CALL TO ORDER:

A regular meeting of the North Central Regional Transit District Board was called to order on the above date by Commissioner Dan Barrone, Chair, at 9:11 a.m. at the Jim West Transit Center, 1327 Riverside Drive, Española, New Mexico.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Moment of Silence

3. Roll Call

Ms. Lucero called the roll and it indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Present:</th>
<th>Elected Members</th>
<th>Alternate Designees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos County</td>
<td>Councilor Geoff Rodgers</td>
<td>Mr. Tomás Campos [later]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Río Arriba County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos County</td>
<td>Commissioner Daniel Barrone</td>
<td>Commissioner Miguel Chávez (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fé County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambé Pueblo</td>
<td>Mr. Lonnie Montoya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pojoaque Pueblo</td>
<td>Mr. Tim Vigil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohkay Owingeh</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ildenfso Pueblo</td>
<td>Ms. Lillian Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Santa Clara Pueblo Absent
Teseque Pueblo Ms. Sandra Maes
City of Santa Fe Mr. Jon Bulthuis
City of Española Absent
Town of Edgewood Councilor Chuck Ring
Rio Metro (ex officio) Ms. Elizabeth Carter

Staff Members Present
Mr. Anthony J. Mortillaro, Executive Director
Ms. Glenda Aragon, Financial Manager
Mr. Gus Martinez, Fleet and Facilities Maintenance Manager
Mr. Jim Nagle, Public Information Officer
Ms. Dalene Lucero, Executive Assistant
Mr. Mike Kelly, Transit Operations Manager
Ms. Stacey McGuire, Projects and Grants Specialist

Others Present
Mr. Peter Dwyer, Legal Counsel
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer
Mr. Antonio Sierra, Rio Grande Sun
Mr. Greg White, NMDOT
Mr. Jim Luttjohann, Santa Fe Convention & Visitors Bureau
Mr. Andrew Martinez, Rio Arriba County
Mr. Chris Cordova, Southwest Planning and Marketing
Mr. Ken Hosen, KFH
Mr. Gary Forrest, Sipapu Ski and Summer Resort
Mr. Erick Aune, Santa Fe County

4. INTRODUCTIONS

All present introduced themselves to the Board.

5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilor Rodgers moved to approve the agenda as published. Mr. Bulthuis seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Santa Fe County, Taos County,
Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against. Rio Arriba County was not yet represented.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 2, 2013

Councilor Rodgers moved to approve the minutes of August 2, 2013 as presented. Councilor Ring seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Santa Fé County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against. Rio Arriba County was not yet represented.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

8. PRESENTATIONS

A. Presentation and Discussion of Service Plan Update Technical Memoranda 2 and 3

Mr. Mortillaro said the District was in the process of updating the five-year service plan and engaged KFH and Southwest Planning and Marketing to help with that. Today they would present the information that had been gathered to date and seek the Board's input on some of them.

Mr. Tomás Campos arrived at this time.

Mr. Mortillaro asked people to ask their questions during the presentation.

Mr. Hosen (with KFH) used a power point presentation to share the information. He said he would cover: Review of Outreach Efforts, Route by Route review and Discussion of Needs and Opportunities. He said they had 16 public meeting and rode on every route and talked with customers on the routes. He saw the RTD as the "Glue" connecting the communities and the services together into one regional network and would speak about connectivity throughout.

Outreach: Mr. Chris Cordova (with Southwest Planning and Marketing) talked about their outreach efforts. His firm did all the outreach in the District’s communities.

Mr. Cordova said they wanted comments from those who used the service. They had advertising in magazines, posters in churches and a bi-lingual interpreter. He did a lot of the travel meetings himself. The Pueblo Councils got presentations. He was very confident they understood the issues from the riders’ point of view. They also used a web survey and got good responses. He listed the meetings they held in various
communities.

Outreach focused on route destinations, service times, safety and comfort, communities and information, branding and familiarity, funding, etc. They asked questions about their support when the next tax issue came up and got a very good response.

There was no attendance in Española or in Santa Clara. Comment sheets were provided at each meeting and they had the web survey online. Data from all of them were compiled.

Issues included route destinations and Santa Fé was the most frequently mentioned. Service times were requested on weekends and mid-day service was requested. Buses generally were considered to be comfortable and safe. Bus drivers were the major means of communication. Blue Bus branding was strong.

There was widespread support for both existing GRT and a potential increase. There were concerns about the number of buses that could be provided.

There were no questions from the Board concerning their outreach.

Mr. Hosen provided summaries on performance measures. Ridership continued to go up and costs per passenger and miles were going down. He emphasized that here there was nothing bad to report.

**Route Reviews**

The route by route review details were in the document. Facilities had a few issues. Overall connectivity was analyzed. Combined with outreach and demographics, they had a clear picture of unmet needs.

- Route of Pojoaque to Nambé has morning and afternoon service only with none between 10 am and 2 pm. The route served Nambé and Pojoaque for business and government needs. It was long and slow. It needs ADA service. It has very low ridership with under 2 trips per hour. Route changes would add more locations. It was difficult to serve with a fixed route and consideration should be given to dial a ride service.

