. We’ve already merged with Espanola, so we run the Espanola system. Then there is going to have to be some kind of provision made for reallocation of the resources that the NCRTD presently has to resume local operations. It would go back to a local operation at some level, and all the regional services would cease to exist.

Mr. Dwyer continued, "I’m optimistic that’s not going to happen, but it does require work on our part as a staff to go forward in 2018, educate the public, as to – do you like this service, do you want to retain it or not, and then see if, at an election in 2018, 2020 or 2022, they will keep this tax in place. Now please keep in mind, I do want to be clear, you are beneficiaries of that tax. When we talk about giving money to Santa Fe Trails, that is just a straight cash transfer from us that Keith uses for his operational money. So if that tax goes away, it’s really bad for you as well, because right now it is 1/12th of your operating costs."

Mr. Dwyer continued, "So, we're pretty optimistic that everybody is going to want to keep that tax in place, and it's not asking for a new tax. It's just simply asking to remove the sunset provision. But, I do want to make sure we understand. We provide other services to Santa Fe County and Santa Fe City beyond the cash transfer. The cash transfer was the brokered deal, but we are a Regional Transit District and we provide service all the way to Edgewood, and we get people in from out of town into Santa Fe. We do services for special events here, all kinds of things in Santa Fe. So there's more to it than just a cash transfer."

Councilor Rivera asked, "If Los Alamos decided to privatize then, they wouldn’t be included in the mix. They wouldn’t be included in the vote."

Mr. Dwyer said, "Oh yes, they would be included in the vote and the next stage. They’re just one of the four counties. They have to impose the same tax as everybody else, or remove the sunset on the same tax as everybody else. And we’ve met with your City
Attorney, your City Manager. We met with each of the counties. We’ve met with everybody to try to let them know what our plan is, so we don’t interfere with other people, because we’re aware of the other tax issues that are out there.”

Mr. Dwyer continued, “Tony does annual updates to each of our members, including you. So I think we’ve been kind of open about what our plans and our process are. But it remains to be seen. It is a risk. There is a risk that the voters in the District as a whole will not want to continue the ‘Blue Bus Service,’ and if that’s what they want, that’s what would happen.”

Councilor Rivera said, if we were to integrate, clearly we would be contributing a significant amount of money to the NCRTD, and asked Mr. Dwyer if our mix and the make-up of the Board would change at all.

Mr. Dwyer said it probably would not, but that is an issue for the Board, not for him. He said, “I assume that, coming out of this meeting, we’re really asking you to do what you’re doing now, which is ask questions, see whether it’s even something that is viable that we didn’t consider. And then, those kinds of hard issues about what would it mean, what it would look like, if we went forward. The consultant I think has said a couple times, they aren’t getting to that level of detail of okay, here the consolidation plan of every of detail for you. What we would like to know at this point, is what would be the issues, the problems and if it is worth pursuing. So I don’t know if it’s worth pursuing.”

Mr. Dwyer continued, “I don’t know what our Board is going to say. They met this morning. They have some kind of tenor or an amendment, and perhaps Councilor Maestas can share his perspective on that because he was at the meeting. But they’re not going to decide until October what they are going to recommend. And, of course, it’s entirely contingent on what you recommend. And I imagine our staffs will have to put together packets and materials after we hear from the public tonight and tomorrow night, what they think, making some kind of recommendation – it’s worth pursuing, or it’s not worth pursuing at all, here’s how you could save some money or, there is no money to be saved. I don’t know what that will be. We’re not there yet.”

Councilor Rivera said a lot of his decision would hinge on the makeup of the Board and the mix of Santa Fe in the voting power on the Board. He said he has heard there may be a plan to convert the buses so that they are all the same. He asked if that would consider the fact that Santa Fe is trying to reduce its carbon footprint, and if that would factor into it. Or, is NCRTD then in charge and would make up its mind or a decision based on whatever they wanted to do.
Mr. Silverman said, “I think I addressed that issue in my presentation. I said in the short term, the near term, the likelihood of the fleet uniformity is not there, because the markets are very different, the cost of changing fuel systems for NCRTD to match the CNG investment established for SFT would be extreme. And also, propulsion technology is changing. Electrical propulsion is becoming more and more of a possibility in the next 8-10 year period. We’re saying that fleet uniformity is not a short term goal of consolidation. Okay.”

Councilor Rivera asked if it could be in the long term.

Mr. Silverman said, “It could be. It’s something to look at. It depends on what happens. It may be that CNG isn’t the way to go down the road long-term. It’s possible. It may be that it is, but right now the hybrid electric is another option. Straight diesel propulsion or gasoline propulsion is also an option, but in the near term, it’s not an issue that should be on the table for a potential consolidation.”

Councilor Rivera asked who would have the authority to make the final decision.

Mr. Mortillaro said the RTD has a sustainable plan and such, and in that plan, we are looking at CNG and LPG as ultimate fuel systems, again, in terms of reducing our carbon footprint and becoming carbon neutral to the extent we can. So we are evaluating those right now. But one of the long term things we do also want to look at is electric propulsion, and what have you. He said, as the consultant has indicated, we are not likely to be making a wholesale change in our fleet and how it’s powered in the near term future. It is under consideration, but it’s going to take some time. There are places where we can’t get CNG. We go to Chama, we service Chama, Dulce, we can’t get CNG up there. We could probably do LPG. It just depends. Our service area is so expansive, that it limits the type of fuel we can use in some of our vehicles. And our routes are so long, and some of these vehicles have limited mileage in terms of how many miles they can travel on a single tank of fuel of a certain kind.

Councilor Rivera said he read in the Study that there are no fare boxes for most of the RTD, but there are fare boxes in Santa Fe. He asked if that will continue to be the case, or if it would change.

Mr. Silverman said what we are saying, is that if you want to optimize the service integration, having a common fare would be a goal. It is not a requirement of consolidation. It would be important if you want to get maximum efficiency and enhanced service down the road. To do that on the NCRTD side would require its implementation of the modern fare collection system, which they presently do not have. In the presentation there is an estimated cost for that. That too could be… the initial capital costs could be covered by
federal funding. It’s a very normal eligible item in federal funding in the past, but it’s not a significant revenue enhancer. It’s more for consistent policy so that the two organization can merge their resources and get efficiency as they grow and expand in the future.”

Councilor Maestas said he is the City-appointed representative on the RTD Board. He thinks we should take pride in agreeing to do this study, and looking at merits, efficiencies and benefits to consolidation. This is the second time he has heard this presentation.

Councilor Maestas continued, saying we should have had a status quo scenario, so the Governing Body can see the true condition of the RTD. He said the RTD is burning through its reserve, and expected to be in deficit in 2023, independent of a consolidation. He asked if that means a higher GRT is inevitable with or without consolidation.

Mr. Del Sorbo said it’s possible. He said there are other revenue options to consider, but it is hard to see how they can close the deficit on the expense, so there would have to be some new revenue streams, whether a GRT or something else. He thinks there could be a revisiting of the allocations to the other transit providers as one step. He said effectively, that is a significant chunk of the GRTs that come in. He said the leading candidate would be a GRT increase if it is a stable situation. He said there would be no ability to fund any of the longer range strategic initiatives, what you will be doing is “coming up above water again.”

Councilor Maestas said he agrees with Councilor Harris that Scenario #3 is the only one in which he is interested. He said one of his ulterior motives in sponsoring this whole effort, the Resolution, was that we potentially could re dedicate those revenues currently going to Public Transit – Lodgers' Tax, GRTs, noting one of his underlying objectives and his hope is that the subsidy no longer would be required under a consolidation scenario.

Councilor Maestas continued, referring to Slide #42, saying the current RTD GRT sunsets in 2023. He said a previous version of this study recommended for Scenario #3 that a higher GRT should be effective in 2021. However, this slide presentation says it should take effect by FY 2019. However, we just heard that isn’t workable, and it’s not going to be a special election, and likely will be on the 2018, 2020 or 2022 ballot for the election.

Councilor Maestas continued, saying this recommendation isn’t workable from election timing standpoint. He asked the reason the financial analysis recommended a higher GRT.
Mr. Del Sorbo said it actually was bundling the things – it was bundling a consolidation in that time period and with the elimination of the MGRT in the City and the increase offset of that. He said if the timing is later, it shifts some of the assumptions to the right, i.e., going toward 2035. He said at some point, you make a projection based on what you think might be relevant,

Mr. Silverman continued, saying they were looking in Scenario #3, and one of the objectives with which they were tasked, was to fund the long range initiatives, in addition to any kind of solvency issue that is out there too, and that was the level that would accomplish it. If we deferred it, obviously, you just put off the phasing of those initiatives, and the timing just shifts.

Councilor Maestas said it is important to point out that Scenario #3 fully funds the NCRTD’s long range plan initiatives, which is $100 million of long range plan recommendations. However, Santa Fe Transit only has a 10-year capital plan at $10 million, but we apparently have not identified any needs beyond 10 years. He asked Mr. Wilson to clarify the reason we do not have a long range plan beyond 10 years. He said that could temper the revenue projections on Scenario #3.

Mr. Wilson said he believes the 10 year projection was talking about our capital needs. He said in part of the latter stages of the study, we sat and scoped out what we thought, based on what we know now, our capital needs would be through 2035. He said the $10 million is for the first 10 years, basically $900,000 a year for [inaudible] places. He said as stated the other night, we have no plan for service changes or expansion in the future. The MPO did a Transit Master Plan two years ago, and came up with recommendations showing medium/long term recommendations. Those are in the plan right now. However, $100,000 was programmed last FY to do this study to take the next steps of looking out our system comprehensively to see how we can improve it. That didn’t happen last year because of the transition, but it is in the budget this year and “what we are working toward. A longer range plan similar to what the NCRTD has now where can lay out how we can improve and expand the system in the future and come up with the fiscal projections.”

Mr. Wilson said the “10 year thing,” was just basically the next 10 years of our capital, what we expect to spend on capital. He said there is no expansion in the numbers.

Councilor Maestas asked if that is based on our ridership projects, because we have topped out apparently, but there is no potential for our ridership to....
Mr. Wilson said it is based on that we haven’t actually done the detailed analysis to see what expansion, if any warranted, based on capital needs going forward based on what we know right now.

Councilor Maestas said he thinks we need to identify our needs up to 2035 which coincides with what the RTD has identified and would fund under Scenario #3, to the tune of $100 million. He said we can talk about other issues.

Councilor Maestas continued, “I do want to state, on the governance side, the steady governance, but hopefully, my expectation would be under a consolidation that we still would have a Transit Advisory Board. That way our constituents can approach [inaudible], and if they have any concerns with service they can be heard, and considered, and there could be a direct link to the Board from the Transit Advisory Board. So I think there are some mechanisms we can have to ensure that there still are redundant mechanisms for local feedback and changes that our public wants, even if it is under an RTD type consolidation.”

Mayor Gonzales thanked both organizations for everything – professionalism, level of service – given the level of resources. It is good to be in this position where both organizations are doing at least somewhat well, and we were able to have this conversation. He understands the importance of a study to determine if there are more effective, efficient ways of delivering service. He asked in the Transit environment, how do we assess the needs of the people who depend on the service. He said in the City, we struggle with transit routes that the ones in place are being utilizing and serving an existing need – connecting people to work, health care, or existing need in the household – that is done as conveniently as possible. How do we make sure to think about this as being smarter, better, more efficient and our eye is constantly on the ball in terms of public transit providing a true service/need for those who can’t afford regular transportation and need a reliable/affordable system that connects them to various activities in life.

Mr. Mortillaro said he can only speak for, and share what they have done over the years to answer these questions. They do a short range service plan update, looking out only 5 years, noting it was last updated in 2014. They hired consultants to do the work, but ended up holding 16 public meetings in the service area to ask the constituency their needs, and would they utilize the system, and how often. He said they go out and ask these questions, and the consultants work that into either the current services and suggest adjustments. If the funding isn’t available, then we put in the short range service plan. The Board expects we will work, over the years, to putting those services in place.
Mr. Mortillaro continued, saying they review their services every year, and will be going to the Board in September with the review of the routes, and what adjustments need to be made and why. He said in some cases, they have reduced services because there is no ridership. They reallocate those funds to those areas where ridership and demand is growing, or there is an increased need. He said the Chama route and ridership has grown to 5 days a week.

Mayor Gonzales said his point is that, through this process, as part of his consideration, he believes there has to be a parallel or almost a service level assessment done in front of this so we ensure that even while pursuing better/more efficient/smarter strategies, that we understand what services we are trying to meet for the public. It may result in something that actually may be more costly. However, right now, it seems at this point there are good studies based on developing permanent revenue streams, that we are managing labor contracts, that the existing service routes aren't affected. He said a lot of that good analysis is in this study. He is interested about the 16 public hearings. He thinks it is important to go into the community to understand employment needs, etc., and wants these to be part of this consideration so we make decisions in alignment primarily with the needs of the citizens in public transportation. This would be helpful to him as part of this type of review. He said making decisions like this before evaluating our service needs doesn’t makes the most sense to him as Mayor.

Mr. Mortillaro said the City has $100,000 set aside for a service area study, but that is specific to Santa Fe. They will be updating their service plan in FY2019, and perhaps this is an opportunity to put our resources together and take a large look from a broader service area.

Mayor Gonzales departed the meeting

Councilor Harris said he thinks the comprehensive service evaluation which is underway for our particular needs should come first.

Councilor Harris continued, asking Mr. Wilson if he agrees that Scenario #3 is the only one that really makes sense and the one we need to talk about. It is the only one that funds the long range, strategic plan RTD has in place. He said the City doesn't go that far out, and Mr. Mortillaro spoke to capital needs for equipment. He said he would like to confirm that the Southside Transit Center is designed and construction is funded.

Mr. Wilson said they are in the process of finalizing the design for the Southside, and the majority of what they are waiting on are the finalized cost estimates. However, the vast majority of the Southside is funded.
Councilor Harris asked the status of the Downtown Transit Center.

Mr. Wilson said the funding is available.

Councilor Harris said we are doing an upgrade to the CNG facility, but Mr. Wilson described an enterprise solution to get the work done.

Mr. Wilson said tomorrow is the deadline for the RFP submittals. The RFP was structured so we wouldn't have up front capital costs, and we would pay them back.

Councilor Harris said these 3 projects, to him, identify much of what a long range strategic plan would have to incorporate – to major transit centers, and the first step to upgrade our CNG facility, which are identified, designed and funded to a certain level, noting we haven't gotten bids yet.

Councilor Harris said he has one closing comment, and read a sentence from the first paragraph of Task #3A, the Financial Analysis of Consolidate Options, "The most likely critical consideration and evaluation of the decision to consolidate, would be the ability for these currently independent transit agencies to have a financial sustainable environment over the short and long term." He said he has come to the conclusion that right now, it's not appropriate to take the next steps to consolidate. He believes we have a lot of work to do, and Santa Fe Trails is financially sustainable, short and long term. He appreciates the difficulties ahead for the RTD and believes it is working hard to address those. The answer he gave to himself is what he just said. He just doesn't think this is the time to do it now.

Councilor Dominguez said some of the question he asked were about the current financial overview in Slide #33, and the $1 million and the 1/8¢ for the County. He said the real question is where does the remainder of the $2.8 million go – overhead or what. He said one thing coming up and we haven't talked a lot about it is the Rail Runner. He said there is a balloon payment coming for that. He apologized because he said he got confused with the way it was worded in that particular bullet.

Mr. Mortillaro said the State of New Mexico has the responsibility for the debt service on the Rail Runner. He said it is operated by the Rio Metro RTD. He said in terms of the remaining funds, they provide services in all 4 counties, including Santa Fe County. Any funds remaining after the $4.6 million is paid goes to fund all those services directly.

Councilor Dominguez asked when he says services, what does that mean.
Mr. Mortillaro said it means the other routes specific to Santa Fe County – Eldorado, Madrid, 599, Turquoise, Mountain Trail, La Cienega.

Councilor Dominguez asked if it pays for routes in the region – Taos, Rio Arriba.

Mr. Mortillaro said the county whose revenues don’t pay for the services they receive is Rio Arriba, and it gets a threefold increase. He said keep in mind there are also federal funds that comes in to provide services as well. He said Los Alamos County continues to make a contribution to the RTD. Initially, it was making contributions equal to $1.1 million annually, after 5 years that decreased, but it still contributes $350,000 to the RTD for services.

Mr. Mortillaro continued, saying one more thing he wants to correct, is that the RTD is not in an economic deficit position.

Councilor Dominguez thanked staff and everyone involved in putting the study together. He thinks the RTD is a fine organization with a fine staff which works hard to provide its services.

Councilor Dominguez continued, saying his initial concerns still exist, one of which is governance, and something he requested when the Resolution was approved back then – was what does the governance look like, what are our options. He said so much of what happens or could happen under any scenario really depends on governance – how much of a reserve the Board will mandate, removal of the sunset, increasing the portion of the GRT or whatever the case may be. He really didn’t see a lot in the Study about governance. He said so much of what shakes out really could sway what voters decide to do in other parts of the region. It could sway the outcome of the sunset. He said there are a lot of variables that contribute to that. He said if we want to be a one-stop shop, and provide the level of service desired by residents of the City, it may sway what other voters in the region have to say about that.

Councilor Dominguez continued, saying we really didn’t have a discussion about the services. He said he feels the same as Councilor Harris. He isn’t necessarily inclined to have City staff continue to work on something that he doesn’t know really benefits the City. He thinks this is something that could benefit the NCRTD, but not necessarily the City’s transit system. He said perhaps we would have to look at Scenario #3 even more closely. He still has the same reservations – governance, level of service and how we see transportation. He asked if our community sees transportation as an essential service, then what does that mean. The reality is people depend on transportation to get to work, the workforce. He asked if we want to see it as essential as every other department in the City, such as the Police Department, whatever the case. People depend on transit to get to the
doctor, to school. The question for him is how this community sees transit. He said, from our perspective, the City should work at getting its transit level of service right, before we even start talking about regionalization.

Councilor Rivera said he also agrees with Councilor Harris and Councilor Dominguez, noting one of his main concerns is governance, the other is about the employee transition. He said after reading the Study, it seems to be muddier than he thought.

Councilor Rivera said, regarding Labor Considerations for Potential Consolidation with current pension, health plan, contributions, the leave/benefit due our employees equals to a monetary amount, and asked how much that is, and how much would be transferred to RTD if we were to consolidate.

Mr. Wilson said they did a quick calculation two days ago, based on a snapshot of balances for the 123 employees, it is roughly about $750,000 – the liability of all leave balances for all staff in the Transit Division.

Councilor Rivera said it seems our pay rates are considerably higher at the mid and max points. He is concerned that some of our current employees who have been representing this City well for many years would then go over and have to become part of the Teamsters Local #42, and potentially take cuts in pay. He asked if that is a fair assessment, or if it is too early to tell.

Mr. Del Sorbo said, “There is absolutely no provision for any cut in pay. What was assumed is effectively the salary structure exists today and projections are inflated over time. It was a consideration that needed to be pointed out because of the difference, and definitely clearly going to be a negotiating point. Our experience in past negotiations are that the dependence is for one side to look for the better portion of the other side kind of situation, but there is no pay cut in any of this analysis.”

Councilor Rivera said he presumes the Teamsters Local then would try to negotiate up to the higher wages of what would be coming over from this City.

Mr. Del Sorbo said, “There were so many variable provisions that could be negotiated in the things, it’s hard to say what would be the priorities of all sides.”

Councilor Rivera asked if there is any language in the current union contract that prohibits privatization or looking outside the current bargaining unit to provide these services – is there anything like that in the AFSCME contract.
Brian Snyder, City Manager, said he is unaware of any specific language. He said he can look into it.

Nick Schiavo, Director, Public Works Department, said there is language about privatization, but in this case, he doesn’t know how that would play out. It wouldn’t be privatization, it would be the employees being shifted to a new organization.

Councilor Rivera asked Mr. Schiavo, in his opinion, if he would think consolidation would be something with which the City should proceed and if it is a benefit to the City. He asked if we are in a good position and probably should stay where we are. He said, “I’m putting you on the spot, so if you don’t want to answer, feel free to do that.”

Mr. Schiavo said we are working with RTD and thinks there are things that we could do better. He said, “If it’s okay, I won’t answer your last question on that one.”

Councilor Ives asked Mr. Wilson, in terms of the Study the City proposes to do in connection with our transit system, to describe what the results are intended to be.

Mr. Wilson said, “I haven’t scoped this out or given it too much thought, because I’ve been kind of busy for the past year. But what I envision, because the starting point of the MPO is a Transit Master Plan that kind of fleshed out, preliminarily, a bunch of ideas of how service could be improved or changed, and stuff like that. So, I envision at the end of that process, we may have a new service plan. So some of the routes as you see them now may not exist, or they may be changed, or different schedules. As part of the MPO Plan there was a lot of public outreach, a lot of surveying. Things we heard, just trying to recollect, were more frequent service on weekends to specific areas, or service later into the evenings and stuff. I envision we will be looking at all the information that was collated as part of that process, seeing what we can do within the fiscal constraints to make a better system and also potentially come forward, if we got X dollars more, we could do this. And then maybe give you a menu of options of options of different gradations of improving service.”

Councilor Ives asked Mr. Wilson to speak to the timing on that.

Mr. Wilson said his plate is full right now, trying to get the Downtown, Southside and various other projects done, saying they were looking at the Fall initially, but they are backlogged on those projects. He thinks it probably will be at least the end of this year or early next year before they go out for RFP under that scenario. So he is thinking they are 12-18 months from a completion of that Study to be realistic.
Councilor Ives said he was a proponent of taking a look, but he is unsure he was fully cognizant that we were proposing to do a similar study within the City’s own system that would post-date this study. He said part of the presumption stated in doing this study is that service would remain the same, but at some level, we are talking about evaluating whether we need to change the service in the first instance, and the process is underway. He said it makes it a little difficult to look at this against the context of our reassessment of the delivery of service across Santa Fe on all of those points you’ve just mentioned.

Councilor Ives continued, saying there is a part of him that thinks he has a better understanding of how we can improve our own service before looking at consolidation “and this has some sense to it, which is why I’m asking the question about the timing and those types of things. Because, again if services are to remain the same, or at least that’s the analysis, but we think we’re going to be changing that service, that raises a few of the issues that folks have talked about here tonight.”

Former Councilor Romero said we are at the end of our time, with a 6:30 p.m. public meeting to follow. She said she asked the Governing Body to keep an open mind, that they were tasked to create these scenarios, and there is plenty of room for discussion. She said one of the better things that will happen out of this is looking at what are some of the best management practices. She said all the NCRTD does is transit as an agency. She said there are a lot of things to learn from each other around labor, efficiencies, some of the outreach, reiterating, “Let’s keep in mind some of the best practices as you [inaudible] perhaps.”

Former Councilor Romero continued, saying, “The next steps are to reaffirm that our role is to summarize the comments from the Governing Body and the public meetings. We are recording these similar to what your have in Court Reportings. We’ve got Charmaine Clair doing this for us at the public meeting. So they will be verbatim. They won’t be summarized in that sense. They will be verbatim so that we don’t lose again. So we’ll take those comments from the public meetings and what we’ve heard here, and from the RTD Board. The consultant team will complete Task 4 with a final report, taking into account the comments that were made, and then we will present it to the RTD and the City of Santa Fe.”

Former Councilor Romero continued, “The final step will be up to you again. It’s in your hands as decision-makers, as policy-makers, to determine the feasibility of consolidation and associated implementation strategies. And those are whatever you choose them to be. I know that Tony announced at their Board that they will be looking at next steps at their October 13th meeting. So they’ve gotten direction that they need to do some work. We’ve got to get the information to you, it’s a tight timeline, but that’s what they’re looking at. Tony
did I get that right. All right. So we are off to the next two public meetings, with deep appreciation for the really good questions. In the outreach I have done, governance certainly was one of the issues, but I think that’s part of the negotiations that have occurred. There are things that are set in stone. I think the City is very well represented on the RTD Board. So as a former Chair, and Board member of the RTD, I am really pleased to see that it’s absolutely solvent. It’s come a long way to be what it was meant to be, which was a regional effort. So kudos to all of you for the hard work you’re doing and your time and energy. So we hopefully will see you at a public meeting."

Councilor Villarreal asked how tonight’s meeting, and tomorrow night’s meeting, were advertised.

Former Councilor Romero said the outreach was focused, from her part, on all of the Boards and Commissions the City has that are interested in transit issues, meeting with all of the decision-makers on both boards, as well as staff. Outreach also included other organizations, and she has produced that list, which includes Chainbreakers, but she was unsuccessful with Somos un Pueblos, but she is confident they will be attending the meetings. It was at a much higher level than at the grassroots, and said she believes there will be a lot of feedback from the meetings.

Councilor Villarreal said then those are targeted outreach, including the Mayor’s Committee on Disability, and Former Councilor Romero said the Mayor’s Committee had its own meeting as well as the Transit Committee, along with the Tourism group, the Lodger’s Tax Board – She met with all boards and commission with an interest in Transit or on GRTs.

5. ADJOURN

There was no further business to come before the Governing Body, and upon completion of the Agenda, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.
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TRANSPORT CONSOLIDATION STUDY PUBLIC MEETINGS

SANTA FE COMMUNITY CONVENTION CENTER,

O'Keeffe Room, 201 Marcy St. Santa Fe New Mexico

August 28, 2017

Welcome/Introductions/Ground Rules/Purpose of Study

Facilitator Rosemary Romero introduced herself and the Transportation Management & Design Team, Inc. (TMD) of Tom Del Sorbo and Norm Silverman and the Stenographer for the event, Charmaine Clair.

She explained a Transit Consolidation Fact Sheet was provided with information regarding the study, as well as a Comment Form. (Exhibit 1) The report is available online and there are three websites: www.nctrd.org, www.santafenm.gov, and www.transitconsolidationstudy.com that contain the information. Attendees could comment in person, at the meetings or in writing and/or on the websites.

Attendees were given guidelines in conduct to ensure a friendly, courteous meeting and to the opportunity for anyone who wanted to comment.

The presentation process was explained. The TMD team would present one section of the presentation at a time, stopping between each to allow questions before continuing to the next section.

Introductions were made of those in attendance

*Sign-in Sheets are incorporated herewith into reference with all exhibits and written comments left at meetings. (Exhibit 2)*

TMD PRESENTATION - TMD Team Norm Silverman and Thomas Del Sorbo.

Mr. Silverman said the study was conducted on opportunities, constraints, options, advantages, disadvantages, cost, benefits, etc. of a potential consolidation of the Santa Fe Trails (SFT) system with the North Central Regional Transit System (NCRTD).
The study had four tasks and task three was just completed and today is a summary of task three. There were four separate elements to task three: Finance, Physical Assets, Labor Force, and Analysis of Fixed Route and Paratransit Consolidation Options. The final report is a summary of the first four items.

The goal was to make policy makers aware of the various issues surrounding the potential consolidation of the SFT service with NCRTD. The study was not a service design study and all existing services were assumed to remain intact upon consolidation. The study is an analysis of the issues related to consolidation, assuming existing services remain intact.

- Fixed Route and Paratransit Analysis Service Evaluation - presented by Norm Silverman

The following compares the two organizations and their service:

**North Central Regional Transit Department (NCRTD)**
- The service area is a huge, largely rural and connects rural centers, suburban centers and an urban center to a large geographic territory.
- Route frequency and span of service is much less than SFT and route length is much longer.
- Fleet operation is 24 fixed and flexed routes and complementary paratransit service within ADA regulations. Nine routes operate within Santa Fe and offer regional connectivity and 22 of the routes operate fare free.
- One premium route operates daily with a fare and one premium route operates on weekends and serves trip-based (planned around the schedule).
- Fleet operation and maintenance includes 53 in-service vehicles and 11 non-revenue vehicles. Most of the vehicles are 12 to 14 passengers; however the fleet varies in size from passenger vans to large 40-passenger vehicles. Fuel for the vehicles is gasoline and fueling is done off-site through contract.
- There are 2 maintenance facilities: Jim West in Espanola includes administrative offices and light duty maintenance and a Taos facility used for storage and dispatching and medium-duty maintenance. Heavy duty maintenance is outsourced.
- A proposal is to transfer the out-sourced maintenance to in-source is dependent on the future plans to expand the Espanola facility to full maintenance.
- Ridership has grown from 2007 to 268,000 customers a year in 2016.

**Santa Fe Trails (SFT)**
- Service is more compact (a little over 52 square miles) and more dense than NCRTD. Service provided is for small area urban transit along a fixed route.
Route operation is 10 fixed routes and all but two are operated Monday through Saturday, including two pickup shuttles and a paratransit. More than half of the vehicles operate 7 days a week with scheduled frequency.

Operation is a largely urban service territory. The service is more frequent and of longer span than NCRTD and a fare is charged: $1 per trip for adults, $2 for eligible paratransit trips and $5 for senior paratransit users. Shuttles are free of charge.

Fleet operations/maintenance of for 34 midsize buses, 18 paratransit and 16 nonrevenue vehicles.

Vehicles are fueled by CNG at the SFT Santa Fe facility. The fueling capability of the facility is being upgraded. The facility provides full maintenance with little out-sourcing.

In 2014 there were 1,065,000 riders, but in 2016 ridership has declined to 937,000 passengers.

Challenges Presented with the Integration of Services:

- The two levels of service would be difficult to integrate because of the disparity of frequency between the two services. SFT operates on more frequently on large daily spans and NCRTD operates only a few daily trips.
- Fare structures are different; NCRTD is free and SFT charges $1, etc. Integration of service would require a common fare structure.
- NCRTD developed a Long-Range Strategic Plan (LRSP) in 2015 that identifies opportunities to improve service in phases and includes elements within the City of Santa Fe.

Opportunities Presented with the Integration of Services:

- Consolidation would allow better scheduled connections between the two services. A small group of SFT vehicles could serve the greater Santa Fe area and the SFT facility could be used to help dispatch vehicles.
- Consolidation would offer the opportunity to communicate region-wide schedules on a common database.
- SFT does not have a dedicated planner and consolidation would offer two NCRTD full-time employees that are dedicated to service planning.
- Consolidation offers the opportunity to acquire a modern scheduling software system typically used in larger transit systems offering a more efficient, effective way for bus operators to do their job.
- Consolidation would allow the integration of paratransit efforts by either SFT or NCRTD to be more efficient. However, since paratransit requires a common fare and there is a difference in processing, the coordination for the service requests and dispatching of vehicles would need to be considered.
Questions / Answers

*Colin Messer - In regard to integrating paratransit service and maintaining the level of integrity of the current service in Santa Fe, how would the funding for paratransit be affected?*

**Answer:** Funding would not be affected. The FTA requires three quarters of a mile within any other and Santa Fe’s policy is to serve anyone within the City of Santa Fe. Consolidation would allow service to be provided more efficiently by a larger fleet of vehicles and a larger population of bus operators. Paratransit is a costly component that is required by federal government, but is not funded by the federal government.

*Unidentified person - You said when talking about integration opportunities that it would be possible to integrate the schedules on a regional-wide, common information platform. Did you find that the schedules for both these systems are maintained in the common GTFS file standard and could in fact be integrated by using Google Maps?*

**Answer:** Mr. Silverman - They both have locator systems. He thought the answer is yes, but was not certain.

Jeanette Bachand with NCRTD, GIS System – Currently we are in the initial Q&A [Question and Answer] stage of getting our GTFS files approved by Google Transit. It is one of my main duties on a regular basis to get NCRTD on file at Google Transit.

- Physical Assets of each Independent Operation

Vehicle Fleets
- The fleets are comparable in size but very different in nature in fueling and individual size. They will remain that way because of the long distance, low volume, trip specific nature of NCRTD versus the shorter distance, more routes and typical urban transit-oriented service of SFT.
- TMD feels the question of whether consolidation would seek uniformity of fleet is that it would not in the near term, but await more service changes and service expansion. There will also be changes in technology in the next 8 to 10 years for hybrid-electric type and all-electric vehicles that could change the decision of uniformity in the future.
- NCRTD has identified around $6 million is needed for the current fixed route service for normal vehicle replacement in a ten-year period. Their LRSP (Long-Range Strategic Plan) identified $10 million more will be needed for additional fleet purchases to support service enhancement through 2035.
- SFT identified replacement costs of about $9 million over a 10 year period for fixed route service and they have not identified any fleet expansion. They have assumed their fleet size will stay as is through 2035.

Maintenance Facilities
- NCRTD has a facility in Espanola (light duty and storage) and Taos (medium duty).
- SFT facility is full service and capable of all levels of maintenance. Consolidation could provide an opportunity to make greater use of the SFT facility on some of the NCRTD services.

Capital Plan Overview
- NCRTD has a LRSP, but is currently unfunded.
- SFT does not have a similar plan, but will develop a service plan in the next year. Their capital plan is currently funded year to year. Specific grant funding in future years is uncertain and a 5-10 year plan could help with decisions on what is wanted and needed based on available funds.

Vehicle Technology
- Both NCRTD and SFT have the technology of location and real time information. Consolidation of the systems would require a consistent platform and would be a longer-term issue to make the systems compatible.

Fare Collection
- Consolidation does not require that both systems have uniform fares, but to maximize the opportunity for service integration it would require consistent fares.
- For NCRTD to collect fares it would need to implement a fare collection system. In addition charging a fare under current State rules would reduce Federal 5311 funding by the same amount of the fare. TMD feels that the NMDOT Policy interpretation should be revisited.
- NCRTD identified a cost for the operation of a fare collection system is around $38,000 a year.

Questions / Answers

Miles Conway - Regarding the 5311 funding, I know it is a federal policy that NMDOT carries, but are there other federal funding streams that would be going to NCRTD that would be held to a different standard if they began a fare structure?

Answer: Mr. Silverman - No, I don’t believe it is federal funding, I believe it is local and that could be confirmed by NMDOT.
Miles Conway – You said Santa Fe Trails has no long-range plan for fleet replacement? I was going to ask about the $18.5 million fleet replacement through 2035.

**Answer:** Fleet replacement of overaged vehicles represents two buses every year through 2035.

Mr. Colin Messer – In your analysis did you look at the current situation that we do not have a stable south side transit facility yet? Sheraton is under construction and is being radically rebuilt and expanded. Was that taken into consideration in the overall costs of establishing this?

**Answer:** No. The study assumes the current levels of service are maintained. Service was not part of the scope of the study and is somewhat of a separate issue - although not un-costly. SFT has indicated they will be doing something similar in the next year or so.

Sonia Maria - So based on what you just stated, does that mean it's kind of left in the air and nobody cares about the south side? And if you're not going to be affirmative of what the cost is going to be, then do you just dismiss it?

**Answer:** The south side facility is included in the financial analysis because for the most part, funding is available. The study didn’t look at what the implications of the south side would be relative to service, etc., but because of the cost of the project it is included in the financial analysis.

*Keith Wilson* with SFT added - The South Side Transit Center is nearing final design. We have a lot of different funding pots and pretty much it is fully funded based on the latest cost estimates. We just need environmental clearance from FTA (Federal Transit Administration) to finalize the designs and then can move forward with bids to construction. I am hoping within the next few months we will be taking a step forward.

*Olivia Moreno-Carlson* – So, I'm trying to understand this and from what I'm getting from this presentation is RTD is going to take over Santa Fe Trails and Santa Fe Trails is a good bus system. I've used it. I have not used NCRTD.

So what I'm getting from these slides is you're saying it's going to cost less to take over a bus system that works right now, which is Santa Fe Trails. That I don't understand. How is that going to cost less to take over Santa Fe Trails?
Facilitator Romero reaffirmed that the purpose of the study and the team was to look at opportunity and get a better understanding of the opportunities for service coordination, potential cost efficiencies and future service improvements.

When everyone was looking at the deficits and how the City could be more efficient, they were looking at services of the City as a whole. Not just Transit, but Transit was part of that discussion.

Facilitator Romero - The City of Santa Fe thought it is always good to evaluate and assess the potential for efficiencies. They passed a resolution and then the NCRTD Board passed a similar resolution. Between the two entities the City of Santa Fe put up $15,000 and NCRTD put up $15,000 and the State put in $120,000 for a study.

The status is now in the study stage and the comments made will, as much as possible, drive what happens in phase four. There has been no decision and the City Council has specific questions possibly around governance and some of the services.

We are just the messengers of the information. People don’t always understand what each of the entities does specifically and the populations they address. These are two different Transit systems. The NCRTD is only focused on transit and the City of Santa Fe has transit as a component as well as senior services, water, roads, etc. and is addressing the issues of a very diverse population as a whole.

So to reaffirm, there is no decision that has been made. This is to try to understand the possibilities. There may be efficiencies from short-term to longer-term and we are at the beginning of a process.

Mr. Silverman added that the study does not presume any change in SFT services.

*Joshua Vigil – Since the NCRTD is fare free, if the consolidation did go through would Santa Fe Trails be fare free also?*

*Answer:* There is no requirement for the consolidation to change any of the fares, but a good and useful element of consolidation would be to establish a common fare structure.

The study looked at fares versus a no-fare option. We do not recommend a fare-free and neither does SFT because they are a frequent system and you have issues about vagrancy if you charge nothing. In addition then the paratransit fare would have to be zero as well for a very expensive service. So we do not advocate fare free, but we do advocate considering as part of the consolidation a common low fare over time.
Sonia Maria - So I think I read through the report where you stated something about vagrancy — the 80 page report. I don’t think that that’s necessarily... to propose that there will be a vagrancy because there are no fares is, I found a bit offensive.

Also there was a statement in the 80 page report. You made some kind of statement about wanting less riders in the report, which makes no sense to us as an organization. We like to see more ridership, because that obviously leaves less of a footprint when you talk about environmental issues. So, I don’t think that statement should be made. I don’t know if RTD has experienced vagrant issues with people because there are no fares, but I don’t appreciate that statement.

But anyway, another reason why we feel concerned with these issues is because our riders many times make recommendations, or they have concerns about Santa Fe Trails, or maybe even RTD.

I think that if you do merge you take away the voice of the riders here in Santa Fe. And that’s an absolute concern for us, because we think that the community and the riders should have say-so about what happens in their community and what happens in frequency of riding, about fares, about all the things that concern riders here in Santa Fe.

Answer: Mr. Silverman offered to answer the three questions. First, in respect to agencies, again we’re talking about frequent, scheduled transit services not the nature of what RTD currently operates. There have been examples at other transit agencies and when you run a free bus frequently in issues of cold weather and warm weather, you can have it [vagrancy].

With respect to ridership, we all in the Transit business want riders. That’s what we do. What we are saying though when we said you need to control demand is in the world of paratransit if you have a free fare paratransit system, on-demand for free in a dense area like Santa Fe, you are encouraging greater usage. Which on paratransit, in the real world, is not an infinite resource. The cost of paratransit is often 20 to 30 times the cost of regular fixed route across the country. You want to try to manage that demand, which is why having a higher paratransit fare is allowed by the federal government.

Lastly, with respect to your concern about communication; I’m sure Mr. Mortillaro from NCRTD could tell you how active and responsive NCRTD is to community concerns and will be so as well in a consolidated operation.

