Vision: Promote and provide efficient, accessible, affordable, seamless, equitable, responsive, and easy to arrange transportation options for Boulder County residents through coordination and collaboration between service providers.

AGENDA

I. Welcome & Introductions (5 min)

II. Presentation by Michael Washington (40 min)
   RTD Transit Equity Manager
   michael.washington@rtd-denver.com
   303.299.2436

III. LCC Member Updates (15 min)
   a. LCC Asset Inventory, Bob
   b. Others

IV. Boulder County Update (20 min)
   a. Mobility for All Website and Newsletter Changes
   b. LCC Passenger Testimonials
   c. RTD Service Changes
   d. Transit Map Options
   e. HHS Fair Housing Assessment
   f. Bike Lights Clients

V. Advocacy Working Group (15 min)
   a. Public: Snow Removal and ADA Accessibility Issues
   b. Decision Makers: Affordable Transportation is a Basic Social and Economic Need
      i. LCC Policy Brief Paper
   c. Stakeholders: Partnership Building
      i. Who do we have participating? Who do we need?
   d. Public: Mobility Education

VI. Public Outreach Working Group
   a. Distribution Plan, Material Requests

VII. Needs and Solutions (5 min)

VIII. Conclusion
   a. Next meeting: Monday, December 11, 2017, 2:00-3:30 pm
**Who are we missing?**

We would love to invite the right groups/field/organizations/individuals to our meetings. If you have a contact or a suggestion for a presentation, please contact: abond@bouldercounty.org

**Needs and Solutions**

If you identify any community needs or potential solutions throughout the meeting and presentation, please take notes here for group discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Needs</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jared Hall</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakura Gardner</td>
<td>VIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis Lindsay</td>
<td>BCEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim De Graff</td>
<td>ACL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Elg</td>
<td>City of Laurel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zareen Tasneen</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Johnson</td>
<td>EFDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Sureau</td>
<td>Bridgehouse/POP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Bear</td>
<td>Boulder County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob DAlessandro</td>
<td>Via Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Williams</td>
<td>DPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION PosSU C PUD</td>
<td>CROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Hilde</td>
<td>City of Longmonte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Stewart</td>
<td>OUR Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Herman</td>
<td>City of Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bonfanti</td>
<td>Workforce BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Mayne</td>
<td>City of Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Washington</td>
<td>RTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bitzer</td>
<td>VIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Bond</td>
<td>M4A Bldg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vision: Promote and provide efficient, accessible, affordable, seamless, equitable, responsive, and easy to arrange transportation options for Boulder County residents through coordination and collaboration between service providers.

November BoCo LCC Minutes

I. Attendees:
Jared Hall  Boulder County Transportation
Sakura Gardiner  Via Mobility Services
Regis Lindsay  Boulder County Care Connect
Kim DeGraff  Association for Community Living
Megan Davis  City of Louisville
Elain Erb  Boulder Transportation Connections
Zareen Tasneem  Boulder County Transportation
Audrey Johnson  Emergency Family Assistance Association
William Sweeney  Bridge House/BOHO
Tim Beal  Boulder Housing Partners
Bob D’Alessandro  Via Mobility Services
Kate Williams  Denver Regional Mobility & Access Council
Aaron Pasterz  Center for People with Disabilities
Eden Mayne  City of Boulder Senior Services Manager
Michele Waite  City of Longmont Senior Services
Sandy Stewart  OUR Center
Megan Herman  City of Lafayette Senior Services
Claire Benton  Workforce, Boulder County
Michael Washington  Regional Transit District
Lisa Bitzer  Via Mobility Services
Angel Bond  Boulder County Mobility for All

II. Presentation RTD Transit Equity
Michael Washington, RTD Transit Equity Manager, gave a presentation on RTD’s Transit Equity program to promote fairness in transit. Michael covered Title VI and Environmental EO 12898 requirements and reviewed a public engagement case study for RTD service changes connected to the opening of the A Line in the Montbello neighborhood, Denver. The presentation is attached. Michael mentioned that the Pass Program Working Group is looking at fare options for low income individuals in district. They are evaluating impacts of offering discount fares to individuals at 138% and/or 200% FPL. William Sweeney raised concerns about how unaffordable the RTD fares are for the Bridge House and BOHO clients, which can be at 5% of the Area Median Income. He stated that behind personnel costs, the next
largest line item in their budget is bus passes. For questions regarding RTD Transit Equity Program, please contact michael.washington@rtd-denver.com.

III. LCC Member Updates
a. Bob D’Alessandro suggested that the LCC conduct an asset inventory of who is around the table and what we can do to facilitate transportation services for shared clients. Part of the process would be to determine who is missing from the LCC. We discussed incorporating the inventory into the Policy Working Groups efforts to build stronger partnerships and engage more stakeholders.

b. Aaron Pasterz was selected as one of 12 representatives on RTD Advisory Committee for People with Disabilities. The Committee is drafting a letter recommending accessibility changes to RTD Union Station doors. Aaron is checking with the Committee to see if it would be useful for LCC to draft a separate letter or sign on to the letter the Committee is drafting.

c. Eden Mayne said that the City of Boulder Job Fair, Oct, was a success. More than 750 job participants attended! Angel Bond mentioned it may be useful to locate the community resource tables in the same area as the job providers.

d. Sandy Stewart and Angel Bond will attend the Pass Program Working Group meeting, Nov 14, and speak during the public comment period.