- San Ildefonso Route - 7-9 am and 4-6 pm. Connects with POjaoque park and ride lot. This route requires ADA service. Ridership was low but doubled recently. Service starts too late and ends too early for commuters to jobs in Santa Fé. Anyone using it must stay at their destination for up to 7 hours. Many complained the bus was difficult to access at the pueblo as everyone has to go to the Visitors’ Center. It would be helpful to have a park and ride stop on Highway 502 by the Pueblo.

- Riverside Route - The route is changing and now going to the Ohkay Owingeh Library. It has two buses on a half-hour headway from 6 am to 7 pm. The route has 7.7 one way trips per hour with 27% improvement in 2012. This route needs to be re-timed so that the bus did not sit at a stop when nobody was there. Timing points should be about 10 minutes apart.
The southern portion sees almost no ridership. It should connect to a transfer point (Park and Ride lot) in both directions and needs to connect better with Chimayó, Santa Clara and the west side routes. The service needs to be speeded up so routes could be run in 20-25 minutes and make sure it connects with these other routes.

Mr. Bulthuis said in the text Mr. Hosen mentioned one-hour headways but it was really a half hour.

Mr. Hosen agreed - especially during peak times. The Westside route was hard to understand and difficult to operate. The problem was that it just meandered all over and didn’t serve anything directly. This route could be straightened out in a more coherent manner. And needs to connect with other routes at no additional cost. It also has excess timing.

• UNM Taos Klauer Route - the route goes from downtown Taos south to the campus 8-6:30. It duplicates the Chile Line except the last 1.5 miles to the campus. There was not much ridership when school was out. The RTD should consider compensating Chile Line to extend their route to the campus when school was in session and therefore not duplicate service.

• NM599 route was strictly a commuter route with destinations near the train stop. It has very good ridership and didn’t need ADA. A new route of NM599 now also goes to Madrid and would require ADA service. It was new and could grow. Many people in Golden were also interested.

• Questa to Taos was a commuter route that didn’t extend to Costilla. It does well for commuters and students with good performance. The only concern was to change schedule to allow more shopping.

• Peñasco to Taos was a rural route connecting form Las Trampas to Taos. It had good ridership at 4.3 per one way trips. There was discussion about stops along the way. It was in need of ADA service.

• Taos to Española regional route with 3 trips each way per day. There were issues of timing. The route gets you to New Mexico College but to get back you have to take the Westside route to Taos. It should be better timed for connections. Service levels should include midday runs. Perhaps it should run through to Santa Fé. In Taos, it competes with the Chile Line.

• Española to Santa Fé Route - one of 3 routes in the Santa Fé - Española corridor. A DOT Park and Ride serves that same connection. It is subject to ADA requirements. This route connects to the Rail runner, to Española and to the Taos bus. It could offer a variety of express routes and options to connect with DOT buses but should not operate at the same times in same route. Perhaps it could offer more local service.

• Española to Los Alamos to Pojoaque is a "schizophrenic" route that goes all over the place and needs more succinct service from Española to Los Alamos so the Los Alamos folks could have a midday way home with a midday option. Ridership was extremely low.

• Española to Chimayó - gets okay ridership but it stops about a block short of Riverside and turns
around at an apartment complex that no one wants. Also it doesn’t have connections with any other bus. It should serve the Park and Ride lot and allow access from Chimayó into Santa Fé and Los Alamos.

- Española to El Rito and Ojo Caliente - it gets very low ridership and has a big giant loop. It takes a long time to get through the loop. It should have a commuter option with added stops and maybe try to get tourists as well as commuters. Between El Rito and getting back to the Chama highway there was nothing there so it was 20 minutes of dead space.

- Las Trampas to Chimayó to Española - attempts to transport commuters but the afternoon run was too early for commuters. Ridership was very low. It was subject to ADA service. At 5 pm it has virtually no riders to Española and none from Española to Las Trampas at 8 am.

- Chama to Española operates 3 days each week - Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. It serves the county seat in Tierra Amarilla. It could be tied into Ghost Ranch and packages for tourist runs. It needs many more bus stops, especially close to Española on the highway.

- Questa to Red River was seasonal and serves the convention center and ski village in Red River. It makes six round trips.

- Eldorado to Santa Fé was straight forward with six trips daily from 7:10 to 5:52. It is subject to ADA. It has no connections to the Rail runner.

- Edgewood to Santa Fé was a straight commuter route with good ridership. Sometimes it was crowded and it needs a bigger bus. A midday option would be a good option. Recruitment of a commuter driver and backup drivers was a serious issue. (Deadheading would be very high cost).

- Tesuque to Santa Fé - has been modified a little. It has the same corridor as Española to Santa Fé and has low ridership. The route is partly regional and partly local. Maybe it should be local and connect to the Española to Santa Fé buses. It should be kept local and have transfers to commuter buses which would give more options.