Miles Conway – How is the Santa Fe Trails federal funding diminished by charging a fare? And if you are only looking at $3 million to $4 million in revenues from
fares, if SFT did go to fare-free would there be an expansion of the federal dollars available to Santa Fe or through NMDOT?

Answer: No, the $4 million would be a dream for fare revenue. SFT brings in about $400,000 and change right now.

Keith Wilson added information regarding the fares and federal funding - NCRTD receives their funding through NMDOT and SFT receives directly from FTA (Federal Transit Administration), because we are smaller and not governed by that. We do charge a fare and that doesn’t go against the funding.

Facilitator Romero noted that when looking at service routes at the City Council meeting, it was important to reaffirm the good job NCRTD is doing in continuing to do public involvement around routes and assessment. One of the best management practices has been the NCRTD’s outreach work to assess routes and make them efficient and they are seeing an increase in ridership because of that.

SFT as a parallel has no growth but has opportunities for growth doing some of the work coming up. She heard that SFT has reached out to find where the greatest needs are and addressing the needs of the constituents.

Mr. Mortillaro – Every five years we do a service update and go out to the ridership. The service update for example in 2014 had 16 public meetings just like this throughout our service area with the general public. We asked them what they thought about our service and how we could improve it and what service needs they have or see as needed in their community or neighborhoods.

From the data we made adjustments to routes. Some of the other requests were more ‘when you have additional resources can you increase frequency of service; can you increase time of day of service’ and those were adopted in our short range service plan. About 90% of those recommendations have been implemented.

NCRTD will be looking at our next service plan update in 2019. We look at it every five years and I believe as a result we are able to stay current with the needs of our constituency. Also every year we look at our routes and what is going on with them and if there are needs that are not being met or requested needs that can be met. We will be discussing that at our Board meeting in September.

NCRTD is a very proactive and reactive organization and if a resident says I would like a stop here, we can put a stop there. We have that latitude and don’t have to go to our Board or to any agency. That’s how flexible and responsive we are.

Ain McDonald – I was curious to know two things. I will call the buses by their colors because I don’t know the names. I just use Santa Fe Trails myself, so I know
that system. But are we talking about the blue buses and the white buses as well, or just the blue buses and Santa Fe Trails?

Answer: Facilitator Romero explained that NCRTD is the blue bus that services four counties and is supported by a Gross Receipts Tax. The City of Santa Fe Santa Fe Trails has larger buses that are mostly gas operated and have an active advertising that add a sliver to the budget.

- Financial Analysis Study – presented by Tom Del Sorbo

- The Financial Analysis Study is an overview of the size, scope of revenues and expenses for each of the two agencies. The two main takeaways are that although NCRTD receives $12.4 million in revenues, they can only spend $7.8 million because $4.6 million is transferred out to other service providers as part of the agreement when the tax was implemented.
- Secondly, from a 2017 standpoint both agencies either finished with a balanced budget (RTD) or a slight surplus (SFT).
- SFT is projected to have sufficient operating surpluses to support their current service levels in daily operations. One reason is a local ordinance in 2016 for a ¼ of a cent Municipal Gross Receipts Tax (MGRT) which brings in over $7 million dollars a year for SFT. The percentage they might receive from the tax was not locked in. The board has guaranteed a minimum of 89%, which has enhanced their ability to have sustainability for the vital revenue stream.
- NCRTD has a 1/8 cent County Regional GRT which also generates over $7 million; however 60% (about $4.6 million) is distributed to other regional transit providers. SFT is a recipient of about $1 million of the $4.6 million.
- The GRT is not only the primary source of revenue for NCRTD, but will sunset in 2023 unless the removal of the provision is approved by voters in the four counties. NCRTD is in the process to get that before the voters.
- NCRTD has a Board policy cash reserve requirement of 25% and has used drawdowns to sustain the budget in recent years, mostly for capital matches. Based on the current projections, the requirement of 25% will not be met by 2020.
- A pie chart shows expenses and revenues for both agencies:
  - NCRTD – the GRT brings in 57% of revenues, but net is only 32% because of distribution.
  - SFT – brings in about 54% from their GRT and another 7% (about $1 million) from the transfer of funds from NCRTD.
  - Federal Operating and Capital grants also contribute a large amount of revenue into the mix in both cases.
  - A slight difference on the expense side is that salaries/benefits represent about 46% for RTD and is a little higher with SFT due to their benefits.
- Part of the scope of the study was to explore scenarios that provide an overview of what is needed to ensure financial stability for a consolidated agency. They
considered that there is about $99 million in the LRSP that NCRTD developed in 2015. The plan has a tremendous amount of initiatives that benefit not only RTD customers, as well as the Santa Fe customers.

- Three scenarios were developed:
  - Scenario 1 – what happens if NCRTD and SFT consolidate and there are no new revenues or cost savings.
  - Scenario 2 - Santa Fe has $300,000 in Lodger's Tax revenues that was offset with support cost savings. SFT has administrative and support functions that are provided by other Santa Fe City Departments. The study found that there were 9 positions that could be increased at NCRTD under consolidation to perform those functions at a lower cost.
  - Scenario 3 - using the assumptions of Scenario 2, it removed the revenue stream of ¼ cent tax for Transit from Santa Fe, but increased the County Regional GRT from 1/8 cent to close to 5/16 cent tax.

- First they had to assume that in a larger agency the current Board requirement of 25% of cash reserves would probably be too high. That was modified to have 25% through 2020; 20% from 2021-2025 and 15% in 2026 to the end of 2035.

- In contrast of the Board requirement, the State Division of Finance and Administration requires a one month (8%) cash balance in their reserves (one third of the current Board requirement).

- Fleet replacement costs assumed that 80% of the cost would be revenues from FTA grants through 2035.

The end result of the scenarios was:

  - Scenario 1 - there would be an annual deficit of almost $500,000 through 2035 and the consolidated fund balances would reach a deficit in 2028. There would be no money and funding for LRSP initiatives. The Board requirement of 25% would not be met even when modified and the State requirement of 8% would only be met for the first three years of the plan.

  - Scenario 2 - there would be an average deficit of $100,000 mostly concentrated in years 2019-2022 and no funding for long-range initiatives, and the reserve end would be short until 2025. SFT has projected another $2.5 million upgrade for the fuel facility in 2035 that drops that balance. This scenario would meet the State reserve balances.

  - Scenario 3 - the Santa Fe tax is removed as a revenue stream and the County regional tax would increase. The entire $99 million in LRSP initiatives could be funded in phases. The Board reserve requirements would not be met until 2023, as modified, but the State reserve requirements would be easily met. The GRT revenue that Santa Fe would contribute to a consolidated agency would be about $167 million less, offset by $265 million in new revenue in GRT from the County tax. This scenario also has a significant reserve balance in the later years.

The Findings:
- A consolidated agency needs permanent and fairly consistent revenue streams and the sunset provision has to be addressed. GRT is one of the more predictable sources of revenue for a transit agency. Other revenue options could be a State generated funding stream or the GRT currently transferred to other providers could be capped.

- In terms of a cost effective operation of a consolidated agency – both agencies do a good job of containing operating expenses now. NCRTD could add positions to absorb the work provided outside of SFT. There could be longer term consolidation savings such as the SFT maintenance facility that might be able to inherit fleet work currently outsourced and some management of the agency.

- Capital Program funding is always uncertain and will have an impact on long-term capital investments with replacements, system upgrades and long range strategic initiatives. The TMD view is that a consolidated transit operation would provide greater rationalization for capital planning and better identify the needs of the consolidation for facility size, etc.

- The reserve requirement of 25% in a consolidated agency would have to be reevaluated downward.

Questions / Answers

Tomás Rivera with Chainbreaker Collective - We have been organizing Santa Fe Trails bus riders for over a decade. I have a couple of questions about finances; if Option 3 which has the most interest moves forward, do I understand that Santa Fe Trails would have to be dependent on the GRT from NCRTD and would have to triple and that would have to be put through to the voters in four counties.

Answer: Yes.

Tomás Rivera - If that does not happen and the merger winds up happening, is it realistically possible that Santa Fe Trails could cease to exist in a consolidated agency?

Answer: In a consolidated agency, first you may not necessarily have the distinction; it is not either or. It would be a hit to the consolidated agency and presumably an equitable distribution, but there are many versions.

We were tasked with 3 scenarios in the study, but there are multiple variations and permutations that could exist in terms of tax changes. To some extent it is limited on the cost saving side early in the consolidation. The framework would have to be in place in a lot of different areas to go long-term and the focus in early years would have to be on revenue. Costs go up every year with contract increases, vendor contract increases and costs don’t drop unless significant
economies are made. The revenues have to keep up and it is up to policy makers as to what the most viable options are for revenue enhancement.

The study used GRT because it is obvious and exists in both agencies. There are other scenarios; the existing State funding relative to what it could be and tapping the Regional GRT that is currently 60% diverted from NCRTD. I wouldn’t say someone would cease to exist, but if there is no merger and the sunset provision goes away, you are basically taking away two-thirds of NCRTDs revenue base.

Tomás Rivera – To clarify, not necessarily Santa Fe Trails itself would seek this deal, but if that [provision] does sunset and there is no revenue found from any source GRT or otherwise, as a consolidated agency there would be cuts across the board probably distributed between the blue buses and SFT.

Answer: That is a hypothetical.

Facilitator Romero asked Peter Dwyer to comment about new GRT information at City Council for those who were not there.

Peter Dwyer – If they went with Scenario 1 of the two entities merging with nothing changing, to address the question about cutting Santa Fe Trails out; that would be one of the last. In Transit you look where your ridership is and the ridership is mainly in Santa Fe. You would not cut that right away, but there would have to be some equitable distribution.

The way things are now, if the sunset does pass, our organization [NCRTD] would cease to exist. Keep in mind that 1/12 of Santa Fe Trails budget comes from that same tax and if the sunset passes Santa Fe Trails will have to start cutting.

It is the same no matter how you look at it. Once it becomes a consolidated entity everyone, Taos, Santa Fe, etc. would want to protect their routes, but you would distribute the pain across the entire organization, the entire system. It is hypothetical and the elected officials will decide all of that. But I can tell you it would be bad no matter how you slice it if the sunset doesn’t get approved, I don’t plan on having a job in 2024.

Colin Messer – I think it was said in Scenario 1 that you are making the assumption that the FTA funding would continue and is stable. We’re not getting 1/10 of what we used to get in capital at SFT.
**Answer:** No, the assumption made across all of the scenarios was that fleet replacement would still have an 80% federal contribution and the 20% local matches come from sources other than the feds.

*Colin Messer – We are not getting it.*

**Answer:** Mr. Mortillaro - I think that is the assumption we use whether on the SFT side or NCRTD’s side. The best case is you could get 80/20 and the worst case is you don’t get any of that and you’re going to have to find a way to replace those vehicles and capital.

The mechanism that SFT found was to borrow it. What NCRTD does is have high reserve levels and if federal funding doesn’t come in we can use the reserves to pay for a certain amount of capital. We don’t touch our reserves if the federal comes in. We have that luxury. SFT doesn’t have a requirement to keep a reserve and if you did, what would those financials look like?

We are both different, but in trying to keep an apples to apples comparison in long-range projections, we use the same assumptions on the federal funding side.

*Miles Conway – Back to the cost of the two agencies, is risk management a part of this? It seems that the risk to SFT might be stratospheric in comparison to NCRTD.*

**Answer:** Defining risk management as the liability piece, SFT is a much bigger agency and they carry many more passengers. The annual projection is in the range of $280,000 and NCRTD is about 130,000 dollars.

*Miles Conway – The tribal governments have seats on the NCRTD Board. Where is that revenue stream? Does it just come through the County GRT, or is it the same federal grant?*

**Answer:** No, there are also tribal grants that are written into revenue base for NCRTD.

Mr. Mortillaro added - Under the 311C Program, the FTA Tribal Funding Program, they put $30 million annually into the non-discretionary program and another $5 million in discretionary funding. NCRTD applies for the non-discretionary funding on behalf of their Pueblos.

The FTA has a formula for the amount of allocation based on the number of road miles within the Pueblo, the population and other factors. The Pueblos are awarded the funding and NCRTD has a Memorandum of Agreement with them to provide service. Funding does not pay for 100% of the service, but there is also 5311 Nontribal Funding that offsets some of that as well as the GRT.
Mr. Peter Dwyer explained - NCRTD administers that for the tribes in a unique way the FTA is not accustomed to. We get direct grants from the federal government on behalf of our tribal members, except for one tribe that operates its own transit system. NCRTD also just received a big grant for a new route.

Mr. Conway – it’s hard with the consolidation. You really start to imagine tourism components of a well oiled Transit system that goes all over.

**Answer:** Mr. Mortillaro – That is part of NCRTD’s components, to take them out on the trail route which services the downtown area, Ski Santa Fe, the Santa Fe mountains. Local tourism and others utilize it for that to ski and go to the Santa Fe mountains to bike, etc. We did surveys that show it is about 60% tourists and 40% locals.

Ain McDonald – I was curious though. The purpose of the meeting was just for input purposes and I guess you’ll hear from the public and the agencies. What is the projected time to bring this back once you’ve decided on the next step, since these are all preliminary things?

**Answer:** Facilitator Romero explained the next steps will be discussed after the last presentation.

Tom Johnson - The comment that I picked up on is you said one of the tribes, one of the Pueblos is running its own transit system. So we’ve got your transit system - the Regional Transit System - we’ve got Los Alamos, we’ve got 4 systems in Santa Fe, the Santa Fe Trails, the paratransit, etc. So now we have eight. Are there other transit systems? Does Taos have their own?

**Answer:** Mr. Mortillaro – No, we consolidated the Taos and Espanola systems into NCRTD’s and consolidated Los Alamos Transit, which left Rio Arriba County in our system.

All that remains in terms of stand-alone transit systems is Red Miner, out of Red River, which is one; Santa Fe Trails is two and Los Alamos is three. Ohkay Owingeh is a paratransit system, not a fixed route system and relies on NCRTD for the fixed route portion. The Park and Ride is a State-wide transit system that mainly addresses commuter needs.

In the four-county area there is only three stand-alone systems.
Mr. Johnson – I’m saying we’ve got Trails here, we’ve got the Pick-Up system here in Santa Fe that goes through the historic districts and to the museums. They have separate routes but I can’t see them when I look at the Santa Fe Trails.

What I’m saying is how do I get from point A to point B in Northern New Mexico? So, maybe we’re not asking the right question. How do we have a unified transit system in Northern New Mexico where I can say I’m sitting here right now - how do I get to somewhere out there?

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – I agree, I know what he is saying. You can’t go onto transit and say I want to go from X to Z because there are systems that are not on Google Transit, so there are gaps in terms of transit planning.

Both Los Alamos County and the NCRTD will soon be on Google Transit; Red Miner will never be. It is a long process and I guess the hope is in a year or so there will be more transit agencies and you can plan your trip from Taos all the way to Albuquerque.

Karen Heldmeyer – In the other meeting Nick Schiavo head of Public Utilities, talked about that very issue. He said there may be opportunities for cooperation and coordination that don’t involve consolidating all of the various routes into a single entity.

- Labor Force
  - NCRTD operation is represented by Teamsters Local Union 42 and the contract will end June, 2019. The contract is transit specific because it is a singular transit agency. The contract wage rates increased July 1, 2017 to about 2.7% and calls for another 2.7% wage increase on July 1, 2018.
  - SFT representation is by AFSCME and their contract expired at the end of June, 2017 and contract negotiations are in progress. Their contract provides for a $.50 an hour increase in 2014 with no increase in 2015 and 2016.
  - Key differences between the 2 labor contracts:
    - SFT’s is part of a larger city-wide contract and there are many titles that are non-transit specific. NCRTD’s contract is very transit specific with provisions that apply only to transit employees.
    - NCRTD generally has a higher pay rate at entry level, but SFT has higher contractual rates at midpoint & maximum.
    - NCRTD’s grievance process is two-steps and the SFT is four steps.
    - NCRTD’s fleet maintenance is basically outsourced and SFT is mostly in-house.
    - SFT’s pension contribution has a lower level of employee contributions relative to NCRTD employees.
The Labor attorneys for both NCRTD and the City determined that the current labor law prohibits two separate unions from representing employees with the same titled job function. Only one union can be the exclusive bargaining agent where the entities have the same job function.

That implies in consolidation there will be a transition of SFT employees to a common representation on the NCRTD side.

Issues that have to be considered on the labor side in terms of unification are pay rates; pension and health plan contributions for both the employer and employee; grievance procedures; seniority - SFT employees carry vacation and sick leave balance accruals and there would be a cost to transfer those; and the ability in consolidation to intermingle/interchange labor forces to perform certain functions could be a possibility and will require discussion over long-term.

A slide was is shown with the potential management structure for the organization with four basic categories: Fixed Route, Paratransit, Finance/HR/Training, and Procurement. All current budgeted supervisory, drivers and maintenance positions under Fixed Route, Paratransit, Transportation and Maintenance would be incorporated in a combined structure under one single management control.

Questions / Answers

Miles Conway – The pension calculation assumes hypothetically a 1.3% difference in major contributions for the employee. Is there a number in either direction of how much more NCRTD or SFT would have to put into pensions?

Answer: No, because it is a subject for negotiations and impossible to determine which direction it would go. Negotiations would look at a lot of things and in any contract you look at net costs and the pros and cons.

Miles Conway – At a 54% labor cost I'm trying to think how NCRTD is saving so much money on their staff, or where the savings are being realized.

Answer: NCRTD operates pretty lean and their salaries are not outrageous. Also when departments supply services from a different part of an agency/city there is an overhead rate that is added in. You are paying for the costs of someone else who doesn't work for you.

Patrick Romero with facility maintenance – I'm supporting SFT and I've also been a union rep. What is your number of union representation of Teamsters now, opposed to the City's AFSCME representation?
Answer: AFSCME is about 100 and about 50 Teamsters for NCRTD.

Patrick Romero - Under the proposed consolidation are AFSCME members going to have to move over to a Teamsters representation, where historically this union has built itself...

Answer: First, in any potential consolidation the management structure would be effectively run by NCRTD. Secondly, the labor attorneys from both NCRTD and the City of Santa Fe say that the labor law today requires one representative.

Patrick Romero - I totally get that, but which one would represent them.

Peter Dwyer added - I can tell you that it is not a management decision and is not decided by NCRTD or the City of Santa Fe. Representation is decided by the workers, generally.

In the short term using Taos as an example, Taos was not unionized and the employees left employment with the Town of Taos and became NCRTD employees. At that time they were given the choice to join the union with the NCRTD, or do fair share, or whatever.

I think no one has gotten to that point in this process of deciding what a transition plan would look like and how that would work. But ultimately, representation is always decided by the workers.

Patrick Romero - That will be a big elephant in the room.

Answer: Peter Dwyer - I think we’re a long way from getting to that level of detail. Still I’m not sure that the concept has traction yet.

Patrick Romero - I’m looking at this because I’ve got members that are always asking these types of questions. I was at the genesis of this conversation over a year and a half ago when our council was given $50k for the study. I was a rep at that time and we’re listening to this and people were asking; the drivers were asking.

It is a great opportunity for drivers, even entry level paratransit, whatever the case; it was a good entry level at the time. Then they’ve got a place to move further into careers throughout the City of Santa Fe. So, I’ve got a bias toward this consolidation.

Next Steps
Facilitator Romero explained that next the stenographer’s job is to summarize the comments heard. Some of the comments have been answered and other questions may require more information. The team will address those in the final phase. The comments from the Governing Bodies, the NCRTD and City of Santa Fe public meetings and Special Session City Council will be summarized.

The TMD will then start work on task four, the final report that addresses the study comments and the comments submitted in writing or online. Then all of it will be up to the policymakers, the elected officials to decide which direction they want to go.

The NCRTD has announced a Board meeting on October 13, 2017 where their members will do more on the analysis.

The hope is that this will continue to be discussed in the next month or so. There will be one more public meeting at the Genoveva Chavez Center at 5:30 p.m. on August 29, 2017 and everyone is invited.

Adjourn

*The meeting at the Santa Fe Convention Center adjourned at 8:09 p.m.*
North Central Regional Transit District and
City of Santa Fe Transit
System Consolidation Study

Appendix D
Task 4 Presentation Minutes, Santa Fe Community
Districts 3 & 4
Welcome / Introductions/Purpose/Ground Rules

Facilitator Rosemary Romero introduced herself and the TMD Team: Norm Silverman, Thomas Del Sorbo, and Stenographer Charmaine Clair

Public introductions were made. Sign-in sheets are attached.

Facilitator Romero explained the presentation process and the Question and Answer period between each section to address concerns.

A Transit Consolidation Fact Sheet was provided with information regarding the study, as well as a Comment Form. The report is available online and there are three websites: www.nctrd.org, www.santafenm.gov, and www.transitconsolidationstudy.com that contain the information. Attendees could comment in person at the meetings or in writing and/or on the websites.

Guidelines were given for a courteous and friendly meeting where everyone would be given an opportunity to speak.

A summary of the presentation can be read earlier in the minutes or online. This portion of the minutes will indicate the section only that was presented before the Question and Answer period.

TMD PRESENTATION – Norm Silverman and Thomas del Sorbo

- The Fixed Route and Paratransit Analysis Service Evaluation was presented by Norm Silverman
Questions / Answers

Mary McGinnis - I had difficulty hearing, but it sounds like NCRTD has some sort of service plan, but Santa Fe Trails doesn't.

Answer: NCRTD has conducted a Long-Range Strategic Plan (LRSP) which has a series of investments to maintain existing services and to consider more routes, frequency of routes and days of service. The plan is not funded at this point, however it is a road map for the things they would like to do in the future.

SFT on the other hand does not have a long term strategy, but they do plan a study of their surface structure next year to do the things NCRTD has done.

Mary McGinnis – You did not really answer my question. I don’t understand how that affects day to day services in terms of users and customers. As a customer who uses Santa Fe Ride every day, I would like to know more about the implications of that.

Facilitator Romero confirmed that Mary’s question was the implications from a planning perspective of an agency that has completed the long range planning. She asked Keith Wilson to address the question of why the City of Santa Fe has a shorter term planning effort.

Keith Wilson with Santa Fe Trails - The City has a longer-range planning effort through the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization). They did a Transit Master Plan a couple of years ago which is not just for the City, but encompasses surrounding areas as well.

That Plan is a guiding document and the City will begin in the next phase to focus more on direct services and look at expanding services. NCRTD has already completed that process.

Facilitator Romero added that from a ridership perspective the City has a short-term one-year budget. The City will look for money and opportunities to implement the longer-range plan.

Barbara Conroy - In what way is it more efficient? Where is the cost savings that makes it more efficient?

Answer: In terms of service integration, the point of the first section is to show the opportunities are limited on day one, but with consolidation they could pursue other opportunities.

• The Physical Assets section was presented.
Questions / Answers

Barbara Conroy – Why does Santa Fe Trails system have such large buses?

Answer: SFT needs larger vehicles than NCRTD because they carry more people than NCRTD. TMD did not do a service design analysis, but it has been indicated that one is planned for next year. Something to look at is whether the vehicles are properly used or a slightly smaller vehicle could be used for some routes. There is also a desire to have commonality of fleet which would lessen the maintenance costs.

Facilitator Romero asked Keith Wilson with SFT to address their study next year to evaluate the size of buses.

Keith Wilson – SFT looks at the size of buses on an ongoing basis. The current fleet has a variety of sizes; the bigger blue ones and some smaller buses. They have to mix the travel of the buses so they are not on the same route all the time and is why you might see a giant bus when it isn’t really needed.

Tomás Herrera with Chainbreaker Collective - Two things; first more people should be riding the bus so if we had expanded service we would need the double-decker bus.

Second, I always tell people if they look out on Cerrillos at certain times of the day you only see one or two cars go by, but that doesn’t mean that Cerrillos Road doesn’t need to be bigger. From the perspective of someone looking outside into the buses they may look empty, but there is standing room only on a lot of the buses.

Olivia Moreno-Carlson – I’m a community member in southwest Santa Fe. What I’ve seen here on the screen is a comparison of different services and that the NCRTD covers a more expansive area. And Santa Fe Transit covers Santa Fe, which is much more needed and a different type of service. NCRTD is expansive and very few people ride that bus.

So I’m not sure why it is only one sided. Where’s Santa Fe Transit here in counteracting these accusations on the Santa Fe Transit? I don’t see how these changes are going to make it for the better.

Answer: Facilitator Romero – This portrays the comparison of two distinct services. The City of Santa Fe does not just do transit services, it does senior
services, roads, it provides water and library services, etc. It is an all encompassing service with transit as part of it.

The difference in NCRTD is that it does serve four counties through a regional tax and does do more rural service. These are two distinct services, but they both provide transit; one totally and one partially.

It is sometimes difficult to compare apples to apples. The team has given the best comparison of what is relevant for consideration to move forward with if there is a consolidation merger option.

Mr. Silverman added - The consolidation would allow the NCRTD management team to manage Santa Fe Trails, but doesn't necessarily change SFT as far as the customers, although there could be changes down the road. The study would propose that the management operation of SFT transfer from a City operation to a regional operation.

NCRTD can legally run a full four-county area and SFT is currently restricted to the greater Santa Fe area. One of the goals when NCRTD was created was to look at the source of regional consolidation and this is the next step.

Mary Schruben – On the consolidation of the fleet, are the large SFT's natural gas buses built for the extensive routes.

Answer: No, the goal is still a local service and it seems highly necessary.

Tony Ortiz, driver for Santa Fe Trails - If they go private that means a lot of our benefits are going to change.

Answer: First, there is no consideration to go private. NCRTD is not a private operation, it is a public State agency but it has a Board and gets the majority of their funding from a GRT tax passed in 2008. It also gets federal and State funding and does not charge a fare. They are the equivalent of a State agency, they are not private.

Tony Ortiz – So if they go in that direction they’re going to be able to collect funds?

Answer: That will be covered in the Financial section of the presentation.

• The Financial section of the presentation was presented.

Questions / Answers
Tony Ortiz – In the study did you account for the vacancies that we have that occurred in all the services that are rendered?

**Answer:** No, we took the numbers as they were. The actual expenses based on cost-of-living increases etc., projected out to 2035.

Karen Heldmeyer asked that the questions and comments be repeated because the acoustics were terrible.

Mary Schruben – There are four counties that each contribute GRT to the NCRTD. What is the amount they contribute based on; ridership, miles, budget...?

**Answer:** Tony Mortillaro - There is a 1/8 of a cent GRT collected legally in all four counties. They do not have the option to opt out of the tax. When it goes to an election the congruent vote is the vote of all four counties together of the registered voters and it is a simple majority vote.

Tomás Rivera – On the fare structure the study talked about the different options for the financial piece. There was some talk was about increasing fares or omitting a fare and I didn’t hear anyone speak to that.

**Answer:** The current fare structure was assumed in every scenario.

Tomás Rivera – On page 8 under the paratransit piece it says that ‘Santa Fe Trails is dependent on the need to have a fare on their small driven buses despite a low cost recovery ratio, as a way to manage demand for fixed route and paratransit services’. Am I to understand that they are charging fares in order to keep ridership down?

**Answer:** Mr. Silverman - They are not charging fares to keep ridership down on fixed route. But on paratransit our experience is paratransit is a very open-ended system and if you don’t charge fares in an urban area you will get much higher usage. And if you have some fare it can be somewhat mitigated.

Mr. Silverman - Paratransit costs are extremely high and are typically 20 to 30 times per passenger than the cost of fixed route service throughout the country. You want to try to moderate that demand - not nonexistent - but you want people in an urban area with a lot of density to think about it before they request service. It is an on-demand service, not a scheduled service.
Tomás Rivera - it sounds like the answer is yes.

Mr. Silverman – No, I didn’t say ‘yes’. I said with paratransit in an urban area the team’s view is you will want to have some sort of fare level. The federal government supports that and allows transit agencies to charge up to double the fixed route fare for paratransit.

Mary Schruben - Is any of that urban paratransit fare subsidized? And what is it subsidized by?

Answer: Mr. Silverman – It is and is subsidized by the various funds that they get throughout the system; federal and State funds, etc., the flow of revenue that comes from throughout those sources. The MGRTD and whatever Santa Fe Trails sources are for their paratransit is a part of it.

Mary Schruben – Is it subsidized at 100%, or 50% or...?

Answer: Mr. Del Sorbo - Paratransit operation revenues from fares bring in about 2% of the cost to operate and 98% has to be filled by other revenue sources to pay for the service. That is not atypical and is a nationwide phenomenon, not just to this region.

Tony Ortiz – It seems like if the ridership is very small, then the amount of money they bring in is not being utilized in a good fashion. We saw a lot of slides but to me that is like Chinese; I don’t know what that’s all about. You guys are professionals at that and you’ve got to bring it to our level so we understand.

And not just me, I know City Council is going to vote on this ultimately and whatever they vote on is going to happen. So we are at the mercy of what’s going to happen there.

My concern is what are they truly going to do with the funds that are coming in. I think it can be utilized. I mean we’ve proved – I’ve been with the system 22 years - Santa Fe Trails - and we do a heck of a job. We service the people with dignity, compassion, we’re timely.

Tony Ortiz - Man, I don’t know who else can do that kind of job. We get perks from people who come within the City and they say, ‘You know what - you have the best transit system in the nation. I’ve never been in a transit system as good as yours.’
So being that this is a tourist element, Santa Fe, there is a way to approach these people. Now you come Johnny-come-lately, coming over here. Now that we’ve set it up they want to come in and re-do this at the behest of new ideas, or whatever that is. To me it’s very personal, because I take my job with a lot of pride; obviously, I’ve been there 22 years.

Facilitator Romero explained – You might have missed the part in the very beginning of what got us here. It was not the Johnny-come-lately. The budget last year of the City of Santa Fe was really tight and at the Council level, the Councilors that were elected and the Mayor, thought maybe there is a better idea of how to be more efficient.

Councilor Maestas passed a resolution that put into place a study to come up with options and that’s what this team has done. This is a study to come up with options that is one transit system that only does transit, and the City of Santa Fe that does a variety of services that include transit.

The decision is not being made tonight. The decision is to choose options going forward to combine. I’ve heard the professionals, those who have analyzed the numbers of the transit part say there are a number of options that could be generated within each of those, but we’re not there yet.

This team is tasked with looking at the options. We got here because the City had been struggling with balancing its budget and that started the conversation of what we could do that is better.

Karen Heldmeyer – You are sounding much more optimistic than these numbers give, because one option, which many of the Councilors felt was a reasonable option when presented at Council, is to leave it alone. Let us run Santa Fe Trails the way we’ve been running it and everyone else can do whatever else they want to do.

I didn’t see a whole lot of examples of where efficiencies were going to come in. The efficiencies that might come in that I think people in this room are interested in weren’t even mentioned, such as if SFT becomes part of NCRTD will the way they deliver service change?

That could be an efficiency, but it would be one that would not be terribly acceptable to a lot of people. And I think you’re hearing bits and pieces of that.

Facilitator Romero asked if the team wanted to add anything before the presentation continues with the Labor section.
Mr. Del Sorbo – A lot of these things will require the negotiation of a labor force piece to enhance this. There is a wide variety of areas where things could be done. Within transit agencies you have fixed route transportation, fixed route maintenance and paratransit and administrative and support services.

In terms of efficiencies we did see that the City of Santa Fe’s departments are supplying services to SFT at high cost. Some of the other services require additional steps to be taken that were beyond the scope of the study. Such as would a consolidated agency have a common platform for a scheduling system to look at the routes to see if they are as efficient as possible?

On the maintenance side how does the outsourcing within NCRTD play out in a consolidated agency with the ability to bring some of the work in-house? You are dealing with agencies that have less than 200 total positions, so the efficiencies will take time. There are not a lot of quick hits other than what was spotted in support services.

Other things have to play out on the labor side of things in terms of whether there are efficiencies and economies that could be negotiated. Those are all longer term than day one.

We are laying out a few options and policy makers could have completely different options that generate different efficiencies. It is premature to say specifically what could be done until you know what the content of the organization as a consolidated agency could be.

Mr. Silverman – We experience throughout the country that generally when transportation is run by transportation-specific agencies like NCRTD - you have an overall better efficiency and better service over time. Day one would be unchanged, but the concept of a transportation agency running transportation seems in general seems to work well.

- The Labor section of the report was presented by Tom Del Sorbo.

Questions / Answers

*Chris Armijo - Is NCRTD going to employ every SFT Transit employee and assume the positions?*

*Answer:* Mr. Mortillaro - They will assume everything.
Chris Armijo – My understanding was from yesterday’s presentation in Espanola, you mentioned a scenario where you could not get the personnel records for the employees. So you would put employees on a probationary period once you guys took over. Is that correct?

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – That was after the Taos consolidation because NCRTD acquired all of the employees and all of the assets. We did not have any work experience with those employees and the only way NCRTD could ascertain what their performance would be was to put them on probation. It was a nonunionized workforce.

We said if you don’t want to give us access to your personnel files you will be on a six month probationary period, but if you give us access the probationary period is only three months. Most employees opted for that.

Chris Armijo – So by getting access to the personnel file, then you would be vetting out the employee.

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – No, that is not what NCRTD was doing. We had the file just in case there were any performance issues or anything during the three month period. We could look through the personnel file to see if there was similar behavior in the past that might lead in the direction that this has been happening. It was not a vetting process. NCRTD accepted everybody as is and the only difference was whether they were on a six month or a three month probation period.

Chris Armijo – So you did say it may lead to a disciplinary action based on what you were reading from the personnel file.

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – No, I said it could lead to a personnel action or it wouldn’t, based on what they did at the time they were employed with us. And we would also look at the personnel files to see if there had been similar behavior or infractions from a progressive disciplinary standpoint.

Chris Armijo – So Mr. Ortiz here, who has been here with the City for 20 plus years, in the event of consolidation and something happens to him within that six-month probationary period - he is out.

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro - Not necessarily. It depends on the personnel infraction and the seriousness of it. It is no different with the City of Santa Fe.
Tony Ortiz - So I would have to start at probation again. You’re still on probation. In most corporations I know, there’s favoritism. Now, we don’t know if you guys operate that way. I mean obviously everybody’s got their best foot forward and everything’s supposed to be peachy and wow, we’re going to really go for it. But is that really the reality?

We built this thing. I remember using some of the oldest buses. I mean, you talk about putting ice in the coolers; we didn’t have air-conditioners. We made it work. I mean we can make anything work if you want. If you want people that want to make it work and that care for their job, they do whatever they have to do to make it work. I mean we had holes on the floor. We used our overalls to make it work.

I mean, now that it’s nice everybody wants to jump on the wagon here and say hey, we want part of what you’re doing.

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – There’s no question about the caliber and the quality of the Santa Fe Transit System, but remember, NCRTD didn’t approach the City. The City approached us.

Tony Ortiz – I know I understand that, but I want you to hear my side of the story.

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – Our employees have stories about how we developed. We started over 13 years ago with one employee...

Tony Ortiz – Thirteen years ago, so you guys are a new operation. We’ve been doing this for a long time. But between all the drivers that we have, we have guys that have driven coast-to-coast; truck drivers. These guys are committed. We’ve got the best crew. I’m really proud of our crew.

Karen Heldmeyer - So, I’ve seen this presentation now three times. It was given to the City Council and I think this is an appropriate presentation for a Governing Body and I know it was given to the NCRTD Board as well. That was appropriate, but when you go out to the public I think it needs to be clarified, simplified. We heard one comment, “It is all Greek to me”. You don’t want the public to say it’s all Greek.

The unions have individuals who can evaluate what was in this proposal, but the average person, the average rider, cannot. I don’t know if you have to throw the consultants a bit more money to have two presentations rather than just one, but this didn’t even address the questions that people have been asking me that they want
answered. And some of them could've been I think, had the presentation been more simplified.

Facilitator Romero asked to answer from a public involvement perspective and then have the consultant team add comment.

The kind of work I do is that after the analysis is done there is input. In this instance the analysis was done. There is probably a step where if decision-makers had given more boundaries of what was possible before going out to the public, options could have been simplified. In this instance the analysis was narrowed down to three options and the decision-makers heard the information, the same information you are talking about.

The next level of analysis is to say we really think this is a great idea or we could make option two work. There are different ways of creating options, but the piece that is missing is do you want to spend more money to do a further analysis. Is there the will to go to the next level to get an analysis you can sink your teeth into?

There is a limited budget to get this part done to find if there is enough appetite here to hear that it warrants more. And if there is, let's hear that. That is the part the public will want to grapple with.

Karen Heldmeyer – It is not me that makes that decision, it is the Governing Body. The problem is that it is not clear what the public wants or whether they are expressing what they want if they don’t understand what the questions are in the first place.

Facilitator Romero agreed it is a lot of information for the public to absorb.

Mr. Mortillaro – It is definitely a difficult issue. I think from my perspective usually what the public wants to know is if anything is going to change. And if it changes, is anything going to be detrimental to the services. I can tell you from what the NCRTD has done historically, we have always increased services. Our background is we've never downgraded, we've always enhanced service.

Karen Heldmeyer - Will you put that in writing?

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – I can tell you that the FTA put that in writing and gave NCRTD the 2014 Rural Service Award, one of only six agencies in the nation. That confirmed for us and our customers that we are a high performing, very sensitive rural agency, but we have urban level services as well.

Tony Ortiz – Where is the urban?
Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – La Cienega, the Town of Taos...

Tony Ortiz – That’s like out in the outskirts, but you don’t have anything within the City?

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – No, because that would be competing with SFT and NCRTD doesn’t compete...

Tony Ortiz – But that’s what you guys want. You want to sort of come into the City.

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – No, that’s not at all what we’re talking about here.

Joshua Vigil with Chainbreaker read a statement into record:

"I’m a Chainbreaker’s member and a bus rider and as a bus rider it is important to me that my voice is not only heard, but also responded to. Right now, Santa Fe Trails is governed by elected officials who were directly accountable to the Santa Fe people. If this merger happens, the future of Santa Fe Trails will be voted on by a majority of people who are not representing Santa Fe and only one who is directly accountable to Santa Fe voters. Mobility is already a challenge to us bus riders and in order to engage directly with RTD, we would have to travel to a different city during work hours. This would be practically impossible for bus riders like myself. If the merger happens, what systems of accountability will there be to ensure that the people who will be making decisions about Santa Fe Trail service, fares and future, will be accountable to bus riders like myself?" (Exhibit 3)

Facilitator Romero thanked Joshua Vigil for his comment.

Dave McQuarie – You know I only care about one thing, which is the paratransit van. That is mainly why I came tonight. But I do agree with Councilor Heldmeyer where if you proceed further, please make it clearer and clarify what’s happening. Also tell us exactly what is going to be impacted.

And on paratransit - what will happen? I have read all your booklets and I can only say that paratransit might as well not even exist. Thank you.

Facilitator Romero asked Mr. McQuarie if he was able to access the information online and he indicated he cannot get online. She provided him with a hard copy of the PowerPoint presentation.
Miles Conway - The report in passing mentions the volatility of federal funding. Are you able to expand on that?