IV. Boulder County Update
a. Mobility for All Website and Newsletter Changes: Modifying the LCC Agenda distribution to an LCC Newsletter was well received. Angel Bond reviewed changes to the M4A website, which included creating three different pages targeting three different audiences: Decision and Policy Makers, Stakeholders & LCC Members, and General Public. Michele Waite recommended adding a link to Boulder County Help to the General Public page.

b. LCC Passenger Testimonials: The English and Spanish language segments are selected and being translated. Expect the first draft of the LCC Video in the next month for review and comments.

c. RTD Service Changes: Jared Hall reviewed the upcoming RTD service changes and encouraged LCC members to inform their clients about the two Hwy 119 BRT public meetings this week.

d. Transit Map Options: Jared Hall and Zareen Tasneem are updating the Boulder County Transit Map and requested feedback on three proposed options. Generally speaking, LCC members preferred more information on the map (option 3). LCC members also discussed the importance of having a paper copy of the map available to give to clients who don’t have smart phones, have disabilities, and/or just prefer paper maps.

e. HHS Fair Housing Assessment: Boulder County, Denver, and Aurora are partnering to conduct a Fair Housing Assessment, which is required by HUD. The survey is available online in English and Spanish.

f. Bike Lights Clients: M4A distributed approximately 70 sets of front and rear bike lights.

V. Advocacy Working Group
a. The group met on Oct 24 to discuss priorities. The summary of that meeting is attached.

b. Next Meeting: Nov 15, 1-2:30 pm, Boulder County Transportation
c. **Snow Removal and ADA Accessibility Issues**: The Advocacy Working Group is developing a resource and outreach effort concerning snow removal and ADA accessibility issues. They are collecting information for local government code enforcement, volunteer snow removal resources, snow removal resources for hire, and working on messaging to the general public on the importance of keeping sidewalks clear so that people with limited mobility can maintain their independence. Regis Lindsay said that they have a waitlist for people who need help with snow removal in Boulder and Longmont and would appreciate it if the LCC could help BCCC with volunteer recruitment. Attached are some for-hire resources that Regis Lindsay and Kate Williams sent after the meeting.

d. **Messaging: Affordable Transportation is a Basic Social and Economic Need**
   i. The Advocacy Working Group is creating an LCC Policy Brief Paper to distribute to Boulder County elected officials. Kate Williams will provide a copy of a Policy Brief Paper that another LCC has already compiled.
   ii. The LCC Transportation Testimonial video will hopefully be ready by Dec 11.

e. **Stakeholder Partnership Building**
   i. Who do we have participating in the LCC? Who do we need? Kate Williams suggested that we include medical providers in the LCC discussions surrounding transportation access, like the Douglas County LCC.

f. **Mobility Education**: The Policy Advisory Group wants to work with Via Mobility Services to develop a more robust community outreach plan to educate the public about mobility options. Bob D’Alessandro recommended inviting Susan Unger to the December LCC to discuss Via’s mobility and travel training program.

g. **RTD 119 BRT**: There are two upcoming **RTD Public Meetings in Nov 15 in Longmont and Nov 16 in Boulder**. Community Cycles is supporting the bike path option that is paved, direct, separate bike path along Hwy 119 BRT Corridor, so that more commuters feel comfortable using the path.

VI. **Needs and Solutions** identified during the course of the LCC:
   a. Kate Williams recommended having a 15-min LCC Member Spotlight each month, so that LCC members can better understand the missions of their fellow members.
   b. Bob D’Alessandro mentioned that Via has included questions regarding technology usage in their passenger surveys for the first time, since we do not fully understand how seniors and people with disabilities are using online platforms as the Baby Boomers age. The survey will be open until 400 Via passengers have completed and returned it. Bob is hoping to be able to report on the survey findings at the Jan LCC.
   c. Michele Waite commented that we will be doing the 4-year plan update for the Boulder County Age Well Plan and AAA is considering adding survey questions regarding technology as well. We will discuss what we need to know from a transportation perspective at the Jan or Feb LCC meeting.

VII. **Conclusion**
   a. **Next meeting**: Monday, December 11, 2017, 2:00-3:30 pm
**Advocacy Working Group**

*LCC Vision: Promote and provide efficient, accessible, affordable, seamless, equitable, responsive, and easy to arrange transportation options for Boulder County residents through coordination and collaboration between service providers.*

The LCC Advocacy Working Group met on Oct 24, 2017 to discuss advocacy priorities. We prioritized the four objectives below.