- Santa Clara route - was part Santa Clara circulator and part regional. The regional part has good ridership but was poor to Española. It could easily be incorporated with Española service without changing it much. Maybe morning and evening service should be regional and connect with the IHS Center or School. That should make it easier to transfer.

**Unmet Needs:**

Mr. Hosen said the good news was that the unmet needs could be filled at low or virtually no cost. By balancing out the service they might get additional benefits and sponsorships could be pursued.

Councilor Ring had a midday Edgewood route would help greatly.
Mr. Hosen said many commuters wanted to have a ride midday back. He also suggested a taxi voucher for emergencies or maybe even an on-call service.

Councilor Ring thought it was feasible.

Mr. Hosen said unserved areas included Tres Piedras, La Cienega and the ski basins. Doing packages with ski resorts and coordinating with Rail runner should be considered. Also the area east of Española had no services.

Underserved Areas Included Edgewood midday, weekend service or night services.

The District should consider more bus stops which was a cheap way to increase ridership. Some would be timing points and others not.

Connectivity and Regional Mobility was the glue that bound each of six systems in the service area. Seamless connections were essential.

Some shelters needed to come into compliance with ADA.

Only a few of the facilities were under control of the RTD. The Española Park and Ride (owned by NMDOT) was full most of the time. Sometimes no spaces were open or another lot needs to be created.

Coordinated Planning Activities were needed. There was at one time a regular meeting to coordinate the six systems informally. He recommended that be brought back as a formal group.

Marketing Needs were already being working on. Route maps and schedule maps, route numbers and new names for routes with numbers instead of colors were needed. The maps should also eliminate the terms, "inbound" and "outbound" with the terms northbound, southbound, etc.

Mr. Hosen went through the recommended next steps: develop a series of options for addressing the needs; select the most appropriate options; develop the draft service plan; implement and finalize funding strategies.

Councilor Rodgers added that once the plan was set, they needed to implement a marketing plan to tell the world.

Mr. Hosen agreed. They needed to work through newspapers, community meetings, ads on buses, and focus groups.

Councilor Rodgers asked if it would all be implemented on one day or staged.

Mr. Hosen said they hadn’t given that thought yet.
Mr. Mortillaro said as they got further along they would do an implementation plan. When you change a route, riders have to get ready for them and be aware well in advance of the change.

Mr. Hosen thought most could be phased in over time.

Mr. Cordova added that in small communities, people all go into the post office to get local news. It would be a mixed bag. Some archaic ways were very effective. La Cienega has a big bulletin board.

Mr. Hosen agreed grass roots was the way to go and inexpensive.

Mr. Aune asked Mr. Hosen about midday ridership. He was curious about who was riding midday and their basic needs.

Mr. Cordova said most doctor’s appointments needed midday transportation as well as shopping or other things. There were seasonal tourist needs too.

Mr. Hosen said midday would obviously have low ridership but it could include more tourists.

Mr. Jim Luttjohnann wanted to reinforce the need for serving visitors. The ski resorts were a place where the CVB had lots of discussion. They would gladly embrace and support that.

Mr. Hosen asked Mr. Luttjohnann to feel free to get in touch with him on those concerns. There were lots of places where the District could get ridership.

Commissioner Chávez was encouraged by the discussion and the effort in public outreach and proposed expansions of routes.

Chair Barrone thanked Mr. Hosen for the presentation.

9. ACTION ITEMS FOR APPROVAL/DISCUSSION

B. Discussion and Direction regarding Sipapu Service Expansion Request

Ms. McGuire said in late July, Mr. Gary Forrest called the RTD to ask for transit services at Sipapu. Mr. Mortillaro and Chair Barrone discussed the matter and asked for recommendations from staff for possible modifications to accommodate his request.

Staff believe the modifications to the Pefiasco route (map shown on page 72 of the packet) originating in Taos in the morning trip would serve Sipapu best so they would need to reverse the route. The Board could consider version 2 (on page 104) and address the expansion request. It would not accommodate a 7 day schedule for staff there. Page 106 showed the Sipapu operation schedule.
Staff did not recommend the Sipapu modification but recommended that funding options should be explored. If desired, staff would provide a resolution at the October meeting with a funding analysis. She gave the estimated costs (on page 401) for the different versions. Version one (on page 403) was estimated to cost $9,400/year. Version one would be a very long day. Version 2 (on page 404) would originate and terminate in Taos at an estimated cost of $7,900/year. Version 3 (on page 405) would eliminate the Taos loop at a cost of $3,900. It would originate in Taos but not at good hours. Version 4 showed and estimated cost of $5,700 savings annually and would eliminate the Taos loop. This option would reverse directions on the pm routing. That would need discussion with the current ridership. Version 2 was the staff preferred version. Staff discussed a possible contribution by the Sipapu Ski Resort.

Chair Barrone asked which route would address their employees best.

Ms. McGuire said that would be version 5. She handed out the modified schedule. It would have a little bit of down time. It wouldn't leave the Taos Administration until 7:48 am. There were possible alternatives to look at.

