



Public notice was given to *The Register-Guard*
for publication on November 9, 2018.

**LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
AD HOC FARE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Friday, November 16, 2018
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

LTD BOARD ROOM

3500 E. 17th Avenue, Eugene (in Glenwood)

AGENDA

Time

3:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

- Jenna Murphy (Chair) Julia Hernandez Noreen Dannels
 Carl Yeh Annie Loe Jay Bozievich Kate Reid

3:05 p.m.

II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

3:10 p.m.

III. FORM RECOMMENDATION

The committee will hold discussion forming their final recommendation to the Board of Directors.

5:00 p.m.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The facility used for this meeting is wheelchair accessible. If you require any special physical or language accommodations, including alternative formats of printed materials, please contact LTD's Administration office as far in advance of the meeting as possible, but no later than 48 hours prior to the meeting. To request these arrangements, please call 682-5555 (voice) or 7-1-1 (TTY, through Oregon Relay, for persons with hearing impairments).

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

AD HOC FARE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, October 15, 2018

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 8, 2018, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District. The Ad Hoc Fare Policy Committee of the Lane Transit District held a Moving Ahead meeting on Monday, October 15, 2018, beginning at 3:00 p.m., at Lane Transit District, E 17th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: Jenna Murphy, Chair
Kate Reid
Jay Bozievich
Carl Yeh
Noreen Dunnels
Tom Schwetz
Andrew Martin
Robin Mayall
Cosette Rees
Mark Johnson
Aurora Jackson
Cammie Harris
Camille Gandolfi
Therese Lang
Meg Kester
Marina Brassfield, Minutes Recorder

Absent: Julia Hernandez

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS — Ms. Murphy convened the meeting at 3:00 p.m. and called the roll.

Those present introduced themselves.

YOUTH PASS PROGRAM DISCUSSION — The committee reviewed the minutes from September 22, 2018 and picked up where they left off in the Youth Pass Program Discussion.

Ms. Dunnels clarified whether the youth pass would be 18 and under, include Lane Community College (LCC) students. She was told 18 and under.

Ms. Reid hoped to see information on current fares, in order to better understand the dollar amount a subsidy would cover for 12 and under, or 18 and under, riding free. Mr. Schwetz provided current fare information: those under 5 rode free, while 6 to 10-year-old kids paid a fare.

Ms. Reid wondered if they knew how much LTD would subsidize for a youth fare. Mr. Martin said about 5.5 percent of the total population was 6 to 10 years. LTD did not survey that population, but he estimated roughly \$200,000 (assuming the age group rode equally as adults and paid fare).

Mr. Yeh asked if data was captured whether children rode with adults. Mr. Martin didn't believe that information was included in the survey. Ms. Dunnels wondered if there was a family fare. She was told there was not. Ms. Reid clarified the idea was discussed during the September 22, 2018,

meeting. Mr. Martin added there was a youth pass, but it was unclear what ages were served. Ms. Murphy said they discussed the differences between age groups for a youth pass. The committee was unclear why 6 to 10 years of age paid a fare, while all other ages under 18 rode free.

Mr. Yeh said that he would like a recommendation to the board to include all children based on grade rather than age. He said that he wanted to some sort of middle/high school identification card. Additionally, those minors accompanied with an adult rider should be free because they were under supervision. They wanted to ensure parents/guardians could easily take kids with them. Mr. Murphy clarified the child wouldn't need a separate pass in those cases.

Ms. Dunnels said that she agreed with Mr. Yeh; it didn't make sense to differentiate among youth. Mr. Yeh said that he could foresee a potential enforcement issue with high school riders who didn't have a school identification. If they were with an adult, they could still ride free. Ms. Dunnels said that she liked the idea, because an adolescent with a non-visible disability could be riding with an adult.

Ms. Murphy asked if there were additional considerations around the 1Pass Program to discuss. Ms. Reid reminded the committee what the 1Pass card was. Ms. Kester explained that it was very popular, and sales had doubled over the past three years. More than 6,800 passes were sold, however, not all pass holders used transit or all participating activities.

Ms. Murphy asked if transit or activity was the draw. Ms. Kester replied that she believed both were as the 1Pass Program grew, it did so more toward community activities (i.e. pools). Ms. Kester said that she thought there was value in having access to LTD busses for students, for both the child and the parent/household.

Ms. Jackson reminded the committee that LTD was pursuing an electronic fare system. She said that most new systems were largely per use or purchase based, meaning the consumer or agency would be charged a fee. There would be a cost associated with free fare – when usage increased, costs increased. Since staff had no data on youth riders, it was unclear how much the subsidy would need to be, in order for those under 18 years of age to not have a cost associated with their pass.

Ms. Reid said she thought Ms. Jackson made a good point about having a walk-on versus a tracked fare. She said that it would be a liability for LTD if they didn't have historical data to rely on regarding free youth pass usage. Ms. Reid said that she thought the recommendation should include some sort of tracking piece.

Ms. Mayall said cost structures varied – some were per tap basis and some were percentage basis. Depending on the system selected, it could cost more or less to operate a pass that was tracked.

Ms. Reid added the 1Pass would offer fare to school kids during the summer, filling the current gap identified. However, if LTD decided to offer free rides for everyone under 18, the dynamic changed. She said that she knew the program would not be sustainable without an LTD partnership, as the organization provided marketing. There were some barriers; the committee needed to weigh whether it was more important to have an active summer youth program, or to have free access year-round. Ms. Reid said that she thought they really needed to think about how to accommodate the 6-11 age range, while allowing for a school year pass.

Ms. Dunnels said it was impressive that 6,800 youth participated in the program. She said that she thought it was an incredible service to the community, and that it was important to offer a recreation

opportunity. She said that she wondered if there was an informal way for partners to track how many kids traveled to their facility via bus.

Ms. Reid asked if drivers tracked students using the 1Pass. Mr. Martin said in the past, drivers visually validated student passes and kept a mental tally of students. In addition, LTD conducted short (i.e. one to two week) surveys on ridership, but he said that he was unsure if they had done one for 1Pass.

Ms. Mayall asked if an 18 and under 1Pass option, not tied to schools, would be feasible. Ms. Reid said that she didn't know; she explained costs associated and how visits were tracked. She said that she thought LTD would need to donate \$25,000 of marketing to the program.

