

PUBLIC SERVICES COMMITTEE OF DUBLIN CITY COUNCIL
Monday, May 4, 2020
Virtual meeting – 3:00 p.m.

Minutes of Meeting

Chairperson Fox called the virtual meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Committee Members present: Ms. Fox, Chair; Vice Mayor De Rosa and Mr. Reiner

Staff members present: Ms. O’Callaghan, Ms. Rauch, Ms. Puranik, Ms. Willis, Mr. Rayburn and Ms. Noble.

Others present: Chris Bongorno, Nelson\Nygaard

Mobility Update - SHARE

Ms. Rauch stated she will introduce this, and then Mr. Bongorno and Mr. Rayburn will follow with the presentations.

Ms. Rauch stated that the outline includes brief background of the mobility study in general, then review Phase 3 that is ending, and then discuss funding and ultimately how the program could be sustained moving forward in Phase 4. This would transition from a pilot program to a permanent program.

Ms. Rauch stated that the mobility study was part of a larger strategic plan looking at how to be innovative in our transportation network and improvements to help support our community in various ways mobility is needed – whether seniors, disabled, and workforce. In terms of phases, the first two phases were in 2017 and 2018 – setting the vision, obtaining public input, looking at strategic priority areas and how to potentially implement that. In 2019, the pilot program implementation began, looking at grant funding sponsorship to launch this type of mobility project. Phase 4 would transition to a permanent mobility program and how that funding would work.

Mr. Bongorno noted that three phases have been completed in the Dublin Mobility Plan. With Council’s leadership, they identified the need for enhanced multi-mode transportation options in order to support the City’s mission of being a vibrant, innovative and engaged community. Nelson\Nygaard supported a vision setting workshop in February of 2017 and worked to define a shared transportation vision to get a policy design and implementation strategies for multi-mode improvements throughout Dublin. The vision that came out of that workshop was to be a city of strong, growing, prosperous and inclusive communities supported by excellent mobility options that bolstered a thriving economy; accommodate new and established populations; facilitate healthier lifestyles; encourage social connections; allow for all Dubliners to fulfill their potential.

The underlying objectives that tie to that vision support economic development; promote equitable access to mobility; expand multimodal options; improve public health; and preserve our environs by focusing on future growth.

Phase 2 in 2018 focused on priority setting and action plan development in alignment with the City’s “Connected Community” theme. Five strategic mobility priority areas were

developed: shuttles and circulators – micro-transit; bike share – shared micro-mobility; wayfinding; concepts for mobility hubs; and complete and smart streets. Phase 3 began in the fall of 2018 and focused on shuttles and circulators – micro-transit and bike share – shared micro-mobility. The bike share pilot operated in 2018 and concluded by the end of that year. With two priority areas for the micro-transit program, we are focusing on (1) the senior and people with disabilities market; and (2) the workforce market – filling gaps in services to those groups. In the fall of 2018, the City went through a solicitation process and contracted with SHARE to begin the senior and disabled shuttle service in January of 2019.

Senior and Disabled Shuttle

Mr. Bongorno stated that the pilot launched in 2019 with three fixed routes. Throughout the year, in partnership with SHARE, modifications to the model have been reviewed to make it more efficient and serve riders better. By October 2019, a shift was made to a fully dynamic model – involving individuals prescheduling rides and rides going to more destinations. Through the course of the pilot, there were about 5,400 rides for seniors and people with disabilities, improving mobility independence to reach local commercial, recreational, educational, and entertainment destinations.

Other highlights are that the vast majority of rides originated from Avondale Senior Living, who is very involved in coordinating rides for their senior residents. The top destination was retail. The ridership picked up during the year and exceeded 600 rides per month. (Shared a map of the ridership destinations)

For the pilot, there were 5,400 rides; 2,775 hours of service; the 2019 cost was \$160,397; and the pilot of 13 months ended with an average cost per ride of \$25.32. (Shared a slide of the ridership numbers and cost per rider)

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated these are “trips” – would there not be a round trip?

Mr. Bongorno responded that each time someone boards a vehicle and goes to a destination, that constitutes one trip. Service back constitutes another ride. People do not always do a round trip.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked if we know how many riders we have. Is that data available?

Mr. Bongorno responded that he does not have that information. They do have the raw data, but it was not broken down this way yet. If it is desired, they can drill down to obtain this.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that over the course of time, are new and different riders using these services or not? In particular, those apart from Avondale. She is interested in how many different Dublin residents are using the services. That would be an important consideration moving forward.

Mr. Bongorno noted that in reviewing data from the end of the pilot, there are riders who use the service regularly; but as the service expanded in October to serve seniors aging in place – not so much focused on the senior communities. There were a number of riders distributed around the City coming from their home location who did not use the service in the first part of the pilot.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that more granularity of that data would be helpful as we think about moving forward.