**Attendees:**
- Lindsay Christopher  
  Safehouse Progressive Alliance for Nonviolence
- Elaine Erb  
  Boulder Transportation Connections
- Laura Mathews  
  Boulder County Area Agency on Aging
- Tim Beal  
  Boulder Housing Partners
- Angel Bond  
  Boulder County Mobility for All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY: PUBLIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE 1: Snow Removal and ADA Accessibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
<th>Tasks/Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Educate public on how to report ADA or snow removal issues | • Improved accessibility to transit  
• Increased mobility | • Contact Ice Busters (AB)  
• Research POCs (LC) |
| 2. Educate public on importance of snow removal | • Highlight individuals who struggle with transit access in snow  
• Social Media Squares | • Ask Aaron re: ppl who may struggle with access  
• Look for individual stories (TB) |
| 3. Prioritize locations with high transit dependent populations | • Improved bus stop facilities at locations that need transit most | • Check Bus Stop Inventory with Transit Depend Index (AB) |

**OBJECTIVE 2: Mobility Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
<th>Tasks/Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Educate the public on mobility options | • Public awareness about multimodal options  
• Reduced intimidation of using transit | • Research what resources are already available  
• Check with Lafayette to see how their learn to ride the bus event went  
• Check with Michele and Eden re: travel training frequencies at senior centers |
2. Work with Via Travel Training to incorporate active transportation options
   - Coordinate with Via’s outreach efforts
   - Don’t reinvent the wheel
   - City of Boulder creating “low-stress” biking networks that may be a good fit for older adults
   - Susan Unger, Travel Training

**CATEGORY: STAKEHOLDERS**

**OBJECTIVE 1: Partnership Building**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
<th>Tasks/Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Build effective, inclusive partnerships</td>
<td>- Ensure inclusion of needs and issues of human services transportation</td>
<td>- Ask LCC for Citizen Advocate Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Maximize reach of messaging</td>
<td>- Invite EFAA, Sister Carmen, Bridge House, BoCo Homelessness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATEGORY: DECISION MAKERS**

**OBJECTIVE 1: Messaging Campaign**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Key Outcomes</th>
<th>Tasks/Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Raise awareness that affordable transportation is a basic social and economic need</td>
<td>- Decision Makers aware of importance of transportation</td>
<td>- Create Policy Brief paper on what the LCC is (AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prioritize funding for human services and transit dependent populations</td>
<td>- Finish LCC video (AB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Research numbers of transit dependent populations in BoCo jurisdictions (AB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Equity

Promoting Fairness in Transit

Michael Washington, Transit Equity Manager
Transit-Oriented Communities Division
To be **Equitable** is to be **Just**

“A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected or revised if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well-arranged must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust.”

~John Rawls “A Theory of Justice”
Equality vs. Equity

**EQUALITY = SAMENESS**

GIVING EVERYONE THE SAME THING → It only works if everyone starts from the same place

**EQUITY = FAIRNESS**

ACCESS to SAME OPPORTUNITIES → We must first ensure equity before we can enjoy equality
Equity Defined by Law

- **Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**
  - Prohibits recipients of federal funds from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin

- **Executive Order 12898: Environmental Justice**
  - Federal recipients must avoid, minimize and mitigate disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations
Consequences of Discrimination

1. **Disparate Treatment:**
   a) Suable offense
   b) Suspension, termination or refusal of federal funding

2. **Disparate Impact:**
   a) Suspension, termination or refusal of federal funding
Focal Point: Direct Impact

Transit agencies focus on the **direct benefits** and **adverse effects** of their activities.

- **Service** – Distribution and quality of bus and rail service
- **Fares** – Access and cost of fare media
- **Capital Investment (Facilities and fixed-guideways)** – access to the investment and displacement due to property acquisition
Promoting and Preserving Equity...

The Federal Transit Administration prescribes the following measures to promote socially equitable transit:

• Equity Analyses
• System-Wide Service Standards and Policies
• Service Monitoring
• Public Engagement
Public Engagement Case Study

The Train to the Plane

Grand Opening

University of Colorado A Line

4.22.16
University of Colorado A Line

- Westminster
- Thornton
- Commerce City
- Federal Heights
- Denver Airport
- Union Station
- Denver
- 38th & Blake
- 40th & Colorado
- Central Park
- Peoria
- 61st & Peña
- 40th Ave & Airport Blvd
- Gateway Park

Legend:
- Current and Future Lines
- University of Colorado A Line
- Park-n-Ride
- Station
Our Challenge

• Circulation of Misinformation

• Concerns of Access to Transit

• Lack of Trust
Our Goals

• Illustrate Benefits of Service Changes

• Remediate Misunderstandings

• Hear and Consider Community Concerns
Our Tactics

1. Ride-a-Route
2. Bus Operator Outreach
3. Table Talks
4. Know Your Routes
Know Your Routes Meetings

- 4 Communities
- 3 Caterers
- 2 Artists
Lessons Learned

- Don’t marry your agenda
- Avoid pedantry
- Prep staff for the passionate moments
- Incentives are a must (food, prizes, free transit passes, etc.)
- Rail brings perceptions of gentrification
Contact:
Michael Washington
Transit Equity Manager
Michael.Washington@rtd-denver.com
303-299-2436
Snow Is Coming!!

Hello Volunteers!

**Ice Buster Volunteers** help seniors stay safe in their homes! Can you help a senior in your neighborhood stay safe from falls?

Did you know you can be fined from the city by not having your sidewalks cleared?

This service is incredibly important, as seniors are especially prone to falling on ice.

As the winter weather approaches, we want to make sure our Ice Busters Program is prepared! If you are interested in helping this season, please email us at clientcare@careconnectbc.org or call 303-443-1933.