Ms. Mayall added there were non-quantifiable administrative costs around data tracking with multiple types of youth passes, even if there was a new fare collection system.

Mr. Bozievich said that he thought LTD should stick with the student pass/1Pass system for now. He pointed out it was too late in the year to notify partners about summer 2019 changes. Once a tap card system was selected, he said that he thought they could return and discuss a new kind of youth pass that didn't segregate systems and ages.

Ms. Mayall said the new system would come July 2019. She pointed out school ID cards were not necessarily compatible so LTD would have to purchase more than 40,000 RFID cards to provide students. If they opted to later transition to a generic youth pass, LTD would have spent that money and would have to retract cards. It was something to keep in mind. Ms. Reid pointed out 1Pass began in May 2019, so she agreed with Mr. Bozievich.

Mr. Bozievich asked whether LTD would ask kids to obtain a card if LTD implemented a universal youth pass to account for trips. Ms. Jackson noted if they went to an electronic fare, the best thing was to focus on rider experience. She said that first and foremost, the District wanted to provide good transportation and that meant having a good product when approaching schools. The most common way youth traveled was with their cell phone; it was another question LTD would have to solve as the system evolved. Ms. Jackson encouraged the committee to focus on the fare structure in relationship to youth and resource-limited individuals, and not in relation to other organizations.

Ms. Kester proposed a transitional consideration. She commented that the 1Pass for summer 2019 could bridge between LTD's current fare structure, and whatever structure was decided on for fall 2019. Ms. Kester said that she thought it made sense to have one more year of 1Pass as it existed. She said that with preplanning she thought partners could survey participants. Then, they could potentially offer households some sort of pass to carry the participating student throughout the school year and summer 2020. She said that at that point, she hoped to integrate some type of summer youth program into the overall fare scheme.

Ms. Murphy asked if the committee would have to recommend, in writing, how to proceed with the 1Pass. Ms. Reid said it was a contractual agreement renewed annually, therefore she didn't think they needed to preplan for 2020.

Ms. Jackson said the 1Pass was not covered under the District's fare policy and was not part of the fare structure that the committee is developing a recommendation for. The 1Pass is an independent Intergovernmental Agreement separate from LTD fare policy. Ms. Murphy clarified if the committee needed to recommend whether or not students were free all the time. Ms. Jackson said no; the 1Pass was not part of LTD's fare structure. The Board and staff would revisit the

partnership based on whatever fare structure was recommended and then discern what type of partnership made sense.

Ms. Murphy reiterated they did not need to be thinking about how a fare structure might impact another program. Ms. Jackson said the decision might open up other opportunities, and it might close doors. They wouldn't know until it was looked at.

Mr. Bozievich said that he thought free under 18 was the simplest; however, he didn't think they addressed projected costs relative to the new income stream. He said that he was very interested in discussing resource limited/group passes, so he needed to see all costs prior to making a recommendation.

Ms. Dunnels said she agreed that looking at the resources required would be helpful.

Ms. Reid asked what LTD's profit on the 1Pass was. Ms. Kester replied that it was \$24,261, however the figure didn't include marketing. Ms. Reid said she thought the student program cost estimate was \$2,224,000 annually, if they considered the 1Pass along with Mr. Martin's estimation of annual rides for the six to 10 years age group, and costs from the previous youth pass. Ms. Mayall added LTD would also potentially pay per tap. Ms. Reid asked about the dollar estimation per tap. Mr. Martin said it depended on what type of contract they entered into. He said that LTD could possibly negotiate a per month rate, especially since many people were on a monthly or group pass option. Previously, Ms. Mayall said that she heard five to ten cents per tap.

Ms. Jackson told the committee the final recommendation would go through another vetting process. She said that she knew the committee was trying to make the best, most sustainable recommendation but the Board could revise and accept only some parts of the recommendation if desired. Staff was missing data on financial impacts, so there was some speculation. Ms. Jackson explained the committee could ask to cap on the amount spent on fare programs. Then, the fare structure was maintained intact and LTD could look for additional partners to help with additional costs. LTD would pick up the surcharge. After a year, they could review successes and failures and revise the recommendation based on informed decisions.

RESOURCE LIMITED PROGRAM DISCUSSION — Ms. Murphy clarified there was \$500,000 spent on group passes. Ms. Rees said that LTD spent between \$200-280,000 a year on resource limited passes and about 60 organizations subscribed to the program.

Ms. Dunnels asked whether the passes were offered at a 50 percent discount; she was told yes. Ms. Dunnels said that she wanted to under-promise and overdeliver because in the past, great programs were retracted due to lack of funding. She said she preferred setting some sort of limitation, then using the fare system data to help think about the next three to five years.

Ms. Murphy brought up the group pass program in affordable housing organizations. She said that she wondered about opening up the program to individuals at the 200 percent poverty level and below. Ms. Dunnels noted 44 percent of Lane County was at that asset limitation, and those were families probably using LTD services. She said that she wanted to ensure the demographic had access.

Mr. Bozievich asked to define resource-limited programs. Ms. Rees said LTD called it a "not for profit" program. She explained non-profit organizations purchased fares at 50 percent discount. The expectation was the organization provided, and then case managed, those fares for clients.

Ms. Murphy clarified that the discussion was more around individuals at a certain income level, but not associated with an organization. Mr. Bozievich said that he was also still unclear because non-

profit organizations made fare distribution decisions based on what was best for client, not necessarily their income level.

Ms. Rees said there was also a half-fare program, which allowed certain people to ride for half-off. Those individuals had to prove they were eligible and eligibility criteria were SSI and SSD. Both groups automatically qualified.

Ms. Dunnels asked if the half-fare program was subsidized by the federal government. Ms. Rees said no.

Ms. Murphy said that she thought the agenda item referred to expanding the definition of reduced fare for people within income restraints, outside of other programs. Ms. Dunnels pointed out doing so would require more administration by LTD; currently, outside organizations dealt with administrative aspects which was a benefit.

Mr. Bozievich added LTD could possibly partner with Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). The entity was already screening for income, so he thought those individuals could automatically qualify for reduced rates.

Ms. Reid said the conversation was tied into trade-offs the community would consider. Specifically, LTD was considering fare subsidy versus extended/equal evening and weekend service. She wondered if a resource limited subsidy was what they should recommend, or whether a weekend and evening service was more beneficial to the demographic.