Mr. Reiner stated he understands Avondale has a lot of riders, but there are many other senior living facilities in Dublin. Are those numbers of users available?

Mr. Bongorno responded that the numbers are available, but they are all fairly low. When the pilot began, there was a lot of outreach from SHARE to the senior communities. Avondale had a very active and engaged resident coordinator who assisted in booking trips for their residents. Nelson\Nygaard is not involved in the engagement and marketing, so the question would best be answered by SHARE.

Mr. Reiner stated that is a good point. Avondale has an active coordinator supporting this service.

Mr. Bongorno stated that generating more relationships with the senior communities was identified as critical to its success.

Ms. Fox suggested that the questions be held until the presentation is concluded.

Dublin Workforce Shuttle

Mr. Bongorno stated that the original contract with the service provider was never finalized, as they pulled out of the market regionally and nationally. When the service launching was looked at, it was put on hold until the senior/disabled shuttle was up and running and then re-engaged with SHARE for a March 2019 launch. It started somewhat later and focuses on last mile/first mile service to and from COTA bus stops. The overall goal of this mobility program is to shift one percent of the workforce trips to shared mobility as a mode of choice and to promote mobility as a workplace benefit. There were 1,681 rides provided during the course of the pilot. For the workforce pilot, solid relationships were developed with AC Marriott in Bridge Park as well as Friendship Village and Stanley Steemer. Transfers from COTA Route 21 at Tuttle Mall were the most popular. In testimonials from users, they found the service provided time savings of about ½ hour to commute time and a significant cost savings for those who were using Uber or Lyft to fill the gaps in the transportation.

In terms of key performance indicators, the workforce shuttle served 1,680 rides over the course of the pilot; provided 1,254 hours of service; the total 2019 operating costs were \$79,028; and the cost per ride average was \$46.46. Part of the cost being higher than senior shuttle related to the fact that the service was slow to be adopted by employers and employees. The operating model was different from the senior model. The senior model requires at least two passengers to pre-book a trip in order for the trip to take place. For the workforce shuttle, if one rider books a trip at least 24 hours in advance, that trip is scheduled. There are some inherent inefficiencies with the system, but it was viewed as an essential service for those workers using it.

He shared some testimonials from Avondale as well as regular riders of the workforce shuttle.

Key findings of the Dublin Mobility Phase 3 report are that the demand for new mobility services exists; that gaps in Dublin's mobility networks remain unfilled; that effective service delivery requires cross-sector collaboration; that strong City leadership is paramount; and that program sustainability is a primary concern.

Ms. Fox stated that in terms of the SHARE senior shuttle service, they have to reserve in advance and do they have to use an app to do this?

Mr. Bongorno responded that it must be reserved 24 hours in advance. The app is the preferred method, but not everyone is willing/able to download it. The senior coordinator has helped with bookings at Avondale. The dynamics are most efficient when the app is used.

Ms. Fox stated that the SHARE service only takes riders to restaurants, shopping centers, and grocery stores – not to other locations such as a friend's home, etc.

Mr. Bongorno responded that the objective was not to provide health care visits, for example, but they wanted to provide connection to the DCRC, the food pantry, the library. They acknowledged that some social visits to a health facility – visiting or volunteering – were allowed, but it was not meant to serve trips that could be otherwise provided by an existing service that would be funded through Medicare or Medicaid programs.

Ms. Fox asked if the workforce shuttle has to be reserved for pick-up at a bus stop, and how far in advance.

Mr. Bongorno responded it is a minimum 24-hour in advance reservation. In the case of the regular riders, many would book several weeks at a time. It was meant to be an efficient process.

Ms. Fox stated that she, too, is interested in the data that is collected and understanding how often the shuttles sit unused. That would be important information.

Mr. Bongorno stated his understanding is that the operating hours were the hours that the vehicle was making a trip. The way it was programmed was that it would not sit idle. If sitting idle in preparation for the next trip, it should not be counted as an operating hour. He will double-check this. In regard to efficiency, during the six months or so of the senior pilot, it was running trips as there was no prebooking. As the pilot evolved, they wanted to ensure trips were only being made with a passenger on it – not for the prebooking.

Ms. Fox stated that because it is not counted as a deliverable hour – it is important to know on the course of a day, how many hours it is being utilized and how many hours it is sitting idle. That would provide information about the potential for other use.

Mr. Bongorno stated that the two pilots together provide some efficiency as well, as most of the workforce commutes occur in the a.m. and p.m. peak times. Unfortunately, that is not a huge volume at this point. The senior/disabled shuttle rides were occurring between those peak hours.

