

HONORARY PROPERTY AND STATION NAMING POLICY

ADOPTED: JULY 30, 2024

I. PURPOSE

The RTD Board of Directors (Board) has the authority to add to any existing or planned property or station a secondary name to honor an individual, group of individuals, organization, or major event. The act of honoring in this manner should be rare and used only to recognize those individuals, groups, organizations, or events which contributed immeasurably to the progress of public transit nationally or within the RTD.

The primary property name shall remain, in accordance with the broader Property and Station Naming Policy, a wayfinding/geographic identifier.

II. SCOPE

The policy applies to transit stations, park-n-rides, transfer centers, other major passenger facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative buildings.

III. AUTHORITY

The Board shall approve any amendments to this policy and associated procedures.

IV. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND REQUIREMENTS FOR AN HONORARY PROPERTY NAME ADOPTION

The following criteria will be evaluated by a committee of internal and external RTD stakeholders based on the approved rubric, prior to the Board's consideration:

A. Contributions to Transit and RTD

1. Documented significant contributions to public transit nationally, and/or
2. Documented significant contributions to public transit within the RTD, and/or
3. Documented direct connection with a significant event occurring in the vicinity of the property subject to a potential renaming.

B. Support and Review

4. Demonstrated breadth and depth of public support for the proposal by way of formal letters of support from community leaders such as local business improvement districts, local economic development agencies, local chambers of commerce, State legislators, members of Congress, community organizations, schools, and civic clubs, and if applicable, action taken by local county or municipality, and
5. A review by the Honorary Property Name Proposal Review Committee, and
6. Two-thirds majority vote of approval by the RTD Board of Directors

The following are not eligible to receive recognition through an honorary property naming:

- Former members of the RTD Board of Directors
- Any individual who has not been deceased for at least 10 years

An honorary name cannot violate any existing naming agreement.

V. USE OF HONORARY NAME

Honorary names, while secondary to the primary property or station name, are to be used in conjunction with the primary property or station name. Honorary names should be displayed prominently at the property or station, on signage across the system and, where applicable, in printed/digital route schedules.

VI. REVOCATION OF AN HONORARY STATION NAME

Following a discussion and opportunity for the public to comment, the Board may remove an honorary name by a two-thirds majority vote.

HONORARY PROPERTY AND STATION NAMING PROCEDURES

ADOPTED: TBD

I. OVERVIEW

Applications for an honorary property name are accepted on a rolling basis by the Board Office. Each year, the Chair of the Board will convene the Honorary Property Name Proposal Review Committee (Review Committee) no more than once. The Review Committee will then review, and rank the submissions received since the committee was last convened. The Review Committee may or may not choose to support any of the proposals submitted.

II. STEPS

The following steps are to be followed when proposing, considering, and approving an honorary property name.

1. Submission of a complete honorary property name application to the Board of Directors by way of the Board Office, which includes the following:
 - a. A summary of the contemplated honoree's contributions, which addresses the potential honoree's contributions to transit locally and nationally, as well as provides an overview of the connection of the individual, group, organization, or event to the property under consideration for an honorary name.
 - b. Letters of support from a range of individuals, groups, and organizations in the adjacent community, including but not limited to local business improvement districts, local economic development agencies, local chambers of commerce, State legislators, members of Congress, community organizations, schools, and civic clubs.
 - c. A formal resolution from either the local city council or board of county commissioners supporting the name change. (Requirement "c." only applies to facilities primarily serving customers such as stations, park-n-rides, and transfer centers. It does not apply to maintenance or administrative buildings.)
2. Following the receipt of an application packet, the Board Office Executive Manager shall notify the Board of the receipt of a proposal and make the application available to Directors who wish to review it.
3. No more than once annually, the Chair of the RTD Board of Directors, in consultation with the GM/CEO, shall empanel an eight-member Review Committee comprised of the following:
 - The GM/CEO or their designee
 - A Civil Rights Division staff member
 - A recognized historian coming from a local university, library, or museum and who has a record of scholarly work in transit, local, and/or Colorado history
 - The Executive Manager of the Board Office
 - An Operations Department staff member

- A Communications and Engagement Department staff member
 - A Co-Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee or their designee
 - The Chair of RTD's Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities or their designee
4. The Chair of the RTD Board of Directors, in consultation with the GM/CEO, shall designate a member of the Review Committee to serve as chair. The Review Committee chair shall preside over committee meetings, work with the Board Office to ensure appropriate preparation for the committee's meetings, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Chair of the RTD Board of Directors.
 5. The members of the Review Committee will initially score the applications and determine which proposals warrant further review.
 6. The Review Committee will then meet publicly to review the top application packets and hear testimony from the respective applicants.
 7. The Review Committee will issue its final ranked results based on the associated rubric to the Executive Committee. The Review Committee is not obligated to recommend or support any of the proposals. These results will be presented as a Discussion Item by the Board Office Executive Manager at a meeting of the Executive Committee.
 8. For the top-ranked recommended proposal only, RTD staff will compile cost estimates and a timeline for updating signage both on the property under consideration and throughout the transit network. By way of an action of the Executive Committee, staff may be asked to prepare a cost estimate for one or more additional proposals than what was recommended by the Review Committee.
 9. The Board Office Executive Manager shall prepare a recommended action for the Board to consider. This recommended action shall be accompanied by the full application packet for the top-ranked recommended proposal, the Review Committee's proposal ranking, staff's timeline to update the property signage and throughout the transit network, staff's cost estimates to update signage, and an identified external or internal source of funding to cover the costs of the name change by way of an action of the Executive Committee, the Executive Manager may be directed to prepare a recommended action for one or more additional proposals than what was recommended by the Review Committee.