Ms. Dunnels said that she thought the community engagement sessions currently happening were extremely helpful in gathering information on values people held. The committee needed that data to help formulate a recommendation.

Ms. Reid pointed out the community engagement timeline was longer than the STIF timeline. The Board was looking to the committee for input on the issue specifically. Ms. Dunnels said she thought in order to create a quality experience they would have to look at the big ideas and make tough choices.

Ms. Jackson noted all barriers were equally challenging, if making decisions about quality. She encouraged the committee to come up with a recommendation that balanced choices, with funding caps, for both resource-limited and youth passes.

Ms. Dunnels clarified that Ms. Jackson advised the committee to make a recommendation, and then in a year when data was available, revisit discussion and adjust. Ms. Jackson said yes, ideally any program adopted would start small and grow.

Ms. Murphy asked how the committee would come up with a recommended funding cap. Ms. Jackson said the state money coming in would be approximately \$6 million. The state's main goal was to improve connectivity and access to transit for low income households. It was broad, so she thought it was important to find balance. Ms. Jackson noted some money would need to go toward busses.

Mr. Schwetz added transit needed capital assets to do the services that would draw demand. The initial year(s) roll out should be balanced between service and fare management. Ms. Jackson said that she agreed, and thought the committee could add value to that area. The Board would have to decide how to weigh the fare investment. The Board expressed a strong desire to invest in subsidy for fare, as they knew it was barrier for some.

Ms. Reid noted the committee was looking to invest a third of the state funds toward a youth pass.

Ms. Dannels clarified whether the committee needed to consider a fare management system in their recommendation; she was told no.

Mr. Bozievich said that he heard from many community members that the fare could actually go up. He explained FCR in Veneta ran 24/7, but had to juggle shift assignments based on individual transportation or public transit. It put a cap on their job expansion. He reminded the committee many low wage jobs were often weekend and night shifts. He said that he thought expanding service would help those employees.

Mr. Bozievich said that when he saw other transit fares, he found LTD was among the lowest. He said he thought there was room to increase some fares, especially if LTD were to contribute more toward subsidies. He said youth passes would help families overall; he also thought they could raise the subsidy toward non-profit passes to 75 percent and raise the cap to \$500,000. Mr. Bozievich said he also thought a cap on the resource limited program; not everyone eligible would receive the pass. Since they didn't have data to go off of, he recommended not spending the entire \$6 million, and putting at least \$1 million into capital reserve for later expansion.

Ms. Dannels said she wondered if they could do that with STIF funds. She was told yes, to help sustain both capital and operations.

Ms. Dannels said she spoke with Marge Hamilton and asked what her student experiences were with ridership. She said that Ms. Hamilton hadn't heard any complaints, that students were pleased with costs, but wanted more options.

Ms. Dannels asked Mr. Bozievich about FCR in Veneta. She said she wondered if there was an opportunity, in the future, for FCR to help subsidize costs toward transportation.

Ms. Reid said one project proposed in the Community Investment Plan (CIP) was mobility as a service to fill in transit gaps. Ms. Jackson listed private entities, like Uber and Lyft, and nonprofit entities, like South Lane Wheels, as examples. The Board would likely invest some dollars into the service. Mr. Bozievich added the County was looking at some sort of ride hailing service in rural areas to increase mobility of seniors and disabled individuals. Ride hailing would also help LTD avoid running empty busses.

GROUP PASS PROGRAM AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING — Ms. Harris administered the group pass program at LTD. She gave a brief overview of the program. It provided an extremely discount rates for nonprofits, affordable housing developments, and schools. The rate was \$6.30 per month, per person.

Ms. Harris recapped conversations she had with Homes for Good (formerly HACSA). They discussed mobility was an issue for their residents. Homes for Good thought to include the monthly rate into the cost of housing units, and then provide a free pass to each apartment.

Ms. Harris met with Homes for Good a couple weeks ago and the organization was ready to move forward on three complexes. The three complexes were Roosevelt Crossing, the Hawthorne at 29th and Oak; and the Oaks and 14th and Oak Patch. The program provided passes for 266 people. Homes for Good also wanted to cover the Way Home program, which offered passes to another 100 people. Currently, Homes for Good was ensuring HUD would reimburse them for transportation expenses.

Those two programs alone would provide additional revenue of \$20,000 annually.

Homes for Good was considering future development plans, to begin 2020. Additionally, the work location would move downtown in 2020, and Homes for Good would cover their employees passes, as well.

Ms. Harris said if it was successful, LTD could approach St. Vincent de Paul and Community Cornerstone Housing. Staff was also looking at how to feasibly offer more than 1Pass per household.

Ms. Dannels said Homes for Good was doing great work in the community. She asked when they would find out about the HUD reimbursement. Ms. Harris said hopefully by the end of October 2018.

Ms. Dannels asked Mr. Bozievich about a new 50-unit development on Martin Luther King Boulevard. She said she wondered when it would be operational; it was another opportunity to provide greater access. Mr. Bozievich replied by the end of 2020.

Ms. Reid said that she wondered about a potential project on Franklin Boulevard in the Glenwood area. Mr. Bozievich said Homes for Good was busy, but it was on their list of projects.

Ms. Harris noted three housing complexes were already participating in the group pass program. They included Opportunity Village, East Housing Complex, and Community Supported Shelters.

Ms. Reid asked whether Ms. Harris was in contact with local treatment facilities. Some offered or partnered with housing facilities. She said that she thought there might be opportunity there. Mr. Bozievich said he thought the fact revenue was earned would make a strong STIF application. Ms. Harris said if everything went through as planned, including employee passes, the total would be \$40,000 in revenue.

Mr. Bozievich wondered what it would take to subsidize the program if HUD wouldn't reimburse Homes for Good. Ms. Harris said \$6.30 per unit; Roosevelt Crossing, for example, had 77 units. She was unsure if the organization had other funding sources.

Ms. Jackson explained Ms. Harris was asked to provide an update, to let the committee know there were programs they could use as models within their recommendation. Outside organizations not only helped reduce costs, but they helped with vetting of individuals. LTD didn't want to collect individual income information. Homes for Good managed all the information.

Ms. Murphy clarified the affordable housing program was different than the other 60 organizations using the group pass. She was told yes.