Mr. Reiner stated that the information she is asking about is very important, i.e. the downtime for the shuttles. He asked for clarification – if someone is traveling to WalMart or to a restaurant, does the rider book both an 8 a.m. pick-up and return pick-up at 10 a.m.?

Mr. Bongorno said it would be booked as two separate trips.

SHARE transit role during pandemic response

Mr. Rayburn stated that the City had a sharp drop in ridership beginning in mid-March due to the pandemic. This was a challenge, as the more vulnerable members of the community could not risk exposure by going out. The City considered how the service could be changed to serve the community during this time. A new delivery service was deployed by SHARE, transporting food, face masks and essential goods from community partners to residents at Avondale Senior Village, Stoneridge Court, Daniel Wright

Elementary and Abbey Church Village. He thanked SHARE for being flexible with their service at this time.

Mr. Reiner asked how many runs were made during this time and how many people accessed this.

Mr. Rayburn responded that each delivery held between 16-40 units of either food, essential goods or masks. Some of the deliveries were weekly and some were as needed. He can provide better information about those numbers if desired.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that she is aware that COTA is not operating their Express service, but they will begin picking up service as people return to work. The COTA 21 is still running. Is the workforce shuttle still operating?

Mr. Rayburn responded there are some essential employees still using this service. He recalls they are from a senior care facility and other retail businesses. If someone requests the service and they are essential workers, the service is still being provided. It is not a high number at this time.

Mr. Bongorno added there have been additional inquiries during the pandemic from folks who are considering getting to work, and SHARE has remained available to meet those requests.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated she is aware COTA has moved away from fixed routes to demand stops and the ability for SHARE to help with this on demand service will be important. COTA is collecting data and hopefully the data from COTA and the City can be shared. She is interested in knowing who is using the workforce shuttle service and why.

Funding, Grants and Program Sustainability

Mr. Rayburn stated that the Mobility Initiative was approved for \$250,000 per year in the CIP. At the same time, in the 2020-2024 CIP, \$220,000 was approved for Bike Share implementation. Staff also looked for other opportunities for funding resources outside the City. In terms of grants, MORPC and COTA partnered with the City on this. The Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Program provided a grant in 2019 of \$62,496. This is a grant program geared for older adults and individuals with disabilities to enhance mobility for them. The senior/disabled shuttle was a great fit for that program. The grant application was submitted again in 2020 and the City was awarded \$50,000 for the 2020 budget year.

They partnered with COTA on an opportunity through the Ohio Department of Transportation – the Ohio Transit Partnership Program – and were able to secure \$250,000 for the summer of 2019 through May of 2020 toward the workforce shuttle services. They are working with COTA and ODOT, given the circumstances, to extend that grant through the end of 2020.

In terms of where the monies were used in 2019, 67 percent or \$160,397 went toward supporting the Senior/Disabled shuttle. Thirty-three percent or \$79,028 went toward the Workforce Shuttle. In the 2019 budget, the grant reimbursement for the Senior/Disabled Shuttle was 39 percent and the grant reimbursement for the Workforce Shuttle was 81 percent. The costs not covered were those that occurred prior to May of 2019. In

combining all of the grants, the City was able to cover 53 percent of the SHARE program costs through external grant funding.

Looking at the budget in totality in 2019, including the CIP, grants and sponsorships, the actual costs to the City at the end of the program was \$107,774. Through private sponsorships --Costco for the Senior/Disabled Shuttle as well as the Dublin Entrepreneurial Center – it was possible to operate a special lunchtime shuttle for the workforce.

Looking to 2020, program sustainability is a top priority for staff. In terms of funds remaining for 2020, a good amount of monies have been expended in covering the first six months of the SHARE services. Ordinance 10-20 redirected the reimbursement from the grants to the mobility program. For grants, they secured a 5310 grant for 2020 for \$50,000 and they have \$185,763 remaining out of the \$250,000 awarded by the ODOT OTP2 award. They are working with ODOT and COTA to have the funds available through the end of 2020 to support the workforce shuttle for the rest of the year.

In terms of revenue sources available for funding: \$53,428 remains in the Mobility Initiatives balance; Ordinance 10-20 redirected \$142,525 into the Mobility Initiatives; the 5310 grant for this year in the amount of \$50,000; and the 2020 Bike Share funding could be diverted to micro-transit in the amount of \$75,000 to \$200,000. Given the circumstances of COVID-19, staff believes that implementing Bike Share programs in particular should be done with other communities in the region. The Bike Share program is on hold for 2020 and the monies could be used for micro-transit.