Thank you!

Boulder County Care Connect
THURSDAY, NOV. 16
LONGMONT
PARENT FAIR

AN EVENT FOR PARENTS OF YOUNG CHILDREN AND EXPECTING PARENTS
Come learn about a variety of community resources for families in Longmont.

Featured Organizations Include:
• Aspen Center for Child Development
• St. Vrain Valley Schools
• Longmont Children, Youth and Families
• YMCA of Boulder Valley
• Community Roots Midwife Collective
• LENA Start Longmont
• La Leche League of Longmont
... and more!!

Date: Thursday, November 16
Time: 5-7pm
Location: OUR Center – 220 Collyer St.

For More Information Contact:
Caitlin Palar
303-772-5529 ex.286
caitlin@ourcenter.org
JUEVES, 16 DE NOVIEMBRE
FERIA PARA PADRES DE LONGMONT

UN EVENTO PARA PADRES DE BEBES Y MUJERES EMBARAZADAS
Vengan a aprender sobre una variedad de recursos de la comunidad para familias en Longmont.

Organizaciones:
- Aspen Center for Child Development
- St. Vrain Valley Schools
- Longmont Children, Youth and Families
- YMCA of Boulder Valley
- Community Roots Midwife Collective
- LENA Start Longmont
- La Leche League of Longmont
... y mas!!

Fecha: Jueves, 16 de Noviembre
Hora: 5-7pm
Lugar: OUR Center – 220 Collyer St.

¿Estás esperando un bebé?

¿Por primera vez eres un padre?

¿Tiene hijos pequeños?

Estamos aquí para usted!

Acompáñenos con su familia a este evento gratuito. Abra bocadillos, oportunidades de ganar premios y también oportunidad de conectar con organizaciones familiares.

Para más información contactar a:
Caitlin Palar
303-772-5529 ex.286
caitlin@ourcenter.org
The Regional Transportation District (RTD) is holding the first of a series of public meetings Nov. 15 and 16 on the progress of a study, which is evaluating the viability of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service on State Highway 119, between Boulder and Longmont.

The meetings, which are open to the public, will seek input and provide an update on the study. A consultant team, led by Parsons Transportation Group, is addressing the growing congestion and travel demand in the corridor, environmental impacts, multimodal access, transit reliability and corridor transit travel time, among other criteria.

The State Highway 119 BRT study advances one of the recommendations from the Northwest Area Mobility Study (NAMS), which was completed by RTD in 2014. NAMS developed consensus among northwest area stakeholders, the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and RTD to implement cost-effective mobility improvements until the Northwest Rail Line to Longmont can be built.

The public meetings will be held:

**LONGMONT—Wednesday, Nov. 15**
6-8 p.m.
Longmont Museum
400 Quail Rd, Longmont, CO 80501

**BOULDER—Thursday, Nov. 16**
6-8 p.m.
Boulder Chamber
2440 Pearl St, Boulder, CO 80302

Both meetings will cover the same information. Residents are encouraged to attend whichever meeting is geographically convenient.


**Parking/Transit Information:**
*Longmont Museum:* There is ample parking at the museum. It’s also accessible via RTD bus routes LD1/LD2 and 324, Longmont Call-n-Ride as well as the Left Hand Greenway.

*Boulder Chamber:* Parking is available in the chamber’s lot, Mike’s Camera’s lot (across the street) and on Walnut Street and 24th Place. It is also accessible via RTD bus route, the HOP.

# # #
RTD realizará reuniones públicas el 15 de noviembre y el 16 de noviembre sobre el Estudio del State Highway 119 Bus Rapid Transit (corredor de Tránsito Rápido de Autobuses en la Carretera Estatal 119)

El Regional Transportation District (El Distrito Regional de Transporte) (RTD) realizará la primera de una serie de reuniones públicas el 15 y el 16 de noviembre sobre el progreso de un estudio que evalúa la viabilidad del servicio de Bus Rapid Transit (Tránsito Rápido de Autobuses) (BRT) en State Highway (Carretera Estatal) 119, entre Boulder y Longmont.

Las reuniones, las cuales están abiertas al público, buscarán participación y proporcionarán una actualización del estudio. Un equipo de consultores, dirigido por Parsons Transportation Group, está abordando los temas de la creciente congestión y la demanda de viajes por el corredor, los impactos ambientales, el acceso multimodal, la confiabilidad del tránsito y el tiempo de viaje de tránsito por el corredor, entre otros criterios.

El estudio del State Highway 119 BRT avanza una de las recomendaciones del Northwest Area Mobility Study (NAMS), el cual fue finalizado por el RTD en el 2014. NAMS desarrolló un consenso entre las partes interesadas del área noroeste, el Colorado Department of Transportation (Departamento de Transporte de Colorado ) (CDOT) y RTD para implementar mejoras de movilidad económicamente eficaces hasta que se pueda construir la Northwest Rail Line (Línea de Ferrocarril del Noroeste) a Longmont.