Ms. Reid asked if having a certain dollar amount "cap" meant that as soon as LTD hit that threshold, they stopped offering the program. Ms. Jackson said staff managed ahead of time, and tried to predict and enter into agreements they could fulfill.

Mr. Yeh said that he wondered if that meant they wouldn't offer the pass to another agency at that point. Ms. Jackson said not necessarily, there just weren't resources to do outreach and expand the program.

Mr. Yeh returned to the youth fare cap. He said he wondered how the cap would be implemented. Ms. Jackson said staff would consider which organization they would have a successful partnership

with. Some school districts might be more interested in participating than other districts. From there, staff could identify the number of students and approximate costs.

Ms. Reid clarified whether the recommendation needed a cap. She was told no; a cap was suggested due to lack of data to draw from. A cap provided some limitations.

Ms. Dannels liked the idea of having a reserve fund. She said she thought it should be included in the recommendation.

Ms. Murphy asked whether there was data around the effects of raising the fare to \$2 and increasing the subsidy toward group passes. Ms. Dannels said she thought they could ask nonprofit partners. Ms. Jackson said she wondered what type of data. LTD didn't have ridership information. Ms. Murphy said she thought they should know much more money LTD would receive if the fare increased. Mr. Martin responded they could provide some estimated information. He said that LTD knew if fare was raised a certain number of people would stop riding, or switch passes. Additionally, 15 percent of people paid cash.

Ms. Jackson said she hoped the group would reach a recommendation and, once LTD had data, later return and evaluate the programs. For example, LTD wanted to ensure the fare structure wasn't regressive in the way it was implemented. As Mr. Martin noted, a certain percentage paid cash and they were likely lower income because they didn't have \$50 up front. They ended up paying more than those using a card and buying a monthly pass. As LTD had more data and ability to interact with individuals, they could revisit and revise the recommendation.

Ms. Dannels added those paying cash are often unbanked. She said she thought it was great to remove the barrier and cap the money spent by people. Ms. Mayall said a new electronic fare collection system could allow unbanked users to reup cash into their account.

Ms. Reid said she was approached about the honored rider program, where those 65 and up rode the bus for free. It was one consideration, because they were offering free fare to an entire group of people that may not be asset restricted. Ms. Dannels pointed out it depended; they could be asset restricted. Perhaps some level of fare could be subsidized for the age group, similar to the National Park system. She said she thought AARP could weigh in on the conversation. Mr. Bozievich added the pass they chose would work with the tap system, so LTD could also track honored rider's usage.

Ms. Reid said she wondered about connecting to LIHEAP. Mr. Bozievich noted not every low-income person over 65 was a part of LIHEAP.

Ms. Rees provided background and purpose of the honored rider program.

Mr. Yeh said one reason he supported the youth pass was to help normalize riding the bus. Hopefully, youth would take the experience with them into adulthood.

FUTURE MATERIAL, TIMELINE, and MEETINGS' SCHEDULE — The next meeting was scheduled for Saturday, October 22, 2018.

ADJOURNMENT — Ms. Murphy adjourned the meeting at 1:54 p.m.

LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

AD HOC FARE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

Saturday, October 20, 2018

Pursuant to notice given to *The Register-Guard* for publication on October 13, 2018, and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the District, the Board of Directors of the Lane Transit District held an ad hoc Fare Policy Committee meeting on Saturday, October 20, 2018, beginning at 10:00 a.m., at Lane Transit District, E 17th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon.

Present: Jenna Murphy, chair
Tom Schwetz, LTD
Jay Bozievich, Lane County Commissioner
Carl Yeh, LTD Board Member
Kate Reid, LTD Board Member
Noreen Dunnels (called in)
Andrew Martin, LTD
Robin Mayall, LTD
Cosette Rees LTD
Mark Johnson, LTD
AJ Jackson, LTD
Tiffany Edwards, Eugene Chamber of Commerce
Josh Skov, Better Eugene Springfield Transportation
Camille Gandolfi, LTD
Marina Brassfield, Minutes Recorder

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS — Ms. Murphy convened the meeting at 10:05 a.m. and called the roll.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY DISCUSSION WITH CHAMBER ATTENDEES — Ms. Murphy introduced Tiffany Edwards, Eugene Chamber of Commerce. She explained the purpose of the meeting was to discuss changes to fare policy and how they would potentially affect the business community.

Mr. Yeh asked how LTD currently served the business community. Mr. Martin brought up the Choices Report. Mr. Schwetz explained Jared Walker & Associates provided specific information on employment access. Ms. Reid said she thought a main part of the discussion was how changes to fare policy would impact the business community, either by favoring or not favoring a subsidy. Of course, it was also important to consider how people got to their jobs. She said she thought the committee should focus specifically on who would fund a portion of the operating costs, and how they felt about service. Mr. Yeh added getting to jobs was important, but so was engaging in commerce.

Ms. Murphy asked Ms. Reid if she was referring to Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF), in terms of a subsidy. Ms. Reid said she was not, she was referring to the operating/general fund, and the payroll tax that came from employers. Ms. Jackson asked staff to pull up documents including the budget break down.

Ms. Jackson said recent information from Transit Tomorrow discussed how LTD served places of employment. The payroll tax was part of the general fund, and showed how much the business community contributed toward transit. For the purpose of the committee's discussion, any new

subsidy would use new dollars paid by the employee. Even though the employee paid the tax, LTD still knew employers had large say, given they had supported operation of the district historically. Ms. Murphy clarified that historically, funds were received from the employer, but now taxes were on the employee.

Mr. Schwetz shared a slide on job access, to provide a sense of the network. In terms of access, 44 percent of jobs in the metro area were in reach of 10 to 15-minute service; 44 percent had access to 20 to 60-minute service. A budget was included within the agenda packet.

Ms. Murphy discussed outlying areas that could use more service. Ms. Murphy asked Ms. Edwards to chime in. Ms. Edwards was unsure if her organization had polled its members, or whether they data LTD didn't already have. Ms. Murphy said anecdotal feedback was helpful.

Ms. Reid provided a broad overview of the committee purpose to Ms. Edwards. As the committee looked at recommendations, they specifically wondered how to spend STIF money. There was a strong recommendation from the state around youth and low-income fares.