Answer: First, it is a year to year competition for federal funding. Secondly, the study basically used the assumption that was agreed upon by that on fleet replacement 80% of the cost would be covered and 20% would be matched. If we were to have a different analysis, you would have to determine how to pay for replacing millions of dollars of over-age buses, or the kinds of deficits those agencies would incur to replace them.

The conventional assumption on the 80% on fleet replacement, generally the biggest and most expensive component, makes sense. No one can predict especially in the current environment, how federal funding will play out. You have to start somewhere and if you started at 0 or 50% the numbers would have ballooned in terms of deficits and the ability to pay for replacement buses. So we used the 80 percent.

SFT has a two bus a year replacement and a no expansion situation. If we knew for certain there was federal funding, the perspective might have been different.

Mr. Silverman added - With both organizations, the consolidation aspect really doesn’t affect the assumption per se, because the assumption was that the consolidation doesn’t change the federal funding available.

Miles Conway – I think a scenario like a rainy day scenario, didn’t get played out in the goal of this study. And I don’t think anyone here can really speak to scenario three, what the appetite is for county voters to use the GRT for funding. You start to get into these possible outcomes. I don’t think we should go there for fear.

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro - Let me talk about the challenges of transit State-wide. The reason I can speak to that is I’m on my third year as the President of the New Mexico Transit Association. The Association represents all of the public transit agencies in the State. They are all struggling because there is not enough federal money and the needs are greater than the resources. A lot of them have to make do with what they have and a number of them are city operated systems. They are competing with increased demands, road improvements, road repair and maintenance, etc. The same thing you experienced.

Under the FAST (Fixing America’s Surface Transportation) Act, the State of New Mexico will see about $1 million a year increase in federal funding. That doesn’t go very far if you think about there are 47 Transit agencies and giving them all
an equal piece is only about $20,000. That might replace a transmission on a big bus.

So the New Mexico Transit Association has been working with the State Legislature for the last three years. They are trying to find a way to have State funding for Transit systems in New Mexico to help with capital replacement. We’re not asking for operating, we asking for money toward capital replacement.

It has been a struggle and this year, obviously all bets are off because the State is in poor financial condition. But the New Mexico State Transit Association is committed to continued work with the State Legislature and will hopefully get some source of State funding for transit capital needs.

_Miles Conway – You spoke about hold harmless too and that if the State’s calculations on the counties are involved, it is definitely a reality. Rio Arriba County’s budget just hit 16 furlough days and that must trickle down to the Regional Transit._

**Answer:** Mr. Mortillaro – We experienced the highs and lows of the economies in all four counties. There have been times when the economy in Santa Fe and Santa Fe County was performing poorly, but Los Alamos was performing very well and that offset our numbers. Los Alamos and Rio Arriba County has been taking a hit, but Taos County, because of expansion at the ski area and the mine clean up, has generated additional revenues.

You’ve got to be careful because a lot of the revenues are generated sometimes by one-time projects. NCRTD operates in a reserve and a timed reserve. Our base is 25%, but if you actually look at how much money we have in reserves it is more like 60 percent. That gives us the luxury if we don’t get federal money, to go buy a bus for cash. But our preference is to use the federal money, not our money and save our money for rainy days.

Mr. Mortillaro - You are right though, when you go to the voters you never know what the outcome will be. We do our best to educate and inform them and they go into the ballot box and confirm that you are doing a good job with their money, or tell you are doing a lousy job.

_Karen Heldmeyer – As we see with the current county referendum they are saying, “I don’t know. You’re not giving me enough information”. And when that happens they vote no._

Mr. Mortillaro – I think from our perspective we don’t have the luxury of our Board saying ’yes let’s put this tax in place’ as cities and counties do. There are some
GRT elements that have to go to the voters. We have to go to the voters. We don’t have an option and the first time we went to voters was in 2008. We went to the voters in all four counties and asked them to approve a 1/8 of a cent GRT for Regional Transit. The voters were told what they would get for that.

Regional Transit was a brand-new concept. We were formed in 2004 and for three years our members were writing checks to the NCRTD for being members and for services. Los Alamos was writing a $1.1 million dollar check; Santa Fe County and the Pueblos were writing checks. Then when the voters approved the 1/8 of a cent GRT our members didn’t have to write checks anymore. Los Alamos still writes checks to us for services and that’s their generosity.

We don’t know what is going to happen if the one lab goes out for their contract and it goes public. It will impact the GRT collected and the NCRTD by about $1 million and that trickles down. Right now SFT receives $1 million from NCRTD (12% of SFT’s budget) and if we all have to share the pain from the reduction in Los Alamos, we will all share the pain.

So we contribute right now to your operations [SFT] and the costs to operate.

Tony Ortiz – What do you get out of it?

Answer: Mr. Mortillaro – We don’t get anything out of that. We’re contributing because we believe in regional services and you are providing some services that are regional.

Next Steps

Facilitator Romero explained the comments will be gathered for two more weeks. The stenographer will summarize the comments that were made and then all of the comments will be synthesized from all four of the meetings into one document and given to the Governing Body. The consultants will take all of the information and develop a final report. There is a tight timeline to get all of the information together to give people time to review. This concludes this part of the work.

The NCRTD will talk to their Board at the next meeting on October 13, 2017.

Facilitator Romero thanked the TMD team and everyone for coming and encouraged people to go online and contact their Councilors if they had questions. She
apologized for the acoustics and noise and committed to finding venues for future meetings that will be more appropriate.

**Adjourn:**

_The meeting at Genoveva Chavez Community Center adjourned at 7:30 p.m._
Title: Discussion and Consideration of Resolution 2017-33 Authorizing the NCRTD Staff to apply for Federal funding through the FFY2017 TIGER grant program for the following project: a Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Station.

Prepared By:
Stacey McGuire, Planning, Projects & Grants Manager

Summary:
NCRTD Staff is seeking Board approval to apply for FFY2017 TIGER grant funding for a Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Station project.

Background:
The construction of the Transit Maintenance Facility will include a Vehicle Maintenance Garage, a Vehicle Wash Bay and a Fueling Station, to fulfill current needs as well as being capable of accommodating future operations and fleet expansion. Current fleet inventory is approximately 64 vehicles, ranging in size from 40-foot buses to 5-passenger transport vans and standard-size vehicles. Fleet expansion is anticipated to be one (1) to two (2) vehicles annually. The Maintenance Facility complex will be situated on the existing approximately 7 acre site adjacent to the Jim West Regional Transit Center and Vehicle Parking Yard. Work will include site preparation, geotechnical evaluation and preparation, environmental assessment, final design and construction. The facility-to-be design team will maximize utilization of green building energy saving facility standards wherever possible.

The Board of Directors authorized the Staff to move forward with the conceptual design at their February 1, 2013 meeting, with the design contract ultimately awarded to Huitt-Zollars in July 2013. At the March 2014 Board meeting, Huitt-Zollars presented its design findings and construction and general cost estimates. Site assessments and soil borings were also completed. Upon completion of final design and bidding, the Maintenance Facility Complex will be shovel-ready.
**Recommended Action:**
It is recommended that the Board move to adopt Resolution 2017- 33 Authorizing the NCRTD Staff to apply for Federal funding through the FFY2017 TIGER grant program for a Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Station. The FFY2017 TIGER grant application deadline is October 16, 2017.

**Options/Alternatives:**
- Board approval to adopt Resolution 2017- 33 Authorizing the NCRTD Staff to apply for Federal funding through the FFY2017 TIGER grant program for a Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Station; or
- Do not apply for FFY2017 TIGER funding, direct Staff to seek alternative funding sources; or
- Do not attempt to procure funds to construct a Maintenance Facility Complex and continue to outsource vehicle maintenance services.

**Fiscal Impact:**
FFY2017 TIGER funds for rural areas will provide up to 100% of the cost of the project; however, the NOFA does emphasize that projects that demonstrate a local match component will increase their competitiveness in the TIGER arena. Given this, it is recommended that the NCRTD commit to a ten (10) percent match for the Maintenance Facility Complex.

The NCRTD will be requesting TIGER funds for the Maintenance Facility, Fueling Station and Vehicle Wash Bay for the approximate amount of $5,503,097 (assuming an NCRTD match of 10% of approximately $611,455; estimated total project cost is $6,114,552). The potential award would significantly impact the overall cost of the project as well as potentially improve the ultimate construction and implementation timeline.

**Attachments:**
- FFY2017 TIGER NOFO (Notice of Funding Opportunity)
- Resolution No. 2017- 33
North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD)  
Resolution 2017-33  

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT TO APPLY FOR FEDERAL FUNDING THROUGH THE FFY2017 TIGER GRANT PROGRAM FOR A MAINTENANCE FACILITY, WASH BAY, AND FUELING STATION

WHEREAS, the USDOT issued a notice for funding availability for the FFY2017 TIGER grant program on September 7, 2017; and

WHEREAS, final applications are due October 16, 2017; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD has identified capital improvements related to the efficient and effective day-to-day operations and maintenance of its fleet; and

WHEREAS, upon selection to receive TIGER FFY2017 funds, the NCRTD is committed to provide a ten (10) percent match (approximately $611,455) of overall project cost ($6.114 million); and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD was created through legislative enactment (NMSA 1978, Section 73-25-1 et seq.); and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD is a sub-division of the State of New Mexico; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD was approved and certified by the New Mexico Department of Transportation on the 14th day of September 2004.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the request for NCRTD Board authorization to submit for a FFY2017 TIGER grant to fund a new Maintenance Facility, Wash Bay, and Fueling Station is approved.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ON THIS 13th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017.

Approved as to form:  

__________________________________  
Daniel Barrone, Chairman

__________________________________  
Peter Dwyer, Counsel
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Office of the Secretary of Transportation
Notice of Funding Opportunity for the Department of Transportation’s National Infrastructure Investments Under the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017
AGENCY: Office of the Secretary of Transportation, DOT.
ACTION: Notice of funding opportunity.

SUMMARY: The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (Pub. L. 115–31, May 5, 2017) ("FY 2017 Appropriations Act" or the "Act") appropriated $500 million to be awarded by the Department of Transportation ("DOT" or the "Department") for National Infrastructure Investments. This appropriation stems from the program funded and implemented pursuant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (the "Recovery Act") known as the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery, or "TIGER" Discretionary Grants," program. Because of the program’s similarity in structure and program name recognition, DOT will continue to refer to the program as "TIGER Discretionary Grants." Funds for the FY 2017 TIGER program ("TIGER FY 2017") are to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region. The purpose of this Final Notice is to solicit applications for TIGER Discretionary Grants.

DATES: Applications must be submitted by 8:00 p.m. E.D.T. on October 16, 2017.

ADDRESSES: Applications must be submitted through Grants.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information concerning this notice, please contact the TIGER Discretionary Grants program staff via email at TIGERGrants@dot.gov, or call Howard Hill at 202–366–0301. A TDD is available for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing at 202–366–3993. In addition, DOT will regularly post answers to questions and requests for clarifications as well as information about webinars for further guidance on DOT’s Web site at www.transportation.gov/TIGER.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice is substantially similar to the final notice published for the TIGER Discretionary Grants program in the Federal Register on February 26, 2016 (81 FR 9355) for fiscal year 2016 funds. The selection criteria remain fundamentally the same as previous rounds of TIGER Discretionary Grants, but the description of each criterion was updated. The FY 2017 TIGER program will give special consideration to projects which emphasize improved access to reliable, safe, and affordable transportation for communities in rural areas, such as projects that improve infrastructure condition, address public health and safety, promote regional connectivity, or facilitate economic growth or competitiveness. For this round of TIGER Discretionary Grants, the maximum grant award is $25 million, and no more than $50 million can be awarded to a single State, as specified in the FY 2017 Appropriations Act. Each section of this notice contains information and instructions relevant to the application process for these TIGER Discretionary Grants, and all applicants should read this notice in its entirety so that they have the information they need to submit eligible and competitive applications.
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A. Program Description
The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (Pub. L. 115–31, May 5, 2017) ("FY 2017 Appropriations Act" or the "Act") appropriated $500 million to be awarded by the Department of Transportation ("DOT" or the "Department") for National Infrastructure Investments. Since the TIGER Discretionary Grants program was first created, $5.1 billion has been awarded for capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure over eight rounds of competitive grants. Throughout the TIGER program, TIGER Discretionary Grants awards have supported projects that have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region. This includes, but is not limited to, capital projects in areas which repair bridges or improve infrastructure to a state of good repair; projects that implement safety improvements to reduce fatalities and serious injuries, including improving grade crossings or providing shorter or more direct access to critical health services; projects that connect communities and people to jobs, services, and education; and, projects that anchor economic revitalization and job growth in communities, and specifically those that help bring manufacturing and other jobs. The TIGER program also supports projects that demonstrate significant non-Federal contributions from State, local, and private sector funding sources. The Department recognizes the benefits of shared responsibility and accountability of infrastructure investment, as it facilitates increased rigor in decision making, provides evidence of support for the project, and leverages Federal investment. Over eight rounds, on average, projects attracted more than 3.6 matching dollars for every TIGER grant dollar, representing the shared responsibility for funding infrastructure.

Rural America is home to many of the nation’s most critical infrastructure assets, including 444,000 bridges, 2.98 million miles of roadway, and 30,500 miles of Interstate Highway. More than 55 percent of all public roads are locally-owned rural roads. While only 19 percent of the nation’s population lives in rural areas, 51 percent of all traffic fatalities occurred on rural roads (2014). In addition, public transportation serving rural areas has more than 160 million annual boardings (2015).

B. Federal Award Information
1. Amount Available
The FY 2017 Appropriations Act appropriated $500 million to be awarded by DOT for the TIGER Discretionary Grants program. The FY 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grants are for capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure and are to be awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant impact on the Nation, a metropolitan area, or a region. The FY 2017 Appropriations Act also allows DOT to retain up to $20 million of the $500 million for oversight and administration of grants and credit assistance made under the TIGER Discretionary Grants program. If this solicitation does not result in the award and obligation of all available funds, DOT may publish additional solicitations.

The FY 2017 Appropriations Act allows up to 20 percent of available funds (or $100 million) to be used by the Department to pay the subsidy and administrative costs for a project receiving credit assistance under the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 ("TIFIA") program, if that use of the FY 2017 TIGER funds would further the purposes of the TIGER Discretionary Grants program.
2. Award Size

The FY 2017 Appropriations Act specifies that TIGER Discretionary Grants may not be less than $5 million and not greater than $25 million, except that for projects located in rural areas (as defined in Section C.3.i.1) the minimum TIGER Discretionary Grant size is $1 million.

3. Restrictions on Funding

Pursuant to the FY 2017 Appropriations Act, no more than 10 percent of the funds made available for TIGER Discretionary Grants (or $50 million) may be awarded to projects in a single State. The Act also directs that not less than 20 percent of the funds provided for TIGER Discretionary Grants (or $100 million) shall be used for projects located in rural areas. Further, DOT must take measures to ensure an equitable geographic distribution of grant funds, an appropriate balance in addressing the needs of urban and rural areas, and investment in a variety of transportation modes.

4. Availability of Funds

The FY 2017 Appropriations Act requires that FY 2017 TIGER funds are only available for obligation through September 30, 2020. Obligation occurs when a selected applicant and DOT enter into a written grant agreement and is generally after the applicant has satisfied applicable administrative requirements, including transportation planning and environmental review requirements. No FY 2017 TIGER funds may be expended (actually paid out) after September 30, 2025. As part of the review and selection process described in Section E.2., DOT will consider whether a project is ready to proceed with an obligation of grant funds from DOT within the statutory time provided. No waiver is possible for these deadlines.

5. Previous TIGER Awards

Recipients of prior TIGER Discretionary Grants may apply for funding to support additional phases of a project awarded funds in earlier rounds of this program. However, to be competitive, the applicant should demonstrate the extent to which the previously funded project phase has been able to meet estimated project schedules and budget, as well as the ability to realize the benefits expected for the project.

C. Eligibility Information

To be selected for a TIGER Discretionary Grant, an applicant must be an Eligible Applicant and the project must be an Eligible Project.

1. Eligible Applicants

Eligible Applicants for TIGER Discretionary Grants are State, local, and tribal governments, including U.S. territories, transit agencies, port authorities, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and other political subdivisions of State or local governments.

Multiple States or jurisdictions may submit a joint application and must identify a lead applicant as the primary point of contact, and also identify the primary recipient of the award. Each applicant in a joint application must be an Eligible Applicant. Joint applications must include a description of the roles and responsibilities of each applicant and must be signed by each applicant.

2. Cost Sharing or Matching

This section describes the statutory cost share requirements for a TIGER award. Cost share will also be evaluated according to the evaluation criterion described in Section E.1.v. That section clarifies that the Department seeks applications for projects that exceed the minimum non-Federal cost share requirement described here.

Per the FY 2017 Appropriations Act, TIGER Discretionary Grants may be used for up to 80 percent of a project located in an urban area 1 and up to 100 percent of the costs of a project located in a rural area. Urban area and rural area are defined in Section C.3.ii of this notice.

For a project located in an urban area, the Federal share of the costs for which an expenditure is made under a TIGER grant may not exceed 80 percent. Non-Federal sources include State funds originating from programs funded by State revenue, local funds originating from State or local revenue-funded programs, or private funds. Toll credits under 23 U.S.C. 120(1) are considered a non-Federal source. Unless otherwise authorized by statute, local cost-share may not be counted as the non-Federal share for both the TIGER and another Federal grant program. The Department will not consider previously-encumbered costs or previously-expended or encumbered funds towards the matching requirement for any project. Matching funds are subject to the same Federal requirements described in Section F.2. as awarded funds. Given the TIFIA statute, the Department may not be able to consider funds from

---

1 To meet match requirements, the minimum total project cost for a project located in an urban area must be $6.25 million.

TIFIA towards the matching requirement. While RIF credit assistance will be counted towards match requirements, the Department will give greater preference to state, local, and private sources of matching funds.

3. Other

i. Eligible Projects

Eligible projects for TIGER Discretionary Grants are capital projects that include, but are not limited to: (1) Highway, bridge, or other road projects eligible under title 23, United States Code; (2) public transportation projects eligible under chapter 336 of title 49, United States Code; (3) passenger and freight rail transportation projects; (4) port infrastructure investments (including inland port infrastructure and land ports of entry); and (5) intermodal projects. This description of eligible projects is identical to the description of eligible projects under earlier rounds of the TIGER Discretionary Grants program.2

Research, demonstration, or pilot projects are eligible only if they result in long-term, permanent surface transportation infrastructure that has independent utility as defined in Section C.3.iii. Applicants are strongly encouraged to submit applications only for eligible award amounts.

ii. Rural/Urban Definition

For purposes of this Notice, DOT defines "rural area" as an area outside an Urbanized Area 3 (UA) as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau. In this Notice, an "urban area" is defined as an area inside a UA as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau.4

The Department will consider a project to be in a rural area if the majority of the project (determined by geographic location[s] where the majority of the money is to be spent) is located in a rural area. However, if a project consists of multiple components, as described under Section C.3.iii., then for each separate component the Department will determine whether that component is rural or urban. In some circumstances, this component-by-component determination may result in

---

2 Please note that the Department may use a TIGER Discretionary Grant to pay for the surface transportation components of a broader project that has non-surface transportation components, and applicants are encouraged to apply for TIGER Discretionary Grants to pay for the surface transportation components of these projects.

3 Updated lists of UAs as defined by the Census Bureau are available on the Census Bureau Web site at http://www2.census.gov/geo/maps/dc/10map/ UAUC_RefMap/au/.

4 See www.transportation.gov/TIGER for a list of UAs.
TIGER awards that include urban and rural funds. Rural and urban definitions differ in some other DOT programs, including TIFIA and the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program (§ 1105; 23 U.S.C. 117). This definition affects three aspects of the program. The FY 2017 Appropriations Act directs that (1) not less than $100 million of the funds provided for TIGER Discretionary Grants are to be used for projects in rural areas; (2) for a project in a rural area the minimum award is $1 million; and (3) the Secretary may increase the Federal share above 80 percent to pay for the costs of a project in a rural area.

iii. Project Components

An application may describe a project that contains more than one component, and may describe components that may be carried out by parties other than the applicant. DOT may award funds for a component, instead of the larger project. If that component (1) independently meets minimum award amounts described in Section B and all eligibility requirements described in Section C; (2) independently aligns well with the selection criteria specified in Section E; and (3) meets National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements with respect to independent utility. Independent utility means that the component will represent a transportation improvement that is usable and represents a reasonable expenditure of DOT funds even if no other improvements are made in the area, and will be ready for intended use upon completion of that component’s construction. All project components that are presented together in a single application must demonstrate a relationship or connection between them. (See Section D.2.v. for Required Approvals).

Applicants should be aware that, depending upon the relationship between project components and applicable Federal law, DOT funding of only some project components may make other project components subject to Federal requirements as described in Section F.2.

DOT strongly encourages applicants to identify in their applications the project components that have independent utility and separately detail costs and requested TIGER funding for those components. If the application identifies one or more independent project components, the application should clearly identify how each independent component addresses selection criteria and produces benefits on its own, in addition to describing how the full proposal of which the independent component is a part addresses selection criteria.

iv. Application Limit

Each lead applicant may submit no more than three applications. Unrelated project components should not be bundled in an application for the purpose of adhering to the limit. Please note that the three-application limit applies only to applications where the applicant is the lead applicant. There is no limit on the number of applications for which an applicant can be listed as a partnering agency. If a lead applicant submits more than three applications as the lead applicant, only the first three received will be considered. The FY 2017 and 2018 Infrastructure for Rebuilding American (INFRA) Grants solicitation (82 FR 14042) and the 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grant program have independent application limits. Applicants applying to both INFRA grants and the 2017 TIGER Discretionary Grants program may apply for funding for the same project under both programs (noted in each application), but must timely submit separate applications that independently address how the project satisfies applicable selection criteria for the relevant grant program. To the extent that an application for the same project submitted to both programs contains few or no changes to a benefit-cost analysis or project readiness information, DOT may review and incorporate the previously completed analysis by Department staff into the application’s evaluation when considering the project for a FY 2017 TIGER award.

D. Application and Submission Information

1. Address

Applications must be submitted to Grants.gov. Instructions for submitting applications can be found at www.transportation.gov/TIGER along with specific instructions for the forms and attachments required for submission.

2. Content and Form of Application Submission

The application must include the Standard Form 424 (Application for Federal Assistance), Standard Form 424C (Budget Information for Construction Programs), cover page, and the Project Narrative. More detailed information about the cover pages and Project Narrative follows. Applicants should also complete and attach to their application the “TIGER 2017 Project Information” form available at www.transportation.gov/TIGER.

The Department recommends that the project narrative follow the basic outline below to address the program requirements and assist evaluators in locating relevant information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Project Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Grant Funds, Sources and Uses of all Project Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Merit Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Project Readiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project narrative should include the information necessary for the Department to determine that the project satisfies project requirements described in Sections B and C and to assess the selection criteria specified in Section E.1. To the extent practicable, applicants should provide supporting data and documentation in a form that is directly verifiable by the Department. The Department may ask any applicant to supplement data in its application, but expects applications to be complete upon submission.

In addition to a detailed statement of work, detailed project schedule, and detailed project budget, the project narrative should include a table of contents, maps, and graphics, as appropriate to make the information easier to review. The Department recommends that the project narrative be prepared with standard formatting preferences (a single-spaced document, using a standard 12-point font such as Times New Roman, with 1-inch margins). The project narrative may not exceed 30 pages in length, excluding cover pages and table of contents. The only substantive portions that may exceed the 30-page limit are documents supporting assertions or conclusions made in the 30-page project narrative. If possible, Web site links to supporting documentation should be provided rather than copies of these supporting materials. If supporting documents are submitted, applicants should clearly identify within the project narrative the relevant portion of the project narrative that each supporting document supports. At the applicant’s discretion, relevant materials provided previously to an operating administration in support of a different DOT financial assistance program may be referenced and described as unchanged. The Department recommends using appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., “Project Narrative,” “Maps,” “Memoranda of Understanding and
Letters of Support,” etc.) for all attachments. DOT recommends applications include the following sections:

i. Project Description

The first section of the application should provide a concise description of the project, the transportation challenges that it is intended to address, and how it will address those challenges. This section should discuss the project’s history, including a description of any previously completed components. The applicant may use this section to place the project into a broader context, utilizing other transportation investments being pursued by the project sponsor, and, if applicable, how it will benefit communities in rural areas.

ii. Project Location

This section of the application should describe the project location, including a detailed geographical description of the proposed project, a map of the project’s location, and connections to existing transportation infrastructure, and geospatial data describing the project location. If the project is located within the boundary of a Census-designated UA, the application should identify the UA.

iii. Grant Funds, Sources and Uses of Project Funds

This section of the application should describe the project’s budget. This budget should not include any previously incurred expenses. At a minimum, it should include:

(A) Project costs;
(B) For all funds to be used for eligible project costs, the source and amount of those funds;
(C) For non-Federal funds to be used for eligible project costs, documentation of funding commitments should be referenced here and included as an appendix to the application;
(D) For Federal funds to be used for eligible project costs, the amount, nature, and source of any required non-Federal match for those funds;
(E) A budget showing how each source of funds will be spent. The budget should show how each funding source will share in each major construction activity, and present that data in dollars and percentages. Funding sources should be grouped into three categories: Non-Federal; TIGER; and other Federal. If the project contains individual components, the budget should separate the costs of each project component. If the project will be completed in phases, the budget should separate the costs of each phase. The budget detail should sufficiently demonstrate that the project satisfies the statutory cost-sharing requirements described in Section C.2;
In addition to the information enumerated above, this section should provide complete information on how all project funds may be used. For example, if a particular source of funds is available only after a condition is satisfied, the application should identify the condition and describe the applicant’s control over whether it is satisfied. Similarly, if a particular source of funds is available for expenditure only during a fixed time period, the application should describe that restriction. Complete information about project funds will ensure that the Department’s expectations for award execution align with any funding restrictions unrelated to the Department, even if an award differs from the applicant’s request.

iv. Merit Criteria

This section of the application should describe how the project aligns with the Merit Criteria described in Section E.1 of this Notice. The Department encourages applicants to either address each criterion or express a position that the project does not address the criterion. Applicants are not required to follow a specific format, but the outline suggested below, which addresses each criterion separately, promotes a clear discussion that assists project evaluators. To minimize redundant information in the application, the Department encourages applicants to cross-reference from this section of their application to relevant substantive information in other sections of the application. The guidance in this section is about how the applicant should organize their application. Guidance describing how the Department will evaluate projects against the Merit Criteria is in Section E.1 of this Notice. Applicants should review that section before considering how to organize their application.

(1) Primary Selection Criteria

(a) Safety

This section of the application should describe the anticipated outcomes of the project that support the Safety criterion (described in Section E.1.i. of this Notice). The applicant should include information on, and to the extent possible, quantify, how the project would improve safety outcomes within the project area or wider transportation network, to include how the project will reduce the number, rate, and consequences of transportation-related accidents, serious injuries, and fatalities among transportation users, or how the project will eliminate unsafe grade crossings or contribute to preventing unintentional releases of hazardous materials.

(b) State of Good Repair

This section of the application should describe how the project will contribute to a state of good repair by improving the condition or resilience of existing transportation facilities and system (described in Section E.1.i. of this Notice), including the project’s current condition and how the proposed project will improve it, and any estimation of impacts on long-term cost structures or impacts on overall life-cycle costs.

(c) Economic Competitiveness

This section of the application should describe how the project will support the Economic Competitiveness criterion (described in Section E.1.i. of this Notice). The applicant should include information about expected impacts of the project on the movement of goods and people, including how the project increases the efficiency of movement and thereby reduces costs of doing business, reduces burdens of commuting, and improves overall well-being. The applicant should describe the extent to which the project contributes to the functioning and growth of the economy, including the extent to which the project addresses congestion, bridges service gaps in rural areas, or attracts private economic development.

(d) Environmental Sustainability

This section of the application should describe how the project addressed the environmental sustainability criterion. Applicants are encouraged to provide quantitative information, including baseline information that demonstrates how the project will reduce energy consumption, stormwater runoff, or achieve other benefits for the environment such as brownfield redevelopment.

(e) Quality of Life

This section should describe how the project increases transportation choices for individuals to provide more freedom on transportation decisions and improves access to essential services for people in communities across the United States, particularly for rural communities.
(2) Secondary Selection Criteria

(a) Innovation

This section of the application should describe innovative strategies used to pursue primary selection criteria and the anticipated benefits of using those strategies. If an applicant is proposing to adopt innovative safety approaches or technology, the application should demonstrate the applicant’s capacity to implement those innovations, the applicant’s understanding of whether the innovations will require extraordinary permitting, approvals, or other procedural actions, and the effects of those innovations on the project delivery timeline. If an applicant plans to incorporate innovative funding or financing, the applicant should describe the funding or financing approach, including a description of all activities undertaken to pursue private funding or financing for the project and the outcomes of those activities.

(b) Partnership

This section of the application should list all project parties, including details about the proposed grant recipient and other public and private parties who are involved in delivering the project. This section should also describe efforts to collaborate among stakeholders, including with the private sector.

v. Project Readiness

This section of the application should include information that, when considered with the project budget information presented elsewhere in the application, is sufficient for the Department to evaluate whether the project is reasonably expected to begin construction in a timely manner. To assist the Department’s project readiness assessment, the applicant should provide the information requested on technical feasibility, project schedule, project approvals, and project risks, each of which is described in greater detail in the following sections.

Applicants are not required to follow the specific format described here, but this organization, which addresses each relevant aspect of project readiness, promotes a clear discussion that assists project evaluators. To minimize redundant information in the application, the Department encourages applicants to cross-reference from this section of their application to relevant substantive information in other sections of the application.

The guidance here is about what information applicants should provide and how the applicant should organize their application. Guidance describing how the Department will evaluate a project’s readiness is described in Section E.1 of this Notice. Applicants also should review that section when considering how to organize their application.

(A) Technical Feasibility. The applicant should demonstrate the technical feasibility of the project with engineering and design studies and activities; the development of design criteria and/or a basis of design; the basis for the cost estimate presented in the TIGER application, including the identification of contingency levels appropriate to its level of design; and any scope, schedule, and budget risk-mitigation measures. Applicants should include a detailed statement of work that focuses on the technical and engineering aspects of the project and describes in detail the project to be constructed.

(B) Project Schedule. The applicant should include a detailed project schedule that identifies all major project milestones. Examples of such milestones include State and local planning approvals (programming on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program), start and completion of NEPA and other Federal environmental reviews and approvals including permitting; design completion; right of way acquisition; award of plans, specifications and estimates; procurement; State and local approvals; project partnership and implementation agreements including agreements with railroads; and construction. The project schedule should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that:

(1) All necessary activities will be complete to allow TIGER funds to be obligated sufficiently in advance of the statutory deadline (September 30, 2020 for FY 2017 funds), and that any unexpected delays will not put the funds at risk of expiring before they are obligated;

(2) the project can begin construction quickly upon obligation of TIGER funds, and that the grant funds will be spent expeditiously once construction starts; and

(3) all real property and right-of-way acquisition will be completed in a timely manner in accordance with 49 CFR part 24, 23 CFR part 710, and other applicable legal requirements or a statement that no acquisition is necessary.

(C) Required Approvals.

(1) Environmental Permits and Reviews. The application should demonstrate receipt (or reasonably anticipated receipt) of all environmental approvals and permits necessary for the project to proceed to construction on the timeline specified in the project schedule and necessary to meet the statutory obligation deadline, including satisfaction of all Federal, State and local requirements and completion of the NEPA process. Specifically, the application should include:

(a) Information about the NEPA status of the project. If the NEPA process is complete, an applicant should indicate the date of completion, and provide a Web site link or other reference to the final Categorical Exclusion, Finding of No Significant Impact, Record of Decision, and any other NEPA documents prepared. If the NEPA process is underway, but not complete, the application should detail the type of NEPA review underway, where the project is in the process, and indicate the anticipated date of completion of all milestones and of the final NEPA determination. If the last agency action with respect to NEPA documents occurred more than three years before the application date, the applicant should describe why the project has been delayed and include a proposed approach for verifying and, if necessary, updating this material in accordance with applicable NEPA requirements.

(b) Information on reviews, approvals, and permits by other agencies. An application should indicate whether the proposed project requires reviews or approval actions by other agencies, indicate the status of such actions, and provide detailed information about the status of those reviews or approvals and should demonstrate compliance with any other applicable Federal, State, or local requirements, and when such approvals are expected. Applicants should provide a Web site link or other reference to copies of any reviews, approvals, and permits prepared.

(c) Environmental studies or other documents, preferably through a Web site link, that describe in detail known project impacts, and possible mitigation for those impacts.

(d) A description of discussions with the appropriate DOT operating administration field or headquarters office regarding the project’s compliance with NEPA and other applicable Federal environmental reviews and approvals.

(e) A description of public engagement about the project that has occurred, including details on the degree to which public comments and commitments have been integrated into project development and design.

5 Projects that may impact protected resources such as wetlands, species habitat, cultural or historic resources require review and approval by Federal and State agencies with jurisdiction over those resources.
(2) State and Local Approvals. The applicant should demonstrate receipt of State and local approvals on which the project depends, such as State and local environmental planning approvals and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) or Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) funding. Additional support from relevant State and local officials is not required; however, an applicant should demonstrate that the project has broad public support.

(3) Federal Transportation Requirements Affecting State and Local Planning. The planning requirements applicable to the Federal-aid highway program apply to all TIGER projects, but for port, freight, and rail projects planning requirements of the operating administration that will administer the TIGER project will also apply, including intermodal projects located at airport facilities. Applicants should demonstrate that a project is required to be included in the relevant State, metropolitan, and local planning documents has been or will be included in such documents. If the project is not included in a relevant planning document at the time the application is submitted, the applicant should submit a statement from the appropriate planning agency that actions are underway to include the project in the relevant planning document.

To the extent possible, freight projects should be included in a State Freight Plan and supported by a State Freight Advisory Committee (49 U.S.C. 70201, 70202), if these exist. Applicants should provide links or other documentation supporting this consideration.

Because projects have different schedules, the construction start date for each TIGER grant must be specified in the project-specific agreements signed by relevant operating administration and the grant recipients, based on critical path items that applicants identify in the application and will be consistent with relevant State and local plans.

(D) Assessment of Project Risks and Mitigation Strategies. Project risks, such as procurement delays, environmental uncertainties, increases in real estate acquisition costs, uncommitted local match, or lack of legislative approval, affect the likelihood of successful project start and completion. The applicant should identify all material risks to the project and the strategies that the lead applicant and any project partners have undertaken or will undertake in order to mitigate those risks. The applicant should assess the greatest risks to the project and identify how the project parties will mitigate those risks.

To the extent it is unfamiliar with the Federal program, the applicant should contact the appropriate DOT operating administration field or headquarters offices, as found in contact information at www.transportation.gov/TIGERgrants, for information on the pre-requisite steps to obligate Federal funds in order to ensure that their project schedule is reasonable and that there are no risks of delays in satisfying Federal requirements.

vi. Benefit Cost Analysis

This section describes the recommended approach for the completion and submission of a benefit-cost analysis (BCA) as an appendix to the Project Narrative. The results of the analysis should be summarized in the Project Narrative directly, as described in Section D.2.

Applicants should delineate each of their project’s expected outcomes in the form of a complete BCA to enable the Department to evaluate the project’s cost-effectiveness by estimating a benefit-cost ratio and calculating the magnitude of net benefits and costs for the project. In support of each project for which an applicant seeks funding, that applicant should submit a BCA that quantifies the expected benefits of the project against a no-build baseline, provides monetary estimates of the benefits’ economic value, and compares the properly-discounted present values of these benefits to the project’s estimated costs.

The primary economic benefits from projects eligible for TIGER grants are likely to include savings in travel time costs, vehicle operating costs, and safety costs for both existing users of the improved facility and new users who may be attracted to it as a result of the project. Reduced damages from vehicle emissions and savings in maintenance costs to public agencies may also be quantified. Applicants may describe other categories of benefits in the BCA that are more difficult to quantify and value in economic terms, such as improving the reliability of travel times or improvements to the existing human and natural environments (such as increased connectivity, improved public health, storm water runoff mitigation, and noise reduction), while also providing numerical estimates of the magnitude and timing of each of these additional impacts wherever possible. Any benefits claimed for the project, both quantified and unquantified, should be clearly tied to the expected outcomes of the project.

The BCA should include the full costs of developing, constructing, operating, and maintaining the proposed project, as well as the expected timing or schedule for costs in each of these categories. The BCA should consider the present discounted value of any remaining service life of the asset at the end of the analysis period (net of future maintenance and rehabilitation costs) as a deduction from the estimated costs.

The costs and benefits that are compared in the BCA should also cover the same project scope.

The BCA should carefully document the assumptions and methodology used to produce the analysis, including a description of the baseline, the sources of data used to project the outcomes of the project, and the values of key input parameters. Applicants should provide all relevant files used for their BCA, including any spreadsheet files and technical memos describing the analysis (whether created in-house or by a contractor). The spreadsheets and technical memos should present the calculations in sufficient detail and transparency to allow the analysis to be reproduced by DOT evaluators.
guidance for estimating some types of quantitative benefits and costs, together with recommended economic values for converting them to dollar terms and discounting to their present values, are available in the Department's guidance for conducting BCAs for projects seeking funding under the TIGER program (see https://www.transportation.gov/buildamerica/TIGERgrants).

vii. Cost Share

The applicant should describe the extent to which the project cannot be readily and efficiently completed without a TIGER Discretionary Grant, and describe the extent to which other sources of funds, including Federal, State, or local funding, may or may not be readily available for the project. This section of the application should include information that, when considered with the project budget information presented elsewhere in the application, is sufficient for the Department to evaluate how the project addresses the Cost Share criterion, including:

(A) A description of the applicant’s activities to maximize the non-Federal share of the project funding;
(B) a description of any fiscal constraints that affect the applicant’s ability to use non-Federal contributions;
(C) a description of the non-Federal share across the applicant’s transportation program, if the applicant is a regular recipient of federal transportation funding; and

(D) a description of the applicant’s plan to address the full life-cycle costs associated with the project, including a description of operations and maintenance funding commitments made by the applicant.

viii. Federal Wage Rate Certification (a Certification, Signed by the Applicant(s), Stating That It Will Comply With the Requirements of Subchapter IV of Chapter 31 of Title 40, United States Code [Federal Wage Rate Requirements], as Required by the FY 2017 Appropriations Act)

The purpose of this recommended format is to ensure that applications clearly address the program requirements and make critical information readily apparent.