Mr. Montoya said it matched with the Chili Line too so they might take some of that over.

Councilor Rodgers asked what the route was for the Taos loop.

Ms. McGuire referred him to page 72.

Mr. Forrest thanked Ms. McGuire and Mr. Mortillaro for listening to his request. He said Sipapu was one of the few private companies here and it was the only resort growing in New Mexico. They went from 10,000 lift tickets about 12 years ago to 40,000 lift tickets now. Employment was an issue. They needed to expand their staff. It was 22 miles from Taos or $16-20 per day to drive it. The Chili Line turned him down so he turned to the RTD. Knowing that a stop was just 5 miles away from them, they wanted to see if they could market in Taos. Sipapu was actually closer to Taos than the Taos Ski Basin. Sipapu was the first to open and the last to close in the day. And if people could ride from Taos at no charge it was something they would want to market. Never before had he been able to work with a government agency like this that wanted to serve the public. He understand the District didn't operate on weekends. Most of their business (50%) was on weekends and holidays which meant most staff worked on weekends and holidays.

He had one of best marketing departments he had known. This little area has got a better reach to get the word out. So they would like to partner with the RTD.

He said they paid $280,000 in GRT per year and would love to pay more. So they would like to enlist the RTD's help to do that.

Chair Barrone asked him about a possible Sipapu contribution to the RTD to help with the costs. He understood there was the possibility of duplication in Taos now between the Chili Line and RTD and they could possibly sit down with the Mayor of Taos and working out a possible redirection of funds to help with it also.
He didn't know that it would fulfill the need for weekend and holiday service.

Mr. Forrest said he had talked with the head of the LLC what Sipapu might be able to contribute. Taos Ski Basin now subsidizes the Chili Line with $30,000 and sells about 140,000 lift tickets per year. That would provide a good comparison of the size of both ski areas. Their comment was that they paid enough taxes already. Mr. Forrest informed them the government agency already had their own criteria and he understood Sipapu should contribute a proportionate amount to make it successful. The bottom line was that Sipapu might be able to come up some funds for this service and the question was about how much it should be. There could be some good things both for Sipapu and the RTD. People could come to Sipapu - catch the bus in the morning and back to Taos and catch the Chili Line to ski at the Taos Ski basin. At a county in Colorado they had a whole bus system so skiers could ski all the ski places in that county while staying at one place. He envisioned that could happen and include Angel Fire and Red River.

Chair Barrone asked Mr. Mortillaro if RTD staff could meet with the Taos Mayor and free up some funding from there to accommodate a portion of this route and work with Sipapu to accommodate the other portion. And then the RTD could free up that duplicate route funding and the Town of Taos could also for this, depending on the negotiations with them.

Mr. Mortillaro agreed those were all options to pursue, pending the Board’s direction, and bring a recommendation to the October meeting. The ski season would be starting soon and he knew they would like to get it going prior to the start of the ski season.

Mr. Forrest said their opening was set for November 16. They were also open to a trial basis as well to operate it for a certain period and see how it worked.

Mr. Montoya asked if they had lots of employees there in the summer time.

Mr. Forrest said he was surprised about the summer business level. Sipapu has 60 lodging units and they ran about 75% occupancy in summer. They had about 400 people there right now for a BMW rally. They had 18 staff there in the summer and in the winter they had about 150 with a payroll over a million dollars.

Councilor Ring asked how careful the Board had to be with the anti-donation clause to give them something exclusively.

Mr. Dwyer didn’t think it would be a big thing. There was no problem with federal funds because the statute just applied to GRT expenditures but this would increase GRT revenues and also serve the general public.

Mr. Forrest clarified that Taos Ski Valley paid about $30,000 to the Chili Line. But when he called them, they told him they were way too busy and suggested he try the RTD. So the ski valley did pay something above and beyond their taxes to offset that public transit system’s expenses.

Mr. Dwyer explained that the RTD was a free service so it could become a potential problem but he didn’t see any problem with changing the service plan.
Councilor Ring saw no problem because it could be used by general public.

Councilor Rodgers pointed out that staff’s recommendation was version 2 and that didn’t solve the problem at Sipapu.

Councilor Rodgers moved to direct staff to enter into discussions with Taos to see what could be accomplished there and then bring a new recommendation to the October Board meeting. Mr. Bulthuis seconded the motion.

Mr. Bulthuis thought staff was saying they couldn’t make things fit right now but the timing issue was critical but Sipapu wanted something that would work for them.

Mr. Forrest said if it didn’t work for Sipapu it wouldn’t work for the RTD.

Mr. Bulthuis agreed. He asked if it was better for us to put something together quickly or to work through what Mr. Forrest was looking for.

Mr. Forrest said he worked on a five year planning schedule. So he would continue to work with the District until something could be done that would work. Obviously they would be pleased to have it for this season. His biggest need was to get employees there from Taos without having to pay money for their transportation. Most people in Peñasco drove to avoid leaving their car at the parking lot so this would be focused more on Taos residents.