Ms. Edwards said she wondered what ridership was currently. She noted while the downtown professional sector had the easiest access for various reasons, they may not utilize transit. However, employers saw less and less opportunities for parking. As that continued to happen, she anticipated seeing a shift in ridership. As for the youth fare, Ms. Edwards said she wondered about the capacity for already serving current routes despite lost revenue. Additionally, she wondered why youth would access busses. She added that she thought it was important to ensure the most likely riders were being served, and that over the next ten years, trends would change.

Ms. Reid said the Business Energy Tax Credit (BETC) previously provided an opportunity for middle and high school students to ride free. During its lifetime, annual costs with increased service were about \$2 million. Current LTD projects including MovingAhead and Transit Tomorrow included routes to schools, meaning LTD wouldn't add new lines but would increase service times.

Ms. Edwards assumed those who grew up more familiar with transit used the system more frequently in adulthood. It seemed as LTD moved into the future and took actions to increase ridership, more access would create beneficial lifelong habits.

Mr. Martin added that once people start riding, they found the system useful and rode frequently. In general, research showed those who rode transit at a younger age also rode more later in life. Ms. Edwards said she was unsure where the business community would be in terms of an investment, however, they tended to want to invest in youth.

Ms. Murphy added that driving kids to school could be time consuming; giving children access to transportation freed up time for the family.

Ms. Edwards asked what the estimated increase in ridership was. Ms. Reid provided ridership information from the BETC program, 2005-2010. Ms. Edwards noted the ridership was a significant sector. Mr. Schwetz said LTD did add service to handle loads so there were some cost considerations.

Mr. Schwetz shared a slide on the frequency of using LTD in 2015, 2011, 2007, 2004, and 1999. He said 60 percent of ridership rode 5 to 7 days a week. Mr. Martin added that those riding 7 days per week rode more times per day.

Mr. Bozievich asked if Ms. Edwards had thoughts around revenue equity between business income tax and fare, percentage wise. He heard a lot of complaints about others not picking up their share. Ms. Edwards said she heard that as well, because many employees/employers didn't access transit at all, yet still paid for it. She said that on the other hand, a lot of people recognized LTD was how employees got to work so people did see value.

Mr. Bozievich noted bussing was very important to FCR Veneta's workforce. He said that he wondered how the business community felt in general about subsidizing low income fares, so there was more access for workers in outlying areas. He inquired as to how much value there was to employers for greater access.

Ms. Edwards said she thought a bigger issue was in the housing market; affordability and vacancy were not present in Eugene and it was a growing trend. She stated that she was unsure if the trend was significant enough for the workforce. She said she was unsure of where employees would be riding to, and whether they were forced to go downtown first.

Ms. Edwards asked about why employees were riding the bus, whether it was for mobility issues, lack of car ownership, or lack of parking. Ms. Edwards said she was uncertain of how many people outside the area commuted to work and what their needs were. For example, places like Santa Clara had lots of parking, so dynamics would change based on employees working within those restrictions.

Ms. Murphy noted the downtown area continued to grow. She said she wondered what percentage of employers offered subsidies or reimbursements for transit. Ms. Edwards was unsure, but knew a few employers paid for parking.

Mr. Johnson said there was a robust group pass program bought into by employers. Mr. Martin added there were 11,408 employees and 104 businesses participating. Ms. Edwards said the Chamber could survey its members on issues, however, its membership was smaller than the whole business community. There were different dynamics between members and nonmembers.

Mr. Schwetz added a large bulk of the group pass program was 20,000 UO students who didn't only use the pass to attend school, but also to visit jobs, businesses and services. Mr. Schwetz said LTD could get data about those coming outside area; LCOG had information.

Ms. Mayall said it was important to consider two kinds of trips; some rural areas were reverse commute, meaning people came from Eugene to outside areas. Ms. Edwards asked how people reached outer areas. She said she was told they had to go downtown first. Ms. Reid explained Transit Tomorrow was looking at route feeders, and considering the issue of having to first travel to a hub. Ms. Edwards said she wondered if students also had to go downtown first. Ms. Murphy said yes, students transferred at the downtown station. Mr. Schwetz said a number of high schools were attached to existing routing.

Mr. Skov noted the group pass had a threshold for a certain number of employees. He encouraged the committee to reconsider the parameter in regard to fare policy; he said he thought it could be opened to more people. Ms. Mayall said a new fare collection system might simplify employee passes; currently, it required administration.

Ms. Edwards said downtown was very easy to access; however, other manufacturing and industrial areas were tougher to reach. Those areas had folks most likely to not have transportation services. They were not working downtown and came from the outer metro area.

Mr. Yeh asked Ms. Edwards if businesses looking to move into the Eugene area asked about transit services. Ms. Edwards said she thought it was a consideration, but not a deciding factor. Generally, businesses recognized transit networks were always evolving. Mr. Schwetz said recruitment questions often asked about transit systems. Ms. Edwards replied yes and that she also thought the type of business mattered.

Mr. Bozievich said he thought the committee could focus on workforce access and find success. It was a big concern within the community. As a fare policy, he wasn't sure whether a low income or a group pass was more helpful. Ms. Reid said she thought the committee also needed to consider whether it was more beneficial to have fare subsidy, or increased service on weekends and evenings.

Mr. Skov stated he was still unclear on trade-offs between fare policy and Transit Tomorrow. He said he thought youth access to transit was a labor market issue, for family convenience and for high schoolers who worked. Many of those students likely didn't own a car. Ms. Edwards said she agreed. She pointed out employers who had challenges with the system and who wanted investments were probably not in the downtown area. In addition, the youth pass investment was likely something the business community wanted to see due to impacts on the workforce, parents, and students.

As for weekend service, Ms. Edwards pointed out some manufacturers worked seven days a week; however, she didn't know where those folks were moving around from. She said she thought better servicing the most likely riders seemed to make more sense, versus trying to change the culture of ridership in Eugene. Ms. Edwards added that she thought transportation choices would shift over time, but for many reasons, public transit still wouldn't work for many people.

Mr. Johnson explained LTD had lots of hits and misses when focusing on employment centers. LTD initially put a lot of service to some places like International Way, but no one used the bus. It was difficult to predict which employees would ride to work. Ms. Edwards offered that the Chamber could poll members on specific questions, which they hadn't done yet.