DOT recommends that the project narrative be prepared with standard formatting preferences (i.e., a single-spaced document, using a standard 12-point font, such as Times New Roman, with 1-inch margins). The project narrative may not exceed 30 pages in length. Documentation supporting the assertions made in the narrative portion may also be provided, but should be limited to relevant information. Cover pages, tables of contents, and the federal wage rate certification do not count towards the 30-page limit for the narrative portion of the application. The only substantive portions of the application that may exceed the 30-page limit are any supporting documents (including a more detailed discussion of the benefit-cost analysis) provided to support assertions or conclusions made in the 30-page narrative section. If possible, Web site links to supporting documentation (including a more detailed discussion of the benefit-cost analysis) should be provided rather than copies of these materials. Otherwise, supporting documents should be included as appendices to the application. Applicants’ references to supporting documentation should clearly identify the relevant portion of the supporting material. At the applicant’s discretion, relevant materials provided previously to a relevant modal administration in support of a different DOT discretionary financial assistance program (for example, New Starts or TIFIA) may be referenced and described as unchanged. This information need not be resubmitted for the TIGER Discretionary Grant application but may be referenced as described above. Web site links to the materials are highly recommended. DOT recommends using appropriately descriptive file names (e.g., “Project Narrative,” “Maps,” “Memoranda of Understanding,” “Letters of Support,” etc.) for all attachments.

3. Unique Entity Identifier and System for Award Management (SAM)

Each applicant must: (1) be registered in SAM before submitting its application; (2) provide a valid unique entity identifier in its application; and (3) continue to maintain an active SAM registration with current information at all times during which it has an active Federal award or an application or plan under consideration by a Federal awarding agency. The Department may not make a TIGER grant to an applicant until the applicant has complied with all applicable unique entity identifier and SAM requirements and, if an applicant has not fully complied with the requirements by the time the Department is ready to make a TIGER grant, the Department may determine that the applicant is not qualified to receive a TIGER grant and use that determination as a basis for making a TIGER grant to another applicant.

4. Submission Dates and Times

i. Deadline

Applications must be submitted by 8:00 p.m. EDT on October 16, 2017. The Grants.gov “Apply” function will open by September 7, 2017. The Department has determined that an application deadline fewer than 60 days after this notice is published is appropriate because this notice is substantially similar to previous years.

To submit an application through Grants.gov, applicants must:

1. Obtain a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number;
2. Register with the System for Award Management (SAM) at www.SAM.gov;
3. Create a Grants.gov username and password; and
4. The E-Business Point of Contact (POC) at the applicant's organization must respond to the registration email from Grants.gov and login at Grants.gov to authorize the applicant as the Authorized Organization Representative (AOR). Please note that there can be more than one AOR for an organization.

Please note that the Grants.gov registration process usually takes 2-4 weeks to complete and that the Department will not consider late applications that are the result of failure to register or comply with Grants.gov applicant requirements in a timely manner. For information and instruction on each of these processes, please see instructions at http://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants/applicant-faq.html. If applicants experience difficulties at any point during the registration or application process, please call the Grants.gov Customer Service Support Hotline at 1(800) 518-4726, Monday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. EST.

ii. Consideration of Applications

Only applicants who comply with all submission deadlines described in this notice and electronically submit valid applications through Grants.gov will be eligible for award. Applicants are strongly encouraged to make submissions in advance of the deadline.

iii. Late Applications

Applicants experiencing technical issues with Grants.gov that are beyond the applicant's control must contact TIGERgrants@dot.gov prior to the application deadline with the user name of the registrant and details of the technical issue experienced. The applicant must provide:

1. Details of the technical issue experienced;
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(2) Screen capture(s) of the technical issues experienced along with corresponding Grants.gov “Grant tracking number”;

(3) The “Legal Business Name” for the applicant that was provided in the SF-424;

(4) The AOR name submitted in the SF-424;

(5) The DUNS number associated with the application; and


To ensure a fair competition of limited discretionary funds, the following conditions are not valid reasons to permit late submissions: (1) Failure to complete the registration process before the deadline; (2) failure to follow Grants.gov instructions on how to register and apply as posted on its Web site; (3) failure to follow all instructions in this Notice of funding opportunity; and (4) technical issues experienced with the applicant’s computer or information technology environment. After the Department reviews all information submitted and contact the Grants.gov Help Desk to validate reported technical issues, DOT staff will contact late applicants to approve or deny a request to submit a late application through Grants.gov. If the reported technical issues cannot be validated, late applications will be rejected as untimely.

E. Application Review Information

1. Criteria

This section specifies the criteria that DOT will use to evaluate and award applications for TIGER Discretionary Grants. The criteria incorporate the statutory eligibility requirements for this program, which are specified in this notice as relevant. There are two categories of selection criteria, “Primary Selection Criteria” and “Secondary Selection Criteria.” Projects will also be evaluated for demonstrated project readiness, benefits and costs, and cost share.

i. Primary Selection Criteria

Applications that do not demonstrate a likelihood of significant long-term benefits based on these criteria will not proceed in the evaluation process. DOT does not consider any primary selection criterion more important than the others. The primary selection criteria, which will receive equal consideration, are:

a. Safety

The Department will assess the project’s ability to foster a safe transportation system for the movement of goods and people. The Department will consider the projected impacts on the number, rate, and consequences of crashes, fatalities and injuries among transportation users; the project’s contribution to the elimination of highway/rail grade crossings, or the project’s contribution to preventing unintended releases of hazardous materials.

b. State of Good Repair

The Department will assess whether and to what extent: (1) The project is consistent with relevant plans to maintain transportation facilities or systems in a state of good repair and address current and projected vulnerabilities; (2) if left unimproved, the poor condition of the asset will threaten future transportation network efficiency, mobility of goods or accessibility and mobility of people, or economic growth; (3) the project is appropriately capitalized up front and uses asset management approaches that optimize its long-term cost structure; (4) a sustainable source of revenue is available for operations and maintenance of the project and the project will reduce overall life-cycle costs; and (5) the project includes a plan to maintain the infrastructure in a state of good repair. The Department will prioritize projects that ensure the good condition of infrastructure, including rural infrastructure, that support commerce and economic growth.

c. Economic Competitiveness

The Department will assess whether the project will (1) decrease transportation costs and improve access, especially for rural communities, through reliable and timely access to employment centers and job opportunities; (2) improve long-term efficiency, reliability or costs in the movement of workers or goods; (3) increase the economic productivity of land, capital, or labor; (4) result in long-term job creation and other economic opportunities; or (5) help the United States compete in a global economy by facilitating efficient and reliable freight movement.

Projects that address congestion in major urban areas, particularly those that do so through the use of congestion pricing or the deployment of advanced technology, projects that bridge gaps in service in rural areas, and projects that attract private economic development, all support national or regional economic competitiveness. Projects that incorporate private sector contributions, including through a public-private partnership structure, are likely to be more competitive than those that rely solely on public non-Federal funding.

d. Environmental Sustainability

The Department will consider the extent to which the project improves energy efficiency, reduces dependence on oil, reduces congestion-related emissions, improves water quality, avoids and mitigates environmental impacts and otherwise benefits the environment, including through alternative right of way uses demonstrating innovative ways to improve or streamline environmental reviews while maintaining the same outcomes. The Department will assess the project’s ability to: (i) Reduce energy use and air or water pollution through congestion mitigation strategies; (ii) avoid adverse environmental impacts to air or water quality, wetlands, and endangered species; or (iii) provide environmental benefits, such as brownfield redevelopment, ground water recharge in areas of water scarcity, wetlands creation or improved habitat connectivity, and stormwater mitigation.

e. Quality of Life

The Department will consider the extent to which the project increases transportation choices for individuals to provide more freedom on transportation decisions and improves access to essential services for people in communities across the United States, particularly for rural communities. The Department will consider the extent to which the project improves connectivity for citizens to jobs, health care, and other critical destinations.

ii. Secondary Selection Criteria

a. Innovation

The Department will assess the use of innovative strategies to address the primary selection criteria. The Department particularly seeks to experiment with innovative approaches to transportation safety, particularly in relation to automated vehicles and the detection, mitigation, and documentation of safety risks. When making TIGER award decisions, the Department will consider any innovative safety approaches proposed by the applicant, particularly projects which incorporate innovative design solutions, enhance the environment for automated vehicles, or use technology to improve the detection, mitigation, and documentation of safety risks. Innovative safety approaches may include, but are not limited to:

i. Conflict detection and mitigation technologies (e.g., intersection alerts and signal prioritization);
Dynamic signaling or pricing systems to reduce congestion;
Signage and design features that facilitate autonomous or semi-autonomous vehicle technologies;
Applications to automatically capture and report safety-related issues (e.g., identifying and documenting near-miss incidents); and
Cybersecurity elements to protect safety-critical systems.

For innovative safety proposals, the Department will evaluate safety benefits that those approaches could produce and the broader applicability of the potential results.

DOT will also assess the extent to which the project utilizes innovative technologies to significantly enhance the operational performance of the transportation system. Further, DOT will consider the extent to which the project utilizes innovative practices in contracting, congestion management, asset management, or long-term operations and maintenance. DOT is interested in projects that apply innovative strategies to improve the efficiency of project development or to improve project delivery, including by using FHWA’s Special Experimental Project No. 14 (SEP-14) and Special Experimental Project No. 15 (SEP-15).

DOT will also assess the extent to which the project incorporates innovative strategies to improve the efficiency of project development or to improve project delivery, including by using FHWA’s Special Experimental Project No. 14 (SEP-14) and Special Experimental Project No. 15 (SEP-15).

b. Partnership

The Department will consider the extent to which projects demonstrate strong collaboration among a broad range of stakeholders. Projects with strong partnership typically involve multiple partners in project development and funding, such as State and local governments, other public entities, and/or private or nonprofit entities. DOT will also assess the extent to which the project application demonstrates collaboration among neighboring or regional jurisdictions, including neighboring rural areas, to achieve national, regional, or metropolitan benefits. In the context of public-private partnerships, DOT will assess the extent to which partners are encouraged to ensure long-term asset performance, such as through pay-for-success approaches.

DOT will also consider the extent to which projects include partnerships that bring together diverse transportation agencies and/or are supported, financially or otherwise, by other stakeholders that are pursuing similar objectives. For example, DOT will consider the extent to which transportation projects are coordinated with economic development, housing, water infrastructure, and land use plans and policies or other public service efforts.

iii. Demonstrated Project Readiness

During application evaluation, the Department considers project readiness to assess the likelihood of successful project. The Department will consider significant risks to successful completion of a project, including risks associated with environmental review, permitting, technical feasibility, funding, and the applicant’s capacity to manage project delivery. Risks do not disqualify projects from award, but competitive applications clearly and directly describe achievable risk mitigation strategies. A project with mitigated risks or with a risk mitigation plan is more competitive than a comparable project with unaddressed risks.

iv. Project Costs and Benefits

The Department will consider the project's costs and benefits. To the extent possible, the Department will rely on quantitative, data-supported analysis to assess how well a project addresses this criterion, including an assessment of the project’s estimated benefit-cost ratio and net quantifiable benefits based on the applicant-supplied BCA described in Section D.2.vi.

v. Cost Sharing or Matching

The Department seeks applications for projects that exceed the minimum non-Federal cost share requirement described in Section D.2. Additionally, the FY 2017 Appropriations Act directs the Department to prioritize projects that require a contribution of Federal funds to complete an overall financing package, and all projects can increase their competitiveness for purposes of the TIGER program by demonstrating significant non-Federal financial contributions. TIGER applications that include INFRA Grants program funding as part of a proposed financing package will be less competitive than those that do not.

DOT recognizes that applicants have varying abilities and resources to contribute non-Federal contributions, especially those communities that are not routinely receiving and matching Federal funds. DOT recognizes certain communities with fewer financial resources may struggle to provide cost-share that exceeds the minimum requirements and will, therefore, consider an applicant’s broader fiscal capability when evaluating non-Federal contributions.

This evaluation criterion is separate from the statutory cost share requirements for TIGER grants, which are described Section C.2. Those statutory requirements establish the minimum permissible non-Federal share; they do not define a competitive TIGER project.

vi. Additional Considerations

The FY 2017 Appropriations Act requires the Department to consider contributions to geographic diversity among recipients, including the need for a balance between the needs of rural and urban communities when selecting TIGER projects.

2. Review and Selection Process

DOT reviews all eligible applications received before the deadline. The TIGER review and selection process consists of three phases: Technical Review, Tier Two Analysis consisting of project readiness and economic analysis, and Senior Review. A Control and Calibration Team ensures consistency across projects and appropriate documentation throughout the review and selection process. In the Technical Evaluation phase, teams comprising staff from the Office of the Secretary (OST) and modal administrations review all eligible applications and rate projects as Highly Recommended, Recommended, Acceptable, or Not Recommended based on how well the projects align with the selection criteria.

Tier 2 Analysis consists of (1) an Economic Analysis and (2) a Project Readiness Analysis. The Economic Analysis Team, comprising OST and modal administration economic staff, assess the potential benefits and costs of the proposed projects. The Project Readiness Team, comprising Office of the Secretary Office of Policy (OST-P) and modal administration staff, evaluates the proposed project’s technical and financial feasibility, potential risks and mitigation strategies, and project schedule, including the status of environmental approvals and readiness to proceed.

In the third review phase, the Senior Review Team, which includes senior leadership from OST and the modal administrations, considers all projects that were rated Acceptable, Recommended, or Highly Recommended and determines which projects to advance to the Secretary as Highly Rated. The Secretary selects from
the Highly Rated projects for final awards.

3. Additional Information

Prior to award, each selected applicant will be subject to a risk assessment as required by 2 CFR 200.205. The Department must review and consider any information about the applicant that is in the designated integrity and performance system accessible through SAM (currently the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS)). An applicant may review information in FAPIIS and comment on any information about itself. The Department will consider comments by the applicant, in addition to the other information in FAPIIS, in making a judgment about the applicant’s integrity, business ethics, and record of performance under Federal awards when completing the review of risk posed by applicants.

F. Federal Award Administration Information

1. Federal Award Notice

Following the evaluation outlined in Section E, the Secretary will announce awarded projects by posting a list of selected projects at [www.transportation.gov/ТИGER]. Notice of selection is not authorization to begin performance. Following that announcement, the relevant modal administration will contact the point of contact listed in the SF 424 to initiate negotiation of the grant agreement for authorization.

2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

All awards will be administered pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards found in 2 CFR part 200, as adopted by DOT at 2 CFR part 1201. Additionally, applicable Federal laws, rules and regulations of the relevant operating administration administering the project will apply to the projects that receive TIGER Discretionary Grants including planning requirements, Service Outcome Agreements, Stakeholder Agreements, Buy America compliance, and other requirements under DOT’s other highway, transit, rail, and port grant programs.

For projects administered by FHWA, applicable Federal laws, rules, and regulations set forth in Title 23 U.S.C. and Title 23 CFR apply. For an illustrative list of the applicable laws, rules, regulations, executive orders, policies, guidelines, and requirements as they relate to a TIGER project administered by the FHWA, please see [http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure/tiger/2015/gr_exhibitindex.htm]. For TIGER projects administered by the Federal Transit Administration and partially funded with Federal transit assistance, all relevant requirements under chapter 53 of title 49 U.S.C. apply. For transit projects funded exclusively with TIGER Discretionary Grants funds, some requirements of chapter 53 of title 49 U.S.C. and chapter VI of title 49 CFR apply. For projects administered by the Federal Railroad Administration, FRA requirements described in 49 U.S.C. Subtitle V, part C apply.

Federal wage rate requirements included in subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 49, U.S.C. apply to all projects receiving funds under this program, and apply to all parts of the project, whether funded with TIGER Discretionary Grant funds, other Federal funds, or non-Federal funds.

3. Reporting

i. Progress Reporting on Grant Activities

Each applicant selected for TIGER Discretionary Grants funding must submit quarterly progress reports and Federal Financial Reports (SF-425) to monitor project progress and ensure accountability and financial transparency in the TIGER program.

ii. System Performance Reporting

Each applicant selected for TIGER Discretionary Grant funding must collect information and report on the project’s observed performance with respect to the relevant long-term outcomes that are expected to be achieved through construction of the project. Performance indicators will not include formal goals or targets, but will include observed measures under baseline (pre-project) as well as post-implementation outcomes for an agreed-upon timeline, and will be used to evaluate and compare projects and monitor the results that grant funds achieve to the intended long-term outcomes of the TIGER Discretionary Grants program are achieved. To the extent possible, performance indicators used in the reporting should align with the measures included in the application and should relate to at least one of the primary selection criteria defined in Section E. Performance reporting continues for several years after project construction is completed, and DOT does not provide TIGER Discretionary Grant funding specifically for performance reporting.

iii. Reporting of Matters Related to Recipient Integrity and Performance

If the total value of a selected applicant’s currently active grants, cooperative agreements, and procurement contracts from all Federal awarding agencies exceeds $10,000,000 for any period of time during the period of performance of this Federal award, then the applicant during that period of time must maintain the currency of information reported to the SAM that is made available in the designated integrity and performance system (currently FAPIIS) about civil, criminal, or administrative proceedings described in paragraph 2 of this award term and condition. This is a statutory requirement under section 872 of Public Law 110-417, as amended (41 U.S.C. 2313). As required by section 3010 of Public Law 111-212, all information posted in the designated integrity and performance system on or after April 15, 2011, except past performance reviews required for Federal procurement contracts, will be publicly available.

G. Federal Awarding Agency Contacts

For further information concerning this notice please contact the TIGER Discretionary Grants program staff via email at TIGERGrants@dot.gov, or call Howard Hill at 202-366-3091. A TDD is available for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing at 202-366-3993. In addition, DOT will post answers to questions and requests for clarifications on DOT’s Web site at [www.transportation.gov/ТИGER]. To ensure applicants receive accurate information about eligibility or the program, the applicant is encouraged to contact DOT directly, rather than through intermediaries or third parties, with questions. DOT staff may also conduct briefings on the TIGER Discretionary Grants selection and award process upon request.

H. Other information

1. Protection of Confidential Business Information

All information submitted as part of or in support of any application shall use publicly available data or data that can be made public and methodologies that are accepted by industry practice and standards, to the extent possible. If the application includes information, the applicant should do the following: (1) Note on the front cover that the submission “Contains Confidential Business Information (CBI)”; (2) mark each affected page “CBI”; and (3) highlight or otherwise
denote the CBI portions. DOT protects such information from disclosure to the extent allowed under applicable law. In the event DOT receives a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for the information, DOT will follow the procedures described in its FOIA regulations at 49 CFR 7.17. Only information that is ultimately determined to be confidential under that procedure will be exempt from disclosure under FOIA.

Elaine L. Chao,
Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2017-19009 Filed 9-6-17; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

United States Mint

Notification of Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee September 19, 2017, Public Meeting

ACTION: Notification of Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee September 19, 2017, public meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to United States Code, Title 31, section 5135(b)(8)(C), the United States Mint announces the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee (CCAC) public meeting scheduled for September 19, 2017.

Date: September 19, 2017.
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Location: Second Floor Conference Room, United States Mint, 801 9th Street NW, Washington, DC 20220.

Subject: Review and discussion of candidate designs for the 2019 America the Beautiful Quarters Program, review and discussion of new and revised candidate designs for the Office of Strategic Services Congressional Gold Medal, and review and approval of annual reports.

Interested members of the public may either attend the meeting in person or dial in to listen to the meeting at (866) 964–9287/Access Code: 62956036.

Interested persons should call the CCAC HOTLINE at (202) 354–7502 for the latest update on meeting time and room location.

Any member of the public interested in submitting matters for the CCAC’s consideration is invited to submit them by fax to the following number: 202–756–6525.

In accordance with 31 U.S.C. 5135, the CCAC:

- Advises the Secretary of the Treasury on any theme or design proposals relating to circulating coinage, bullion coinage, Congressional Gold Medals, and national and other medals.
- Advises the Secretary of the Treasury with regard to the events, persons, or places to be commemorated by the issuance of commemorative coins in each of the five calendar years succeeding the year in which a commemorative coin designation is made.
- Makes recommendations with respect to the mintage level for any commemorative coin recommended.

Members of the public interested in attending the meeting in person will be admitted into the meeting room on a first-come, first-serve basis as space is limited. Conference Room A&B can accommodate up to 50 members of the public at any one time. In addition, all persons entering a United States Mint facility must adhere to building security protocol. This means they must consent to the search of their persons and objects in their possession while on government grounds and when they enter and leave the facility, and are prohibited from bringing into the facility weapons of any type, illegal drugs, drug paraphernalia, or contraband.

The United States Mint Police Officer conducting the screening will evaluate whether an item may enter into or exit from a facility based upon federal law, Treasury policy, United States Mint Policy, and local operating procedure; and all prohibited and unauthorized items will be subject to confiscation and disposal.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Betty Birdsong, Acting United States Mint Liaison to the CCAC; 801 9th Street NW, Washington, DC 20220; or call 202–354–7200.


David Motl,
Acting Deputy Director, United States Mint.
[FR Doc. 2017–19005 Filed 9–6–17; 8:45 am]
Title: Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-34 Amended Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Program for Fiscal Year 2018

Prepared By: Dora A. Anaya, Human Resources Director

Background: Federal responsibilities under Section 717 of Title VII and Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act.

✓ Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII) and Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Rehabilitation Act): Mandate that all federal personnel decisions be made free of discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, reprisal or disability and also require that agencies establish a program of equal employment opportunity for all federal employees and job applicants. 42 U.S.C. §2000e-16 and 29 U.S.C. §791.


  ○ Provides policy guidance and standards for establishing and maintaining effective affirmative programs of equal employment opportunity under Section 717 of Title VII (PART A) and effective affirmative action programs under Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act (PART B). The Directive also sets forth general reporting requirements (PART C).

  ○ Requires agencies to take appropriate steps to ensure that all employment decisions are free from discrimination. It also sets forth the standards by which
EEOC will review the sufficiency of agency Title VII and Rehabilitation Act programs, which include periodic agency self-assessments and the removal of barriers to free and open workplace competition.

- Reporting: Agencies must report annually on the status of activities undertaken pursuant to its equal employment opportunity program under Title VII and activities undertaken pursuant to its affirmative action obligations under the Rehabilitation Act. Agency reports must also include a plan that sets forth steps it will take in the future to correct deficiencies or further improve efforts undertaken pursuant to this Directive.

- The Model EEO Program: Includes instructions regarding the format and content requirements.

**Summary:** In November 6, 2015, the NCRTD Board adopted the EEO Program and Policy for implementation. The EEO Program called for an annual review and update of the yearly analysis of the data collected for all employees and applicants for employment to ensure equal employment opportunities and to prevent unlawful discrimination. The 2017 annual update was not performed due to a transition to a new Human Resource Director.

Significant progress has been made in the officer and manager categories towards the Board's 2016 goals. There was an increase in hiring in Hispanic/Latino male and female in all categories. However, female representation across the board has remained flat at approximately 40 percent. American Indian/Alaskan representation in the work force is up.

The inclusion of two protected categories has been added to the EEO Program: Military/Veteran Status and Individuals with Disabilities.

Genetic Information is now protected and has been integrated into the plan document.

The yearly review of the 2017 data has been completed and the EEO Program has been updated for the review and approval of the NCRTD Board. Goals are for 2018.

**Recommended Action:** The Executive Director and EEO Officer recommend the approval of the Amended EEO program,

**Fiscal Impact:**
- $2,805 Budgeted for training to support the plan.
- Reduce out-of-pocket costs associated with workplace disputes.

**Attachments:**
- Resolution No. 2017-34
- Equal Employment Opportunity Plan
- Redline edition of old plan
- Utilization Analysis Spreadsheet
North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD)

Resolution No. 2017-34

ADOPTING AN AMENDED EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PLAN

WHEREAS, the NCRTD is a "special District" pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 73-25-1 et seq., and a subdivision of the State of New Mexico; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors adopted its existing "Equal Employment Opportunity Plan by Resolution No. 2015-32, on November 6th, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD is committed to having a diverse workforce, providing equal employment opportunity, ensuring nondiscrimination in all actions affecting NCRTD employees and applicants for employment and prohibiting illegal harassment and discrimination; and

WHEREAS, the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan supports and defines this commitment and outlines the way in which the NCRTD implements procedures to honor this commitment; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD and its Board of Directors comply with all required Federal laws including but not limited to:

USERRA 32 U.S.C §4311
the U.S. Constitution, including the 14th Amendment
Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) 4704.1,
the Civil Rights Act of 1866,
the Civil Rights Act of 1871,
Equal Pay Act of 1963 (EPA),
Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA),
Title II of the Genetic Information Act of 2008 (GIINA),
Title VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1974,
the State and Local Fiscal Assistance (Revenue Sharing) Act of 1972,
the Age Discrimination in the Employment Act of 1975,
the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970,
Housing and Community Development Act of 1974,
and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973
and all relevant executive orders and regulations including but not limited to Executive Order 13672.

PASSED APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ON THIS 13TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2017.

Approved as to form: ________________________________

Daniel Barrone, Chair

Peter Dwyer, Counsel
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EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PLAN

I. EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS’S POLICY STATEMENT POLICY

The Regional Transit District Act was adopted by the State Legislature and signed on March 21, 2003. The Regional Transit District Act, NMSA 1978 Section 73-25-1 et seq., authorizes New Mexico governmental units to establish regional transit districts that are authorized to finance, construct, operate, maintain, and promote regional transit systems. The North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) satisfied the conditions of the Regional Transit District Act and was certified by the New Mexico Transportation Commission on September 14, 2004, and is a sub-division of the State of New Mexico. The NCRTD has entered into Intergovernmental Agreements with the following entities: Counties of Santa Fe, Los Alamos, Rio Arriba and Taos; Cities and Towns of Santa Fe, Edgewood, Taos and Española and the Pueblos of San Ildefonso, Nambe, Tesuque, Santa Clara, Pojoaque and Ohkay Owingeh.

Elected and appointed representatives of these organizations serve on the NCRTD’s Board of Directors and give the organization direction.

The NCRTD’s mission is to provide safe, secure and effective public transportation within North Central New Mexico in order to enhance the quality of life of our citizens by providing mobility options and economic opportunities throughout the region.

The NCRTD provides a variety of transit routes and services to citizens within the District’s four county service area, and is funded through a combination of federal, state and other grants, a voter authorized Regional Gross Receipts Transit Tax, and miscellaneous revenues.

NCRTD prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance.

The NCRTD will keep these tenets in mind in recruitment, selection, placement, promotion, training, compensation of its employees, and in all other official acts of the NCRTD and its employees and agents.

The Human Resources Director will be appointed to serve as our EEO officer for NCRTD. The EEO Officer will be responsible for ensuring that we comply with all EEO responsibilities.

We are committed to an Equal Employment Opportunity program including goals and timetables for good-faith efforts to achieve full utilization of minorities and women at all levels and segments of NCRTD’s workforce where deficiencies may exist.

All management personnel share in this responsibility and will be assigned specific tasks to assure compliance is achieved. The performance of managers and supervisors will be evaluated on their contribution to the success of the EEO program the same way as their performance on other NCRTD goals is evaluated.
Employees and applicants will have the right to file complaints and reports alleging discrimination with the appropriate official(s). All such complaints and reports will be thoroughly investigated. No adverse action or retaliation will be taken or permitted against any employee who reports issues of workplace discrimination or harassment.

SIGNED:

Anthony J. Mortillaro
Executive Director
II. POLICY

North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

It shall provide equal employment opportunity to its employees and applicants for employment on the basis of fitness and merit without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, veteran status, or disability except where sex or age or lack of disability is an accepted occupational qualification, or handicap. This policy shall be followed in recruiting, hiring, promotion into all position classifications, compensation, benefits, transfers, layoffs, returns from layoffs, demotions, termination, NCRTD-sponsored training programs, educational leave, social and recreational programs, and use of NCRTD facilities.

Any person employed by NCRTD who fails to comply with this policy is subject to disciplinary action, up to, and including termination.

Where necessary, this policy is to be extended in order that NCRTD be in compliance with the following federal restraints:

USERRA 32 U.S.C §4311

the U.S. Constitution, including the 14th Amendment

Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) 4704.1,

the Civil Rights Act of 1866,

the Civil Rights Act of 1871,

Equal Pay Act of 1963 (EPA),

Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA),

Title II of the Genetic Information Act of 2008 (GINA),

Title VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1974,

the State and Local Fiscal Assistance (Revenue Sharing) Act of 1972,

the Age Discrimination in the Employment Act of 1975,

the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970,

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974,

and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973

and all relevant executive orders and regulations including but not limited to Executive Order 13672.
The implementation of this EEO plan is a reaffirmation of adherence to and promotion of the policy of nondiscrimination in all action affecting NCRTD employees and in managing NCRTD resources. The guidelines and objectives contained in this plan are designed to assist NCRTD and all of its employees in adhering to that policy.

III. ANNUAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The North Central Regional Transit District's goal is to make its workforce more closely reflect the labor force in North Central New Mexico. The Agency will make specific good faith efforts to identify the underutilization of women and minorities, and make the necessary changes to remove any existing barriers to their employment. NCRTD will also work to recruit and retain qualified minorities, women, military service members, veterans, and individuals with disabilities at all employment levels.

Underutilization may be caused by barriers to employment. Therefore, the NCRTD's hiring officials will review their recruitment, selection, and promotion process as well as the on-the-job treatment of employees to ensure that women, minorities, military service members and veterans and individuals with disabilities receive equal employment opportunity to secure employment and promotion.

The NCRTD Executive Director, with the assistance of the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, will annually perform the following activities necessary to prepare and update the goals and objectives of the Affirmative Action Plan for Equal Opportunity:

A. Analyze current staff and staffing patterns to determine the race/ethnicity and sex composition of NCRTD employees and of the four-county regional area workforce in order to establish benchmark ratios of race/ethnicity and sex.

B. Based on the ratios developed under Section III. “A” above, establish short range (less than 1 year) employment goals and objectives to address any areas of under-utilization of minorities, military service members and veterans, individuals with disabilities (to the extent they are able to perform the essential functions of a job) and/or females which would further equal employment opportunity for NCRTD employees or the projected work force.

C. Based on the ratios developed under Section III. “A” above, establish longer range (1-5 years) employment goals and objectives to address any areas of under-utilization of minorities, military service members and veterans, females and/or which would further equal employment opportunity for NCRTD employees or the projected work force.

IV. DISSEMINATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The NCRTD Equal Employment Opportunity Program will be communicated in the following manner:

Internal

- A copy of the full EEO Plan will be provided to each manager.

- The EEO/Policy will be placed in all future employee handbooks and manuals with a presentation and discussion held during New Employee Orientation.
• The EEO/AA Policy will be discussed at appropriate supervisory meetings covering the subject of recruitment, employment, training, promotion and transfer of employees and procurement of services.

• The EEO Policy and Complaint Resolution Procedure posters will be permanently posted and conspicuously displayed in areas available to employees and applicants for employment.

• NCRTD’s EEO Program Plan and related documents will be posted on the internet.

External

• Notification of NCRTD’s EEO Program Plan will be given to all recruitment sources and community groups.

• All employment advertising methods utilized by NCRTD will include its EEO Policy Statement.

• NCRTD’s EEO Program Plan and related documents will be on its website.

• NCRTD’s EEO Policy Statement will be included on employment applications.

• NCRTD will advise contractors and business partners of the EEO policies and procedures to ensure awareness and compliance.

The dissemination of NCRTD’s EEO/ policy is not limited to the above referenced items. As considered appropriate, NCRTD utilizes whatever means necessary to convey the organization’s commitment to equal employment opportunity.

V. RESPONSIBILITIES

A) NCRTD EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Ultimate responsibility for the implementation of this policy and the NCRTD’s affirmative action program rests with the NCRTD Executive Director. The Executive Director’s responsibilities may include:

1. Assisting in identifying problem areas and establishing agency and unit goals and objectives;

2. Being actively involved with local minority organizations, women’s and handicapped groups, veteran organizations, community organizations and community service programs designed to promote EEO;

3. Participating actively in periodic audits of all aspects of employment in order to identify and to remove barriers obstructing the achievement of specified goals and objectives;

4. Holding regular discussions with managers, supervisors, and employees to assure the agency’s policies and procedures are being followed;
5. Reviewing the qualifications of all employees to assure that minorities, disabled persons, veterans, military service members and women are given full opportunities for transfer, promotions, training, salary increases, and other forms of professional advancement;

6. Participating in the review and/or investigation of complaints alleging discrimination;

7. Participating in periodic audits to ensure that all agency facilities are in compliance (e.g., EEO posters are properly displayed on all employees bulletin boards);

B) EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (EEO) OFFICER

The Human Resources Director will assume the position of the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and perform the following duties and functions:

1. Developing and recommending an EEO policy, a written program, and internal and external communication procedures;

2. Assisting management in collecting and analyzing employment data, identifying problem areas, setting goals;

3. Designing, implementing, and monitoring internal audit and reporting systems to measure program effectiveness and to determine where progress has been made and where further actions is needed;

4. Reporting yearly to the Executive Director on the progress of each unit in relation to the agency’s goals;

5. Serving as a liaison between the District, Federal, State and Local governments, regulatory agencies, minority, veterans, military service members disabled and women’s organizations, and other community groups;

6. Assisting in recruiting minorities, women, veterans, military service members and disabled applicants and establishing outreach sources;

7. Evaluating and commenting on all hires and promotions;

8. Processing, investigating, and managing all employment discrimination complaints.

C) DEPARTMENT HEADS AND SUPERVISORS

Each member of management and supervision is responsible within his/her area of responsibility for conducting activities in a manner which will ensure compliance with the policy and the Equal Opportunity Employment programs. Furthermore, each is made to understand that his/her work performance in the area of equal employment is being evaluated.
VI. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PERSONNEL AND WORKPLACE PRACTICES

The personnel practices of the NCERTD shall at all times conform to the requirements of the law and any legal requirements collectively bargained by the NCERTD notwithstanding any provision of this EEO Policy to the contrary. NCERTD personnel practices shall integrate the following specific EEO considerations.

A) RECRUITMENT

Applicants for employment shall be considered and placed without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, military status or disability.

The NCERTD shall display equal employment opportunity notices in conspicuous places available to all employees and applicants for employment. Employment application forms shall be in compliance with applicable federal laws. A copy of the NCERTD EEO Policy may be obtained from the EEO Officer or any manager or on the NCERTD’s website.

Applications and supporting documents shall be screened for evaluation taking into account this EEO Policy. Applicants deemed most suited for available position may be asked to submit additional supporting data for further evaluation, and/or may be asked to submit themselves for an interview. Before a formal offer is made, the EEO officer shall be consulted to ascertain that a good faith effort to implement this EEO Policy has indeed been made. The EEO Officer shall obtain evidence to confirm that the applicant pool from which the selection (hiring) was made had been established without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, or disability. If this cannot be confirmed, the EEO Officer may object to the hiring and the Executive Director shall consider alternatives prior to filling the position. In order enhance the employment opportunities of minorities, women, veterans, military service members and individuals with disabilities, managers are especially urged to develop a better understanding of minorities, women, veterans, the disabled in the work force and the conditions, problems and expectations of the groups.

The recruitment of persons to fill vacancies will be accomplished without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, military status or disability. NCERTD will maintain contacts with various minority, women, military, veteran and handicapped groups and organizations concerning manpower resources and requirements when necessary.

1. The EEO Officer will have primary responsibility for recruitment activities with direct assistance from other NCERTD staff involved in the hiring process.

2. Whenever practical all job openings will be advertised in the news media. They will also be advertised in any news media forum that targets women and minorities as well as organizations and institutions catering predominantly to minorities, women, veterans, military service members and they disabled. Where visual media (such as online posts, posters or flyers) is used, all pictures that show visual representations of the NCERTD staff shall include minorities and/or females. The NCERTD may choose not to advertise vacancies when more than 5 current (three months or less) applications are on file for a position, or selections can be made from a pre-selected standing list of qualified applicants, or a collective bargaining agreement or law does not permit advertising the position.
3. The latest job listing will be posted in such a manner that all employees and potential employees have equal access to this information.

4. Communications will be maintained with educational institutions and vocational schools for recruitment, including predominantly minority and women’s institutions.

5. The Executive Director will determine where to advertise vacant positions; either in-house only or in the local news media.

The Utilization Analysis will be annually reviewed by both the EEO Officer and other appropriate NCRTD staff in an effort to ensure that identified qualified groups are provided opportunities at rates substantially similar to those of qualified men and non-minority employees. NCRTD will strive to employ and retain qualified individuals with disabilities in all levels of its workforce.

B) SELECTION

The selection of persons to fill job vacancies will be accomplished through approved procedures only, adhering to the documented NCRTD hiring process. Persons will be hired without regard to non-merit factors following a completely objective appraisal of each eligible individual interested in the position.

C) PROMOTION

Promotion will be proposed in accordance with applicable rules, on a nondiscriminatory basis. The procedures used in selecting persons for promotion will be evaluated periodically to ensure that they are realistic and relevant. Any employee who feels he or she has not been accorded fair and impartial treatment regarding employment will be offered an opportunity to discuss this problem. In order to encourage merit based promotions the NCRTD shall seek to fund and provide assistance as follows.

1. Continued emphasis will be placed on the NCRTD’s educational assistance programs.

2. Training programs shall be designed to upgrade the skills of employees so that they can improve performance in their present position.

3. On-the-job training will be designed so that employees have an opportunity to acquire skills needed to qualify for promotions and/or an enhanced position with the NCRTD.

4. Employees with managerial ability will be encouraged to acquire skills on-the-job or through more formalized training prior to their advancement into a management position.

D) EEO TRAINING

All personnel involved in the recruitment and selection process will be trained to ensure they understand the EEO Program Plan, and are committed to its intent. Training shall also be provided annually to appropriate personnel including the NCRTD Executive Director, the EEO Officer and all Department Heads.

E) DISCIPLINARY ACTION
An employee may be disciplined for any of the reasons provided under the NCRTD’s Personnel Rules. Any NCRTD employee who feels that he or she has been wrongfully subjected to disciplinary action has the right to appeal the action, either verbally or in writing, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the NCRTD Personnel Rules.

This EEO Policy may serve as grounds for disciplinary action against employees. Any employee, who is found to have violated this policy may be subject to prompt and appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

If an employee believes any disciplinary action against him or her is EEO related, he/she has the right to request a review from the EEO Officer to ensure compliance with NCRTD’s EEO Policy. If the EEO Officer finds that an EEO issue exists, the Procedures outlined in Section VIII: Issue Resolution of the Policy will be implemented and followed.

The EEO Officer will be apprised of all verbal and written appeals based upon EEO compliance issues.

F) WORK ASSIGNMENTS

All management personnel will be responsible for monitoring employee placement, assignment of duties and work sites to ensure that assignments are made on a non-discriminatory basis.

G) SEPARATION FROM EMPLOYMENT

Exiting employees shall be afforded the opportunity to participate in an optional exit interview conducted by Human Resources or other appropriate staff that will allow them to:

- Discuss the precise reason(s) for the termination.
- Voice any concerns they may have been reluctant to express while employed.
- Provide positive and negative comments and suggestions related to their employment experience.

NCRTD will review recorded terminations’ information to identify if women and minorities leave the Agency at rates substantially different from those of men, non-minority employees, and employees without disabilities.

H) WAGES AND SALARIES

NCRTD complies with the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which requires all employers subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide equal pay for men and women performing similar work.