Mr. Montoya asked if they would get any projected ridership numbers. He wondered if it would significantly increase ridership on those routes.

Ms. McGuire didn’t have any numbers but the potential ridership was both staff and tourists.

Mr. Montoya asked if this would be the first arrangement with ski places. Ms. McGuire agreed.

Mr. Montoya asked if the RTD had 4-wheel drive vehicles.

Ms. McGuire said those roads were well maintained and she didn’t see that as an issue.

Mr. Montoya liked version four that was cost-efficient and had a schedule that would jibe with employment at Sipapu. But he thought they needed to do a little more research.

Mr. Vigil asked if they would be serving employees or skiers. Ms. McGuire said it would be both.

Mr. Vigil asked about accommodations for skis.
Mr. Forrest said buses could be approved things extending for six inches behind the dimension of the bus. Most ski buses allowed skiers to hold their skis. Even in bad weather it would only be about 30 minutes but racks could be put on the outside.

Mr. Kelly said they had a few buses that were 96" wide so they could accommodate 102" with modifications to secure the equipment.

Chair Barrone said the Chili Line buses used PVC pipes to hold skis vertically and was an easy modification to the bumper. It was not a big deal.

Mr. Vigil wondered if insurance would increase.

Mr. Mortillaro said there would be no increased insurance costs.

Chair Barrone asked Mr. Forrest if at that time he would be able to get a determination if the LLC would agree to put up money for it.

Mr. Forrest thought there was a possibility of that. He asked if there was a tire chain requirement in New Mexico for large vehicles.

Mr. Kelly said currently the RTD didn’t have to use chains on the buses. They could use studded tires on certain routes.

Mr. Forrest thought studded tires worked much better. They were an excellent winter safety device.

Ms. Maes asked if Sipapu’s employees were on a staggered schedule.

Mr. Forrest said there were very few - ski patrol, lift crew, housekeeping and food service. They needed to be there to open at 8:00. The ones that worked at night were about five or six people per night.

Ms. Maes asked if the schedule had to assist the staggered crew. Mr. Forrest said no.

Ms. Maes also asked if this was for the employees or the tourists.

Mr. Kelly reiterated that current service was Monday through Friday.

Mr. Forrest said more people were there on weekends. People working at night had a slightly higher wage so their costs were being offset by the inconvenient time.

Mr. Bulthuis explained that the Board was talking through how Sipapu’s goals and needs could be met. The Board would deal with those in the October meeting. Sipapu’s primary service would be weekend service. So to understand, he asked if the plan being offered would meet their needs. The District wants people on their buses but also wanted that to align and they were just not sure what the RTD could provide would meet
Mr. Forrest said the number one goal would be seven-day service from 7:45 to 5:15. That would provide the best opportunity for employees and tourists. The last option would be one where it was incorporated that would better serve employees and tourists and keep working on it.

Mr. Vigil understood he was trying to get employees and skiers there at the same time and the skiers would have to wait until it opened.

Mr. Forrest clarified that there were actually staff living at the site who would have things set up. About 75% of the time, the skiers wouldn’t have all their equipment and it would take about an hour for them to get to the rental shop and eat, etc. so the lifts would start at 9:00 a.m. So the coffee would be ready. The lifts close at 4:00 p.m and then the skiers would turn in the equipment, get a drink or a snack and the bus would show up at 5:15 and they were taken back.

Mr. Bulthuis thought in order to get folks, some would want midday service. He asked if Sipapu would look for the RTD to provide that also.

Mr. Forrest suspected one reason they might have needed midday service would be an accident but ambulance services would take care of that. And people coming up would already know the bus goes back at 5:15. But if they got lots of requests, he could come back and ask to add that service.

Councilor Rodgers amended his motion, in addition to work with the Town of Taos would be to work with the company on any funding options. Mr. Bulthuis agreed it was friendly. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against. Santa Fé County did not vote as Commissioner Chávez had left the meeting.

Mr. Forrest thanked the Board for agreeing to work more on it.

C. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2013-18 providing for the District to Pay 75% of the 1.5% Increase in PERA Contribution for all District Employees, Union and Non-Union Earning More than $20,000 Per Year

Mr. Mortillaro said the Resolution would provide for the agency’s contribution of 75% of the 1.5% increase for PERA for all District employees. The Board discussed this as part of the compensation study reported at the July Board meeting and subsequently at the Finance Subcommittee meeting. The Board also discussed this issue in the discussion on Senate Bill 27 which amended the Public Employees Retirement act regarding collective bargaining. He discussed it with the Teamsters and they were in support of that increase. They wanted 100% but it was narrowed down to what the law allowed. So this resolution was in context of that discussion.
Mr. Bulthuis left the room during his presentation.

Councilor Rodgers noted in the packet it said the RTD could absorb that in the budget this year but he wondered about next year.

Mr. Mortillaro thought they could.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this matter.

Councilor Ring moved to approve Resolution No 2013-18 to approve the pickup of the proposed increase in PERA contribution for all District employees. Mr. Vigil seconded the motion and it passed by roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against. Mr. Bulthuis was out of the room at the time the vote was taken.