Ms. Reid said she thought getting questions out to Chamber members before the next round of Transit Tomorrow would be useful. LTD was currently looking at how to implement the youth fare for the 2019-2020 school year. The recommendation needed to be solidified that meeting to forward onto SPC and then the board. Mr. Skov said there were opportunities for helping the labor market depended upon fare policy and fare productivity trade off.

Mr. Yeh said he wondered how the general membership would react if LTD implemented a youth fare policy. Ms. Edwards said she thought there would be a mix of reactions, however, the Chamber supporting certain investments as a body made sense. Mr. Yeh said he hoped membership would see value in the, especially if LTD could offset revenue lost.

Mr. Bozievich returned to the topic of rural connectivity. He said Creswell would likely have a new urban renewal district. He imagined major employers moving into Creswell within 5-10 years. In addition, Coburg expanded its UGB while Junction City had been a fast-growing city. Mr. Bozievich noted the senior community in Florence also wanted a connection to Eugene by bus, so transit was really a county wide issue.

Ms. Reid said LTD was looking to implement a mobility on demand (MOD) pilot service in Cottage Grove. Ms. Rees explained LTD currently served Cottage Grove through a circular around the community, with South Lane filling in service gaps. The combination wasn't very productive, so the organization was looking both services with MOD. Ms. Rees explained MOD. MOD was a ride

share model using origin to destination transit, but it was not a taxi. LTD would purchase a mobile application to support the service. The model could potentially be implemented in other areas.

Mr. Bozievich said he thought the future of transit would stick with high level routes and frequent often service. Neighborhood routes replaced with something like MOD. Travelers would move origin to bus route, bus route to destination.

Ms. Murphy asked about fare for MOD; she assumed it was less than Lyft and Uber. Ms. Rees said LTD was considering a one dollar or free fare. The pilot program would be 12 months, so staff had the opportunity to measure success and make changes along the way.

In response to a question from Ms. Reid, Ms. Jackson said keeping the fare structure the same, while subsidizing the group, nonprofit, and youth programs as well as the youth fare would likely be the easiest model to implement. If the committee asked for a fare structure change rather than a subsidy there would be a longer process.

Ms. Reid noted Mr. Bozievich suggested raising the base fares. Mr. Martin said he did research and found raising fare wouldn't increase revenue and less people who end up riding. Mr. Bozievich said he wouldn't want to recommend raising any rates, at least until an electronic fare system was in place to better understand consequences.

Ms. Jackson said once an electronic fare collection was available, LTD could create a monthly cap. It didn't need to be implemented right away but did need to be recommended, because it would take four months. Mr. Bozievich thought capping would fix some Title IX issues. Fare added up quickly for those paying cash daily.

Ms. Reid said she wondered if Mr. Bozievich thought all employers should have access group passes. Mr. Bozievich said he thought LTD could either drop the 10-employee limitation or make group passes cheaper. He said he would be more likely to drop the 10-employee limit, so it could be more accessible to smaller businesses.

Mr. Schwetz explained the group pass concept. LTD proposed using STIF funding to help remove transit access barriers. Ms. Reid asked what the discount was for a group pass. Mr. Skov said passes were around \$5.50 a person compared to \$50. The passes worked because not everyone buying into them rode LTD.

Mr. Skov said he wondered if the committee could raise the group pass rate. Ms. Edwards said he thought incremental increases would be more accepted by the business community.

Ms. Dunnels called in at 11:33 a.m.

Mr. Schwetz said there hadn't been an increase in several years. Ms. Reid said those already using the group pass likely wouldn't be okay with paying \$10 instead of \$5, for example. It would be a big increase for them although it was still a great deal. Ms. Jackson said the more employers taking part in the program brought success; costs became more irrelevant. If there were capacity issues, then the group pass needed to be raised. Currently, LTD did not have that. The only place with regular overcrowding was the UO corridor.

Ms. Reid said she thought they could create a pilot for a small business group pass program, for those under the employee threshold. Ms. Edwards said she liked the idea, and thought one consideration for a group could be an organization like the Chamber or TAO. Mr. Bozievich said one difficulty for smaller businesses was paying per number of employees.

Mr. Bozievich said he thought the committee should recommend holding some STIF as reserve, to ensure LTD did not spend all money. Ms. Reid clarified they were not looking to spend all \$6 million.

Mr. Skov said he thought they needed to prioritize quality of data for any new fare management system. The biggest sticking point within the discussion was the inability to make a case for certain decision. Ms. Reid said that was also a board priority. Ms. Mayall said data not only dependent on system and software chosen but also on policies and procedures adopted.

The committee took a break at 11:50 a.m. and reconvened at 12:15 p.m.

BUSINESS COMMUNITY DISCUSSION — Ms. Jackson said that she spoke with Ms. Edwards during the break. She said that Ms. Edwards noted that she thought after the committee engaged in discussion, she could provide some insight for what the chamber could holistically represent. Ms. Edwards said she didn't believe cost was preventing people from accessing the bus. She said she thought expanded service was preferred.

Ms. Reid said there were four scenarios being considered within Transit Tomorrow. She said she wondered if expanding the route area, frequency, or a bit of both would be beneficial. Ms. Edwards said she thought more frequency. However, in underserved areas where jobs were expanding into, like West Eugene, would be beneficial. Mr. Yeh said he thought it was about maximization of ridership.

Mr. Schwetz brought up an LTD survey from a presentation given to City Council the previous Monday. Mr. Skov highlighted more frequency and shorter waits would move LTD toward increased cost effectiveness per ride.

Mr. Schwetz explained the survey was a part of the core design workshop for ridership. The scenario was ridership with lots of frequency. There was a transit beltline allowing for more connections, and more direct service so people could move without going downtown first. Additionally, within the existing budget, service could be provided seven days a week.

Mr. Schwetz noted there were other mobility needs to consider. He said that during a recent City Council presentation, Councilor Syrett asked about a funded ridership plan to connect those who really needed access, such as the elderly and disabled. Ms. Reid clarified funds wouldn't be taken from other para-transit services.

Ms. Edwards said she wondered what community need LTD would meet by extending service out. She said she wondered what those potential riders did now. Mr. Schwetz provided an example of proposed ridership service out on River Road. A ridership scenario was "useful" transit; less useful was coming every half hour, or required some walking. Ms. Edwards said that outer lying areas wouldn't use transit if only came once an hour, for example. Mr. Bozievich said people would use their cars if service came less than 15 minutes, which was one reason why EmX worked so well. Ms. Mayall added LTD was not only competing with cars, but also Uber and Lyft.