Las reuniones públicas se llevarán a cabo:

LONGMONT—miércoles, 15 de noviembre
6-8 p.m.
Longmont Museum
400 Quail Rd, Longmont, CO 80501

BOULDER—jueves, 16 de noviembre
6-8 p.m.
Boulder Chamber
2440 Pearl St, Boulder, CO 80302

En ambas reuniones se cubrirá la misma información. Se fomenta la asistencia de los residentes a cualquier reunión que sea geográficamente conveniente.


Información de Estacionamiento/Transporte Publico:

Museo de Longmont: Hay amplio estacionamiento en el museo. También se puede llegar a través de las rutas del autobús RTD LD1 / LD2 y 324, Longmont Call-n-Ride y Left Hand Greenway.

Cámara de Boulder: Hay estacionamiento disponible en el lote de la cámara, en el lote de Mike’s Camera (al otro lado de la calle) y en Walnut Street y 24th Place. También se puede llegar a través de la ruta del bus RTD, el HOP.

# # #
Conteste nuestra encuesta de Vivienda | Trabajo y ayude a los condados de Denver, Aurora y Boulder a entender las decisiones de vivienda que los residentes como usted han tomado.

¡La fecha límite es el 30 de noviembre!

¡Necesitamos su ayuda!

¿Vive en los condados de Denver, Aurora o Boulder?

¿Cuál es su experiencia con la vivienda?

Conteste nuestra encuesta de Vivienda | Trabajo y ayude a los condados de Denver, Aurora y Boulder a entender las decisiones de vivienda que los residentes como usted han tomado.

¡La fecha límite es el 30 de noviembre!

https://es.surveymonkey.com/r/DAB_AFH2017s

Si tiene alguna discapacidad y le gustaría pedir ayuda o utilizar un formato diferente, por favor comuníquese con Jen Garner a jgarner@bbcresearch.com o al 800-748-3222 ext. 236.
Take the Live|Work Survey and help Denver, Aurora, and Boulder County understand the housing choices residents like you have made.

Deadline November 30, 2017!

Do you live in Denver, Aurora, or Boulder County?

What is your housing story?

Take the Live|Work Survey and help Denver, Aurora, and Boulder County understand the housing choices residents like you have made.

Deadline November 30, 2017!

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/DAB_AFH2017

Inform policy.

Feel good.

Enter to win $100.

If you have a disability and would like to request assistance or an alternative format, contact Jen Garner at: jgarner@bbcresearch.com or 1-800-748-3222 x236.
Collaborating for Accessible, Affordable, and Equitable Transportation

The Local Coordinating Council is an alliance of community organizations, individuals, and interest groups working together to achieve common goals regarding transportation services to people with mobility challenges in Boulder County, including seniors, low-income families, and people with disabilities.

At the November 13 LCC Meeting we will be discussing transit equity with Michael Washington, RTD Transit Equity Manager. I look forward to seeing you there!

Monday, Nov 13
2 to 3:30 p.m.
Via Mobility Services
2855 63rd Street in Boulder

LCC November Agenda

- Welcome & Introductions
- Presentation RTD Transit Equity
- LCC Member Updates
- Boulder County Update
- Public Outreach
- Advocacy Working Group
- Needs and Solutions
- Next meeting: Dec 11, 2017, 2:00-3:30 pm

LCC Member Events
Nov 14: 5-6:30 pm, Longmont Enhanced Multi-Use Corridor Public Meeting
Nov 14, 5:30-7 pm, Resiliencia para todos/Resilience for All, Boulder, Email for details
Nov 15: 9-11 am, Peak to Peak Human Services Task Force, Basic Needs Focus Group
Nov 15: 6-8 pm, RTD Hwy 119 Public Meeting, Longmont
Nov 16: 6-8 pm, RTD Hwy 119 Public Meeting, Boulder
Nov 16: 5-7 pm, OUR Center Parent Fair
Dec 1: 12:30, DMRAC Lunch & Regional Coordinating Council Meeting, Email for details
Dec 1: 9 am-12 pm, Aging Advisory Council, Louisville Senior Center
Dec 5: 11:30 am-1 pm, Boulder Transportation Connections Free Luncheon
Dec 6: 5:30-7:30 pm, Via Mobility Services, Boulder Chamber After Hours Event
Dec 7: 9-10:30 am: Longmont Senior Services, Get Acquainted Session
Dec 17: 10 am-3 pm, Community Cycles Kids Holiday Bike Giveaway

Transportation Highlight

When Bonnie McIntosh moved to Boulder from North Carolina, she was struck by how much better the transportation resources are here. In her North Carolina town, she was forced to take a taxi to work every day because the local buses were not equipped with wheelchair lifts. In Boulder her cerebral palsy doesn't slow her down! She uses her scooter to get around her neighborhood, Via Mobility Services for inclement weather and longer distances, and after completing Via's Travel Training Program, she marvels that she can even go to Denver on RTD!

As winter approaches, it is important to remember to shovel our sidewalks, so that people who rely on clear sidewalks and buses can maintain their mobility and independence. Bonnie admits to having some “close calls” navigating Colorado winters in her scooter. “One time, I had to call the police, because I did fall coming out of the snow,” said Bonnie. She now makes sure that she calls Via first before heading out on snowy days.

Please remind people to do their part to keep communities safe and accessible during winter weather!