NCRTD will evaluate current salaries to ensure appropriate range placement based on job related experience, skills and abilities. NCRTD will examine salary anomalies and ensure equality among male and female employees.
I) EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES

It is the policy of NCRTD not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of physical or mental disability in regard to any position for which the employee or applicant for employment is qualified. NCRTD takes affirmative action to employ, advance in employment and otherwise treat qualified individuals with known disabilities without discrimination based upon their physical or mental disability in all employment practices.

NCRTD will attempt to provide reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities, unless such accommodation would impose an undue hardship on the conduct of its business. NCRTD also commits to engaging in an interactive process with the person requesting the accommodation (or their representative), as needed, to determine an appropriate accommodation.

J) MILITARY/VETERAN STATUS

It is the policy of the NCRTD not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of their military or veteran’s status regarding any position for which the employee or applicant for employment is qualified. NCRTD takes action to employ, advance in employment and otherwise treat qualified individuals with known military veteran’s status without discrimination based upon their status in all employment practices.

K) SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY AND PRACTICES

NCRTD will not tolerate sexual harassment of its employees by anyone. Persons suspected of sexually harassing others will be investigated.

Normal, courteous, mutually respectful, pleasant, non-coercive interactions between employees that are acceptable to both parties are not considered to be sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment as defined by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is:

- Unwelcomed or unwanted sexual advances;
- Requests and demands for sexual favors;
- Verbal abuse or kidding that is sexually oriented and considered unacceptable by another individual;
- Engaging in any type of sexually oriented conduct that would unreasonably interfere with another’s work performance; and
- Creating a work environment that is intimidating, hostile, or offensive.

Sexual harassment includes a wide range of behaviors, from the actual coercion of sexual relations to unwelcome offensive comments, jokes, innuendos, and other sexually-oriented statements and unwelcome emphasizing of sexual identity. It can occur between employees, and between employees and members of
the public, including vendors, visitors, passengers, or others with whom employees come into contact while working for NCRTD.

Harassment of any kind, including sexual harassment, is illegal and prohibited. Any employee, who feels he or she is the victim of workplace harassment, or who witnesses unlawful harassment or abuse, whether from management, co-workers, or third parties, should promptly report the matter to their supervisor or manager. Both victim and the harasser can be either a woman or a man, and the victim and harasser can be the same sex. All such reports will be thoroughly investigated. No adverse action or retaliation will be taken or permitted against any employee for reporting the issues of workplace harassment.

It shall be the responsibility of the EEO Officer to advise any employee who feels she or he has been sexually harassed of the proper procedure for handling the complaint.

1) NCRTD FACILITIES AND BENEFITS

Equal opportunity shall be assured to all NCRTD employees for proper use of NCRTD facilities.

The benefits and conditions of employment as outlined in the NCRTD Employee Handbook shall be monitored to assure that they continue to be equally available to all employees.

VII. RECORDS

Race/sex records will be kept on the following:

- applicants
- hiring
- terminations
- promotions
- transfers
- training
- complaints of discrimination

Records on the subjects listed above will be maintained by the EEO Officer. They will be reviewed periodically to ensure that actions taken by the organization are consistent with EEO Policy. Records of correspondence with the various recruitment contacts (minority, female, veteran, military and handicapped organizations) will also be maintained.

A file of all job advertisements will continue to be kept by the EEO Officer. At least annually all department heads and supervisors will be provided training in EEO subjects including interviewing techniques.

VIII. EEO ISSUE RESOLUTION

It is NCRTD’s policy to provide a pleasant working environment for all employees. The EEO issue resolution procedure outlined below will address discrimination complaints regarding race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, military or veteran status or disability.
Utilization of this issue resolution procedure will not in any way jeopardize current or prospective employment status and shall be independent of, and in addition to, any other procedural rights afforded to employees under the NCRTD Personnel Rules and Procedures.

Issue Resolution Procedures are as follows:

1. The EEO Officer will receive all written complaints of discrimination. These complaints may be direct from the employee, applicant or referred from a supervisor or manager who has received a complaint from an employee.

2. All discrimination complaints filed under this procedure will be accepted for investigation up to and including 30 days after the date of the alleged discriminatory act.

3. All complaints will be properly recorded and signed by the complainant. Employees will be advised and counseled as to other avenues of redress including, but not limited to, the following:
   - New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions, Human Rights Bureau

4. All complaints will be investigated and processed by the EEO Officer within 30 days of receipt.

5. The complainant will receive written notification regarding the results of the investigation and the final disposition of the complaint including remedial actions to be taken.

6. If the complainant disagrees with the findings and decisions of the EEO Officer, he/she will be advised and counseled as to other avenues of redress including, but not limited to, the following:
   - New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions, Human Rights Bureau

7. The EEO Officer will take necessary steps to ensure the confidentiality of all discrimination or harassment complaint records and of any counseling done in the course of the complaint procedure to the maximum extent permitted by law.
IX. SIGNATURE AND APPROVAL

NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

Approved by Executive Director:

______________________________  Date: _________________________
Anthony J. Mortillaro

Approved as to form and legal sufficiency by the NCRTD legal counsel:

______________________________  Date: _________________________
Name
X. APPENDIX

UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Equal employment opportunity assumes that the workforce of any given business should mirror the race and sex composition of the population. A major factor in assessing equal employment opportunity is the skill availability of the labor pool.

Employment Opportunity legislation (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended) and subsequent executive orders (Executive Order 11246, as amended); require that Federal contractors and subcontractors certify that they do not discriminate with respect to employment and the conditions thereof.

The assessment below analyses the workforce composition metrics of NCRTD vs. Labor Market in Rio Arriba, Taos, Santa Fe and Los Alamos Counties.

The following tables have been created to aid in the Utilization Analysis process:

- NCRTD'CURRENT WORKFORCE ANALYSIS
  
  Reflects the make-up of our current workforce as of August 4, 2017.

- LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS
  
  Represents the available raw data extracted from the US Census Bureau - 2010 Census.

- UTILIZATION
  
  Compares the values from NCRTD's current workforce and the Labor Market.

  **Percent difference:** The comparison includes a 'percent difference' between the Market and NCRTD and its corresponding index of those percentages.

  **Index:** The Index is instrumental in calculating the percent of the percent in other words, is the comparison between the two percentages, the Market's and NCRTD's.
NCRTD'CURRENT WORKFORCE ANALYSIS

The NCRTD workforce consists of sixty-seven (7) employees representing eight (8) Job Categories:

- Executive/Senior Level Officials and Managers
- First/Mid-Level Officials and Managers
- Professionals
- Technicians
- Administrative Support Workers
- Craft Workers
- Operatives
- Laborer's and Helpers

Observations:

NCRTD’s workforce is made of 59.7% male and 38.8% female.

Overall NCRTD’S Workforce is made up of:

- Hispanic/Latino workers at 64.2%
- White at 29.9%
- American Indian at 5.9%.

The largest job category is Operatives at 67.2%. Operatives are primarily males at 64.4%.

The second largest category is Officials and Managers who make up 14.9% with 50% male and 50% female in those positions.
LABOR MARKET

Officials and Managers:

1 in 10 workers are Officials and Managers.

Most Officials and Managers in the Labor Market are female at 51.4%. More than half of all the females in the Officials and Managers job category are White.

Even though the primary race for this category is White at 59.7%, the largest inequality happens between the Hispanic/Latino men and women with 15.8% male and 20.2% Hispanic/Latino female. The White race has a close representation from male and female at 30.1% and 29.5%.

Professionals:

The largest job category in the market are professional workers at 26.6% which is primarily female with 53.6%.

The largest inequality is between Hispanic/Latino and White workers. Hispanic/Latino make up 21.9% and White workers 72.7% for this job category.

Notable in this category are Asians at 2.7% which makes this the highest representation of Asians for all job categories in the market.

Administrative Support:

Administrative support workers make up 15.1% of the Market workforce. Most of the Administrative support workers in the Market are females at 76.1%.

Craft Workers:

Craft workers make up 11.4% of the entire workforce. The great majority of Craft workers in the Market are males at 96.5%.

Operatives:

Operatives is a fairly small share of the Market’s workforce with only 2.6%. Most Operatives are males at 70%.

Observations:

Generally notable in the Market is the inequality between men and women with women in the higher paid job categories.

However, male continue to have the higher share of the Labor Market at 51.5%.

There are three main races within this market:
- Hispanic/Latino at 35.8%
- White alone at 59.7%
- American Indian and Alaska at 2.5%

The two main categories Hispanic/Latino and White make up 94.7% of the total Market’s workforce in Rio Arriba, Santa Fe, Taos and Los Alamos counties.

Males represent the Hispanic workforce while female dominate the White workforce.

**UTILIZATION: NCRTD Workforce vs. Labor Market Analysis**

A comparison of NCRTD’s workforce to the Market labor statistics for Rio Arriba, Santa Fe, Taos and Los Alamos counties provides the following information on utilization:

- Hispanic males and Hispanic/Latino females dominate the NCRTD workforce with 13.7% and 1.6% more than the Market’s workforce.

- We have a 50% Hispanic/Latino representation in Officials and Managers which is only 14.2% of the Market’s average which is 35.8%.

- Overall, we have 8.2% more male workers than the Market average.

- The Market has a representation of 2.5% from the American Indian and Alaska race in the Officials and Managers job category.

**Observations:**

The Operatives job category represents all 3 of main races in the market: 64.2% Hispanic/Latino, 29.9% White alone and 6% American Indian and Alaska.

When it comes to gender, our Index value reflects that we have 6% more females in the Operatives job category than the Market.

The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino male category increased by 13.7%, while White Males decreased by -5.8% over the market.

The NCRTD has fewer Female’s than the Market with a -9.7% decrease, the market is at 48.5% while the NCRTD is 38.8%

The NCRTD has an increase of 1.6% in Hispanic/Latino females, the market is 20.8% while the NCRTD is at 22.4%.

The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino male is at 14.2% above the market, the market is 35.8% while the NCRTD is 50%.

The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino Official and Manager category is above the market by 9.8%. The NCRTD is 30% vs. the market at 20.2%.
The NCRTD is up 1.7% in the American Indian / Alaska category with 3.0% vs. the Market of 1.3%.

**GOALS 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Goal</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase White females’ representation. Our White females represent only 13.3% of our workforce which is 53.3% of the market average.</td>
<td>The White females’ representation as of August 4, 2017 is update by .1% or 13.4%. It remained flat throughout the timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase Hispanic/Latino representation in the Officials and Managers functions.</td>
<td>The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino representation in the Officials and Managers function is up from 30% to 50%, which is an increase of 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase female representation in all job functions.</td>
<td>The female representation has remained flat at 40%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase our American Indian participation in the Officials and Managers functions.</td>
<td>This objective has not been achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We are fully committed to embracing diversity and inclusion in all aspects of our operation. Our Diversity and Inclusion Goal:</td>
<td>We have recruited for vacant positions with consideration to all ethnicities and races.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We aspire to developing a workforce that reflects the changing Labor Market and continue to build a multicultural and diverse team by embracing other minorities in the Labor Market such as African Americans and Asians.</td>
<td>Through the recruitment process, we are continuing to recruit for all ethnicities and races in the Labor Market area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals for 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Increase our American Indian participation in all job categories within the NCRTD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase the female representation in all job categories within the NCRTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recruit individuals in a Veteran Status and with Disabilities that can perform the essential functions of the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We will work towards more diversity in the Labor Market categories such as, African Americans and Asians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PLAN

1. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S POLICY STATEMENT POLICY

The Regional Transit District Act was adopted by the State Legislature and signed on March 21, 2003. The Regional Transit District Act, NMSA 1978 Section 73-25-1 et seq., authorizes New Mexico governmental units to establish regional transit districts that are authorized to finance, construct, operate, maintain, and promote regional transit systems. The North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) satisfied the conditions of the Regional Transit District Act and was certified by the New Mexico Transportation Commission on September 14, 2004, and is a sub-division of the State of New Mexico. The NCRTD has entered into Intergovernmental Agreements with the following entities: Counties of Santa Fe, Los Alamos, Rio Arriba and Taos; Cities and Towns of Santa Fe, Edgewood, Taos and Española and the Pueblos of San Ildefonso, Nambe, Tesuque, Santa Clara, Pojoaque and Ohkay Owingeh.

Elected and appointed representatives of these organizations serve on the NCRTD’s Board of Directors and give the organization direction.

The NCRTD’s mission is to provide safe, secure and effective public transportation within North Central New Mexico in order to enhance the quality of life of our citizens by providing mobility options and economic opportunities throughout the region.

The NCRTD provides a variety of transit routes and services to citizens within the District’s four county service area, and is funded through a combination of federal, state and other grants, a voter authorized Regional Gross Receipts Transit Tax, and miscellaneous revenues.

NCRTD prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual’s income is derived from any public assistance.

The NCRTD will keep these tenets in mind in recruitment, selection, placement, promotion, training, compensation of its employees, and in all other official acts of the NCRTD and its employees and agents.

The Human Resources Director will be appointed to serve as our EEO officer for NCRTD. The EEO Officer will be responsible for ensuring that we comply with all EEO responsibilities.

We are committed to an Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Program including goals and timetables for good-faith efforts to achieve full utilization of minorities and women at all levels and segments of NCRTD’s workforce where deficiencies may exist.

All management personnel share in this responsibility and will be assigned specific tasks to assure compliance is achieved. The performance of managers and supervisors will be evaluated on their contribution to the success of the EEO program the same way as their performance on other NCRTD goals is evaluated.
Employees and applicants will have the right to file complaints and reports alleging discrimination with the appropriate official(s). All such complaints and reports will be thoroughly investigated. No adverse action or retaliation will be taken or permitted against any employee who reports issues of workplace discrimination or harassment.

SIGNED:

Anthony J. Mortillaro
Executive Director
II. POLICY

North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

It shall provide equal employment opportunity to its employees and applicants for employment on the basis of fitness and merit without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, veteran status, or disability except where sex or age or lack of disability is an accepted occupational qualification, or handicap. This policy shall be followed in recruiting, hiring, promotion into all position classifications, compensation, benefits, transfers, layoffs, returns from layoffs, demotions, termination, NCRTD-sponsored training programs, educational leave, social and recreational programs, and use of NCRTD facilities.

Any person employed by NCRTD who fails to comply with this policy is subject to disciplinary action, up to, and including termination.

Where necessary, this policy is to be extended in order that NCRTD be in compliance with the following federal restraints:

**USERRA 32 U.S.C §4311**

the U.S. Constitution, including the 14th Amendment

Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) 4704.1,

the Civil Rights Act of 1866,

the Civil Rights Act of 1871,

Equal Pay Act of 1963 (EPA),

Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA),

Title II of the Genetic Information Act of 2008 (GINA),

Title VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1974,

the State and Local Fiscal Assistance (Revenue Sharing) Act of 1972,

the Age Discrimination in the Employment Act of 1975,

the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970,

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974,

and the Rehabilitation Act of 1974

and all relevant executive orders and regulations including but not limited to Executive Order 13672.
The implementation of this EEO plan is a reaffirmation of adherence to and promotion of the policy of nondiscrimination in all action affecting NCRTD employees and in managing NCRTD resources. The guidelines and objectives contained in this plan are designed to assist NCRTD and all of its employees in adhering to that policy.

III. ANNUAL GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The North Central Regional Transit District’s goal is to make its workforce more closely reflect the labor force in North Central New Mexico. The Agency will make specific good faith efforts to identify the underutilization of women and minorities, and make the necessary changes to remove any existing barriers to their employment. NCRTD will also work to recruit and retain qualified minorities, women, military service members, veterans, and individuals with disabilities at all employment levels.

Underutilization may be caused by barriers to employment. Therefore, the NCRTD’s hiring officials will review their recruitment, selection, and promotion process as well as the on-the-job treatment of employees to ensure that women and minorities, military service members, veterans, and individuals with disabilities receive equal employment opportunity to secure employment and promotion.

The NCRTD Executive Director, with the assistance of the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, will annually perform the following activities necessary to prepare and update the goals and objectives of the Affirmative Action Plan for Equal Opportunity:

A. Analyze current staff and staffing patterns to determine the race/ethnicity of NCRTD employees and of the four-county four-county regional area workforce in order to establish benchmark ratios of race/ethnicity and sex.
B. Based on the ratios developed under Section III. "A," above, establish short range (less than 1 year) employment goals and objectives to address any areas of under-utilization of minorities, military service members and veterans, individuals with disabilities (to the extent they are able to perform the essential functions of a job), and/or females which would further equal employment opportunity for NCRTD employees or the projected work force.

C. Based on the ratios developed under Section III. "A," above, establish longer range (1-5 years) employment goals and objectives to address any areas of under-utilization of minorities, or military service members and veterans, females and/or which would further equal employment opportunity for NCRTD employees or the projected work force.

IV. DISSEMINATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The NCRTD Equal Employment Opportunity Program will be communicated in the following manner:

Internal

- A copy of the full EEO Plan will be provided to each manager.
- A copy will be distributed and discussed with and given to each existing NCRTD employee.
- The EEO/AAP Policy will be placed in all future employee handbooks and manuals and discussion held during New Employee Orientation and in-training programs.
- Both current and existing employees shall be asked to review the policy and save it along with their employee handbooks and manuals.
• The EEO/AA Policy will be discussed at appropriate supervisory meetings covering the subject of recruitment, employment, training, promotion and transfer of employees and procurement of services.

• The EEO Policy and Complaint Resolution Procedure posters will be permanently posted and conspicuously displayed in areas available to employees and applicants for employment.

• NCRTD’s EEO Program Plan and related documents will be posted on the internet.

External

• Notification of NCRTD’s EEO Program Plan will be given to all recruitment sources and community groups.

• All employment advertising methods utilized by NCRTD will include its EEO Policy Statement.

• NCRTD’s EEO Program Plan and related documents will be on its website.

• NCRTD’s EEO Policy Statement will be included on employment applications.

• NCRTD will advise contractors and business partners of the EEO policies and procedures to ensure awareness and compliance.

The dissemination of NCRTD’s EEO/AA policy is not limited to the above referenced items. As considered appropriate, NCRTD utilizes whatever means necessary to convey the organization’s commitment to equal employment opportunity.

V. RESPONSABILITIES

A) NCRTD EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Ultimate responsibility for the implementation of this policy and the NCRTD’s affirmative action program rests with the NCRTD Executive Director. The Executive Director’s responsibilities may include:

1. Assisting in identifying problem areas and establishing agency and unit goals and objectives;

2. Being actively involved with local minority organizations, women’s and handicapped groups, veteran organizations, community organizations and community service programs designed to promote EEO;

3. Participating actively in periodic audits of all aspects of employment in order to identify and to remove barriers obstructing the achievement of specified goals and objectives;
4. Holding regular discussions with managers, supervisors, and employees to assure the agency’s policies and procedures are being followed;

5. Reviewing the qualifications of all employees to assure that minorities, disabled persons, veterans, military service members, and women are given full opportunities for transfer, promotions, training, salary increases, and other forms of professional advancement;

6. Participating in the review and/or investigation of complaints alleging discrimination;

7. Conducting and supporting career counseling for all employees.

8. Participating in periodic audits to ensure that all agency facilities are in compliance (e.g., EEO posters are properly displayed on all employees bulletin boards);

B) EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (EEO) OFFICER

The Human Resources Director will assume the position of the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and perform the following duties and functions:

1. Developing and recommending an EEO policy, a written program, and internal and external communication procedures;

2. Assisting management in collecting and analyzing employment data, identifying problem areas, setting goals;

3. Designing, implementing, and monitoring internal audit and reporting systems to measure program effectiveness and to determine where progress has been made and where further actions are needed;

4. Reporting periodically/yearly to the Executive Director on the progress of each unit in relation to the agency’s goals (at least semiannually at the direction of the Executive Director);

5. Serving as a liaison between the District Agency, Federal, State and Local governments, regulatory agencies, minority, veterans, military service members, disabled and women’s organizations, and other community groups;

6. Assuring that current legal information affecting affirmative action is disseminated to responsible officials;

7. Assisting in recruiting minorities, women, veterans, military service members, and disabled applicants and establishing outreach sources;

8. Evaluating and commenting on all hires and promotions;

9. Processing, investigating, and managing all employment discrimination complaints.

C) DEPARTMENT HEADS AND SUPERVISORS
Each member of management and supervision is responsible within his/her area of responsibility for conducting activities in a manner which will ensure compliance with the policy and the Affirmative Equal Opportunity Employment Programs Action Programs. Furthermore, each is made to understand that his/her work performance in the area of equal employment affirmative action is being evaluated.
VI. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PERSONNEL AND WORKPLACE PRACTICES

The personnel practices of the NCRTD shall at all times conform to the requirements of the law and any legal requirements collectively bargained by the NCRTD notwithstanding any provision of this EEO Policy to the contrary. NCRTD personnel practices shall integrate the following specific EEO considerations.

A) RECRUITMENT

Applicants for employment shall be considered and placed without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, military status or disability.

The NCRTD shall display equal employment opportunity notices in conspicuous places available to all employees and applicants for employment. Employment application forms shall be in compliance with applicable federal laws. A copy of the NCRTD EEO Policy may be obtained from the EEO Officer or any manager or on the NCRTD’s website.

Applications and supporting documents shall be screened by individual managers for evaluation taking into account this EEO Policy. Applicants deemed most suited for available position may be asked to submit additional supporting data for further evaluation, and/or may be asked to submit themselves for an interview. Before a formal offer is made, the EEO officer shall be consulted to ascertain that a good faith effort to implement this EEO Policy has indeed been made. The EEO Officer shall obtain evidence to confirm that the applicant pool from which the selection (hiring) was made had been established without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, or disability. If this cannot be confirmed, the EEO Officer may object to the hiring and the Executive Director shall consider alternatives prior to filling the position. In order enhance the employment opportunities of minorities and women, veterans, military service members and individuals with disabilities, managers are especially urged to develop a better understanding of minorities and women, veterans, the disabled in the work force and the conditions, problems and expectations of minority the groups and women.

The recruitment of persons to fill vacancies will be accomplished without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, military status or disability. NCRTD will maintain contacts with various minority, women, minority veterans and handicapped and organizations concerning manpower resources and requirements when necessary.

1. The EEO Officer will have primary responsibility for recruitment activities with direct assistance from other NCRTD staff involved in the hiring process.

2. Whenever practical all job openings will be advertised in the news media. They will also be advertised in any news media forum that targets women and minorities as well as organizations and institutions catering predominantly to minorities, women, veterans, military service members and minorities/disabled. Where visual media (such as online posts, posters or flyers) is used, all pictures that show visual representations of the NCRTD staff shall include minorities and/or females. The NCRTD may choose not to advertise vacancies when more than 5 current (three months or less) applications are on file for a position, or selections can be made from a pre-selected standing list of qualified applicants, or a collective bargaining agreement or law does not permit advertising the position.
3. The latest job listing will be posted in such a manner that all employees and potential employees have equal access to this information.

4. Communications will be maintained with educational institutions and vocational schools for recruitment, including predominantly minority and women's institutions.

5. The Executive Director will determine where to advertise vacant positions; either in-house only or in the local news media.

The Utilization Analysis will be annually reviewed by both the EEO Officer and other appropriate NCRTD staff in an effort to ensure that qualified women and minority groups are provided opportunities at rates substantially similar to those of qualified men and non-minority employees. NCRTD will strive to employ and retain qualified individuals with disabilities in all levels of its workforce.

B) SELECTION

The selection of persons to fill job vacancies will be accomplished through approved procedures only, adhering to the documented NCRTD hiring process. Persons will be hired without regard to non-merit factors following a completely objective appraisal of each eligible individual interested in the position.

C) PROMOTION

Promotion will be proposed in accordance with applicable rules, on a nondiscriminatory basis. The procedures used in selecting persons for promotion will be evaluated periodically to ensure that they are realistic and relevant. Any employee who feels he or she has not been accorded fair and impartial treatment regarding employment will be offered an opportunity to discuss this problem. In order to encourage merit based promotions the NCRTD shall seek to fund and provide assistance as follows.

1. Continued emphasis will be placed on the NCRTD's educational assistance programs.

2. Training programs shall be designed to upgrade the skills of employees so that they can improve performance in their present position.

3. On-the-job training will be designed so that employees have an opportunity to acquire skills needed to qualify for promotions and/or an enhanced position with the NCRTD.

4. Employees with managerial ability will be encouraged to acquire skills on-the-job or through more formalized training prior to their advancement into a management position.

D) EEO TRAINING

All personnel involved in the recruitment and selection process will be trained to ensure they understand the EEO Program Plan, and are committed to its intent. Training shall also be provided annually to appropriate personnel including the NCRTD Executive Director, the EEO Officer and all Department Heads.

E) DISCIPLINARY ACTION
An employee may be disciplined for any of the reasons provided under the NCRTD's Personnel Rules and Regulations. Any NCRTD employee who feels that he or she has been wrongfully subjected to disciplinary action has the right to appeal the action, either verbally or in writing, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the NCRTD Personnel Rules and Regulations.

This EEO Policy may serve as grounds for disciplinary action against employees. Any employee who is found to have violated this policy may be subject to prompt and appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

If an employee believes any disciplinary action against him or her is EEO related, he/she has the right to request a review from the EEO Officer to ensure compliance with NCRTD’s EEO Policy. If the EEO Officer finds that an EEO issue exists, the Procedures outlined in Section VIII: Issue Resolution of the Policy will be implemented and followed.

The EEO Officer will be apprised of all verbal and written appeals based upon EEO compliance issues.

F) WORK ASSIGNMENTS

All management personnel will be responsible for monitoring employee placement, assignment of duties and work sites to ensure that assignments are made on a non-discriminatory basis.

G) SEPARATION FROM EMPLOYMENT

Exiting employees shall be afforded the opportunity to participate in an optional exit interview conducted by Human Resources or other appropriate staff that will allow them to:

- Discuss the precise reason(s) for the termination.
- Voice any concerns they may have been reluctant to express while employed.
- Provide positive and negative comments and suggestions related to their employment experience.

NCRTD will review recorded terminations’ information to identify if women and minorities leave the Agency at rates substantially different from those of men, non-minority employees, and employees without disabilities.

H) WAGES AND SALARIES

NCRTD complies with the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which requires all employers subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide equal pay for men and women performing similar work.

NCRTD will evaluate current salaries to ensure appropriate range placement based on job related experience, skills and abilities. NCRTD will examine salary anomalies and ensure equality among male and female employees.
1) EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES

It is the policy of NCRTD not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of physical or mental disability in regard to any position for which the employee or applicant for employment is qualified. NCRTD takes affirmative action to employ, advance in employment and otherwise treat qualified individuals with known disabilities without discrimination based upon their physical or mental disability in all employment practices.

NCRTD will attempt to provide reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities, unless such accommodation would impose an undue hardship on the conduct of its business. NCRTD also commits to engaging in an interactive process with the person requesting the accommodation (or their representative), as needed, to determine an appropriate accommodation.

2) MILITARY/VETERAN STATUS

It is the policy of the NCRTD not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of their military or veteran’s status regarding any position for which the employee or applicant for employment is qualified. NCRTD takes affirmative action to employ, advance in employment and otherwise treat qualified individuals with known military veteran’s status without discrimination based upon their status in all employment practices.

3) SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY AND PRACTICES

NCRTD will not tolerate sexual harassment of its employees by anyone. Persons suspected of sexually harassing others will be investigated.

Normal, courteous, mutually respectful, pleasant, non-coercive interactions between employees that are acceptable to both parties are not considered to be sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment as defined by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is:

- Unwelcomed or unwanted sexual advances;
- Requests and demands for sexual favors;
- Verbal abuse or kidding that is sexually oriented and considered unacceptable by another individual;
- Engaging in any type of sexually oriented conduct that would unreasonably interfere with another’s work performance; and
- Creating a work environment that is intimidating, hostile, or offensive.

Sexual harassment includes a wide range of behaviors, from the actual coercion of sexual relations to unwelcome offensive comments, jokes, innuendos, and other sexually-oriented statements and unwelcome emphasizing of sexual identity. It can occur between employees, and between employees and members of
the public, including vendors, visitors, passengers, or others with whom employees come into contact while working for NCRTD.

Harassment of any kind, including sexual harassment, is illegal and prohibited. Any employee, who feels he or she is the victim of workplace harassment, or who witnesses unlawful harassment or abuse, whether from management, co-workers, or third parties, should promptly report the matter to their supervisor or manager. Both victim and the harasser can be either a woman or a man, and the victim and harasser can be the same sex. All such reports will be thoroughly investigated. No adverse action or retaliation will be taken or permitted against any employee for reporting the issues of workplace harassment.

It shall be the responsibility of the EEO Officer to advise any employee who feels she or he has been sexually harassed of the proper procedure for handling the complaint.

**NCRTD FACILITIES AND BENEFITS**

Equal opportunity shall be assured to all NCRTD employees for proper use of NCRTD facilities.

The benefits and conditions of employment as outlined in the NCRTD Employee Handbook shall be monitored to assure that they continue to be equally available to all employees.
VII. RECORDS

Race/sex records will be kept on the following:

- applicants
- hiring
- terminations
- promotions
- transfers
- training
- complaints of discrimination

Records on the subjects listed above will be maintained by the EEO Officer. They will be reviewed periodically to ensure that actions taken by the organization are consistent with EEO and Affirmative Action Policy. Records of correspondence with the various recruitment contacts (minority, female, 

A file of all job advertisements will continue to be kept by the Personnel EEO Officer. At least annually all department heads and supervisors will be provided training in EEO/Affirmative Action subjects including interviewing techniques.
VIII. EEO ISSUE RESOLUTION

It is NCRTD's policy to provide a pleasant working environment for all employees. The EEO issue resolution procedure outlined below will address discrimination complaints regarding race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, military or veteran status or disability.

Utilization of this issue resolution procedure will not in any way jeopardize current or prospective employment status and shall be independent of, and in addition to, any other procedural rights afforded to employees under the NCRTD Personnel Rules and Procedures.

Issue Resolution Procedures are as follows:

1. The EEO Officer will receive all written complaints of discrimination. These complaints may be direct from the employee, applicant or referred from a supervisor or manager who has received a complaint from an employee.

2. All discrimination complaints filed under this procedure will be accepted for investigation up to and including 30 days after the date of the alleged discriminatory act.

3. All complaints will be properly recorded and signed by the complainant. Employees will be advised and counseled as to other avenues of redress including, but not limited to, the following:
   - New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions, Human Rights Bureau

4. All complaints will be investigated and processed by the EEO Officer within 30 days of receipt.

5. The complainant will receive written notification regarding the results of the investigation and the final disposition of the complaint including remedial actions to be taken.

6. If the complainant disagrees with the findings and decisions of the EEO Officer, he/she will be advised and counseled as to other avenues of redress including, but not limited to, the following:
   - New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions, Human Rights Bureau
7. The EEO Officer will take necessary steps to ensure the confidentiality of all discrimination or harassment complaint records and of any counseling done in the course of the complaint procedure to the maximum extent permitted by law.

IX. SIGNATURE AND APPROVAL

NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

Approved by Executive Director:

__________________________
Anthony J. Mortillaro

Date: ______________________

Approved as to form and legal sufficiency by the NCRTD legal counsel:

__________________________

Date: ______________________
A) UTILIZATION ANALYSIS

Equal employment opportunity assumes that the workforce of any given business should mirror the race and sex composition of the population. A major factor in assessing equal employment opportunity is the skill availability of the labor pool.

Employment Opportunity legislation (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended) and subsequent executive orders (Executive Order 11246, as amended); require that Federal contractors and subcontractors certify that they do not discriminate with respect to employment and the conditions thereof.

The assessment below analyses the workforce composition metrics of NCRTD vs. Labor Market in Rio Arriba, Taos, Santa Fe and Los Alamos Counties.

The following tables have been created to aid in the Utilization Analysis process:

- NCRTD CURRENT WORKFORCE ANALYSIS

  Reflects the make-up of our current workforce as of August 4, 2017 - October 31, 2018.

- LABOR MARKET ANALYSIS

  Represents the available raw data extracted from the US Census Bureau - 2010 Census.

- UTILIZATION

  Compares the values from NCRTD’s current workforce and the Labor Market.

  **Percent difference:** The comparison includes a ‘percent difference’ between the Market and NCRTD and its corresponding index of those percentages.
Index: The Index is instrumental in calculating the percent of the percent in other words, is the comparison between the two percentages, the Market's and NCRTD's.

**NCRTD CURRENT WORKFORCE ANALYSIS**

The NCRTD workforce consists of sixty-seven (67) employees representing eight (8) Job Categories:

- Executive/Senior Level Officials and Managers
- First/Mid-Level Officials and Managers
- Professionals
  - Technicians
- Administrative Support Workers
- Craft Workers
- Operatives
  - Laborer's and Helpers

**Observations:**

NCRTD’s workforce is made of 59.760% male and 38.840% female.

Overall NCRTD'S Workforce is made up of:

- Hispanic/Latino workers at 64.263.3%
- White at 29.934.3%
- American Indian at 5.98.3%

The largest job category is Operatives at 67.2%. Operatives are primarily males at 64.458.1%.
The second largest category is Officials and Managers who make up 14.916.7% once again primarily males with 50% male and 50% female in those positions at 70%.

Also notable that 90% of all Officials and Managers are White.

LABOR MARKET

Officials and Managers:

1 in 10 workers are Officials and Managers.

Most Officials and Managers in the Labor Market are female at 51.4%. More than half of all the females in the Officials and Managers job category are White.

Even though the primary race for this category is White at 59.7%, the largest inequality happens between the Hispanic/Latino men and women with 15.8% male and 20.2% Hispanic/Latino female. The White race has a close representation from male and female at 30.1% and 29.5%.

Professionals:

The largest job category in the market are professional workers at 26.6% which is primarily female with 53.6%.

The largest inequality is between Hispanic/Latino and White workers. Hispanic/Latino make up 21.9% and White workers 72.7% for this job category.

Notable in this category are Asians at 2.7% which makes this the highest representation of Asians for all job categories in the market.

Administrative Support:
Administrative support workers makes up 15.1% of the Market workforce. Most of the Administrative support workers in the Market are females at 76.1%.

Craft Workers:

Craft workers make up 11.4% of the entire workforce. The great majority of Craft workers in the Market are males at 96.5%.

Operatives:

Operatives is a fairly small share of the Market’s workforce with only 2.6%. Most Operatives are males at 70%.

Observations:

Generally notable in the Market is the inequality between men and women with women in the higher paid job categories.

However male continue to have the higher share of the Labor Market at 51.5%.

There are three main races within this market:

- Hispanic/Latino at 35.8%
- White alone at 59.7%
- American Indian and Alaska at 2.5%

The two main categories Hispanic/Latino and White make up 94.7% of the total Market’s workforce in Rio Arriba, Santa Fe, Taos and Los Alamos counties.

Males represent the Hispanic workforce while female dominate the White workforce.
UTILIZATION: NCRTD Workforce vs. Labor Market Analysis

A comparison of NCRTD's work force to the Market labor statistics for Rio Arriba, Santa Fe, Taos and Los Alamos counties provides the following information on utilization:

- White-Hispanic males and Hispanic/Latino females dominate the NCRTD workforce with 13.7% 12.3% and 29.1% more than the Market's workforce. We are flat to the market when it comes to Hispanic males with only 6.5% more as reflected by the Index value.

- We have a 50% Hispanic/Latino representation in Officials and Managers which is only 14.2% 27.9% of the Market's average which is 35.8%.

- NCRTD's Officials and Managers are primarily by male while in the Market most are female.

- Overall we have 46.5% more male workers than the Market average.

- The Market has a representation of 2.5% from the American Indian and Alaska race in the Officials and Managers job category.

Observations:

The Operatives job category represents all 3 of main races in the market: 58.46% Hispanic/Latino, 29.9% White alone and 11.6% American Indian and Alaska.
When it comes to gender, our Index value reflects that we have 64.4% more females in the Operatives job category than the Market.

While in the Market Hispanic/Latino make up most of the Operatives job category, NCRTD has 20.4% more White workers than the market as reflected by our Index comparison.

The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino male category increased by 13.7%, while White Males decreased by -5.8% over the market.

The NCRTD has fewer Female's than the Market with a -9.7% decrease, the market is at 48.5% while the NCRTD is 38.8%.

The NCRTD has an increase of 1.6% in Hispanic/Latino females, the market is 20.8% while the NCRTD is at 22.4%.

The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino male is at 14.2% above the market, the market is 35.8% while the NCRTD is 50%.

The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino Official and Manager category is above the market by 9.8%. The NCRTD is 30% vs. the market at 20.2%.

The NCRTD is up 1.7% in the American Indian / Alaska category with 3.0% vs. the Market of 1.3%.

**GOALS 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Goal</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase White females' representation. Our White females represent only 13.3% of our workforce which is 53.3% of the market average.</td>
<td>The White females' representation as of August 4, 2017 is update by +1% or 13.4%. It remained flat throughout the timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase Hispanic/Latino representation in the Officials and Managers functions.</td>
<td>The NCRTD Hispanic/Latino representation in the Officials and Managers function is up from 30% to 50%, which is an increase of 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase female representation in all job functions.</td>
<td>The female representation has remained flat at 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Increase our American Indian participation in the officials and managers functions.

   This objective has not been achieved.

5. We are fully committed to embracing diversity and inclusion in all aspects of our operation. Our diversity and inclusion goal:

   We have recruited for vacant positions with consideration to all ethnicities and races.

6. We aspire to developing a workforce that reflects the changing Labor Market and continue to build a multicultural and diverse team by embracing other minorities in the Labor Market such as African Americans and Asians.

   Through the recruitment process, we are continuing to recruit for all ethnicities and races in the Labor Market area.

Goals for 2017-2018

1. Increase our American Indian participation in all job categories within the NCRTD.

2. Increase the female representation in all job categories within the NCRTD.

3. Recruit individuals in a veteran status and with disabilities that can perform the essential functions of the job.

4. We will work towards more diversity in the of Labor Market categories such as African Americans and Asians.
GOALS

1. Increase White females’ representation. Our White females represent only 13.3% of our workforce which is 53.3% of the market average.