D. Discussion and Possible Ratification of Collective Bargaining Agreement Wage Re-opener between the NCRTD and Teamsters Local No. 492

Mr. Mortillaro explained to the Board that the existing collective bargaining with the Teamsters Local No. 492 had a wage re-opener for 2014. They entered into discussions with the union several months ago; met twice and agreed that the union would accept the wage package that was determined through the compensation and classification study.

Basically, the market study analyzed wages in other areas and established new minimums and maximums for the collective bargaining group. And the only ones eligible were those below the minimum rate and that resulted in approximately 20 out of 32 being eligible for an increase. The rest were well within the range. The adjustments varied, depending on their hourly rate. He presented the data to the union and told them that they should either accept that concept (about a 2.3% impact) and if they wanted more, they would have to discuss it further. The union agreed with the concept and took it to their membership who then ratified the agreement. The total cost was about $20,836. It was well below the budgeted amount in FY 2014.

Mr. Bulthuis returned to the meeting.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this matter.

Councilor Rodgers moved to ratify the Collective Bargaining Agreement Wage Re-opener between the NCRTD and Teamsters Local No. 492. Mr. Montoya seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé, and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against.
E. Discussion and Consideration of Resolution No. 2013-23 Adopting an Infrastructure Capital Improvement Plan (ICIP)

Ms. McGuire listed the eight items on the ICIP list to the Board. They included: 1) Fleet replacement; 2) Paving the bus parking area; 3) Constructing a fueling facility; 4) Emergency electrical generator; 5) Satellite facilities in Taos and Santa Fé; Installing bus awning shelters; 7) Solar panels and electrical conversion to power NCRTD facilities; and, 8) a skid loader. She explained this was the annual request for appropriations from the State Legislature for the NCRTD. The alternative would be to not participate in the state ICIP process and would result in the loss of potential state funding over the five year period. Page 414 presented the resolution itself.

Chair Barrone commented that it was hard to get state money without the ICIP participation.

Ms. Maes asked if participation in ICIP would conflict with GRT and be considered double-dipping.

Mr. Mortillaro said it would not because the funds the RTD was requesting was allocated from other state revenues. Legislators had a certain amount of money they could get allocated within their area of representation. But if the RTD didn’t ask for it, they wouldn’t get any of that money. The Governor added a restriction to have audits completed and any findings being addressed in order to get an appropriation. Every city and county asked for both GRT and ICIP funding.

Mr. Buthuis moved to adopt Resolution No. 2013-23 approving the ICIP plan as submitted. Chair Barrone seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Santa Fé County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against.

F. Resolution 2013-22 providing for the Continuation of Resolution 2011-15 to Eliminate Fares for all fixed routes and Para-Transit up to Three fourths of a Mile from Fixed routes

Mr. Mortillaro said the Board at one time analyzed this issue every year and the last time it was done for a two-year period and was to be brought back at the September meeting every other year.

Ms. McGuire provided the background for this resolution. The Board first adopted the free fare policy on May 9, 2008 and was continued by resolution in 2009, 2010, and 2011. This resolution would continue free fares until December 31, 2015. Retaining free fares would eliminate the necessity for capital investment in fare box equipment of approximately $50,000 at minimum with anticipated administrative and collection costs annually of approximately $52,000. Free fares would provide continued high ridership, driver focus on safety and routes running in a timely manner. Fare free transit brings many benefits which include a barrier-free transportation option to every member of the community; not just to those who could afford it. It reduces greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution, noise pollution and runoff, excessive consumption of oil and gasoline. It also eliminates fare invasion and criminal invasion of transit-using citizens. The NCRTD is currently undergoing a service plan update working with the KFH Group. Dependent upon the consultants’ findings and
analysis, KFH might recommend implementation of a “premium fare” structure that would require a fare for passengers utilizing premium enhanced and/or weekend transit service. If that comes to fruition, staff would return to the board and request direction. She anticipated that the consultants would likely recommend that the system remain fare-free. She recommended that the Board approve Resolution 2013-22.

As an option, the Board might choose to establish fares, request staff with various options regarding fares and a time line for hearings to solicit public comment in its implementation and acquisition of capital equipment and staffing. The costs would range from $49,000 to as much as $637,000 for equipment and installation and $52,000 more to operate with fares for pulling fare boxes, counting the money and making deposits. She referred to the matrix on page 418 - 420 of the Board packet that showed three options for equipment for collecting fares.

She described the limitations on the low cost fare box. $79,000 would be the cost for a better fare box. The best one could use magnetic cards and distinguish currency denominations at a cost of $637,000.

Mr. Vigil asked if this conflicted with the ski area paying for services.

Mr. Dwyer said under the RTD Act there was a provision in which the District could establish cooperative agreements and was allowed to get payments from outside users so it didn’t conflict with the law. There were ways to do cooperative agreements and collect money which was separate from the free-fare policy issue.