Funding Opportunities

- Live and Give Longmont Grants Program, Deadline Dec 1
• CDOT Transit Grants, 2017 Consolidated Call for Capital Projects, Contact Jeff Sanders, Deadline Dec 20

Get Involved!

Join the LCC Advocacy Working Group to help develop transportation messaging, public outreach, and partnership building strategies! Nov 15: 1-2:30 pm, 252 13th Street, Boulder, 80304. Contact Angel Bond to add your email to the distribution list.

Live/Work Survey
What is your housing story?

Boulder County, Denver, and Aurora are conducting a study to better understand residents’ housing decisions and their experiences living, working, or going to school in the region. This survey is an important part of that research. Your input will inform decisions regarding housing planning. This survey is not associated with a ballot issue or political poll.

It is expected that the survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. At the end of the survey you can enter for a chance to win a $100 Visa gift card! Your responses are completely confidential and will only be reported in combination with other responses.

Click here to take the survey.

Deadline to complete the survey is November 30th, 2017.

I will send you all a separate email that you can forward to your clients.

In The News

Settlement Prompts Changes To RTD Light Rail Trains, CBS4 Denver Video

Reimagining Transportation to Improve Healthcare for Older People, Live Long and Master Aging Podcast

Study Says Look at Price and Incentives to Get Low-Income Residents on Bike Share, Better Bike Share

2M & 2N for Boulder's Community, Culture and Safety, Check after Nov 7

Boulder County Program Launches to Serve Area's Un- and Under-Banked, Daily Camera

What is Driving the 'Unbanking of America'?, Fresh Air Podcast

Request Brochures and Maps

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=2171eb246b&js_ver=M-xhRNw0p0.0.en&view=pt&msg=15fa204e51a9839e&search=inbox&siml=15fa204e51a9839e
Request mobility resources and we will bring them to the next LCC meeting. Examples include:

- DRMTC Getting There guides
- VIA brochures
- LCC brochures
- M4A brochures
- Ride Free Longmont Maps
- And MORE!

Contact
Mobility for All Program
720-564-2218
mobilityforall@bouldercounty.org
Agenda

- Modeling Challenges
- Options B, C & E General Results
- Comparison of the Options by Component
- Discussion
Modeling Challenges

- When we dig into the data and wrestle with the assumptions – it raises questions and challenges our thinking in ways that have significant implications for the options and the modeling

- Significant questions that we are continuing to work through – inside our team and in conversations with RTD staff:
  - The projected ridership & revenue in the 2019 baseline model
  - The gap between current pricing and the actual value of the trips made and the implications of right pricing on organizations decision to continue to participate in the program
  - SLA boundaries that haven't been redefined for changes in service levels since 2013 when the W line opened
  - Underpricing of programs due to missing tap data due to riders not tapping prior to boarding rail
  - The feasibility and implications of changing the prices all at once
Option B, C & E General Results

- The options with the 2019 base fare will not reach the SBP revenue targets in the 2019 baseline as the discounts offered increase and/or ridership losses expected due to right pricing of the programs that are currently underpriced

- Ridership generated by discounts offered do not offset the revenue losses resulting from offering a discount

- Cross subsidization that is occurring within programs is creating unfairness as not everyone is paying their fair share

- Right pricing fares and reducing discounts does pose a risk to ridership and revenue as riders and programs that experience an increase may choose to leave
Option B

General public
- 10% load bonus: converted to stored value discount & discount on day pass
- 3-hour pass on MyRide and mobile ticketing
- Day pass priced at 2x the fare
- 50% discount for low income at 138% FPL, senior/disabled & youth

Pass programs
- Business - stored value
- College - no program
- Neighborhood - no program
- Youth - no pass program
## Option B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Greater discount on Regional &amp; Airport fares paid electronically</td>
<td>No monthly or annual passes available, minimizing convenience for frequent riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Increased affordability of fares for registered low income riders</td>
<td>Revenue loss from 50% discount not offset by increase in ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Cost savings from no longer needing to administer the program</td>
<td>Significant losses in ridership and revenue expected as students forgo trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Cost savings from no longer needing to administer the program</td>
<td>Losses in ridership and revenue expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>Pay only for what is used</td>
<td>Losses in ridership and revenue expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option C

General public

- Stored value discount: $0.25 full fare; $0.15 discount fare
- 2-hour pass
- Day pass priced at 2x the fare
- Monthly pass priced at 32x the fare and 38x the fare
- 50% discount for low income at 138% FPL, senior/disabled & youth

Pass programs - stored value discount

- Business - utilization pricing by institution (no SLAs)
- College - utilization pricing by institution
- Neighborhood - no program
- Youth - no pass program
## Option C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Minimized revenue leakage by reducing fraud by limiting fares to 2-hour pass</td>
<td>Revenue loss from increasing discount of monthly pass by reducing the multiple from 38 to 32</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Increased ridership due to improved affordability of fares for registered low income riders</td>
<td>Revenue loss from 50% discount not offset by increase in ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Maintain ridership &amp; revenue from pass program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Cost savings from no longer needing to administer the program</td>
<td>Losses in ridership and revenue expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>Pay only for what is used</td>
<td>Losses in ridership and revenue expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option E