Mr. Martin noted with ridership models, LTD was required to provide ADA service within ¼ mile of stops whenever a fixed route service was implemented. It was very costly to provide the service. The farther that transit was taken from people, the more LTD would spend on the service. Ms. Rees added another level of analysis would need to be complete to ensure accessibility was ensured.

Ms. Reid recapped that it sounded as though the business community would support a youth fare and more access for employees, and that costs weren't necessarily barriers. However, LTD had conducted surveys that indicated fare was too expensive. Ms. Edwards said she was unclear what type of transportation people used that was cheaper than transit. Ms. Reid noted these respondents likely weren't moving around at all, which was another issue.

Ms. Edwards said that a fare increase was justified a fare increase as costs were always rising, and the fact that LTD hadn't risen fares in a while indicated there could likely be one successfully. She said she thought the business community might be amicable to small raises.

Mr. Schwetz made notes throughout the meeting on a white board. He reviewed the list, titled Options for Fare Policy:

- Subsidizing group passes (and half fare program to nonprofits)
- Subsidize youth fare
- McKinney-Vento Program
- Include all high school students – no age limit
- All youth ride free during school year – transition of “1Pass”
- Electronic fare – capping monthly level
- Future of group pass funding?
 - Capping monthly level?
 - Increase price of group pass program?
 - Bigger share from STIF?
 - Smaller business group pass pilot
- Holding STIF money in reserves
- LTD data holding is “no creepier” than Google

Another list was titled Low Income:

- Nonprofit fare / low income:
 - Currently half fare (50%)
 - LTD costs around \$250,000/year
 - LTD share could go up; subsidy goes up; and administration of program tightens
- Affordable housing based low income fare subsidy:
 - 1Pass per household
 - Group pass program
 - Level of subsidy
- Goal: to improve mobility of those in need
 - Lower cost to nonprofits
 - Transit accessibility

Ms. Murphy introduced the topic of youth pass recommendations. Mr. Yeh said he wanted to maintain some sort of identification system for middle and high school students. Those 10 and under generally didn't have ID cards so they needed to be accompanied. He didn't want kids to forget they had to show some sort of pass.

Mr. Skov clarified kids would still receive some sort of electronic pass. Ms. Reid said the committee was unsure and it was not part of the fare policy recommendation. The committee would set a cap on funds to direct to the program. Mr. Bozievich clarified all youth rode free during the academic year, but anyone under 10 rode free all year, to encourage use of the 1Pass program by older students during the summer.

Mr. Skov encouraged that ages 11-18 be integrated with fare management otherwise staff wouldn't have data. Ms. Reid said LTD still wanted to integrate the age group, however, the discussion wouldn't take place until July 2019.

Mr. Martin clarified that Mr. Yeh said he wanted those 10 and under who were accompanied by adults to ride free. Ms. Jackson said that wouldn't prohibit youth from riding but those alone had to pay fare. The Board could not prohibit children from riding alone. Ms. Mayall said creating a stipulation like that also penalized people like working parents. Ms. Rees said there was no age limit; riders were more looking for problem behaviors.

Mr. Skov brought up ORS 163.545 which set a ten-year-old age threshold. He said it was an important precedent to consider. Mr. Yeh said he didn't want to require parental presence, but did want to ensure those traveling with kids didn't have to pay for the fare.

Ms. Reid said she thought they needed two different fare programs – a student school year pass and a youth pass for everyone else. Doing so would circumvent removal of the 1Pass and allow all youth to ride free during school year. She said she was concerned about age thresholds, and was unclear whether it should be 10 and under or 12 and under. Ms. Mayall said she thought 12 and under would cover everyone.

Ms. Jackson said ages weren't always enforceable. A threshold based on grade level would be more successful.

Mr. Bozievich returned the conversation to the intent; he noted the recommendation would be all kids ride free; those under the middle school level rode free all year long, while those at the middle school and high level would purchase a 1Pass to ride during the summer. Any other logistics, such as passes and data tracking, could be figured out at a later date by the board. The committee needed to assign a subsidy to the recommendation.

Ms. Reid noted only 2,300 1Passes were sold the last year, while there were 24,000 passholders during the last iteration of a youth program. She was concerned about reach and didn't want to restrict access during a time transit could be needed more. Mr. Martin added that some ID cards might not work with electronic validation.

Mr. Skov asked if she thought the free fare should be year-round. Ms. Reid said yes, she thought it would be the most equitable way to look at youth fare; however, the 1Pass was growing successfully every year. She added that she also didn't want to force families to purchase something they might not be able to afford.

Mr. Bozievich said he disagreed, and that LTD was about to offer 9 months of free passes for age groups who currently didn't have the access. He said he guessed that the majority of the 24,000 were riders who only made trips to and from school. When school was out, the need might not be there. There was not 100 percent cross over of ridership between the academic year and the summer. During summers, students could also walk or ride bikes. However, due to more student exposure, he said he thought they might see an increase in 1Pass, since students might be used to riding the bus and might see more benefit.

Mr. Skov said he thought a new set up would make it easier for parents to put money toward a card for just the summer if they were able to use the same pass. Ms. Mayall said there may not be continuity in pass use if there was an ID during the school year, and then a collection system for 1Pass.

Ms. Jackson thought the expectation was to transfer to an electronic system once in place everyone would be able to more easily collect data. The student could register through the electronic system and tie it to their school. Ms. Mayall added it would be a gradual process.

Ms. Reid clarified there was consensus around a recommendation for youth programs and funding of \$2.5 million. Mr. Yeh asked if they needed to consider homeschooled students more. Ms. Mayall said no, they would consult with Lane ESD.

Ms. Murphy added that homeless youth might have issues with access. Ms. Reid said if the youth didn't attend school but still accessed services, they had access to a pass. Ms. Dunnels noted the McKinney-Vento program worked with homeless students; Ms. Rees said the program purchased half-fare passes for students.

Ms. Rees said one challenge was that school districts were still required to provide homeless students who completed traditional high school with services until they were 21. The Board would have decided if those individuals counted as "high school" students. Mr. Yeh said he was okay with supporting fare for that demographic. Ms. Reid said there were similar concerns within the 1Pass. She said that she thought Ms. Kester could take recommendations to 1Pass meetings, so they could be on the same page.