2. Increase Hispanic/Latino representation in the Officials and Managers functions.

3. Increase female representation in all job functions.

4. Increase our American Indian participation in the Officials and Managers functions.

5. We are fully committed to embracing diversity and inclusion in all aspects of our operation. Our Diversity and Inclusion goal:
   - We aspire to developing a workforce that reflects the changing Labor Market and continue to build a multicultural and diverse team by embracing other minorities in the Labor Market such as African Americans and Asians.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hispanic and Latino</th>
<th>White alone</th>
<th>Not Hispanic or Latino, one race</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other</th>
<th>Total, both sexes</th>
<th>Hispanic and Latino</th>
<th>White alone</th>
<th>Not Hispanic or Latino, one race</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other</th>
<th>% of Job Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Official and managers</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>4,665</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional workers</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>2745</td>
<td>9,065</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,810</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>4,635</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>2,415</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>7,105</td>
<td>3835</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,405</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft workers</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>5,360</td>
<td>3830</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and helpers</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>1620</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>4795</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4,170</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Breakdown Totals</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>46650</td>
<td>22720</td>
<td>22205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24170</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22480</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table provides a breakdown of job categories and percentages for various market types, including service industries and sales and manufacturing sectors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCRTD</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hispanic and Latino</th>
<th>White alone</th>
<th>Not Hispanic or Latino, one race Black or African American Indian and Alaska</th>
<th>Asian alone</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian and Other</th>
<th>Not Hispanic or Latino, two or more races White and Black</th>
<th>White and AIAN</th>
<th>Black and AIAN</th>
<th>Balance of not Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>% of Job Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officials and managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technicians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative support workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Craft workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laborers and helpers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race Breakdown Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Hispanic and Latino</td>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino, one race Black or African American</td>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino, two or more races White and Black or AIAN</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other</td>
<td>Balance of not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>% of Job Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials and managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>139.6</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>125.7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-46.4%</td>
<td>-48.3%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-43.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-56.2%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-46.4%</td>
<td>-48.9%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-35.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-64.9%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>-50.7%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-23.9%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-64.9%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>185.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>204.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and helpers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-70.1%</td>
<td>-24.0%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-63.8%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td>-62.9%</td>
<td>-28.9%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-54.2%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-45.3%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Breakdown Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, both sexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference Index</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>-17.4%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>136.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-9.7%</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unit value                  |       |                     |             |                                                          |                                                                  |                           |                                 |                  |
| Balance of                  |       |                     |             |                                                          |                                                                  |                           |                                 |                  |
| not Hispanic or Latino      |       |                     |             |                                                          |                                                                  |                           |                                 |                  |
| % of Job Category           |       |                     |             |                                                          |                                                                  |                           |                                 |                  |

Note: The table provides percentages for various demographic categories, including race, ethnicity, and gender, for different job categories.
Title: Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2017-35 Adopting a Records Retention and Disposition Policy.

Prepared By: Peter Dwyer, Legal Counsel

Background: New Mexico state statutes do not require that the District have or maintain a record retention policy per se. The District is required to maintain records for audit purposes and is required to allow inspection of public records. In addition, as a practical matter, the District needs to keep and maintain records to perform its business and to operate its daily affairs. The existing policy on record retention and e-mails was adopted as Resolution No. 2012-17. It does provide some general guidance on records management but it does not follow best practices for records management and it does not adequately address key areas such as access and security of records, the preservation of "Mission Critical" records and the proper way to store and maintain and dispose of records. The key point to keep in mind is that "Records" for the purposes of this policy means original documents that have a business function and that should be preserved for a prescribed time before being "disposed" of by either archiving or destruction. In other words, records retention and disposal is about building a reliable set of authentic District documents that are not altered, changed, copied and reused.

Summary: The Public Records Act, NMSA 1978, Section 14-3-1 applies to the state of New Mexico and provides explicit authority for the management and disposition of state records. However, there is no provision for the records of special districts such as the NCRTD and the only authority of the Commission of Public Records is to have the State Records Administrator provide guidance on records management and retention to municipalities (not special districts).

In order to develop a more robust District policy the District's legal counsel and staff have sought training through the State Commission on Public Records and have performed extensive research on the topic. However, the District is not large enough to have or allocate resources to a Records and Information Management system or a staff person with records management expertise.
Therefore, the District is only able to implement a limited version of the current best practices recommended by the State Commission on Public Records. For example, the District makes extensive use of electronic record storage and retention but does not follow the process for document digitization and storage recommended by the State Commission on Public Records because that process requires a highly detailed Imaging System Plan, sophisticated software to make the records accessible and searchable and specialized staff training for the implementation in the plan. The core difficulty is that electronic records management seeks to preserve records in a manner that ensures the authenticity and accuracy of records and their systematic preservation or disposal that far exceeds the current practice of simply keeping a copy of a document on a particular server or drive.

Current best practices for records management are to require all staff within an organization to ensure they file and categorize documents for eventual storage, archiving or destruction. At the present the District does not manage its files in this manner and file management is ad hoc with each department or division maintaining its records according to its own system. Furthermore, the State Commission on Public Records expressly states that adoption of a Record Retention and Disposition Schedule (RRDS) is not advisable because that document needs to change regularly and is not a substitute for a written policy guiding the staff. Therefore the 2012 policy which contains one page of directions (Section 5.0 "Instructions") and then 14 pages of RRDS is not consistent with the best practices as indicated by the state. In fact, the use of a 14 page RRDS is likely to be a strong deterrent to District staff who would need to go through that list for each of the documents in each of their files annually in order to comply with the current policy. For this reason, the attached policy give the authority to the Executive Director to change the RRDS as needed and contemplates that the RRDS in final form will be developed in the coming months based upon staff feedback to greatly simplify the process.

A key component of records management is to limit access to and use security protocols on all "Records." So, for example the District's Resolutions and Policies are readily available as copies on the District's web site and could easily be downloaded and modified. To guard against this possibility the true "Record" is the hard copy signed and maintained in the Executive Director's offices and the copies on the web site are not "Records" within the meaning of the policy. Likewise, the various contracts, financial documents, personnel records, and legal documents all should be safeguarded by having an official "Record" that is not likely to be overwritten, lost, altered or updated that is maintained with limited access and security protocols.

Other issues with the policy revolve around the retention and disposition of audio and video records which need to be purged regularly (approximately every 30 days for bus video tapes) in order to limit the large amounts of data used to store them.

In summary the District is incrementally moving toward modern best practices for records management and disposition but has limited resources and staff time to do so. The attached policy attempts to strike a balance between the need for better records management and the limited resources of a small entity like the NCRTD.

**Recommended Action:** It is recommended that the Board adopt Resolution No. 2017-35.

**Options/Alternatives:** Continue to operate under resolution No. 2012-17.
Fiscal Impact: None at this time but the District should consider budgeting for more robust software and records management in the future.

Attachment:
Resolution No. 2012-17
Proposed new Records Management and Disposition Policy
North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD)

Resolution No. 2017-35

ADOPTING A RECORD RETENTION AND DISPOSITION POLICY

WHEREAS, the NCRTD is a "special District" pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 73-25-1 et seq., and a subdivision of the State of New Mexico; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors adopted its existing "Record Retention and E-Mail Policy" by Resolution 2012-17; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD needs to limit access to and assure the security of its records in order to ensure that an accurate history of the District's business is maintained; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD needs to be able to dispose of records that have no further usefulness and value to the District in a manner that properly documents the orderly disposition of any document whether it is stored and archived or destroyed; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD and its Board of Directors wish to ensure systematic control of all District records in order to ensure records are accurate and reliable by ensuring the authenticity, integrity, reliability and usability of all district records.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE NCRTD BOARD THAT THE ATTACHED "Records Retention and Disposition Policy" Is hereby adopted.

PASSED APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT ON THIS 13TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2017.

Approved as to form:

Daniel Barrone, Chair

Peter Dwyer, Counsel
1.0 Purposes

The North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) ("District") generates numerous physical and electronic records in the course of performing its primary function as a public transit agency. The ability of the District and the public to obtain correct copies of District records is important to ensure that District operations are transparent, reasonable and consistent with Board approved policies.

2.0 Scope of Policy

This policy covers all District records regardless of the format in which the records are generated, stored, or retained. District records shall include all records obtained by District staff and employees in the course of their conduct of District business and such records of the District's Officers and agents as the District staff may obtain in the course of conducting the District's business. This policy only covers the District's own actions in managing its records and does not cover the inspection or reproduction of records.

3.0 Oversight Responsibility:

This policy shall be administered by the Executive Director and his/her administrative assistant. However, each employee of the District shall be responsible for retention and disposition of District records within the individual's control and nothing herein shall excuse District employees from compliance with laws including but not limited to the Inspection of Public Records Act.

4.0 Definitions:
The following terms shall have the respective meanings provided in this Policy. Terms capitalized for non-grammatical purposes in this Policy shall have the meanings as defined in this Policy.

A. "Agency" means the administrative subdivision of a county or municipal government.

B. "Archives" means the permanent records of the state of New Mexico, which may include government and private collections of the Spanish, Mexican, territorial and statehood periods, assessed to have significant historical value to warrant their preservation by the state of New Mexico.

C. "Disposition" means final action that puts into effect the results of an appraisal decision for a series of records (i.e., transfer to archives or destruction).

D. "Executive level" means elected and appointed officials, statutory agency heads and management personnel with decision making authority granted by the agency head.

E. "File closed" means the date the trigger event occurred, or, for electronic records, equivalent to the date last modified unless otherwise stated in retention.

F. "Historical" means records deemed to have archival value by the commission.

G. "Non-record" means extra copies of documents kept solely for convenience of reference, stocks of publications, transitory records, records not usually included within the scope of the official records of an agency or government entity and library material intended only for reference or exhibition. The following specific types of materials are non-records: materials neither made nor received in pursuance of statutory requirements nor in connection with the functional responsibility of the officer or agency, extra copies of correspondence, preliminary drafts, blank forms, transmittal letters or forms that do not add information, sample letters and informational files.

H. "Public Record" means all documents, papers, letters, books, maps, tapes, photographs, recordings and other materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, that are used, created, received, maintained or held by or on behalf of any public body and relate to public business, whether or not the records are required by law to be created or maintained.

I. "Record" means all documents, papers, letters, books, maps, tapes, photographs, recordings and other materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, that are used, created, received, maintained or held by or on behalf of the District for the conduct of official District business. Other materials such a blank forms, extra copies of forms, draft documents and spam e-mail are not records.

J. "Retention" means the period of time during which records should be maintained by an organization because they are needed for operational, legal, fiscal, historical or other purposes.

K. "Transitory" means messages which serve to convey information of temporary importance in lieu of oral communication. Transitory messages are only required for a limited time to ensure the completion of a routine action or the preparation of a subsequent record. Transitory messages are not required to control, support or to document the operations of government.
J. "Trigger event" means the closing event of a record which begins the retention period.

**5.0 General Policy on Records Management, Retention and Disposition:**

It is the general policy of the District to maintain records in an orderly fashion so as to ensure that the District and its officers and agents have reliable written documentary support for the conduct of all District business. In order to ensure the authenticity, integrity, reliability and usability of District records the District shall generally not give or lend originals of any District record to anyone and shall only provide inspection or copying of district records in lieu of providing the original records unless the provision of the original record is required by law or permitted by this policy.

**6.0 Identification of Mission Critical Records:**

The District's Mission Critical Records shall include but not be limited to the following:

- Board Resolutions and attached Exhibits;
- All policies adopted by the Board;
- All administrative procedures implemented by the Executive Director;
- All formally adopted plans for the District.
- All minutes of District Meetings.

The Executive Director may, from time to time, identify additional records as "Mission Critical" if, in the Executive Director's opinion the records warrant retention and disposition other than that normally prescribed for records of that category.

**7.0 Access and Security:**

Access to and security of District records is limited through the physical and electronic storage of records as well as the passwords and security permissions granted to employees and agents of the District. Generally, only the officers, employees and agents of the District shall have access to District records. Any information technology specialist whether an employee or a contractor of the District may have access to District records when necessary to perform their assigned job duties but shall not have authority to inspect, alter or delete any District record without express written permission of the executive director. Inspection or reproduction of District records by the public are not covered by this policy.

**7.1 Purposes of Restricted Access and Security Measures:**

The purpose of access and security limitations are to ensure systematic control of records, ensure that the records are accurate and that the documentation of District decisions is reliable. In order to ensure accurate and reliable records the District must ensure the authenticity, integrity and usability of all records it retains. Access and security limitations are designed to protect sensitive, personal or proprietary information from improper or illegal alteration, use, and dissemination. Access to records and security protocols shall apply to specific staff members on the following bases:
7.2 Access to Personnel Records:

Generally access to all personnel records shall be limited to the Executive Director, the Human Resources Director and the employee. Others may have access to personnel records:
(a) when given express written permission by the employee
(b) when the record is required to perform job duties for the District
(c) when the record is required to be provided by law
(d) when the record is required as part of an investigation or audit by a person or entity either hired by the District or whom has authority to investigate the District's operations.

7.3 Access to Financial Records:

Generally access to all financial records shall be limited to the Finance Director and his or her staff. Others may have access to financial records:

(a) when given express permission by the Finance Director;
(b) when the record is required to perform job duties for the District;
(c) when the record is required to be provided by law;
(d) when the record is part of an investigation or audit by a person or entity either hired by the District or whom has authority to investigate the District's operations;
(e) when required by a person or entity other than the District's agents or employees to complete a transaction or authenticate another record;
(f) when required by the Board of Director's to verify or inform the Board's decisions.

7.4 Access to Legal Records:

Generally access to all legal records shall be limited to the District's attorney and Executive Director. Others may have access to legal records:
(a) when given express written permission by the Executive Director;
(b) when the record is required to perform job duties for the District;
(c) when the record is required to be provided by law;
(d) when the record is required as part of an investigation or audit by a person or entity either hired by the District or whom has authority to investigate the District's operations.

7.5 Access to Drug and Alcohol Testing Records:

All drug and alcohol testing records shall have limited access as personnel records under 7.2 above but with the following additional access permitted:

(a) access to federal and state employees may be permitted as necessary to authenticate records and to confirm District compliance with mandated drug and alcohol testing laws and regulations;
(b) access to contractors required to perform their duties under the District's drug and alcohol related policies;
(c) access to authorized doctors, therapists and medical practitioners necessary to perform any assessments or render any medical services following a drug and alcohol test.
7.6 Security for All District Records:

District records shall be maintained using security protocols to ensure the record's authenticity, integrity, reliability and usability. Nothing herein shall limit the ability of the district to make or provide copies of records so long as the original record is secured properly. Security of District records shall be ensured by the use of password protections on electronic access to electronic files, limitations on physical access to offices and storage spaces where original records are retained, and network security limiting access to portions of the District's computer network containing original records.

(a) Passwords shall be utilized to limit access to District electronic files. Only persons having access to records under this policy shall be given passwords allowing them access to the electronic records. Passwords shall be changed not less than every 180 days to ensure security. Passwords shall also be change any time there is a new employee who receives access to District records and every time there is a former employee who is no longer permitted access to District records. Specific portions of the District's network shall be segregated from the open and shared portion of the network in order to limit access pursuant to this policy. The District may password protect access to the portions of the network if it deems such security measures necessary or prudent.

8.0 File Maintenance:

District record files shall be maintained as either "Active" or "Closed." Active files shall include all records which are final and currently in regular use by District staff. Closed files shall include all records which are no longer in active use and which have been designated "Closed" and assigned a retention date pursuant to this policy. All files are deemed Active until designated as Closed by the person responsible for maintaining those files and records. Closed files shall be maintained primarily by listing the closure date and the retention date followed by the name of the Active file and any other descriptive information that may assist in managing the records contained in the file. District staff shall annually review their files and records and shall submit to the Executive Director a list of files to be Closed along with the assigned retention dates and file descriptions. The Executive Director shall review the list of proposed file closures and shall approve or deny the closure depending on whether all possible actions involving the file (other than use as a historical or archival record) have been completed and the record is no longer in regular use by District employees or agents.

9.0 Classification of Records:

District records shall be classified according to the Records Retention and Disposition Schedule the "RRDS") attached hereto as Exhibit A. The RRDS shall, to the maximum extent possible, classify all District records by their functional use when they were Active records.

10.0 Official Records and Copies:

Official records are the District records which are final (non-draft) records that have been duly executed or authorized by their originator and that are expressly designated by the District employee who uses them as Official Records. Official records should be maintained in a segregated file or folder and protected against alteration, amendment, deletion or other changes that would compromise their authenticity, integrity, reliability and usefulness. Mission Critical Records as defined herein shall be
maintained as hard copy original files in the offices of the Executive Director and all electronic copies of said Mission Critical Records including copies provided to the public or published on the Districts web page shall be marked and designated through watermarking, version saving, or other methods as being copies and not the authentic original records. All personnel and legal records shall similarly be maintained in the respective Human Resources and Legal offices as hard copy original records and copies shall be marked and designated through watermarking, version saving, or other methods as being copies and not the authentic original records. Financial records shall be maintained in hard copy original to the extent that the documents are generated and maintained by the District staff and where such documents are generated externally a hard copy shall be printed and preserved in the condition it was received.

Reference copies or duplicates may be maintained by the District or District employees or agents for their own convenience but shall not be deemed records within the meaning of this policy.

11.0 Storage of Records

District records shall generally be stored in hard copy format in files developed and maintained by each functional unit of the District according to needs, purposes and uses of the District's employees and agents. Electronic storage of records may be utilized in the following circumstances:

(a) the person using the record must create a specific and segregated electronic file for the category of records using the RRDS to classify the Active records on an interim basis pending the closure and final designation of the records;
(b) the electronic file must meet the access and security requirements of this policy;
(c) the electronic file must be regularly backed up to a server or site that is secure and that minimizes the risk of loss, alteration or damage to the record;
(d) the electronic file must contain only records in a file format that minimizes the risk of alterations and deletions of District records.

12.0 Disposition of Records

Disposition of records means either archiving the record or destruction of the record. All records may be disposed of after the time set for in the RRDS. All Mission Critical Records shall not be destroyed and shall be archived. Any time a record or a series of records is disposed of the person destroying the record shall first complete and sign a Notice of Destruction form substantially in the format attached hereto as Exhibit B.

12.1 Litigation Holds

Legal counsel for the district is responsible for notifying District employees if there is threatened or pending litigation that may require the preservation of Records, Non-Records, or Public Records. In the event that the District's staff, officers, employees and agents are advised of a Litigation Hold all documents pertaining to the topic shall be retained and all retention periods under the RRDS shall be suspended until such time as the Litigation Hold is lifted by legal counsel.

12.2 Administrative Hold
Any time the Executive Director or the Board Chair decides that records should be retained in order to perform an investigation or analysis of any District or District employee activity they may require the preservation of Records, Non-Records, or Public Records. In the event that the District's staff, officers, employees and agents are advised of an Administrative Hold all documents pertaining to the topic shall be retained and all retention periods under the RRDS shall be suspended until such time as the Administrative Hold is lifted.

13.0 Audio and Video Records

Due to the limited storage capacity of the District, audio and video records regardless of their RRDS categorization may be overwritten or destroyed once the District staff has reviewed samples and segments of the audio or video recordings and determined that the audio or video is unlikely to contain any Record information that is needed for future District business or activities. Notwithstanding the preceding provision, the District shall retain and store any audio or video record that the District determines to be needed or useful for its future business including audio or video documenting incidents, accidents or violations of the law or District policies to the extent the District has actual knowledge of the existence of such audio or video records.

14.0 E-mail Records

E-mail records shall be retained and managed in the same fashion as hard copy records except that the electronic storage of e-mails shall be permitted by maintaining all e-mails in their native format until such time as the e-mails are reviewed, sorted for relevance and deleted by the person maintaining the e-mail account. E-mails accounts should be reviewed and sorted not less than annually to ensure that transitory and ephemeral documents, solicitations and spam and all other Non-records are removed from the e-mail account and are not retained as Records. All E-mails that are Records should be retained and saved into a file folder by employee and year.

15.0 Externally Generated Records

Records that are created by persons outside the District but that qualify as Records under this policy shall be retained in the form and format in which they are received.

16.0 Tampering With District Records

Knowingly altering destroying, concealing, mutilating or removing without lawful authority any record or document belonging to or under the direct control of the District at a time or in a manner that would constitute a violation of this policy shall be grounds for disciplinary action.

17.0 Records Retention and Disposition Schedule:

The Records Retention and Disposition Schedule attached hereto as Exhibit A shall be utilized in the District's retention, storage and disposal of records. The Schedule may be amended from time to time by the Executive Director who shall post a current version of the schedule and the effective date of any subsequent schedule on the District's website.
North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD)  
Resolution No. 2012-17

ADOPTION OF AN AMENDED NCRTD RECORDS AND EMAIL RETENTION POLICY

WHEREAS, the records of the North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) are important assets and include essentially all records the NCRTD produces, whether paper or electronic; and

WHEREAS, the law requires the NCRTD to maintain certain types of records, usually for a specified period of time and failure to retain those records for those minimum periods would be improper and could subject the NCRTD to spoliation of evidence claims or civil liability; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD on November 4, 2011 adopted Resolution No. 2011-13 establishing a Records and Email Retention Policy and Disposition Schedule; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in their Financial Management Overview found the NCRTD Records and Email Retention Policy to be incomplete in regards to specific language pertaining to Accounting Records; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD wishes to incorporate the FTA comments as addressed in the Records Retention and Disposition Schedule, Appendix A, page 7, item 8, “Accounting Records”; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD wants to add an additional category regarding “Aboveground Storage Tank Facility Files” to the Records Retention and Disposition Schedule, Appendix A, page 11, item 23; and

WHEREAS, the NCRTD desires to implement and move forward with an updated and amended policy.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE NCRTD BOARD THAT, the NCRTD Records and Email Retention Policy is approved and adopted as amended and attached hereto as “Exhibit A” on this 3rd day of August 2012.

[Signature]
Daniel Barrone, Chair

Approved as to form:

[Signature]
Peter Dwyer, Counsel
Exhibit A

NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

RECORDS AND EMAIL RETENTION POLICY AND DISPOSITION SCHEDULE

1.0 Objective

To establish a records retention schedule for the orderly management and retirement of records necessary for carrying out the Public Records Act.

The records of The North Central Regional Transit District ("NCRTD") are important assets. Records include essentially all records the NCRTD produces, whether paper or electronic. A record may be as obvious as a memorandum, an email, a contract or a case study, or something not as obvious, such as a computerized desk calendar, an appointment book or an expense record.

The law requires the NCRTD to maintain certain types of records, usually for a specified period of time. Failure to retain those records for those minimum periods could subject the NCRTD to liability.

2.0 Applicable Staff

The NCRTD expects all employees to fully comply with any published records retention or destruction policies and schedules including the retention and disposition schedule module incorporated as part of this policy, provided that all employees should note the following general exception to any stated destruction schedule: If you believe, or the NCRTD informs you, that NCRTD records are relevant to litigation, or potential litigation (i.e., a dispute that could result in litigation), then you must preserve those records until Legal Counsel determines the records are no longer needed. That exception supersedes any previously or subsequently established destruction schedule for those records. If you believe that exception may apply, or have any question regarding the possible applicability of that exception, please contact the Executive Director.

Failure to comply with this Document Retention Policy may result in an action against an employee, including suspension or termination. Questions about this policy should be referred to the Executive Director of the NCRTD, who is responsible for enforcing and directing the administration and updating of this policy.
3.0 Reference to Future Compliance

From time to time the NCRTD will establish, maintain or supplement retention or destruction policies or schedules for specific categories of records in order to ensure compliance, and also to accomplish other objectives, such as preserving intellectual property and cost management. Several categories of documents that bear special consideration are identified below; also incorporated is a retention and disposition schedule modeling the schedule provided by the NM Commission of Public Records, Department of Transportation Executive Records Retention and Disposition Schedules (ERRDS). While minimum retention periods are suggested, the retention of the documents identified below and of documents not included in the identified categories should be determined primarily by the application of the general guidelines affecting document retention within this document.

4.0 Definitions

A. "Administrator" means the NCRTD records administrator

B. "Agency" and/or "District" means the NCRTD

C. "Archives" means the NCRTD archives.

D. "Disadvantaged business" means a for-profit small business that is at least 51 percent owned by one or more individuals who are both socially and economically disadvantaged or, in the case of a corporation, in which 51 percent of the stock is owned by one or more such individuals; and whose management and daily business operation are controlled by one or more of the socially and economically disadvantaged individuals who own it.

E. "Disposition" means final action that puts into effect the results of an appraisal decision for a series of records (i.e., transfer to archives or destruction).

F. "Electronic document management system" means a system that manages electronic documents contained in an information technology system, using computer equipment and software to manage, control, locate, and retrieve information in the electronic system.

G. "Let or Letting" means the process of preparing bid for release on NCRTD construction projects.

H. "Non-record" means extra copies of documents kept solely for convenience of reference, stocks of publications, records not usually included within the scope of the official records of the NCRTD, and library material intended only for reference or exhibition. The following specific types of materials are non-records: materials neither made nor received in pursuance of statutory requirements nor in
connection with the functional responsibility of the officer of the NCRTD; extra copies of correspondence; preliminary drafts; blank forms, transmittal letters or forms that do not add information; sample letters; and reading file or informational files.

I. "Public record" means all books, papers, maps, photographs or other documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received by the NCRTD in pursuance of law or in connection with the transaction of public business and preserved, or appropriate for preservation, by the agency or its legitimate successor as evidence of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, operations or other activities of the government, or because of the informational and historical value of data contained therein.

J. "Records custodian" means the statutory head of the agency using or maintaining the records or the custodian's designee.

K. "Records management" means the systematic control of all records from creation or receipt through processing, distribution, maintenance and retrieval, to their ultimate disposition.

L. "Records retention and disposition schedule" means rules adopted by the NCRTD Board of Directors describing records of an agency, establishing a timetable for their life cycle and providing authorization for their disposition.

M. "Retention" means the period of time during which records must be maintained by an organization because they are needed for operational, legal, fiscal, historical or other purposes.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS:

A. --- "AR" stands for accident report

ADA. "ADA" stands for Americans With Disabilities Act

C. --- "ARR" stands for certified return receipt

DOT. "DOT" stands for Department of Transportation

EMT. "EMT" stands for emergency medical service

FSR. "FSR" stands for financial status report

FTA. "FTA" stands for Federal Transit Administration

GPS. "GPS" stands for global positioning system

HUD. "HUD" stands for housing and urban development

MPO. "MPO" stands for metropolitan planning organization

MVDC. "MVDC" stands for motor vehicle division

NCRMC. "NCRMC" stands for National Crime Information Center

NM. "NM" stands for New Mexico

NMSA. "NMSA" stands for New Mexico statutes annotated

RPO. "RPO" stands for rural planning organization

TRDAS. "TRDAS" stands for traffic data analysis system

US. "US" stands for United States
5.0 Instructions

A. For records of a general administrative nature, financial nature, personnel nature and medical nature refer to "Appendix A" labeled "Records Retention and Disposition Schedule."

B. Retention periods shall be extended until six months after all current or pending litigation; current claims, audit exceptions or court orders involving a record have been resolved or concluded.

F. The descriptions of files are intended to be evocative, not complete. For example, there will always be some documents that are filed in a file that are not listed in the description, and similarly, not every file will contain an example of each document listed in the description.

G. Confidentiality is denoted for files likely to contain confidential materials, but files without a confidentiality note nonetheless may contain confidential or privileged materials, and failure to include an express confidentiality note in the description of a file does not waive the confidential or privileged nature of those materials. Some or all materials in a file may be confidential. Refer questions concerning the confidentiality of a file or portions of a file to legal counsel for the agency.

H. Access to confidential documents or confidential files shall be only by authorization of the NCRTD Executive Director or attorney general or by court order, unless otherwise provided by law. Release of confidential documents to law enforcement and other government agencies shall only be upon specific statutory authorization subpoena or court order. Nothing herein shall prohibit duly designated NCRTD personnel from performing their job functions including the review of personnel files and other confidential records where such review is necessary to perform a job duty.

I. Records, papers or documents may be photographed, microfilmed, microphotographed or reproduced on film. Such photographs, microfilm, photographic film or microphotographs shall be deemed to be an original record for all purposes, including introduction in evidence in all courts or administrative agencies.

J. Public records placed on magnetic tapes, disks or other data processing media shall be retained for the length of time specified in "Appendix A of the Records Retention and Disposition Schedules" and are subject to the same confidentiality and access restrictions as paper records.

K. Appendix A, North Central Regional Transit District ("NCRTD") Records Retention and Disposition Schedule, and Appendix B, North Central Regional Transit District ("NCRTD") Email and Email Retention and Disposition Policy are incorporated herein.
Appendix A

North Central Regional Transit District ("NCRTD")
Records Retention and Disposition Schedule

1.) ELECTRONIC DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: document management system that stores images and electronic records produced by the NCRTD. Data may include payroll and personnel data, contracts and agreement data, project files, environment reference files, etc.
   D. Data retention:
      (1) Metadata: until related records are destroyed.
      (2) Federal reports: 10 years after close of calendar year in which report is created.
      (3) Local government project files: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after project completion.
      (4) District maintenance project files: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after project completion.
      (5) Request for property abandonment files: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after date of request.
      (6) Abandonment document forms: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after abandonment filed.
      (7) Encroachment files: 30 years after final disposition of encroachment, then transfer to archives for review and final disposition.
      (8) Property sales files: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after date of sale.
      (9) Disclaimer files: five years after date property is disclaimed, transfer to archives for review and final disposition.
      (10) Contract award recommendations files: six years after project completion date.
      (11) Payroll records: 10 years after end of federal fiscal year in which created.
      (12) Accident reports: seven years after end of federal fiscal year in which created.
   E. Output: Because the electronic document management system is a data-based system, ad hoc and regularly scheduled reports may be generated upon request or demand. When produced, these reports are forwarded to the requesting entity.

2.) FEDERAL PLANNING REPORTS:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: reports containing various federally-mandated information. Some of these reports may include performance monitoring system report, monthly volume summary reports, monthly and quarterly audit reports.
D. Retention: 10 years after close of calendar year in which created

3.) FEDERAL AND STATE APPORTIONMENTS REPORTS FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: reports concerning obligated federal and state funds for various transit related projects (i.e., construction, planning programs, feasibility studies, consultants, etc.).
D. Retention: five years after end of federal fiscal year in which created

4.) DAMAGE CLAIM FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: damage claims submitted by the NCRTD to individuals or representatives of individuals that have negligently damaged NCRTD property. File may include police reports, estimate of damage, cost reports, final demand notices, receipt of payments, correspondence, etc.
D. Retention: three years after final disposition

5.) INTERNET SITE VISIT MONITORING REPORTS:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: monthly report, if any showing NCRTD employee internet visits to both agency permitted and agency blocked internet addresses. Report may include NCRTD employee name, date, time, source, destination, internet protocol address, protocol, category, etc.
D. Retention: six months after report created

6.) ACCIDENT FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning accidents involving any NCRTD Bus and Driver File may include copies of accident reports, medical information, annual summary of accident information,
D. Retention: 10 years after date of accident, then transfer to archives for review and final disposition
E. Confidentiality: Portions of record may be considered confidential pursuant, but not limited to 5 USC, Section 552a and 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), (i.e., social security number), Section 14-6-1 NMSA 1978 (i.e., health information) and Section 14-2-1 NMSA 1978 (i.e., "law enforcement records that reveal confidential sources, methods, information or individuals accused but not charged with a crime").

7.) ACCIDENT RECORDS CITATION SYSTEM:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: database or other records maintenance system that maintains accident report information for statistical purposes. Data may include personal identifiers of individuals involved in an accident (i.e., name, social security number, address, license number, age, etc.), location of accident, accident detailed information, etc.
D. Data retention: seven years after end of federal fiscal year in which created
E. Confidentiality: Portions of record may be confidential pursuant, but not limited to 5 USC, Section 552a (i.e., social security number), Section 66-7-508 NMSA 1978 Confidentiality of records, Section 29-10-4 NMSA 1978 (i.e., arrest records) and Section 14-2-1 NMSA 1978 (i.e., "law enforcement records that reveal confidential sources, methods, information or individuals accused but not charged with a crime").
F. Input: All records used as input for the accident records citation system are destroyed once input to system is verified and complete.

8.) ACCOUNTING RECORDS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records must be maintained that adequately identify the source and application of funds provided through Federal and State grants and subgrants for financially-assisted activities. These records must contain information pertaining to grant or subgrant awards and authorizations, obligations, unobligated balances, assets, liabilities, outlays or expenditures and income.
D. Retention: Except as otherwise specified, records must be retained for three years from the starting date.

Starting date of retention period:
1. General Records. The starting date for retention of records related to multi-year projects is the date of submission of the final FSR upon project completion or, if waived, the date it would have been due.
2. Equipment Records. The three year retention period for equipment records starts from the date of the equipment's disposition or replacement or transfer at 1A's direction.
9.) BID LETTING AND AWARD SYSTEM:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: database or other method of record retention that captures letting, bidding and award information for NCRTD projects. Data may include contractor bids for a specific project, advertising documentation, district office recommendations for award, authorization from a federal administration, bid reviews, preliminary award of contract, project estimates, cost list, items list to generate proposals for contractors, bid letting information, data used to analyze bids, etc.
D. Data retention: six years after project completion date
E. Confidentiality: Portions of this file may contain confidential information pursuant, but not limited to Section 13-1-122 NMSA 1978 (i.e., Competitive sealed qualifications-based proposals; award of architect, engineering, landscape architect and surveying contracts) and CFR 40 Subsection 53.15 (i.e., trade secrets and confidential or privileged information).

10.) AUTHORIZATION FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning authorization for project advertising and letting requirements that are going to be let in a given month. Files may include letting schedule, licensing requirements, project information work sheet, invitation for bid, addendum to projects, preliminary design plans, work sheet for working days, disadvantaged business goal, and certifications from appropriate in-house offices, etc.
D. Retention: six years after project completion date
E. Confidentiality: Portions of this file may contain confidential information pursuant, but not limited to Section 13-1-122 NMSA 1978 (i.e., Competitive sealed qualifications-based proposals; award of architect, engineering, landscape architect and surveying contracts) and CFR 40 Subsection 53.15 (i.e., trade secrets and confidential or privileged information).

11.) CONTRACT AWARD RECOMMENDATIONS FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning recommendations and award information from the DOT bid review committee to award a contract to a particular bidder. Files may include advertising documentation, recommendations for award, authorization from federal highway administration, DOT contract goal for disadvantaged business in highway construction, bid review work sheets, bid tabulations, copy of preliminary award of contract letter, etc.
D. Retention: six years after project completion date
E. Confidentiality: Portions of this file may contain confidential information pursuant, but not limited to Section 13-1-122 NMSA 1978 (i.e., Competitive sealed qualifications-based proposals; award of architect, engineering, landscape architect and surveying contracts) and CFR 40 Subsection 53.15 (i.e., trade secrets and confidential or privileged information).

12.) SITE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: system that tracks and maintains information for all aspects of construction management. Data may include construction contract data, daily diaries, change orders, contractor payments, finalization, disputes, claims, materials used, etc.
D. Retention: six years after project completion date

13.) CALLED IN LOAD LOG:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: log used to record the overload permits issued by the department of public safety to travel on state bridges. Log may show date, load number, requester, time, firm name, load type, gross weight, height, width, length, axle number, weight, distance, origin, truck unit number, destination, number of axles, route numbers, remarks, rejected, notified, etc.
D. Retention: three years after close of calendar year in which created

14.) REQUEST FOR PROPERTY ABANDONMENT FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning NCRTD's recommendations and decisions regarding incoming requests from entities on properties owned and abandoned by NCRTD. File may include right of way maps showing parcels of land, copy of associated easement, survey of intended abandonment, legal land description, interdepartmental comments and recommendations for or against abandonment, declaration of vacation and abandonment, etc.
D. Retention: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after date of request

15.) ABANDONMENT DOCUMENT FORMS:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: form that documents property abandonment
D. Retention: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after abandonment filed
16.) ENCROACHMENT FILES:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning encroachments onto NCRTD property. Files may include surveys, copies of deeds, contracts, notice of encroachment on highway right of way, license for encroachment, correspondence, etc.
   D. Retention:
      (1) Structural encroachment files: 25 years after final disposition of encroachment, then transfer to archives for review and final disposition
      (2) All others: transfer to archives 25 years after disposition of encroachment for review and final disposition

17.) PROPERTY SALES FILES:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning the sale of NCRTD property. Files may include right of way maps, quitclaim deeds, correspondence, etc.
   D. Retention: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after date of sale

18.) DISCLAIMER FILES:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning the NCRTD disclaimer of interest or ownership of specific property. Files may include right of way maps, disclaimer, correspondence, etc.
   D. Retention: five years after date property is disclaimed, transfer to archives for review and final disposition

19.) AIRSPACE FILES:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning the leasing of the NCRTD right of way airspace. Files may include lease agreements, right of way maps, correspondence, etc.
   D. Retention: six years after termination of lease agreement

20.) BILLBOARD OWNER PERMIT FILES:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning the approved issuance of permits to erect or maintain outdoor advertising along the city, county, interstate and other federally funded primary highways. Files may include application for permit, inspection
documentation of proposed advertising location, check copies, billing
information, plats, local government permit copy, renewal notice copy, copy of
permit plates issued, correspondence, etc.

D. Retention:
(1) Approved permit: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after termination of
permit.
(2) Rejected application: five years after date of rejection

21.) CULTURAL RESOURCE REPORT FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning investigation and assessments conducted to
determine any historic or archeological site issues affecting proposed or existing
NCRTD properties or rights of way. Files may include site investigation report,
surveys, clearance letter, denial letter, correspondence, etc.
D. Retention: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after date of letter of clearance
or denial
E. Confidentiality: Portions of record may be confidential pursuant, but not limited
to Section 18-6-11.1 NMSA 1978, Confidentiality of site location.

22.) ENVIRONMENTAL REFERENCE FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: environmental assessments conducted on NCRTD properties and
potential property acquisitions. Files may include site investigation reports (i.e.,
detailed site investigation, field notes, drill logs, laboratory results, disposal
manifest, etc.), hazardous materials assessments, photos, clean up report,
correspondence, etc.
D. Retention: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after file assessment
consducted

23.) ABOVEGROUND STORAGE TANK FACILITY FILES
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: Records concerning the design and construction, maintenance,
inspection, repair and removal of aboveground storage tanks located on the
grounds of NCRTD property. Files may include contracts for removal, work
plans and approvals, photos, authorizations to work, correspondence, etc.
D. Retention: seven years after facility is closed or tank is removed

24.) UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK FACILITY FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning the maintenance, inspection and removal of underground storage tanks located on the grounds of any NCRTD property. Files may include contracts for removal, work plans and approvals, photos, authorizations to work, correspondence, etc.
D. Retention: permanent, transfer to archives 25 years after date storage tank removed

25.) LABORATORY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: database or any records retention method that maintains information regarding the testing of materials used for maintenance and construction projects. Data may include test sample name, lab number, project number, hours worked, materials used, maintenance activity, date reported, district number, test, date sampled, nature of source, location of source, date received, test results, identifiable marks, manufactured by, district number, refinery source, weekly asphalt report number, tested by, approved by, etc.
D. Data retention: permanent

26.) PRODUCT EVALUATION DATABASE:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: database or any records retention method that maintains information on products available for construction projects. Data may include product name, evaluation of product, approved date and status, product specifications, representative name and demographic information, comments, etc.
D. Data retention: until product is no longer approved or use is discontinued

27.) PRODUCT FILES:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning approved products available for construction projects. Files may include application for product evaluation, data sheet on use of product, product specifications, material safety sheets, correspondence, etc.
D. Retention:
   (1) Approved products: 20 years after product evaluation approved
   (2) Rejected products: three years from date of rejection

28.) EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM:
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: database or any records retention method that maintains information on all heavy equipment and fleet vehicles. Data may include district information, class unit, item number, contract number, vendor, base price, options to be ordered, total cost, date paid, budget balance, warranties, serial number, dealer name, body style, fuel type, shipping weight, vehicle description, activity code, mileage (beginning and end), daily miles, project code, account code, part number, labor, parts (i.e., task code, part number, vendor, quantity, unit price and part description, etc.), fixed assets number, inventory value, mile or hour readings, servicing information, inspections, book value, resale value, etc.