Mr. Bulthuis, following up on that and looking ahead to other requests like Mr. Luttjohann’s request for service to the Santa Fé Ski Area, that this was kind of a premium fare schedule and he hoped that would not interfere with this policy of not charging fares on their fixed routes.

Mr. Mortillaro had discussions with KFH about those exact things. And if you looked at the verbatim dialogue from the public meetings, you would see discussion whether people would pay for additional premium services who said they would. “Free fare service was X but if you wanted direct, such as the most direct route to Santa Fé, maybe people would pay for that.”

Mr. Bulthuis thought that was great and wished he had that flexibility.

Councilor Ring said he attended the ridership meeting at Edgewood and every rider there said they would be willing to pay so if that issue was ever raised, it would be acceptable to the Edgewood riders.

Ms. Maes asked if that would be something that could be built into next year’s grant.

Mr. Mortillaro explained that none of the District’s grants required fares to be charged. They used GRT as a matching contribution for those grants that required a match but the NCRTD was probably one of very few free fare transits in America. He thought it had served the District and its riders well and would like to see it continue. Although folks sometimes say they would be willing to pay a fare, at the end of the day, usually wouldn’t.
Ms. McGuire said the recommendation was to maintain free fares as the District has been doing.

Councilor Ring moved to approve staff recommendations adopting Resolution 2013-22 providing for the Continuation of Resolution 2011-15 to Eliminate Fares for all fixed routes and Para-Transit up to Three fourths of a Mile from Fixed routes. Councilor Rodgers seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against.

G. Discussion and Consideration of Bus Shelter Designs

Mr. Mortillaro the District had funds that needed to be expended before the end of the fiscal year and had asked Mr. Gus Martínez to consider how to use those funds for bus shelters with better designs.

Mr. Martínez explained that the District was awarded $80,000 as a 5311 grant from NMDOT to purchase bus shelters, benches and signage and had to be spent by the end of September, 2013. At present, the District had spent $48,506.00 on bus stop benches and bus schedule holders at bus stops. That left $31,494.00 that could purchase two bus shelters. Staff was requesting Board input in the selection of a new bus shelter design for these purchases as well as in the future.

He said the Board had the option of taking no action or requesting staff to decide on shelter designs for which the $31,494 would be used. Among those designs, there were three designs the staff recommended and they were shown on pages 422, 423 and 424 whose design would allow the RTD logo to be placed on it.

Chair Barrone recalled in the earlier presentation the Board talked about ADA standards. He asked if any of the designs met ADA guidelines.

Mr. Martínez said all of them met ADA standards.

Mr. Vigil thought the first shelter looked like a glass enclosure.

Mr. Martínez said it had 3 sides with glass on one side and metal screens on the other two. Staff liked the last two for keeping snow out. Along with this, the District would have the option for using solar panels or other amenities.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if any of the manufacturers were local.

Mr. Martínez said the last two were from San Diego.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if there were any cost estimates.

Mr. Martínez said the last two were about $15,000. The other one was about $17,000.
Mr. Mortillaro added that the estimated cost didn't include any amenities.

Councilor Rodgers asked if whichever design the Board approved would become the standard for future shelters. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Mr. Bulthuis asked if these designs were scalable or just one size or did the company have alternate sizes that would keep the same scheme.

Mr. Martínez didn't know but agreed to ask that from the company.

Mr. Mortillaro clarified that at some stop locations there would just be benches and would use that process as well. There were locations where they didn't meet ADA standards - places where the concrete pads were not the right dimensions and they might have to spend money to correct that.

Mr. Bulthuis commented that glass shelters required far more maintenance and his board decided to remove them because they couldn't keep up with the vandalism.

Chair Barrone asked if they could allow someone put ads on the shelters.

Mr. Martínez agreed.

Chair Barrone asked if the bench was included.

Mr. Martínez said yes and also a trash container.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this matter.

Councilor Rodgers moved to approve the design shown on page 424 as the approved shelter design. Mr. Vigil seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Los Alamos County, Rio Arriba County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Pojoaque Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against.

Mr. Vigil moved to take a five-minute recess. Chair Barrone seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

The Board meeting was recessed at 11:45.

At 11:57 a.m. Councilor Ring moved to reconvene. Mr. Bulthuis seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

During the recess, Councilor Rodgers and Mr. Vigil left the meeting.
10. DISCUSSION ITEMS

H. Financial report for August 2013

Ms. Aragon presented the Financial Reports which were included in the Board packet on pages 425 - 436 and went through the details. She noted among revenues were $81,000 from federal sources and a little more than $1,000 from demand service fares during August. All GRT revenues from the last fiscal year had been received. Overall, the RTD was going to see a majority of activity flowing in September.

She said the external audit would be conducted in November by Hinkle and Landers, the same auditors who audited the RTD last year. Probably by January they would bring the full audit for Board review after the State Auditor permitted it.

Chair Barrone referred to page 431 (Taos County) and asked if the budgeted amounts were in red. Ms. Aragon agreed.

Chair Barrone asked what had actually come in.