HONORARY PROPERTY AND STATION NAMING REVIEW RUBRIC

ADOPTED: TBD

I. PURPOSE

The rubric is designed to assist the Review Committee in its work to objectively and fairly evaluate proposals to add an honorary name to an RTD property. An effective rubric should help the Review Committee be more efficient and consistent in its review, while also signaling to potential applicants the committee's expectations.

II. CHANGES TO THE RUBRIC

The Board of Directors may change the rubric and encourages the Review Committee as well as public to provide feedback on ways to improve the rubric on an on-going basis.

III. OVERVIEW

Evaluators are asked to review each application using the following rubric. Applications for honorary names should be assessed relative to the application's ability to convey the extent to which the proposed individual, group or event has historical significance to RTD and/or transit, significant community support, and aligns with RTD's values. Each criterion is scored individually on a 1-7 scale, with the total points possible being 21. Committee members scores will be aggregated and discussed before the committee invites those who submitted top-scoring applications to meet with the committee to further discuss their proposals.

IV. RUBRIC EVALUATIVE CRITERIA

(Rubric Evaluative Criteria 1-3 follow on the subsequent three pages)



Rubric Evaluative Criteria 1 of 3 – Historical Significance to RTD or Transit

Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>Application has not demonstrated why or how the honoree had positive connection to transit or RTD history as outlined in Section IV, A. of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Contributions to Transit and RTD)</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>Application demonstrated why or how the proposed honoree had positive connection to transit or RTD history by meeting only one of the criteria as outlined in Section IV, A. of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Contributions to Transit and RTD)</p> <p>(1-2 points)</p>	<p>Application demonstrated why or how the honoree had positive connection to transit or RTD history by meeting at least two of the criteria as outlined in Section IV, A. of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Contributions to Transit and RTD)</p> <p>(3-4 points)</p>	<p>Application demonstrated why or how the honoree had positive connection to transit or RTD history by meeting at least two of the criteria as outlined in Section IV, A. of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Contributions to Transit and RTD)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Effectively communicated the potential positive impact on the community and the Regional Transportation District</p> <p>(5-7 Points)</p>
<p>Evaluator Scores and Comments:</p>			

Rubric Evaluative Criteria 2 of 3 – Breadth and Depth of Community Support

Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>Application has not demonstrated community support for proposed honoree as evidenced by a lack of letters of support from community leaders as outlined in Section IV, B. 4 of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Support and Review, “demonstrated breadth and depth of public support”)</p> <p>(0 Points)</p>	<p>Application has demonstrated decent levels of community support for proposed honoree as evidenced by of letters of support from a narrow section of community leaders as outlined in Section IV, B. 4 of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Support and Review, “demonstrated breadth and depth of public support”)</p> <p>(1-2 points)</p>	<p>Application has demonstrated sufficient levels of community support for proposed honoree as evidenced by of letters of support from a range of community leaders OR a significant number of support letters from a portion of the community as outlined in Section IV, B. 4 of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Support and Review, “demonstrated breadth and depth of public support”)</p> <p>(3-4 points)</p>	<p>Application has demonstrated exceptional levels of community support for proposed honoree as evidenced by of letters of support from the broadest range of community leaders as well as significant depth of support within multiple stakeholder groups within the community as outlined in Section IV, B. 4 of the policy (Requirements of an Honorary Property Name, Support and Review, “demonstrated breadth and depth of public support”)</p> <p>(5-7 points)</p>
<p>Evaluator Score and Comments:</p>			

Rubric Evaluative Criteria 3 of 3 – Alignment with RTD Values (Passion, Respect, Diversity, Trustworthiness, Collaboration, and Ownership)

Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
<p>Application does not communicate how proposed honoree has lived up to RTD’s values as evidenced in the narrative provided by the applicants and the letters of support.</p> <p>(0 Points)</p>	<p>Application communicates how proposed honoree reasonably reflects RTD’s values as evidenced in the narrative provided by the applicants and the letters of support. Specifically, the honoree has a documented history of advocating for transit on behalf of others.</p> <p>(1-2 Points)</p>	<p>Application communicates how proposed honoree sufficiently reflects RTD’s values as evidenced in the narrative provided by the applicants and the letters of support. Specifically, the honoree has a documented history of successfully advocating for transit on behalf of others.</p> <p>(3-4 Points)</p>	<p>Application communicates how proposed honoree sufficiently reflects RTD’s values as evidenced in the narrative provided by the applicants and the letters of support. Specifically, the honoree has a documented history of successfully advocating for transit on behalf of others.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The potential honoree was a trailblazer with a demonstrated commitment to public service (including civic life).</p> <p>(5-7 points)</p>
<p>Evaluator Score and Comments:</p>			