General public

- Stored value discount: $0.25 full fare; $0.15 discount fare
- 3-hour pass
- Day pass priced at 2x the fare
- Monthly pass priced at 38x the fare
- Annual pass priced at 11x the monthly pass; youth annual pass priced at 12x
- 50% discount for low income at 138% FPL and senior/disabled
- Youth 12 and under free
- 70% discount for youth day, monthly, and annual pass with 50% discount on 3-hour passes

Pass programs - 10%, 20% & 40% discount

- Business - utilization pricing by SLAs; + $5 fee
- College - utilization pricing by institution
- Neighborhood - utilization pricing by neighborhood
- Youth - youth regional pass
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>No change from 2019 baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/D/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Increased ridership</td>
<td>Revenue loss from discount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Increased ridership due to improved affordability of fares for registered riders</td>
<td>Revenue loss from 50% discount not offset by increase in ridership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>Maintain ridership from pass program</td>
<td>Greater the discount, greater the revenue loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/employers currently overpriced or right priced remain in the program</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/employers with high transit use experiencing cost increases drop out of the program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>Employer SLAs minimize the cost increases for employers with high transit use</td>
<td>Greater the discount, greater the revenue loss and lower the ridership loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option Components

- Low Income Program
- Regional Youth Pass Program
- College Program
- Business Program
- Neighborhood Program
Discussion

- How do we repackage the options to make more successful?
- Can we eliminate anything now?
# Low Income Program

## High-Level Modeling Results:
- Increase in ridership amongst registered low income riders
- Revenue loss since increase in trips does not offset the 50% discount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winners:</th>
<th>Losers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered low income riders</td>
<td>Non-registered low income riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-low income riders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Challenges:
- How do you make it easy for participants to register and reload value to their card?
- How do you minimize impact on riders who do not qualify or low income riders who do not register?
- How do you offset the revenue loss by increasing revenue from other programs?
Low Income Program Challenges

- Several income thresholds for a low income program have been suggested
- As the income threshold goes up the percentage of riders who would be eligible for a discount fare increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Poverty Level Threshold</th>
<th>2017 Survey Income Threshold</th>
<th>% of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualify for Adult Low Income Fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138% FPL</td>
<td>&lt; $35,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150% FPL</td>
<td>&lt; $35,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185% FPL</td>
<td>&lt; $45,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% FPL</td>
<td>&lt; $50,000</td>
<td>~29%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For 200% FPL, the % of survey respondents who would qualify is an approximation and is subject to further clarification.

- As more riders receive a discount, more fare revenue or other long-term dedicated revenue sources must be identified:
  - Other regions do not offer a 50% a discount
  - Other regions have increased other fares and/or eliminated discounts to help offset the fare revenue loss
  - Other regions have obtained legislative funding or corporate sponsorship
## Regional Youth Pass Program

### High-Level Modeling Results:
- Increase in ridership due to increase in discount from 50% to 70% on passes for youth 12+ and free fares for youth 12 & under
- Revenue loss since increase in trips does not offset the additional discount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winners:</th>
<th>Losers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- All youth riders</td>
<td>- Non-youth riders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Challenges:
- How do you offset the revenue loss by increasing revenue from other programs?
- How do you implement program on smart card to track ridership and usage?
# College Program

## High-Level Modeling Results:
- Significant ridership & revenue loss expected with discontinuing program in Option B
- No impact on ridership expected in Options C & E
- Minimal impact on revenue in repricing programs in Option C and in Option E with 10% discount
- Revenue loss in Option E with 20% & 40% since no increase in trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winners:</th>
<th>Losers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who use transit and</td>
<td>Students who do not use transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend participating institutions</td>
<td>and attend participating institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Challenges:
- In Option B, how do you minimize ridership losses from eliminating the program?
- How do you offset the revenue loss in Option E with a 20% & 40% by increasing revenue from other programs?
- How do you implement significant increases in cost?
- In right pricing of the programs, how do you account for students not tapping?
College Program Challenges

- Student fees commonly used to cover cost of the program
- Based on 2016 face value of trips trips taken, 4 institutions would experience rate increases in addition to 2019 fare increase
- For some, while the percentage increase would be greater than 20%, the total increase in the contract value would be less than $20,000
- For institutions on rail lines, decrease in pricing in part due to missing taps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 Contract Rate/Student</th>
<th>2016 Face Value of Trips/Student</th>
<th>% Change to Price Appropriately</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$18.65</td>
<td>$93.26</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$35.54</td>
<td>$48.05</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$40.20</td>
<td>$20.86</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$68.62</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$46.80</td>
<td>$22.45</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$47.87</td>
<td>$13.37</td>
<td>-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$51.08</td>
<td>$77.05</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$70.50</td>
<td>$28.36</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$173.83</td>
<td>$171.73</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High-Level Modeling Results:

- “Right pricing” has a significant impact on contract prices and impact on whether employers opt out
  - Employers who opt out are currently underpriced and would see the largest increase in cost. These employers are more likely to have higher transit use and more costly trips
  - Employers who remain are currently overpriced and would experience a decrease in contract price
- Sign-up rates result in attraction of employers with lower transit use
- There is currently a cross subsidization between employees, employers, SLAs, and employer sizes
- Growth in ridership from increased participation of new employers at higher discount rates does not offset the loss in revenue from the discount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C32</th>
<th>Option C38</th>
<th>Option E10</th>
<th>Option E20</th>
<th>Option E40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linked Trips</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
<td>↓↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Business Program