D. Data retention: two years after date of disposition of heavy equipment or vehicle

E. Input: All records used as input for the equipment management system are filed in fixed asset (equipment) acquisition history files

29.) EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE FILES:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: complete service and maintenance history on heavy equipment and vehicles. Files may include equipment inspection report, equipment registration, equipment transfer form, change report, preventative maintenance report, inspection condemnation report, certificate of property loss, equipment usage report, copy of authorization to purchase surplus equipment, copy of verification of public entity funds for purchase of surplus equipment, etc.
   D. Retention: two years after date of disposition of heavy equipment or vehicle

30.) PUBLIC ENTITY BUDGET AUTHORIZATION FILES:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records relating to purchase of NCRTD equipment by public entities. Files may include authorization to purchase surplus equipment, verification of public entity funds for purchase of surplus equipment form, copy of memo of charge, request for waiver, hardship analysis report from department of finance and administration, correspondence, etc.
   D. Retention: three years after close of fiscal year in which authorization received

31.) AUCTION DATABASE:
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: database maintains or records maintenance system containing information pertaining to the auction of NCRTD equipment. Data may include inventory lot number, description, fixed asset number, serial number, meter reading, location, inspection and condemnation number, transfer number, bid number, bid amount, bidder name, bidder address, etc.
   D. Data retention: five fiscal years after date in which sale occurred
32.) AUCTIONEER REPORT FILES:
   A. Program: NCR TD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCR TD preference]
   C. Description: report listing all equipment sold at auction. File may include
      equipment acquisition packet (i.e., dealer name, registration, equipment
      inspection report, etc.) and disposal packet (i.e., inventory lot, description, fixed
      asset number, serial number, meter reading, location, inspection and
      condemnation number, transfer number, bid number, bid amount, sold with,
      bidder name, bidder address, transfer title request, etc.), copy of memo of charge,
      etc.
   D. Retention: five fiscal years after date of sale

33.) FACILITY INSPECTION FILES:
   A. Program: NCR TD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCR TD preference]
   C. Description: routine inspections of the department facilities. Files may include
      inspection reports, cover letter to supervisor of facility, listing of areas inspected,
      discrepancies noted, response from supervisor on corrective action,
      correspondence, etc.
   D. Retention: five years after date of inspection

34.) SAFETY RESEARCH FILES (STUDIES):
   A. Program: NCR TD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCR TD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning research conducted on safety issues (i.e.,
      workplace violence, safety vests, safety processes, etc.). File may include study,
      employee safety analysis, notes, etc.
   D. Retention: 10 years after research is completed

35.) RESOLUTION FILES
   A. Program: NCR TD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCR TD preference]
   C. Description: formal statements expressing the opinion, will, or intent of the
      NCR TD governing body.
   D. Retention: permanent

36.) CAPITAL PROJECT FILES
   A. Program: NCR TD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCR TD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning the use of capital funds. Records document the
      progress and completion of capital projects (e.g., construction, redesigning,
      renovation, remodeling of NCR TD structures, streets, utility lines, etc.). Files may
      contain bid or quote documentation, contracts, payroll documentation,
expenditure reports, blueprints, architectural drawings, soil tests or analyses, engineering specification, payment documentation, etc.

D. Retention:
(1) Fiscal or contractual documents (e.g., bids, quotes, agreements, contracts, etc.): 10 years after completion of project
(2) Technical documents (e.g. blueprints, architectural drawings, soil tests or analyses, engineering specifications, etc.): permanent
(3) All other documents: two years after close of fiscal year in which project completed

37.) NCRTD BONDS, NOTES, INTEREST COUPONS, AND CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: record of debt in form of a bond, note, certificate of indebtedness, or interest coupon incurred by the NCRTD.
D. Retention:
(1) When paying agent is a bank, savings and loan association, or other third party: until paid and certificate of destruction has been prepared
(2) When paying agent is the debtor agency (i.e., NCRTD): two years following payment and certificate of destruction has been prepared

38.) INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BOND FILES
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning the issuance of NCRTD revenue bonds to acquire, own, lease, or sell projects for the purpose of promoting industry and trade other than retail trade. Files may include agreement for the abatement of taxes, project descriptions, industry or trade information, correspondence, memoranda, etc.
D. Retention: six years after termination of agreements

39.) NCRTD BOND CERTIFICATE OF DESTRUCTION
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: shows the number and maturity of the bond, note, certificate, coupon, the date paid, etc.
D. Retention: six years after date created

40.) NCRTD BOND REGISTER
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
41.) PETITION FILES
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning requests on a variety of issues (e.g., special election, ordinance change, traffic light installation, speed bump installation, etc.).
   D. Retention:
      (1) All other petitions: one year after close of fiscal year in which received

42.) ADA COMPLIANCE FILES
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning the Americans With Disabilities Act. File may contain ADA plan, policies, grievance procedures, grievances, resolutions, etc.
   D. Retention:
      (1) Plans, policies, and procedures: until superseded or one year after affected grievances have been resolved
      (2) Grievances and resolutions: one year after date closed
      [Note: Policies and plans adopted by ordinance or resolution.]

43.) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FILES
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning transactions with labor organizations representing employees in collective bargaining. Files may contain copy of certification of labor organization as the exclusive representative of employees, mediation documentation and recommendations, agreements, grievances and resolutions, decertification, correspondence, memoranda, etc.
   D. Retention:
      (1) Agreements: six years after termination of agreement
      (2) Grievances and resolutions: three years after date of resolution
      (3) All other documentation: until no longer needed for reference

44.) CLAIM OF LIEN FILES
   A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
   B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
   C. Description: records concerning liens placed against private property for services rendered by the NCRTD. Files may contain claim of lien, assessment table, copy
of notice of public hearing, copy of notice of violation, court order, copy of work order, copy of billing, release of lien, correspondence, memoranda, etc.

D. Retention: six years after close of fiscal year in which lien released

45.) VEHICLE FILES
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning the history of NCRTD-owned or leased vehicles. Files may include purchase or lease information, warranty documentation, maintenance documentation, maintenance expenditure information, disposal information, etc.
D. Retention: three years after disposition of vehicle

46.) VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FILES
A. Program: motor pool records
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning the maintenance performed on NCRTD-owned vehicles. Files may include work orders, repair orders, work schedules, maintenance orders, maintenance schedules, work reports, etc.
D. Retention: three years after close of fiscal year in which created

47.) BUS ROUTE PLANNING FILE
A. Program: transportation and transit records
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records used to establish and modify the NCRTD transit route system. Files may include studies, maps, population surveys, schedule plans, route schedules, etc.
D. Retention:
   (1) Route schedules and maps: until superseded
   (2) All other records: three years after close of calendar year in which created

48.) CHARTER BUS FILES
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning charter rentals of transit system buses to private groups. Files may include rental information, fiscal documentation, related correspondence, etc.
D. Retention: three years after close of fiscal year in which created
49.) DAILY BUS PASSENGER REPORT
A. Program: transportation and transit records
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: records concerning all NCRTD buses, including airport shuttle buses, per route in the NCRTD transit system, used to summarize operational statistics for management review purposes. Report may show name of operator, number of regular fares, senior citizen fares, handicapped persons fares, etc.
D. Retention: three years after close of fiscal year in which created

50.) BUS DRIVERS DAILY CHECKLIST
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: record concerning the condition and appearance of NCRTD buses including airport shuttle buses used to identify maintenance problems on vehicles.
D. Retention: three years after close of fiscal year in which created

51.) TRANSIT OPERATION SUMMARY REPORTS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: reports documenting daily fares received. Reports may include monthly reports documenting ridership, revenue, route information, fuel usage, and other operational details.
D. Retention: three years after close of fiscal year in which created

52.) TAX RECORDS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: Include but may not be limited to, documents concerning payroll expenses, accounting procedures and regarding the NCRTD's revenues.
D. Retention: six years from the date of filing a return if applicable

53.) EMPLOYMENT RECORDS/PERSONNEL RECORDS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: State and federal statutes require the NCRTD to keep certain recruitment, employment and personnel information. The NCRTD should also keep personnel files that reflect performance reviews and any complaints brought against the NCRTD or individual employees under applicable state and federal statutes. The NCRTD should also keep all final memoranda and correspondence reflecting performance reviews and actions taken by or against personnel in the employee's personnel file.
D. Retention: six years
54.) PRESS RELEASE/PUBLIC FILINGS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: Permanent copies of all press releases and publicly filed documents should be retained under the theory that the NCRTD should have its own copy to test the accuracy of any document a member of the public can theoretically produce against the NCRTD.
D. Retention: All in perpetuity

55.) LEGAL FILES
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: Legal counsel should be consulted to determine the retention period of particular documents.
D. Retention: should generally be maintained for a period of ten years.

56.) MARKETING AND SALES DOCUMENTS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: Copies of marketing and sales documents, invoices, contracts, leases, licenses and other legal documents
D. Retention:
(1) Marketing and Sales Documents should be maintained for at least six years
(2) Sales invoices, contracts, leases, licenses and other legal documentation; Three years beyond the life of the agreement.

57.) CONTRACTS
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: Final, execution copies of all contracts entered into by the NCRTD should be retained.
D. Retention: three years beyond the life of an agreement, and longer in the case of publicly filed contracts.

58.) EMAIL
A. Program: NCRTD records custodian
B. Maintenance System: [NCRTD preference]
C. Description: Email and Email Retention and Disposition is hereby incorporated as Appendix B, Email and Email Retention and Disposition Policy.
D. Retention: printed in hard copy and kept in the appropriate file; or downloaded to a computer file and kept electronically or on disk as a separate file. The retention period depends upon the subject matter of the e-mail, as covered elsewhere in this policy.
Appendix B

North Central Regional Transit District ("NCRTD")

Email and Email Retention and Disposition Policy

Objective

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance to NCRTD employees in managing information sent or received through email transmissions and to ensure the proper use of the NCRTD email system.

Applicable Staff

All NCRTD employees

Definitions

"Email" means a message transmitted electronically over a communications network. A system that enables users to compose, transmit, receive and manage electronic messages and images across networks and through gateways connecting to other local area networks.

"Electronic record" means a computer-generated item such as an email message, a document file, an image file, etc.

"Non-record" means extra copies of documents kept solely for convenience of reference, stocks of publications, records not usually included within the scope of official records of an agency or government entity, personal correspondences that do not pertain to NCRTD business and library material intended only for reference or exhibition. The following specific types of materials are non-records: materials neither made nor received in pursuance of statutory requirements or in connection with the functional responsibility of the officer or agency; extra copies of correspondence; preliminary drafts; blank forms, transmittal letters or forms that do not add information; sample letters and reading or informational files.

"Public records" means all books, papers, maps, photographs or other documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, made or received by any agency in pursuance of law or in connection with the transaction of public business.
Policy Statement

It is the policy of the NCRTD to provide employees email resources and services to assist them in the performance of their work. All email resources and services are to be managed in a lawful and effective manner. To assure this, the NCRTD has the right to monitor all aspects of the email system to ensure compliance with this policy and applicable law. Employees should not have the expectation of privacy in anything they create, send or receive on the NCRTD email system. Employees shall conduct themselves in a manner consistent with appropriate behavior standards as established in existing NCRTD policies. All NCRTD policies relating to intellectual property protection, privacy, misuse of NCRTD equipment, sexual harassment, sexually hostile work environment, data security and confidentiality shall apply to the use of email.

Public Records

All email transmissions made or received by the NCRTD in pursuance of law or in connection with the transaction of business are public records. Employees shall determine if email transmissions, both "sent" and "received," are public records; separate "public records" from "non-records"; and store only that information that is a public record. Records shall be stored and retained based on the retention period for the particular records series established in records retention and disposition schedules and agency procedures.

Electronic documents, including email, are subject to the provisions of the Public Records Act and the Inspection of Public Records Act.

Destruction of a public record before its retention period has been met is illegal and is a fourth degree felony pursuant to Section 30-26-1 NMSA 1978, Tampering with Public Records.

Passwords

All passwords upon request must be made known to the Executive Director and Financial Manager. The use of passwords to gain access to the email system or to secure specific files does not provide employees with an expectation of privacy in the respective system or document.

Encryption

Employees may not encrypt any emails without obtaining written permission from their supervisor. If approved, the encryption key(s) must be made known to the agency's Executive Director.
Privacy and Access

Subject to tribal sovereignty rights, email messages sent or received in conjunction with NCRTD business may be releasable to the public under the Inspection of Public Records Act with several exceptions such as medical records, letters of reference, matters of opinion, attorney-client information, trade secrets, tactical response information and law enforcement investigative files. Employees are prohibited from disclosing, copying, distributing or forwarding email messages exempted from public disclosure under state and federal laws.

Personal Use

Personal email shall not impede the conduct of NCRTD business. Employees shall not subscribe to mailing lists or mail services that fall outside of the employee's scope of work. Use of social media during working hours for non-work related purposes shall not impede the conduct of NCRTD business.

Questionable Email

The NCRTD will provide employees with periodic Anti-Virus updates for personal computers. It is the employee's responsibility to update his or her assigned computer when notified. Employees shall not willfully and knowingly open email messages that look questionable nor shall they open attachments unless the user is certain that the attachment is from a known sender, is expected and is pertinent to the employee's job. Questionable emails and attachments are to be deleted immediately and then "double deleted" by emptying the Trash bin.

Unacceptable Use of Email

Employees shall not use email resources and services for commercial purposes, including but not limited to, on-line trading and e-bay operations.

Employees shall not send or forward emails containing libelous, defamatory, offensive, racist or obscene remarks. If an employee receives an email of this nature, they must promptly notify their supervisor.

Employees shall not use email to conduct prohibited political activities or business activities related to the holding of public office.

Employees shall not establish user profiles or forward, import or create email accounts other than the profile and account established on their behalf by the NCRTD. Serious disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment may result from evidence of prohibited activity obtained through monitoring or inspection of electronic messages, files, or electronic storage devices. Illegal activity involving NCRTD IT resource usage may be referred to appropriate authorities for prosecution.
North Central Regional Transit District
Financial Summary
As of August 31, 2017

Summary:
The North Central Regional Transit District (NCRTD) is currently reporting two months of FY2018 financial activity. The expenses/revenues that should be reported for the period through August 31, 2017, which represents 16.67% of the budget.

The GRT monthly revenue budget figures are allocated utilizing trends from the last five fiscal years.

The monthly budget figures for the federal grant revenues from the charts/tables have been derived from dividing administration and operation yearly allocations using a straight-line method (1/12 increments) and allocating capital revenue allocations using a straight-line method (1/4 increments) over the last 4 months of the fiscal year.

The monthly budget figures for the expenditures from the charts/tables have been derived from utilizing trends from the last three fiscal years and mirror FTA reporting categories.

Financial Highlights

Revenue:
As of August 31, 2017, total revenue of $997,545 has been recognized, which is 7.6% of budgeted revenues. NCRTD has received one month of GRT and two months of 5311 federal revenues as of August 2017.

Fund Balance:
The use of Fund Balance can cover shortfalls when expenses exceed revenues during the given month. The use of Fund Balance is budgeted as a revenue for the fiscal year and can represent operating and capital funding sources as described in Financial Policy #1.

Expenditures:
As of August 31, 2017, NCRTD recognized expenditures totaling $798,933, which is 6.1% of total budgeted expenditures.

Of the $798,933 spent, $202,319 was in Administration, $591,178 in Operations and $5,436 in Capital Outlay. Administration has spent 12%, Operations 6.5% and Capital Outlay .2% of its budgets.

Other Matters:
N/A
MONTHLY BOARD REPORT
FY2017 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)
NCRTD Revenue and Expenses vs. Budget

Overall Revenue/Expenses FY 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Revenue FY18</th>
<th>Current Year FY18 Actuals Revenue</th>
<th>Budget Expenses FY18</th>
<th>Current Year FY18 Actuals Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td>157,482</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td>406,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td>840,063</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td>392,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,096,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$13,154,374</td>
<td>$997,545</td>
<td>$13,154,374</td>
<td>$798,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MONTHLY BOARD REPORT
FY2017 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)
NCRTD Revenue by Sources
As of August 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2015 Actual</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Actual</th>
<th>2018 Budget</th>
<th>2018 Actual</th>
<th>% of Actual vs Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Receipt</td>
<td>$7,247,360</td>
<td>$6,987,287</td>
<td>$7,566,341</td>
<td>$7,222,500</td>
<td>$669,620</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed Grant</td>
<td>$2,839,376</td>
<td>$2,839,376</td>
<td>$3,582,230</td>
<td>$3,588,879</td>
<td>$312,974</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Capital/Outlay</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$301,312</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Contributions</td>
<td>$156,154</td>
<td>$158,449</td>
<td>$603,189</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Fund Balance</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,096,306</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc Revenues</td>
<td>$105,967</td>
<td>$157,011</td>
<td>$204,002</td>
<td>$293,500</td>
<td>$14,950</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,592,703</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,791,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,956,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,154,374</strong></td>
<td><strong>$997,545</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONTHLY BOARD REPORT  
FY2016 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)  
Gross Receipts Revenue By County  

LOS ALAMOS COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% of Monthly Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>$127,129</td>
<td>$122,791</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$118,427</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$242,003</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$23,577</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$87,669</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$88,617</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$114,227</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$57,181</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$97,425</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$192,139</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$115,311</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$95,633</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YTD Total</strong></td>
<td>$127,129</td>
<td>$1,355,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10/3/2017 Unaudited financials-For Board and Management purposes/review
MONTHLY BOARD REPORT
FY2016 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)
Gross Receipts Revenue By County

RIO ARRIBA COUNTY

![Graph showing revenue by month for RIO ARRIBA COUNTY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual Revenue % of Monthly Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>$43,970</td>
<td>$50,886</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$52,520</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$51,873</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$52,793</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$47,329</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$23,222</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$43,354</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$39,848</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$43,368</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$42,334</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$45,855</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$51,305</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Total</td>
<td>$43,970</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONTHLY BOARD REPORT
FY2016 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)
Gross Receipts Revenue By County

SANTA FE COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>of Monthly Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>$418,301</td>
<td>$381,040</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>$394,680</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>$377,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>$365,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>$423,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>$318,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>$318,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>$365,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>$345,840</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>$363,880</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>$405,680</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YTD Total</strong></td>
<td>$418,301</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Note one-half of the SF County GRT is allocated to Rio Metro
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Gross Receipts Revenue By County

TAOS COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>of Monthly Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>$80,220</td>
<td>$81,714</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$77,380</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$74,702</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$72,293</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$63,725</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$96,836</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$65,777</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$69,080</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$80,950</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$64,439</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$67,384</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$78,270</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YTD Total: $80,220 $892,550 9%
## Gross Receipts Revenue

### Budget to Actual FY2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual Revenue % of Monthly Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$636,431</td>
<td>$669,620</td>
<td>105%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$643,007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$745,658</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$513,863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$539,723</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$662,708</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$541,478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$484,229</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$587,383</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$644,752</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$592,430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$630,888</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,222,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>$669,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prior Year vs. Current Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Year FY2017</th>
<th>Current Year FY2018</th>
<th>Inc/Dec from Prior Year to Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$738,095</td>
<td>$669,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$569,631</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$822,146</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$535,710</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$528,344</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$619,874</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$607,763</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$509,052</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$607,802</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$470,591</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$710,922</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$848,411</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,568,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>$669,620</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Grant Revenue

Budget to Actual FY2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actual FY17</th>
<th>Budget FY18</th>
<th>Actual FY18</th>
<th>% of Monthly Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$139,339</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>$151,082</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$230,674</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>$161,892</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$181,682</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$143,530</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$194,959</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$163,722</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$162,360</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$179,777</td>
<td>$175,689</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$293,398</td>
<td>$545,841</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$435,438</td>
<td>$545,841</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$215,870</td>
<td>$545,841</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$1,241,481</td>
<td>$545,841</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $3,582,230 $3,588,879 $312,974 9%

Prior Year vs. Current Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actual FY2016</th>
<th>Actual FY2017</th>
<th>Actual FY2018</th>
<th>Inc/(Dec) from Prior Year to Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$128,685</td>
<td>$139,339</td>
<td>$151,082</td>
<td>$11,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$145,446</td>
<td>$230,674</td>
<td>$161,892</td>
<td>($68,782)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$223,878</td>
<td>$181,682</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($181,682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$203,353</td>
<td>$143,530</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($143,530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$134,896</td>
<td>$194,959</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($194,959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$235,833</td>
<td>$163,722</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($163,722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$390,639</td>
<td>$162,360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($162,360)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$141,554</td>
<td>$179,777</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($179,777)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$373,815</td>
<td>$293,398</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($293,398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$188,166</td>
<td>$435,438</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($435,438)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$162,963</td>
<td>$215,870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($215,870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$510,148</td>
<td>$1,241,481</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>($1,241,481)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $2,839,376 $3,582,230 $312,974 ($3,269,256)
MONTHLY BOARD REPORT

NCRTD BUDGET EXPENSES BY TYPE

As of August 31, 2017

Year to Date Budget Variance 16.67%

![Graph showing budget expenses by type]

### Comparative Expenses by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY15 Actual</th>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>Budget FY18</th>
<th>FY18 Actual</th>
<th>Year to Date Budget Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$1,831,697</td>
<td>$2,563,915</td>
<td>$2,411,609</td>
<td>$2,814,705</td>
<td>$297,895</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>255,839</td>
<td>141,982</td>
<td>17,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>830,082</td>
<td>1,055,797</td>
<td>1,095,211</td>
<td>1,402,350</td>
<td>178,927</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railrunner, SF Trails and Atomic City Transit</td>
<td>4,118,232</td>
<td>4,092,619</td>
<td>4,708,159</td>
<td>4,655,650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expenses</td>
<td>37,336</td>
<td>62,039</td>
<td>41,682</td>
<td>53,129</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (phone, gas, electric, internet)</td>
<td>33,084</td>
<td>40,873</td>
<td>77,797</td>
<td>77,190</td>
<td>8,155</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>23,433</td>
<td>23,581</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>352,779</td>
<td>236,532</td>
<td>295,851</td>
<td>451,773</td>
<td>36,089</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>82,687</td>
<td>87,181</td>
<td>81,184</td>
<td>119,670</td>
<td>9,807</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Building Expense</td>
<td>36,443</td>
<td>94,244</td>
<td>56,844</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>9,242</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance (property, WC Ins, gen liab, vehicle, civil rj</td>
<td>95,406</td>
<td>119,953</td>
<td>109,556</td>
<td>116,311</td>
<td>104,622</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Wellness/Promotions</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>9,330</td>
<td>26,950</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Related Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues, Licenses and Fees</td>
<td>15,961</td>
<td>19,634</td>
<td>9,087</td>
<td>7,590</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Registration fees</td>
<td>34,092</td>
<td>29,305</td>
<td>71,452</td>
<td>100,714</td>
<td>14,117</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, meetings, lodging and per diem</td>
<td>352,857</td>
<td>334,796</td>
<td>361,380</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>63,945</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>281,244</td>
<td>311,125</td>
<td>350,859</td>
<td>381,800</td>
<td>48,985</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Maintenance, Repairs</td>
<td>22,812</td>
<td>21,144</td>
<td>21,569,967</td>
<td>2,156,994</td>
<td>2,363,650</td>
<td>5,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>374,409</td>
<td>1,458,967</td>
<td>2,156,994</td>
<td>2,363,650</td>
<td>5,436</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$8,534,297</td>
<td>$10,562,213</td>
<td>$12,092,748</td>
<td>$13,154,374</td>
<td>$798,933</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Budget to Actual FY2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY15 Actual</th>
<th>FY16 Actual</th>
<th>FY17 Actual</th>
<th>Budget FY18</th>
<th>FY18 Actual</th>
<th>Inc/Dec of Budget vs Actual</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$226,528</td>
<td>$273,848</td>
<td>$446,362</td>
<td>$388,389</td>
<td>$406,761</td>
<td>$(18,372)</td>
<td>104.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$524,839</td>
<td>$607,663</td>
<td>$482,640</td>
<td>$682,005</td>
<td>$392,172</td>
<td>$289,834</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$543,236</td>
<td>$249,172</td>
<td>$830,729</td>
<td>$688,295</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$688,295</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$1,331,392</td>
<td>$986,567</td>
<td>$691,669</td>
<td>$1,216,404</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,216,404</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$370,513</td>
<td>$709,030</td>
<td>$1,142,422</td>
<td>$897,585</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$897,585</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$275,029</td>
<td>$913,619</td>
<td>$797,642</td>
<td>$842,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$842,220</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$551,091</td>
<td>$1,026,524</td>
<td>$1,152,050</td>
<td>$1,140,821</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,140,821</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$922,081</td>
<td>$673,640</td>
<td>$647,955</td>
<td>$969,798</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$969,798</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$921,872</td>
<td>$727,303</td>
<td>$1,158,397</td>
<td>$1,235,214</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,235,214</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$931,267</td>
<td>$1,023,724</td>
<td>$1,485,499</td>
<td>$1,398,325</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,398,325</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$588,018</td>
<td>$2,099,566</td>
<td>$1,188,077</td>
<td>$1,638,490</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,638,490</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$1,348,431</td>
<td>$1,351,557</td>
<td>$2,028,306</td>
<td>$2,016,801</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,016,801</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$8,534,297</td>
<td>$10,562,213</td>
<td>$12,092,748</td>
<td>$13,154,374</td>
<td>$798,933</td>
<td>$12,355,441</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MONTHLY BOARD REPORT
FY2017 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)
Administration Expense Summary
As of August 31, 2017

![Chart showing monthly expenses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY15</th>
<th>Actual FY16</th>
<th>Actual FY17</th>
<th>Budget FY18</th>
<th>FY18 Actual</th>
<th>Inc/Dec of Budget vs Actual</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$36,996</td>
<td>$76,354</td>
<td>$98,869</td>
<td>$97,683</td>
<td>$98,850</td>
<td>$(1,167)</td>
<td>101.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$65,796</td>
<td>$154,434</td>
<td>$85,687</td>
<td>$140,811</td>
<td>$103,469</td>
<td>$37,342</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$79,531</td>
<td>$75,888</td>
<td>$124,202</td>
<td>$128,707</td>
<td>$150,154</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$107,450</td>
<td>$114,095</td>
<td>$104,670</td>
<td>$116,748</td>
<td>$126,329</td>
<td></td>
<td>116,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$92,871</td>
<td>$72,212</td>
<td>$88,556</td>
<td>$150,154</td>
<td>$126,329</td>
<td></td>
<td>126,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$69,805</td>
<td>$88,349</td>
<td>$116,300</td>
<td>$135,447</td>
<td>$135,447</td>
<td></td>
<td>135,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$82,409</td>
<td>$113,515</td>
<td>$98,338</td>
<td>$144,379</td>
<td>$144,379</td>
<td></td>
<td>144,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$114,696</td>
<td>$96,686</td>
<td>$102,286</td>
<td>$154,186</td>
<td>$154,186</td>
<td></td>
<td>154,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$110,596</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$124,378</td>
<td>$138,616</td>
<td>$138,616</td>
<td></td>
<td>138,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$93,933</td>
<td>$97,006</td>
<td>$110,209</td>
<td>$150,980</td>
<td>$150,980</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$107,700</td>
<td>$101,400</td>
<td>$118,909</td>
<td>$205,202</td>
<td>$205,202</td>
<td></td>
<td>205,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$165,099</td>
<td>$129,705</td>
<td>$151,004</td>
<td>$1,685,243</td>
<td>$202,319</td>
<td>$1,486,924</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $1,126,883 $1,219,644 $1,323,408 $1,685,243 $202,319 $1,486,924 12.0%
### MONTHLY BOARD REPORT

**FY2017 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)**

**Operating Expense Summary**

**As of August 31, 2017**

![Chart showing monthly expenses for FY2017, with July through June months listed on the x-axis and expenses in the y-axis, ranging from $200,000 to $2,000,000. The chart includes data for Actual FY15, Actual FY16, Actual FY17, Budget FY18, and FY18 Actual, along with Inc/Dec of Budget vs Actual and Budget Variance.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actual FY15</th>
<th>Actual FY16</th>
<th>Actual FY17</th>
<th>Budget FY18</th>
<th>FY18 Actual</th>
<th>Inc/Dec of Budget vs Actual</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$ 165,544</td>
<td>$ 197,494</td>
<td>$ 344,546</td>
<td>$ 275,249</td>
<td>$ 305,477</td>
<td>$(30,227)</td>
<td>111.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$ 411,069</td>
<td>$ 448,110</td>
<td>$ 277,454</td>
<td>$ 442,148</td>
<td>$ 285,702</td>
<td>$ 156,447</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$ 415,730</td>
<td>$ 173,284</td>
<td>$ 554,568</td>
<td>$ 444,852</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 444,852</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$ 1,168,758</td>
<td>$ 785,951</td>
<td>$ 545,424</td>
<td>$ 972,548</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 972,548</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$ 275,448</td>
<td>$ 579,144</td>
<td>$ 1,031,722</td>
<td>$ 733,773</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 733,773</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$ 205,224</td>
<td>$ 705,378</td>
<td>$ 530,833</td>
<td>$ 560,716</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 560,716</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$ 393,437</td>
<td>$ 785,516</td>
<td>$ 1,066,848</td>
<td>$ 873,613</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 873,613</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$ 753,200</td>
<td>$ 277,216</td>
<td>$ 495,805</td>
<td>$ 593,698</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 593,698</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$ 811,276</td>
<td>$ 476,098</td>
<td>$ 540,495</td>
<td>$ 711,038</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 711,038</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$ 819,256</td>
<td>$ 801,484</td>
<td>$ 1,099,887</td>
<td>$ 1,057,153</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,057,153</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$ 432,325</td>
<td>$ 1,872,541</td>
<td>$ 475,164</td>
<td>$ 1,081,427</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,081,427</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$ 1,181,739</td>
<td>$ 657,716</td>
<td>$ 1,654,813</td>
<td>$ 1,359,265</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,359,265</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

$ 7,033,005  $ 7,759,932  $ 8,614,559  $ 9,105,481  $ 591,178  $ 8,514,303  6.5%

10/3/2017  Unaudited financials-For Board and Management purposes/review
MONTHLY BOARD REPORT
FY2017 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018)
Capital Expense Summary
As of August 31, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actual FY15</th>
<th>Actual FY16</th>
<th>Actual FY17</th>
<th>Budget FY18</th>
<th>FY18 Actual</th>
<th>Inc/Dec of Budget vs Actual</th>
<th>Budget Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$23,987</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$2,947</td>
<td>$15,457</td>
<td>$2,435</td>
<td>$13,022</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>47,975</td>
<td>5,119</td>
<td>119,499</td>
<td>99,046</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>96,045</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>47,975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151,959</td>
<td>114,736</td>
<td></td>
<td>114,736</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>55,184</td>
<td>66,521</td>
<td>41,575</td>
<td>93,701</td>
<td></td>
<td>93,701</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>57,674</td>
<td>22,144</td>
<td>47,064</td>
<td></td>
<td>47,064</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>119,892</td>
<td>150,509</td>
<td>155,175</td>
<td></td>
<td>155,175</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>75,245</td>
<td>127,493</td>
<td>26,864</td>
<td>131,761</td>
<td></td>
<td>131,761</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>54,185</td>
<td>299,738</td>
<td>49,864</td>
<td>231,721</td>
<td></td>
<td>231,721</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151,205</td>
<td>493,524</td>
<td>369,990</td>
<td></td>
<td>369,990</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>18,078</td>
<td>125,234</td>
<td>279,403</td>
<td>242,583</td>
<td></td>
<td>242,583</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>47,993</td>
<td>65,625</td>
<td>594,004</td>
<td>406,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>406,082</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>564,136</td>
<td>222,489</td>
<td>452,334</td>
<td></td>
<td>452,334</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$374,409  $1,582,637  $2,154,781  $2,359,650  $5,436  $2,354,214  0.2%
EXECUTIVE REPORT
For September 2017

EXECUTIVE

- Attended JAN route launch.
- Presentation to Santa Fe County Commissioners on consolidation.
- Attended SWTA Board meeting in Dallas, TX.
- Meeting with William High, Nelson Nygaard regarding case study on consolidations.
- Meet with Northern and Central New Mexico Transit Providers group coordinated by NMDOT.
- Continued in discussions regarding NM Infrastructure Finance Conference in October.
- Taos Facility Needs Assessment RFQ evaluated, issued RFP.
- Meet with staff and Espanola city planner regarding District ROW concerns and new facility construction.
- Meet with staff regarding route modifications.
- Meet with Union representatives to discuss various contractual issues.
- Continuing project meetings with Staff for Jicarilla Apache Nation service.
- Continued discussions regarding Consolidation Study issues.
- Participated in quarterly IT review with Steady Networks.
- Continued meetings with Executive Search firm regarding Finance Director recruitment.
- Continued discussions on employee staffing issues.
- Participated in new employee orientations.
- Participated in NMTA Board meeting.
- Attended monthly MPO TCC meeting.
- Attended APTA Small Operations Committee (telephonically).
- Attended APTA State Affairs Committee (telephonically).
- Met with Attorney and Staff regarding various legal issues and associated documents.
- Prepared Board and Finance Subcommittee meeting materials.
- Met weekly (telephonically) with Board Chair Barrone on various issues.
- Continued review, revision and creation of various NCRTD policies.
- Maintained continuous communication with board members, subcommittee members, and Chair.
- Attendance at various NCRTD staff and subcommittee meetings, including Board, Finance and Tribal subcommittees meeting.
- Addressed a variety of employee human resources issues and prepared memorandums to document district actions.