Ms. Murphy introduced the nonprofit pass discussion.

The group discussed prior subsidies provided by LTD, generally ranging from \$150,000-250,000. Ms. Murphy said what drove the subsidy was the number of passes purchased by nonprofits. Mr. Bozievich added nonprofits often purchased and awarded passes based on other financial assistance received.

Ms. Reid said she wondered if LTD only offered monthly passes to nonprofits. Ms. Rees responded no, they could purchase any fare for half off. Ms. Reid said she wondered if the committee was interested in increasing the percentage of subsidy provided. Mr. Bozievich said he thought it would help nonprofits to lower the percentage of what they had to pay, but not match, since they had a set number of passes they were able to give out based on their budget.

Mr. Skov said he wondered about the nonprofits that participated. Ms. Rees provided a list on nonprofits currently purchasing passes. There were about 60 nonprofits spending \$60,000 annually. Sponsors, ShelterCare, and Centro Latino were two larger participants.

Mr. Skov said he wondered how people felt about the composition of individual tickets versus monthly passes. Ms. Reid said she thought the issue might be part of fare management later on, but she didn't want to place restrictions on nonprofits. Mr. Bozievich stated that he agreed; nonprofits were trying to help stabilize their client, and sometimes a ten-ride book could be the tool they chose. He said he didn't think LTD should make choices for the organization.

Mr. Bozievich proposed dropping the nonprofit share to 25 percent and raising LTD's subsidy to 75%. General funds could be reserved for other activity.

Mr. Skov said he was curious about reaching transit dependent populations. He said he wondered if there were other ways to reach low income people. Mr. Schwetz brought up the idea of a fare based on affordable housing.

Mr. Bozievich said that he foresaw some housing organizations (who were not currently huge purchasers of group passes), like Cornerstone Community Housing, buying more fares if LTD's subsidy was increased.

Ms. Reid said she wanted to clarify there was a total of \$5 million in funds from STIF, so the committee would not be spending all of it. While LTD was the qualified entity to distribute funds, they were not the only eligible applicant.

Ms. Jackson clarified the committee also needed to recommend expectations for the roll out of a program. There were some capacity issues; if the roll out cost more than awarded STIF dollars, LTD would need to cut service. LTD wanted to contain costs to supplant revenue missing, as less revenue meant less service. Ms. Jackson explained they wouldn't know until the finance department completed projections. If projections were inaccurate, service cuts would be recommended for the fall. She said that absent of data, she was unsure of direct impacts to service. Mr. Martin had provided many best estimates.

Mr. Schwetz spoke to the Transit Tomorrow process. Trade-offs proposed included ridership coverage, and service increases/fare policy, LTD needed revenue to do those increases.

In response to a comment from Mr. Skov around youth pricing, Ms. Jackson explained transit always worked best when large groups were traveling from one location to another all at the same time. So, school aged kids were actually ideal for transit; they were a targeted audience. However, because all kids rode at the same time across the region, there was a direct rise in peak number of busses which couldn't be absorbed, so more busses and more drivers were needed, making costs higher.

Ms. Reid said she thought estimates the committee received included all service costs for running busses and increasing service during peak times. Ms. Jackson said they were discussing two issues; one was the STIF application for cost of fares, and the other part was only for cost of service increases.

Mr. Schwetz asked about students who were considered low income, particularly in affordable housing scenarios. They didn't want to overlap passes. Ms. Murphy said she wondered if that mattered. Mr. Schwetz noted staff would have to sort out true costs and what might happen under different conditions.

Mr. Bozievich said the committee previously discussed providing 1Pass per an affordable housing unit, as provided by the development. LTD wouldn't need to worry about providing access for the kids, as they would be covered under youth fare. Overlapping would help some issues on the low-income side.

Additionally, Mr. Bozievich said that he didn't want to prescribe any subsidy amount for the nonprofit passes, but he wanted to recommend some combination of an increased subsidy and decreased cost to nonprofits.

Ms. Rees said in 2014, about 8-10 percent of fares from nonprofits were purchased, specifically for youth so there was cross over.

Ms. Reid said she thought 25 percent and 75 percent for nonprofits was a strong recommendation. She said she wondered if staff had any idea of the need. Ms. Rees said no, but there were some things LTD could do on their side to increase efficiencies. Administration of the program could be

improved; for example, currently, some people went to multiple nonprofits and were handed multiple half fares. Those half fare passes were then sold on Craigslist or the streets.

Mr. Schwetz asked what the policy intent was that could be formulated and used again in the future.

Mr. Bozievich responded the policy intent for him was improving mobility of low income and high need demographics who interacted with nonprofits. Specifically, how to make it easier for nonprofits to utilize the program. He said he hoped if costs were dropped there would be more usage.

Mr. Schwetz said he didn't see a clean way to include a number within the policy. Mr. Bozievich suggested a cap. Ms. Reid said she felt good about \$750,000 for one year of the program because that would double the riders. She added that she thought for year one it would be acceptable.

Mr. Schwetz discussed policy recommendations with the group. He said he didn't see a clean way to include a number in the policy, but thought they could revisit it annually.

Mr. Skov said he didn't think fare policy articulated need qualitatively. He suggested that data should be included in policy. Ms. Rees added it was addressed in a coordination plan. Mr. Schwetz suggested using whatever was already included in plans and policies to create consistent language.

Ms. Reid said she thought information for STIF applications needed to be done that day. She said she felt satisfied with the discussion, and thought the last meeting in November could discuss the business community and group passes without discussing the STIF application. Mr. Bozievich said he didn't think they would use STIF funds to subsidize business, but wondered if STIF funding would be used for housing agencies. Ms. Reid responded the group pass program would be cheaper per unit.

Mr. Schwetz added the committee might want to explore the concept of rent subsidies assisting transit fares. Mr. Bozievich said he was unsure HUD would allow such a program. Ms. Mayall said numbers weren't quite that simple because the group pass cost was per person whether they used the pass or not; nonprofits only handed out the half fare pass to those who requested one.

Mr. Bozievich said that he was comfortable holding off on the affordable housing conversation until a later date.

Mr. Schwetz reviewed the discussion and priorities of the committee.

The next meeting was scheduled for November 16, 2018 at 3:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT — Ms. Murphy adjourned the meeting at 2:01 p.m.