Ms. Aragon explained that no revenue had come in for July and the District wouldn't know the final July activity until around September 21. So what was received was all from the previous FY. Page 427 showed actuals overall from the prior months and would show how much the RTD received in July.

I. Finance Subcommittee Report

Mr. Vigil was not able to present the report, having left the meeting earlier.

Mr. Mortillaro noted the minutes from the July Finance Subcommittee meeting were in the packet. In August, the only item was the entrance conference with the auditor. Those minutes would appear on the October agenda.

J. Tribal Subcommittee Report

Ms. Valério was not present to give a report.

Mr. Mortillaro added that there was no Tribal Subcommittee held since the last report and no meetings were scheduled in the near future.

K. Executive Report for August 2013 and Comments from the Executive Director
1) Executive Report

2) Performance Measures

3) Ridership Report for July 2013

Mr. Mortillaro asked Mr. Dwyer to address the Rio Arriba tax issue and the issue regarding the contract with Stoven Construction on landscaping.

Mr. Dwyer said the Rio Arriba County Assessor noticed the RTD for taxes past due but the District had never received a tax bill so no one knew what it was for. Eventually he was able to talk with a person at the Treasurer's office who did research parcel by parcel. The result was that they billed the RTD for 3 parcels but the District only owns two parcels. They finally determined that the previous owner was not current on taxes. All taxes should have been paid at closing and the closing settlement statement showed the District actually did pay the pro rata share of its taxes then. So either the title company did not properly determine taxes due or something else so he would have to follow up with the title company to see what they could say. Unfortunately the title company had changed ownership since then. Then they could go to the previous owners in interest and make it an issue for them. He added that in the list published in the Rio Grande Sun, Rio Arriba County was also one that received a bill.

Mr. Campos said besides this entity, there were three others where the title company didn't do their job. Even the County staff had trouble keeping up with taking the County off the tax rolls.

Mr. Dwyer clarified that the issue was not being on the tax rolls. The NCRTD is off the tax rolls and the taxes due should have been resolved at closing. He didn’t know what the County Treasurer intended to do to collect from NMDOT, Rio Arriba County and NCRTD.

The other issue was with the final punch list one year warranty items. The landscaping was done poorly and some irrigation lines were installed on adjacent properties and some of the lines snapped and plants died. He agreed to write a letter of demand and report back to the Board. They have been non-responsive and he didn't know how important it is.

Mr. Mortillaro said his reports were in the packet and needed no comment.

Regarding the performance measures he asked Mr. Kelly to go through them.

Mr. Kelly said the performance measures reports for all NCRTD operated routes and those operated by Santa Fé City and Los Alamos County began on page 451 in the packet - shows ridership for RTD and transit systems with an increase of 48,552. The RTD routes had an increase of 17,504.

Page 453 showed monthly expenditures of $280,618 broken out by trips and by miles traveled and indicated monthly costs were $2.08/mile and $9.29/trip and the report compared costs with others and the Federal District Six averages.
He also shares the statistics for spare vehicle ratio and noted that two new vehicles would arrive in two weeks and it would be a couple of months to take replaced vehicles out of service. Aging of vehicles was done by mileage instead of months. The mileage was reached on the vans and would be replaced next. The fleet average was over 100,000 miles. The on time performance was at 94% and above the average of 87% for comparison. They only missed on two vehicles.

Aging - FTA gives us mileage or months rates. We chose mileage. We were good on HD small buses mileage.

We’ve reached average miles on the vans and would be replacing them. The fleet average put together was over 100,000.

This year they had only one minor accident (in July) and had driven 53,000 miles since. They logged over a half million miles since the last major accident in January. A total of 8 complaints were received and dealt with correctly. They had 9 incidents.

11. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. Bulthuis announced that transit services in Santa Fé City expanded and completed last night for transportation to the Santa Fé Fiesta. Those services were underwritten by this Board and he thanked the Board.

12. MISCELLANEOUS

L. Request for Service to Ghost Ranch

Letter from Tomás Campos regarding Ghost Ranch.

Mr. Campos said the letter requests service to the Ghost Ranch Conference Center. It was not far from El Rito and was on the Chama Route. There was a dirt road to enter and exit from. Staff looked at this request. Ms. McGuire actually wrote the letter. We don’t have a commuter route now so he didn’t know how the RTD could cover that right request now. That would be slightly more expensive.

Ms. McGuire agreed. They would have increased costs and that was something they would have to address.

Councilor Ring moved to ask staff to undertake an analysis on service to Ghost Ranch. Mr. Montoya seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous roll call vote with Río Arriba County, Taos County, Nambé Pueblo, Santa Clara Pueblo, Tesuque Pueblo, City of Santa Fé and Town of Edgewood voting in favor and none against. Mr. Shelton, Commissioner Chávez and Mr. Vigil were not present.
for the vote.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Next Board Meeting: October 4, 2013 at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Bulthuis moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Montoya seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Montoya invited people to the feast day at Nambé on October 4th.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.
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