LEGAL

- Continue work with Association of Counties on GRT election issues
- Meet with Counties on GRT issues
- Document needed changes to Personnel Rules
- Review current cases on Personnel matters
- Prepare for and attend Consolidation Study meetings
- Begin Development of new Construction Contract and RFP forms
- Assist in various personnel matters
- Review legal updates on changing federal regulatory environment
- Complete Records Management and Disposition Policy
- Review consolidation study deliverables and attend meetings re: same
- Prepare Legal Updates for Staff Meetings
• Review all Staff Reports and Draft Agenda Items

MARKETING/PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE

• Prepared to launch the Jicarilla route which included a ribbon cutting event on September 29. Designed and printed the 170-route map and schedule brochure. Issued a press release announcing the new service. Wrote and designed an invite to the launch event. Visited with our Nation partner in Dulce and met with many Nation leaders and stakeholders – Casino marketing rep (also Chama Village Councilor), the newspaper Jicarilla Chieftain, KCIE Dulce radio station, the Chama Valley Chamber of Commerce

• Updated and re-designed six route map brochures to support route modifications and run-cutting. The routes include: El Rito, Questa, Chama, Chimayo, Taos and Taos Express. It involved rebuilding tables, maps and other elements to streamline and make easier to update in the future. The roll-out included preparing rider alerts for posting on each of the buses on routes that would be impacted

• Participated with a bus in the Santa Fe Fiestas

• Attended the REDI Summit 2017 at Buffalo Thunder

• Worked with Ski Santa Fe to promote the added bus to their Golden Days Brewfest event on September 16

• Committed to an inside front cover ad for the Albuquerque Journal Winter Life special pull-out in partnership with the NM Rail Runner Express

• Provided design assistance on the NCRTD/SFT Consolidation/Merger Analysis

• Provided design work for architectural rendering of the Taos Transit Station

• Spoke with Santa Fe New Mexican regarding a ridership story they were working on

• Spoke with the Rio Grande Sun for various pieces throughout the month

• Committed to ads in the winter special pullout editions for Santa Fe New Mexican and Taos Express

• Scripted a new radio spot that began running on Hutton Broadcasting’s Outlaw Country Radio

• Wrote, designed and submitted ad for Jicarilla Chieftain and Chama Times re: 170 route

• Designed site skin ads that ran for two weeks on SantaFe.com to promote fall season on the mountain

• Issued various rider alerts throughout the month

• Provided a series of updates to the NCRTD website throughout the month

• Provided near daily posts and tweets on our Facebook and Twitter pages, as well as Instagram, leading to additional followers and connections to local businesses

• KDCE – 950 AM radio in Espanola, :30 sec radio spot and sponsorship of the 7:30 AM news ran 17 days in September excluding Saturdays and Sundays

• KSWV 810-AM in Santa Fe, :30 sec Mountain Trail spots ran 20 times in September as well as 30 :20 sec promos announcing RTD sponsorship during the 7:30 AM ½ hour

• KTAOS 101.9 FM in Taos, 14 :30 sec radio spots ran each week in September

• One banner ad ran in the Taos News and one in Los Alamos Monitor. One 1/8-page ad ran in the Rio Grande Sun. A strip ad ran on the front page of the Locals Section for the New Mexican

• Began a new radio campaign for the month of September on Outlaw radio. A total of 56 30-second commercials ran within the month

• A series of digital ads ran on SantaFe.com, Santa Fe Hometown News, Valley Daily Post and Los Alamos Daily Post

• Ads also continued running on the Taos News website as well as Facebook pages in the Taos County area

• Ads ran in the Chama Valley Times and in the Green Fire Times this month
OPERATIONS

- Conducted interviews for Transit Driver I & II
- Conducted interviews for Driver’s Academy
- Worked on various personnel items
- Worked on and distributed the Fall Drivers Route Bid
- Worked on employee performance evaluations
- Updated the Operations Position Listing
- Conducted meetings with Supervisors & Dispatchers
- Worked with NMDOT on vehicle transfer
- Participated in Northern NM Providers Group meeting
- Requested quotes for double sided bus stop signs
- Worked on daily staff assignments & coversheet
- Attended weekly JAN meetings
- Attend Espanola Runcutting meetings
- Coordinate driver and bus for Santa Fe Fiesta Parade
- Updated Seniority list for September Bid
- Coordinated drivers and buses for additional service for Santa Fe Thunder and Mountain Trail
- Provided comments for NM Study guide
- Worked with Planning and Marketing on route modifications
- Worked on quotes for FY19 5311 grant application
- Worked with All Aboard America on bus washing arrangements
- Conducted New Employee training
- Conducted employee evaluations
- Assisted with opening and closing dispatch operation
- Assisted with office coverage in Taos

SERVICE DEVELOPMENT

- August 2017 5311 Ridership Report
- ITS AVL/CAD project work including:
- Ongoing feedback loop and review with google transit, email correspondence and discussion related to roadway names, routing, schedule brochures, etc.
- Interactive Voice Response (IVR) implementation process ongoing, facilitating set-up between IT and ITS
- Annual route assessment completed, implementation of Board approved modifications underway
- TAP FY17 contract awarded to H.O. Construction, Inc. Contract and construction process underway; coordination with utilities; meeting with bus stop #264 landowner
- Participated in weekly project meetings related to future service in Jicarilla; TSV service for upcoming season
- Contributed to NCRTD-SFT consolidation study review process, provided feedback on draft deliverables
- Jicarilla pilot route planning ongoing; kickoff celebration coordination support
- Facilitated Tribal Subcommittee meeting at Buffalo Thunder
- Participated in End Hunger in New Mexico Summit, transportation discussion panel member
- Researched potential run-cutting and route planning software options
- Contributed to March run-cutting discussion
- Chaired NPRTPO meeting
- Attended NMDOT STIP-ZIPR meeting

HUMAN RESOURCES

- Celebrated Birthdays and Anniversaries on Wednesday, September 23, 2017;
- Selection of Above and Beyond Quarterly Award;
- Years of Service Awards for Board Meeting;
- New Employee Orientation - (2) two drivers for September;
- Three Employee terminations;
- Processed one (1) Workers’ Compensation claims;
- Stay Well Wellness Biometric Screening for Employees (9/21/2017)
- Seven (7) applicant interviews;
- One (1) unemployment Submission Response;
- Four (4) candidates for employment processed for potential hires;
- Processed new Purchase Orders and Change Orders;
- EEOC Plan update;
- October Calendar;
- Continued audit of personnel files;
- Attended and worked Jicarilla Apache Nation Kickoff;
- Attended and worked both for Rio Metro Job Fair;
- Four Fields of Success Presented at Leadership Team Meeting;
- Worked with Operations Employees on Performance Pro Evaluation System;
- Recruitment for Finance Director;
- Worked with Department of Workforce Solutions to implement Customer Service testing for potential employee candidates;
- Employee Health and Wellness Program (Yoga and Health Fair for NCRTD Employees);
- Two (2) disciplinary actions;
- Two (2) pre-determination hearings;
- Meeting with Union Representatives;
- Processed two (2) FML requests.
# NCRTD Monthly Ridership Summary

August 1, 2017 through August 31, 2017

## Calendar Operating Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Year</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Monthly System Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Year</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCRTD Operated</td>
<td>25,875</td>
<td>25,654</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRTD Funded</td>
<td>21,320</td>
<td>23,049</td>
<td>-7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Systems Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47,195</td>
<td>48,703</td>
<td>-3.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Year to Date Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Year</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCRTD Operated</td>
<td>46,709</td>
<td>46,895</td>
<td>-186</td>
<td>-0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRTD Funded</td>
<td>42,271</td>
<td>47,705</td>
<td>-5,434</td>
<td>-11.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Systems Funded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88,980</td>
<td>94,600</td>
<td>-5,620</td>
<td>-5.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## System Daily Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This Year</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCRTD Operated</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRTD Funded</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>-7.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Total</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>-3.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total Ridership YTD % Change

- Jul-16: -9.05%
- Aug-16: -5.94%
- Sep-16: 
- Oct-16: 
- Nov-16: 
- Dec-16: 
- Jan-17: 
- Feb-17: 
- Mar-17: 
- Apr-17: 
- May-17: 
- Jun-17: 


Aug-2017
Ridership Report

Comparative Ridership NCRTD Funded Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY14-15</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28,959</td>
<td>32,876</td>
<td>28,899</td>
<td>29,309</td>
<td>21,547</td>
<td>20,576</td>
<td>22,877</td>
<td>25,186</td>
<td>28,586</td>
<td>25,212</td>
<td>24,360</td>
<td>29,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15-16</td>
<td>26,067</td>
<td>20,914</td>
<td>29,077</td>
<td>29,566</td>
<td>21,569</td>
<td>18,551</td>
<td>18,369</td>
<td>15,566</td>
<td>16,155</td>
<td>16,292</td>
<td>17,609</td>
<td>19,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-17</td>
<td>24,656</td>
<td>23,049</td>
<td>21,877</td>
<td>21,886</td>
<td>15,163</td>
<td>14,476</td>
<td>13,262</td>
<td>14,920</td>
<td>18,664</td>
<td>17,379</td>
<td>20,559</td>
<td>21,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>20,951</td>
<td>21,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13= 269,146 / FY13-14= 312,093 / FY14-15= 317,616 / FY15/16= 249,641 / FY16/17= 227,142 / FY17/18= 42,271
### Chimayo Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY-14/15</th>
<th>FY-15/16</th>
<th>FY-16/17</th>
<th>FY-17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>1172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13= 6,645 / FY13-14= 7,818 / FY14-15= 8,633 / FY15-16= 8,261 / FY16-17= 9,673 / FY17-18= 2,222

### Eldorado Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY-14/15</th>
<th>FY-15/16</th>
<th>FY-16/17</th>
<th>FY-17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13= 7,045 / FY13-14= 6,636 / FY14-15= 5,154 / FY15-16= 4,760 / FY16-17= 5,168 / FY17-18= 854
El Rito to Espanola Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY-14/15</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-15/16</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-16/17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-17/18</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13= 4,876 / FY13-14= 4,980 / FY14/15= 3,229 / FY15/16= 1,777 / FY16/17= 1,290 / FY17/18= 331

Espanola to Santa Fe Route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 14/15</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>2529</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-15/16</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-16/17</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>2065</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-17/18</td>
<td>1527</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Espanola to Los Alamos Route**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY-14/15</th>
<th>FY-15/16</th>
<th>FY-16/17</th>
<th>FY-17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13 = 1,461 / FY13-14 = 1,685 / FY14-15 = 1,820 / FY15-16 = 1,318 / FY16/17 = 1,085 / FY17/18 = 228

**Penasco to Taos Route**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY-14/15</th>
<th>FY-15/16</th>
<th>FY-16/17</th>
<th>FY-17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13 = 9,189 / FY13-14 = 7,707 / FY14/15 = 6,567 / FY15/16 = 7,368 / FY16/17 = 4,673 / FY17/18 = 799
FY12-13= 12,913 / FY13-14= 10,792 / FY14-15= 9,794 / FY15-16= 12,035 / FY16-17= 14,701 / FY17-18= 1,878

Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY-14/15</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-15/16</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-16/17</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-17/18</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


San Ildefonso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY-14/15</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-15/16</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-16/17</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-17/18</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13 = 3,347 / FY13-14 = 2,951 / FY14-15 = 1,997 / FY15-16 = 4,060 / FY16/17 = 4,861 / FY17/18 = 1,065
FY12-13 = 10,500 / FY13-14 = 10,243 / FY14-15 = 9,862 / FY15/16 = 12,983 / FY16/17 = 13,004 / FY17/18 = 2,252

FY12-13 = 7,524 / FY13-14 = 10,448 / FY14-15 = 9,322 FY15-16 = 8,950 / FY16/17 = 7,742 / FY17/18 = 1,601
Chile Red Line (Taos)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>FY16-17</th>
<th>FY17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>5297</td>
<td>5655</td>
<td>4385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>5231</td>
<td>7071</td>
<td>5518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>5706</td>
<td>6221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>5916</td>
<td>5908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>4871</td>
<td>5472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>5471</td>
<td>5244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>4859</td>
<td>5452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>5832</td>
<td>5631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>5565</td>
<td>6061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>5989</td>
<td>4754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5981</td>
<td>4704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>6331</td>
<td>4988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY15/16 = 67,049 / FY16/17 = 67,161 / FY17/18 = 9,903

Tres Piedras - Services began on March 18, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY-15/16</th>
<th>FY-16/17</th>
<th>FY-17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY14/15 = 236 / FY15/16 = 625 / FY16/17 = 872 / FY17/18 = 161
Taos Ski Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15/16</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1707</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>3301</td>
<td>2772</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17/18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY15/16= 6,200 / FY16/17= 10,208 / FY17/18= 0

UNM Klauser Route - Services resumed on August 17, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY15/16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16/17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17/18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13= 4,504 / FY13-14= 3,579 / FY14/15= 1,908 FY15/16= 1,691 / FY16/17= 1,707 / FY17/18= 140
FY14/15= 105  FY15/16= 384  /  FY16/17= 1,509  /  FY17/18= 164

Pojoaque Route has been changed to Pojoaque Dial A Ride effective 03/16/2015.
Los Alamos Enhanced


Los Alamos Route 11 formerly route 10

June-Route 10 didn’t run due to fire

FY12-13 = 6,792 / FY13-14 = 6,230 / FY14-15 = 6,873 / FY15-16 = 7,117 / FY16-17 = 6,520 / FY17-18 = 417
Santa Fe Route 4

FY12-13 = 10,015 / FY13-14 = 11,543 / FY14-15 = 9,626 / FY15-16 = 8,928 / FY16/17 = 7,103 / FY17/18 = 1,074

Santa Fe Route 22

FY12-13 = 10,925 / FY13-14 = 10,318 / FY14-15 = 7,739 / FY15-16 = 6,323 / FY16/17 = 6,854 / FY17/18 = 648
Santa Fe Pick Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY-14/15</td>
<td>8908</td>
<td>10094</td>
<td>8136</td>
<td>9187</td>
<td>5795</td>
<td>4746</td>
<td>5464</td>
<td>6606</td>
<td>7120</td>
<td>6298</td>
<td>6097</td>
<td>8339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-15/16</td>
<td>3263</td>
<td>8431</td>
<td>7701</td>
<td>9718</td>
<td>4565</td>
<td>4573</td>
<td>4149</td>
<td>4941</td>
<td>6549</td>
<td>6033</td>
<td>7964</td>
<td>8418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-17</td>
<td>9091</td>
<td>8416</td>
<td>9365</td>
<td>9979</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>4377</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>4737</td>
<td>7214</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>8519</td>
<td>8929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>9397</td>
<td>8715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12-13 = 80,318 / FY13-14 = 76,413 / FY14-15 = 86,790 / FY15-16 = 76,305 / FY16/17 = 85,384 / FY17/18 = 18,112

Rail Runner Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY-14/15</td>
<td>34,454</td>
<td>33,020</td>
<td>29,923</td>
<td>30,811</td>
<td>23,537</td>
<td>27,502</td>
<td>25,101</td>
<td>26,186</td>
<td>27,842</td>
<td>25,908</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>28,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY-15/16</td>
<td>30,534</td>
<td>26,572</td>
<td>27,494</td>
<td>28,305</td>
<td>21,210</td>
<td>24,093</td>
<td>22,239</td>
<td>24,390</td>
<td>25,844</td>
<td>22,239</td>
<td>22,989</td>
<td>25,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16-17</td>
<td>26,484</td>
<td>26,723</td>
<td>26,107</td>
<td>26,469</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>22,062</td>
<td>20,965</td>
<td>23,045</td>
<td>26,851</td>
<td>22,019</td>
<td>23,186</td>
<td>25,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17-18</td>
<td>26,266</td>
<td>26,393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Measures

for

Fiscal Year 2017

August 2017
The performance measures that were developed are designed to provide data that can be evaluated in a logical manner. It allows the District to identify areas in which its performance may need to be improved and to understand the characteristics and factors that impact that performance. In addition, to the extent feasible a peer comparison or a benchmark has been included as available or appropriate. This performance data is important since many times the District’s costs, efficiencies and productivity is not measured against any benchmark or standard or attempts are made to compare it against systems that bear no similarities in mission, complexity or service area. Therefore, the data presented should provide some context in which to assess the District and its efforts to deliver services based upon its mission, goals and objectives."
The report data collected is grouped into 3 areas: Administrative, Fleet and Customer Related:

1. Administrative:
   A. Ridership, All Funded Routes
   B. Ridership, NCRTD Operated Routes
   C. Monthly Expenditures
   D. Cost Per Mile
   E. Cost Per Trip

2. Fleet:
   A. Spare Vehicle Ratio
   B. Average Vehicle Age
   C. Percentage of “On-Time” PM / Inspections
   D. Accidents, Major/Minor Tracking

3. Customer Relations:
   A. Complaints
   B. Incidents

The In-state/local comparable is Sandoval/Valencia Counties which are operated by the Rio Metro Regional Transit District. This benchmark/peer entity was chosen since they are within New Mexico and somewhat similar to rural transit service. The FTA benchmarking data used originates from the Rural Transit Fact Book 2014. The data is for 2012 in FTA Region 6, rural providers which includes New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana.
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Ridership Tracking of All NCRTD Funded Routes

Tracking ridership is the #1 way a public transportation agency can gauge its effectiveness of the service it provides. Ridership data for all routes funded by the NCRTD are collected by City of Santa Fe and Los Alamos County. This data is forwarded and combined with the data from the District’s operated routes. These numbers are then compiled into a monthly ridership report. This measurement tracks the number of one way trips taken on all the routes within the district. This graph shows the NCRTD combined total ridership numbers, and compares them each month, identifying any increases or decreases in the number of monthly trips. This also indicates how well the regional district is continuing to address the issue of accessible mobility by routes that are in areas where there is public demand. Sandoval/Valencia counties are used local/in-state comparison benchmark, as they are similar in service but smaller in size: a two county service of the Rio Metro Transit District.

Ridership All Funded Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY 12-13</th>
<th>FY 13-14</th>
<th>FY 14-15</th>
<th>FY 15-16</th>
<th>FY 16-17</th>
<th>FY 17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>41,135</td>
<td>48,552</td>
<td>46,374</td>
<td>45,966</td>
<td>40,932</td>
<td>41,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>43,836</td>
<td>49,624</td>
<td>50,295</td>
<td>42,682</td>
<td>45,202</td>
<td>47,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>36,784</td>
<td>49,034</td>
<td>46,680</td>
<td>52,575</td>
<td>46,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>44,537</td>
<td>49,766</td>
<td>47,152</td>
<td>52,528</td>
<td>45,373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>35,825</td>
<td>37,369</td>
<td>34,702</td>
<td>40,393</td>
<td>36,527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>30,576</td>
<td>36,320</td>
<td>35,509</td>
<td>41,584</td>
<td>37,142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>35,877</td>
<td>40,271</td>
<td>37,422</td>
<td>40,794</td>
<td>39,603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>33,352</td>
<td>40,871</td>
<td>40,320</td>
<td>39,780</td>
<td>40,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>36,135</td>
<td>44,627</td>
<td>43,164</td>
<td>40,830</td>
<td>46,068</td>
<td>42,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>38,724</td>
<td>44,335</td>
<td>39,195</td>
<td>37,248</td>
<td>38,208</td>
<td>44,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>43,060</td>
<td>43,930</td>
<td>37,447</td>
<td>39,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>42,332</td>
<td>39,934</td>
<td>43,676</td>
<td>43,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY12/13 = 462,173  FY13/14 = 521,843  FY14/15 = 501,936  FY15/16 = 517,684  FY16/17 = 503,011  / FY17-18= 88,980
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Ridership Tracking of NCRTD Operated Routes

This ridership data is collected by the NCRTD drivers for all routes operated by the District. This includes 27 flex and commuter routes as well as the demand response and paratransit routes. Totaling the number of one way trips on NCRTD routes, allows staff to evaluate effectiveness and to ensure that the service is reaching areas in the district that have high demand for accessible mobility. Sandoval/Valencia counties were selected as a local/in-state comparison benchmark.

Ridership NCRTD Operated Routes

FY12/13 = 193,027  FY13/14 = 209,750  FY14/15 = 184,320  FY15/16 = 267,870  FY16/17 = 284,285 / FY17/18 = 46,709
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Monthly Expenditures for Administrative and Operating

The NCRTD’s Finance Department provides the administrative and operating expenses in a monthly budget status report. It is important to measure the expenditures to maintain a balanced budget, as well as tracking the administrative and operating margins. This data is used in determining the cost per trip and the cost per mile. Tracking the budget and monitoring operational costs allows management to target specific dollar amounts when creating future budgets and requesting federal funding from the NM Department of Transportation.

Monthly Expenditures FY 16-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>98849.77</td>
<td>103120.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>302952.2</td>
<td>248707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>401802</td>
<td>351827.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Operational Cost per Vehicle Mile

Cost per vehicle mile is the total operating costs per month in relation to the total vehicle miles per month traveled on NCRTD routes. The mileage data is logged daily for each route and compiled into a monthly report. Monthly operating costs are obtained from the Monthly Expenditures (chart above) and the number of miles travelled for NCRTD operated routes. As a cost efficiency measure, operating costs per vehicle mile assesses the financial resources needed for the District’s route operations. This measurement is a beneficial tool for the planning and operation’s departments. The NM Department of Transportation uses this as one of their performance measures in the state-wide transit guide published annually. Additionally this is used when NMDOT evaluates a transit system for the state-wide awards of 5311 funding. This is a management tool to track our cost per mile vs. the amount of budget being spent to operate a particular route as well as collectively for all routes. Sandoval and Valencia counties’ annual average are used as a local/in state comparable benchmark, even though their system is smaller than NCRTD. Data from the 2015 Rural Transit Data Fact Book, specifically FTA’s District 6 (our district) annual cost per mile is included as a benchmark. *This Data from 2015 Rural Transit Data Fact Book has been revised for the FY17 year.

Operating Cost Per Vehicle Mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Cost per Mile</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
<td>$1.93</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6 Total Cost Per Mile</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
<td>$2.21</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Update to reflect the 2013 National Transit Data Base beginning January 2017
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Operating Cost per Trip

When transit data is collected, passengers, riders and rides are counted and referred to as "trips." One passenger can generate several trips in a day, and these are counted individually. Example, a particular rider may board in Questa (1 trip) and transfer to the Taos to Espanola bus (1 trip) and again transfer to the Santa Fe bus in Espanola (1 trip) for a total of three trips. The cost per trip is computed on a monthly basis by dividing the monthly operating costs from the Monthly Expenditures (chart above), by the total monthly number of trips (ridership). NM Department of Transportation uses this as one of their performance measures to the state-wide transit guide published annually. Additionally this is used when NMDOT evaluates a transit system for the state-wide awards of 5311 funding. This is a management tool to track our cost per trip vs. the amount of budget being spent to operate a particular route as well as collectively for all routes. Sandoval and Valencia counties' annual average are used as a local/in state comparable benchmark, even though their system is smaller than the NCRTD. Data from the 2015 Rural Transit Data Fact Book, specifically FTA's District 6 (our district) annual cost per trip is included as a benchmark. *This Data from 2015 Rural Transit Data Fact Book has been revised for the FY17 year (data is from 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Cost per Trip</td>
<td>$14.54</td>
<td>$9.61</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval/Valencia</td>
<td>$21.24</td>
<td>$21.24</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6 Total Cost Per Trip</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$14.70</td>
<td>$12.65</td>
<td>$12.65</td>
<td>$12.65</td>
<td>$12.65</td>
<td>$12.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Update to reflect the 2013 National Transit Database (NTD) beginning January 2017*
Performance Measure - Fleet:

Spare Vehicle Ratio/Combined all Vehicles

FTA defines the spare ratio as the percentage of spare vehicles in comparison to the number of vehicles required for annual maximum service. Recommended FTA spare vehicle ratio is 20% for fleets over 51 vehicles. NCRTD’s fleet totals 55 and is exempt from this guideline but it is a good benchmark to keep in place. With an annual maximum service of now 35 and a backup fleet of 20, the backup ratio is 58.82%. This higher number is needed and reasonable due to the variety of passenger seating requirements for specific routes throughout the District. These backup vehicles ensure consistent coverage of all routes when vehicles are off line due to routine maintenance or unexpected breakdowns.

---

Spare Vehicle Ratio/Combined All Vehicles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spare Vehicles</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Needed to run</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare Ratio</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure - Fleet:

Average Fleet Age

The FTA allows the use of years or mileage to attain usable life. The District uses mileage rather than the year of manufacture because of the large area of the district and the high number of miles traveled on an annual basis. This compares the age of specific kind of vehicles by mileage in accordance to the FTA guidelines. This is useful in fleet replacement planning. The numbers will vary month to month as mileages increase and old vehicles are replaced by new.

Average Fleet Age in Miles by FTA Category

- Heavy Duty Large Bus: 21,108
- Heavy Duty Small Bus: 350,000
- Medium Duty: 127,717
- Light Duty Mid-size Bus: 120,207
- Light Duty Small Bus/ Van: 60,351
- RTD Avg: 65,876

- FTA Minimum Life in Miles
- RTD Average Age in Miles
Performance Measure - Fleet:

Percentage of “On-Time” PM / Inspections

The federal benchmark for the percentage of “on-time” preventative maintenance (PMs) and inspections for the fleet is 87%. Inspections are required to be conducted within certain mileage timeframe by vehicle manufacturers for the various sizes of vehicles. Manufacturer’s recommended maintenance schedules may range in mileage due to the component makeup of a particular vehicle. The FTA recommends they be conducted within the manufacturer’s recommended maintenance schedule. However, as a sub recipient of NMDOT we are allowed varied standards as approved by NMDOT. With the variety of sizes and component makeup of District vehicles, we have determined and hold to a standard of 6000 mile intervals for the light and medium gasoline powered fleet and 7000 miles for the diesel powered medium-heavy fleet. This ensures frequent safety inspections and PM services at reasonable intervals that result in a more dependable and safer fleet. This data is collected and tracked by the Fleet Maintenance Manager.

Percent of Preventative Maintenance Completed Within Scheduled Mileage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 16-17 RTD Maintenance</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Recommendation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure - Fleet:

Accidents per Month

This measurement shows us how many accidents occur within a month and to what frequency they occur. These are logged as minor or major accidents. A minor accident for example, is one where a driver hits a stationary object while backing but there is minimal damage. A major accident is one where there may be significant damage and/or injury, and a FTA Post accident drug screen is required. All accidents are reported to the Operations and Maintenance Manager to decide on what corrective action needs to be taken. There are established internal reporting and follow up procedures. All accidents, major or minor, are investigated and documented, and dealt with accordingly by the operations management team. As a result, disciplinary measures and/or driver re-training may be required by the outcome of the investigation.

Number of Major/Minor Accidents per 113,033 Miles Avg. Driven Monthly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Minor Accident - August 7, 2017

Miles Driven since last Minor Accident - 87,504

Last Major Accident - July 7, 2017

Miles Driven since last Major Accident - 200,530

MINOR ACCIDENT DETAIL
*8/3/17 Driver backed up into another vehicle's bike rack.
*8/4/17 Vehicle was struck by another vehicle (Hit & Run)
*8/7/17 Driver struck metal pole pulling into driveway

*MAJOR ACCIDENT DETAIL
*None
Performance Measure – Customer Relations:
Commendations per Month

This performance tracks monthly the compliments received by the Operations Division of the NCRTD. The compliments are received by Operations and Admin staff. These are categorized by the different positions within Operations, and are recognized with an incentive in the "Above and Beyond" recognition program at the NCRTD. Driver's may use recognition at the time of their evaluation.

No Commendations for August 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 17/18 Number of Commendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure – Customer Relations:

Complaints per Month

This performance tracks monthly the number and type of complaints received by the Operations Division of the NCRTD. The complaints are received by the Operations and Maintenance Manager. These are categorize by the type of complaint, and evaluated as to the seriousness of the complaint and whether or not a course of action needs to be taken, i.e. driver reprimand, driver retraining, vehicle maintenance, etc. This measure is intended to measure the percentage of complaints versus the total ridership for the month. Driver performance can be graded and we can see if more drivers training needs to be scheduled for particular drivers. Customers also have complained about routes, stops, dispatch, bus cleanliness and other various categories.

1. Caller stated one of the bus stops was infested with red ants. Asked if there was anything that the NCRTD could to get rid of the ants. He also asked to have a bench installed at this stop.

   The Fleet Maintenance Manager was sent out to the specific stop to check on the ant problem. The Fleet Manager stated was not able to find any ants piles at the stop.

2. Caller stated she is always late for work due to the driver being late every day. Due to the bus running late has caused her to have issue with her boss at work. She stated when she is late to clock in she is being docked 1 hour. The NCRTD is her only source of transportation to get to work.

   Toos Supervisor called Espanola Supervisor that she had received a phone call from a passenger that stated the driver came to a sudden stop in the middle of the road to yell at some kids that were walking on the side of the road.

   Espanola Supervisor viewed the video and did find the driver made a sudden stop and was yelling at some kids on the side of the road.

### FY 17/18 Number of Complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Schedule Issues</th>
<th>Driver Performance</th>
<th>Against other Passengers</th>
<th>Miscellaneous*</th>
<th>Percent VS Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.010%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.021%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure – Customer Relations:
Customer Incidents

This performance measure calculates the number of customer incidents reported to the Operations and Maintenance Manager on a monthly basis. Customer incidents are any serious occurrence that may have an outcome that could be potentially hazardous to the driver or other passengers. These situations could be anything such as two passengers arguing over something, or a rider threatening a driver, or a non-rider harassing a driver for not being on time. It could also be a passenger falling down on the bus, or a passenger stepping in front of the bus as it pulls away from the curb to stop it to get on the bus. This data is collected by the driver writing an incident report and turning it in to the Operations and Maintenance Manager. This is intended to measure the types of situations that arise and how frequently they arise on the various routes of service provided by the NCRTD. This measurement tells us the frequency of incidents versus the number of monthly riders. We can then see if additional training needs to be implemented for the driver to avoid or control incidents that may occur on his route.

1. While at a bus stop a young male passenger loaded a bike on the bike rake of the bus then boarded the bus. At this time a woman walked up to the bus and spoke with the driver notifying him the young man who had just boarded the bus had stolen her bike. She approached the young man stating to him he had stolen her bike. The young man told her to take the bike, she then unloaded the bike from the bike rake.
2. A young man approached the driver asking him if he found a knife that he left on the bus. The driver told him no knives were found or turned in by other passengers.
3. As the drivers was pulling away from a bus stop she noticed a man riding a bike was on her lane. She stopped the bus, the man on the bike motioned to the driver he wanted a ride. The driver refused as she had been advised the man was not allowed to ride on the buses for the day due to other infractions with other drivers on this specific day.
4. A passenger who has been permanently banned from riding any of the NCRTD buses boarded the bus. The driver did not recognize him so he allowed him on the bus.
5. There was a driver exchange, when the driver boarded the bus to take over the route he recognized a passenger on the bus as being one of the passengers who is permanently banned from riding the bus and asked him to exit the bus at the next stop. The passenger then began arguing with the driver. The driver asked for a supervisor's assistance. At this point the passenger exited the bus before the supervisor arrived.
6. While passengers were boarding at a bus stop the driver noticed a man who was seated on the bus was sweating and seemed uncomfortable. The man then stood up and exited the bus. While he was exiting the bus, he asked the driver to call the paramedics, he stated he wasn't feeling very well. Once the man was out of the bus he sat/laid down on the sidewalk. The driver then called dispatch to have an ambulance sent to his location. The driver was able to leave once the paramedics arrived.
7. While in route driver observed a mower/brush cleaner in the median. As she was getting close to the mower she saw a big rock fly in the direction of the bus. As she turned into the Family Dollar she heard the rock hit the bus. The driver got off and inspected the bus.
8. A passenger boarded the bus at a bus stop. As the route continued the driver became aware the passenger wasn't moving and seemed to be unresponsive. The driver radioed base to ask for medical assistance. Paramedics met the driver at an NCRTD stop, passenger was taken to the hospital by ambulance.
9. A driver radioed into dispatch he had a passenger who was arguing with him stating he passed him by the previous round of the route. The driver stated he did not pass the passenger by and wanted the supervisor to see the video to ensure the passenger was not at the stop. The supervisor pulled the video to see the driver looking down as he passed this specific stop. The supervisor also saw the driver allow the passenger on the bus but continued to argue with the passenger through the route.

10. A passenger claimed he fell and cut his hand while he was trying to get the bus. The driver assisted the passenger with a band-aid.

11. A passenger who was not standing at the bus stop was unsure if he wanted to ride the bus. As the driver was leaving he appeared to change his mind and wanted to board the bus. By this time the driver had pulled away from the stop and was not able to stop for the rider.

12. Riders got upset with the driver when they were not allowed on the bus with their drinks.

13. Riders were complaining to the driver someone had used the restroom in the backseat of the bus. The Driver pulled into the NCRTD yard to clean the seat.

14. As the driver pulled up to a bus stop he notice a man yelling at people who were waiting for the bus. The driver asked him what his problem was, then gave him the information he was asking for. The driver advised the man to stop yelling at the other people or he would have to call law enforcement. Later in the day he saw this same individual at another bus stop yelling at riders who were at the designated stops. Again, the driver advised the man to stop harassing the riders or law enforcement would be called.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Driver-Non Rider</th>
<th>Rider-Rider</th>
<th>Driver-Rider</th>
<th>Non- Rider</th>
<th>Rider</th>
<th>% of Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.054%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.032%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The performance measures that were developed are designed to provide data that can be evaluated in a logical manner. It allows the District to identify areas in which its performance may need to be improved and to understand the characteristics and factors that impact that performance. In addition, to the extent feasible a peer comparison or a benchmark has been included as available or appropriate. This performance data is important since many times the District’s costs, efficiencies and productivity is not measured against any benchmark or standard or attempts are made to compare it against systems that bear no similarities in mission, complexity or service area. Therefore, the data presented should provide some context in which to assess the District and its efforts to deliver services based upon its mission, goals and objectives.”
The report data collected is grouped into 3 areas: Demand Response Administrative, Paratransit Operations and Customer Relations:

1. Demand Response Administrative:
   A. Ridership, All Demand Response Routes
   B. Ridership, Demand Response Paratransit
   C. Demand Response Operational Cost
   D. Cost Per Mile
   E. Cost Per Trip

2. Paratransit Operations
   A. Cancellations
   B. Late Cancellations
   C. No-Shows
   D. On-Time Performance
   E. Trip Length

3. Customer Relations:
   A. Complaints
   B. Incidents

The closest peer comparison is Rio Metro Regional Transit District-Sandoval/Valencia County for 2014. Theirs covers a large area as does NCRTD giving a close comparable to cost per mile. Their percentage of Demand Response trips are 46% of their total ridership, higher than NCRTD’s at 4.7%, showing a considerable spread on the cost per trip. The FTA benchmarking data used originates from the Rural Transit Fact Book 2014. The data is for 2012 in FTA Region 6, rural providers which includes New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas and Louisiana.
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Ridership Tracking of All Demand Response Routes

This measurement tracks the number of rides (trips) taken each month on all the demand response routes within the district. This graph shows the NCRTD demand response ridership numbers, and compares them each month, identifying any increases or decreases in the number of monthly trips. This also indicates how well the regional district is continuing to address the issue of accessible mobility by routes that are in areas where there is public demand.

FY12/13 = 11,374  FY13/14 = 11,941  FY14/15 = 10,164  FY15/16 = 11,937  FY16/17 = 12,017  FY17/18= 1,762
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Ridership Tracking of Demand Response / ADA Paratransit Trips

This ridership data represents the number of ADA paratransit trips that occurred each month within the demand response routes. This also includes any ADA eligible trips that occurred on the fixed/flex routes. Please note that this an incomplete chart at this time will be updated as ADA Paratransit ridership can be mined from the historical data.

Ridership Demand Response Paratransit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY 12/13</th>
<th>FY 13/14</th>
<th>FY 14/15</th>
<th>FY 15/16</th>
<th>FY 16/17</th>
<th>FY 17/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 12/13 = 899  FY 13/14 = 1,539  FY 14/15 = 2,247  FY 15/16 = 3,230  FY 16/17 = 3,283  FY 17/18 = 521
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Monthly Demand Response & ADA Paratransit Operational Costs

The NCRTD's Finance Department provides the administrative and operating expenses in a monthly budget status report. It is important to measure the operational costs to maintain a balanced budget, as well as tracking the administrative and operating margins. This data is used in determining the cost per trip and the cost per mile. The operating budget for demand response is 6.97% of the overall operating budget. Each month's operating expenditures are calculated at 6.97% to acquire a crude demand response share. That share is then calculated to a percentage of the actual ADA trips for the month to determine a cost for paratransit. This number will be used to calculate cost per mile and cost per trip.

![Graph showing monthly demand response & ADA paratransit operational costs FY 17-18]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total Operations</th>
<th>Demand Ops</th>
<th>Paratransit Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$302,952</td>
<td>$21,116</td>
<td>$8,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>$248,707</td>
<td>$17,335</td>
<td>$4,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR TO DATE: FY 17-18 $13,029
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Paratransit Operational Cost per Vehicle Mile

The Paratransit Cost per vehicle mile is the total operating costs per month in relation to the percentage of ADA vehicle miles per month traveled. The mileage data is logged daily for each route and compiled into a monthly report. As a cost efficiency measure, operating costs per vehicle mile assesses the financial resources needed for the District’s demand response paratransit route operations. This measurement is a beneficial tool for the planning and operation's departments. The NM Department of Transportation uses this as one of their performance measures in the state-wide transit guide published annually. Additionally, this is used when NMDOT evaluates a transit system for the state-wide awards of 5311 and 5310 funding. The peer comparison is Rio Metro Regional Transit District-Sandoval/Valencia County for 2014. Theirs covers a large area as does NCRTD giving a close comparable. Data from the 2015 Rural Transit Data Fact Book with data from 2013 (NTD), specifically FTA's District 6 (our district) annual cost per trip is included as a benchmark.

Paratransit Operating Cost Per Vehicle Mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Cost per Mile</strong></td>
<td>$2.58</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region 6 Total Cost Per Mile</strong></td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure - Administrative:

Paratransit Operating Cost per Trip

The paratransit cost per trip is computed on a monthly basis by dividing the paratransit monthly operating costs from the paratransit cost (chart above), by the total monthly number of trips (ridership). NM Department of Transportation uses this as one of their performance measures to the state-wide transit guide published annually. Additionally this is used when NMDOT evaluates a transit system for the state-wide awards of 5311 and 5310 funding. This is a management tool to track our cost per trip vs. the amount of budget being spent to operate a particular route as well as collectively for all routes. The peer comparison is Rio Metro Regional Transit District-Sandoval/Valencia County for 2014. Theirs covers a large area as does NCRTD giving a close comparable. Data from the 2015 Rural Transit Data Fact Book with data from 2013 (NTD), specifically FTA's District 6 (our district) annual cost per trip is included as a benchmark.

Paratransit Operating Cost Per Trip/Passenger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Cost per Trip</td>
<td>$36.80</td>
<td>$14.86</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandoval/Valencia County</td>
<td>$19.82</td>
<td>$19.82</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
<td>$17.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6 Total Cost Per Trip</td>
<td>$20.80</td>
<td>$20.80</td>
<td>$20.80</td>
<td>$20.80</td>
<td>$20.80</td>
<td>$20.80</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
<td>$16.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Update to reflect the 2013 National Transit Data Base beginning January 2017
Performance Measure – Paratransit Operations:

Cancellations, Late Cancellations and No-Shows

Cancellations, Late Cancellations and No-shows by the paratransit rider are tracked as a performance measure. A late cancellation (cancelled within 2 hours of the scheduled trip) is counted as a No-Show. When a rider has accumulated 3 No-Shows in a 30 day period, he/she may be subject to a 30 day suspension of service.

Cancellations = 31  Late Cancellations = 28  No-shows = 6

On Time Performance and Trip Length tracked for scheduling and driver performance. On-Time performance is considered on-time from 10 minutes before to 20 minutes after the scheduled pickup time for the scheduled ride. This is reflected in the percentages of total trips that were early, late and on time. The performance goal for this measure is to attain 90% On-time.

Early = 45.09%  On Time = 54.45%  Late = .46%

Trip length is measured to determine the average trip length riders are on the bus during their trip as the rides are shared with other rider’s pick up and drop offs. This is considered acceptable when ride time is not longer than twice the time it would take to make the ride on a fixed route bus. The average trip time on comparable fixed routes is 15 minutes.

Average Trip Length Per Client = 21.16 Minutes, 7.7 Miles On Board
Performance Measure – Customer Relations:

Commendations per Month

This performance tracks monthly the number and type of complaints received by the Operations Division of the NCRTD. The complaints are received by the Operations and Maintenance Manager. These are categorized by the type of complaint, and evaluated as to the seriousness of the complaint and whether or not a course of action needs to be taken, i.e. driver reprimand, driver retraining, vehicle maintenance, etc. This measure is intended to measure the percentage of complaints versus the total ridership for the month. Driver performance can be graded and we can see if more drivers training needs to be scheduled for particular drivers. Customers also have complained about routes, stops, dispatch, bus cleanliness and other various categories.

Mary Diaz received a commendation from a passenger on the Demand ADA Paratransit (Espanola Service Area). She commended the driver for her excellence service. Riding the Blue Bus has been a life changing experience for her, and she looks forwarding to riding the bus when Mary Diaz is her driver.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Scheduling Issues</th>
<th>Driver Performance</th>
<th>CSR/Dispatch</th>
<th>Miscellaneous*</th>
<th>Percent VS Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure – Customer Relations:

Complaints per Month

This performance tracks monthly the number and type of complaints received by the Operations Division of the NCRTD. The complaints are received by the Operations and Maintenance Manager. These are categorized by the type of complaint, and evaluated as to the seriousness of the complaint and whether or not a course of action needs to be taken, i.e. driver reprimand, driver retraining, vehicle maintenance, etc. This measure is intended to measure the percentage of complaints versus the total ridership for the month. Driver performance can be graded and we can see if more drivers training needs to be scheduled for particular drivers. Customers also have complained about routes, stops, dispatch, bus cleanliness and other various categories.

1. Caller stated an NCRTD driver was driving too fast down a dirt road on Camino De Las Flores. She tried to get him to stop to advise him of his speed but driver did not stop.
Supervisor checked the video, she did see a woman waving at the driver and driver waved back. On replay, the bus speed varied, but the driver did not seem to be going very fast from the video. Supervisor did advise the driver of the complaint in which he said he was not going fast. He advised the supervisor the road is a dirt road and is bad condition, therefore it being impossible to driver fast down that road. He also stated he would use more caution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 17/18 Number of Complaints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measure – Customer Relations:

Customer Incidents

This performance measure calculates the number of customer incidents reported to the Operations and Maintenance Manager on a monthly basis. Customer incidents are any serious occurrence that may have an outcome that could be potentially hazardous to the driver or other passengers. These situations could be anything such as two passengers arguing over something, or a rider threatening a driver, or a non rider harassing a driver for not being on time. It could also be a passenger falling down on the bus, or a passenger stepping in front of the bus as it pulls away from the curb to stop it to get on the bus. This data is collected by the driver writing an incident report and turning it in to the Operations and Maintenance Manager. This is intended to measure the types of situations that arise and how frequently they arise on the various routes of service provided by the NCRTD. This measurement tells us the frequency of incidents versus the number of monthly riders. We can then see if additional training needs to be implemented for the driver to avoid or control incidents that may occur on his route.

1. An ADA passenger made a request while in route to change her destination. The driver radioed into dispatch to ask for approval of the change in destination. The passenger also wanted a different pickup time than was previously scheduled. The driver advised her of the time that had been scheduled, she wasn’t happy about the time so canceled her return trip.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Driver-Non Rider</th>
<th>Rider-Rider</th>
<th>Driver-Rider</th>
<th>Rider</th>
<th>% of Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>