## Winners:
- Employers who are currently overpriced

## Losers:
- Employers who are currently underpriced
- Depending on discount, non-EcoPass riders who are not affiliated with an employer to get the discount

## Challenges:
- How do you retain larger employers with higher transit use without increasing the revenue loss by offering a greater discount?
- How do you update SLAs & employer buckets to be more reflective of transit ridership?
- How do you minimize employer with high transit usage skewing SLA pricing?
- If discount available to EcoPass is greater than what is available to the general public, how do you address equity concerns, especially as participants using EcoPass are higher income and less likely to be minority than the general population?
**Business Program Challenges**

- There is a cross-subsidization between SLA/employer buckets
- If SLAs and employer sizes had been priced correctly based on the 2016 fares and ridership in 2016, the cost per employee would have increased for 25% of the eligible employees
- SLA D significant increases in pricing in part due to opening of A line

### 2016 Pricing (per employee, per year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-24 emp</th>
<th>25-249 emp</th>
<th>250-999 emp</th>
<th>1000-1999 emp</th>
<th>2000+ emp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Outer Suburban</td>
<td>$98</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Major Transit Center</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$189</td>
<td>$173</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Downtown Denver CBD</td>
<td>$532</td>
<td>$493</td>
<td>$470</td>
<td>$459</td>
<td>$434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Airport &amp; Home Business</td>
<td>$544</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$470</td>
<td>$445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016 Pricing, if SLA approach “Right Priced” to match Face Value of Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-24 emp</th>
<th>25-249 emp</th>
<th>250-999 emp</th>
<th>1000-1999 emp</th>
<th>2000+ emp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Outer Suburban</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Major Transit Center</td>
<td>$201</td>
<td>$149</td>
<td>$63</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Downtown Denver CBD</td>
<td>$443</td>
<td>$388</td>
<td>$371</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Airport &amp; Home Business</td>
<td>$958</td>
<td>$1,188</td>
<td>$1,128</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business Program Challenges

- Employers in Zone A with 2,000+ employees would be impacted the most. These employers account for 14% of the eligible employees.
- Rates would increase by 80% before accounting for the proposed 2019 fare increase and projected systemwide increase in transit ridership.
- There is significant variability in usage rates per employee, highlighting the cross-subsidization between employers.
- These employers have employees in multiple SLAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 SLA Price</th>
<th>2016 Usage Rate/Employee</th>
<th>2016 Face Value of Trips/Employee</th>
<th>New SLA Rate at 2016 Face Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>215 trips/year</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>79 trips/year</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>40 trips/year</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 trips/year</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 trips/year</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 trips/year</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 trips/year</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 trips/year</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Business Program Challenges

- Some Master EcoPass programs are significantly underpriced today
- Given restrictions on Master EcoPass contracts, such as the cost of the program cannot be passed through to employers or employees, can make it challenging to secure funding
- It is unclear how Master EcoPass contract holders will respond to significant price increases
Neighborhood Program

High-Level Modeling Results:
- Ridership & revenue loss expected with discontinuing program and loss in third party subsidies from developers and City of Boulder in Options B & C
- Increase in contribution from residents towards transit in Options B & C
- Minimal impact on revenue in repricing programs in Option C and in Option E with 10% discount
- Revenue loss in Option E with 20% & 40% since no increase in trips

Winners:
- NECO residents who use transit

Losers:
- NECO residents who do not use transit

Challenges:
- In Option B & C, how do you minimize ridership losses from eliminating the program?
- How do you offset the revenue loss in Option E with a 20% & 40% by increasing revenue from other programs?
- How do you implement significant increases in cost?
- How do you address concerns about regional equity?
- Does the cost of administration warrant retaining ~0.5% of RTD ridership?
Neighborhood Program Challenges

- Neighborhood EcoPass (NECO) accounts for ~0.5% of RTD ridership
- Ridership from the program only makes up a small proportion of RTD ridership due to limited participation across the region and low transit use by residents
- The number of households in a neighborhood is 195 households with average size of ~260 residents
- Two-thirds of eligible residents do not use their NECO Pass
- For the residents who use their NECO Pass:
  - Avg # of trips: 10 trips/month
  - Median # of trips: 5 trips/month

![Distribution of Neighborhood Eco Pass Use - Linked Trips, Oct-2016](graph.png)
Neighborhood Program Challenges

- Option E proposed using SLA maps to help in pricing new neighborhoods for the first year
- Based on review of the average cost per household, there is too much variability to price neighborhoods based on SLAs
  - In City of Boulder, neighborhoods were assigned SLA based on the employer SLA map
  - 37 neighborhoods in City of Boulder were completely in SLA A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Boulder SLA Zone A</th>
<th>2016 Contract per Household</th>
<th>2016 Face Value per Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>$218.01</td>
<td>$302.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>$96.00</td>
<td>$64.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>$120.19</td>
<td>$144.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$128.00</td>
<td>$121.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>