Regarding how other communities in Central Ohio are approaching micro-transit and how they are using the service, he shared a chart with Dublin, Grove City, Westerville, New Albany, Groveport, Obetz and Hilliard. The various programs are COTA Plus in Grove City, Westerville, Hilliard; SmartRide in New Albany; GREAT in Groveport and Obetz; SHARE in Dublin. Dublin provides this service at no cost to the resident or workforce. There is a base fare for COTA Plus, but it is waived if someone is transferring to or from a COTA fixed route service, which is the vast majority of users.

In terms of commitment from the municipality, the chart shows it ranges from \$120,000 to \$437,500.

In terms of next steps and opportunities for micro-transit in Phase 4, it is worth noting that more time is needed to engage with the partners – COTA, SHARE, and other micro-transit providers. Currently, the SHARE contract expires in June of 2020. Given the COVID pandemic, it has impacted the capability and capacity for SHARE and other operators to provide a response to an RFP. Staff would like to extend the current contract through the end of the year to allow more time for proposals. Based on the outcome of Phase 3, staff is pursuing a series of opportunities as micro-transit involves. We are looking at balancing resources, expanding partnerships, adopting a truly on-demand service, diversify support in view of vulnerable funding sources, adopt progressive parking and demand management policies, refine key performance indicators and continue tracking measures of program success, consider a regular solicitation period for mobility services, and advocate for increased COTA services.

Staff is now seeking feedback from the Committee on these five areas:

1. Input and feedback regarding strategic priority areas.
2. Feedback on subsidizing and sustainability of micro-transit services.
3. Feedback on the extension of SHARE's contract to December 31, 2020.
4. Input and feedback regarding the publication of an RFP by June 1, 2020 to select a micro-transit service provider for Phase 4 commencement.
5. Consolidation of existing funding for mobility projects and proposed spending plan in 2020.

Committee Questions/Discussion

Ms. Fox stated her big question is with data – we can see the gaps, but don't understand what they look like. We did not talk about Bike Share, and she would like data on why the Bike Share program failed. The other committee members made a good point about riders – are we in need of a methodology to evaluate whether or not we are hitting our objectives of a broad use of the service? Are we serving simply a small segment of the same people over and over in one senior living community and not others? She would also like information about how flexible the SHARE shuttle is for other riders – if we have data to know how often it is idle, could we get more efficiencies by opening it up to more than just seniors. Can that data easily be obtained?

Mr. Rayburn responded staff can look to obtain this data. It is worth noting that in looking at other micro-transit services in the region, SHARE is scheduling in advance in order to have the most efficiency out of route planning. In looking at COTA, it is more on demand and there is a different strategy of how many vehicles you need for on demand versus scheduling in advance. In looking at different types of micro-transit and efficiencies, there is more efficiency to be gained with SHARE in their strategy for scheduling rides.

Ms. Fox asked how the SmartRide in New Albany operates. She notices that the cost was \$120,000/year and she is aware it is a small shuttle.

Mr. Bongorno responded that his understanding is it provides a healthy number of rides. It has been on the ground for a number of years and has had time to generate ridership. It focuses primarily on workforce commutes, operates during a fixed period of time, and is not a pre-booked service. It regularly provides between 20,000 to 30,000 rides per year on a budget of \$120,000 – equating to a very low operating cost per ride. It is remarkably low even compared to the Groveport service with a similar ridership yet a cost of four times the New Albany SmartRide. Staff can look into the differences between those two services and why one is operating much more efficiently.

Ms. Fox stated that for her, a strategic priority is starting to analyze the data of what is working here, what isn't working, because the cost of \$45/one way for the workforce shuttle and \$35/back – especially given the number riding who make a minimum wage – is substantially what they earn in a day's work. We have a lot of data to analyze.

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked how SHARE is paid – is it a fixed amount or do we pay SHARE a cost per ride.

Mr. Bongorno responded SHARE books the hours and bills the City monthly.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the City is paying them only for the hours in use, and this is a variable cost.

Mr. Bongorno responded affirmatively.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that there is a fixed cost for one vehicle fully dedicated or not. Back to the data, it is important to understand the minimum overall fixed cost to do the service – whether 10 or 100 riders. For a certain level of service in the City of Dublin, there will be a set of fixed costs – what is that? Adding more riders brings the cost per ride down, but the total fixed costs remain the same. From a cost sustainability aspect, we need to understand that.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that in terms of extending the contract, we may desire to extend it through 2021, as the social distancing will impact ridership for the rest of this year. COTA is limiting their large buses to 20 riders. It is not clear when people will be comfortable with taking transportation with a shared ride. It is important to extend the contract, but we need to think about the timing and the restart of the funding, given the current environment.

She noted that COTA has had enormous success with the C-pass program. In looking at that model, the idea of transportation as a benefit, particularly for low wage earners is very important. We should consider that as well. Clearly, the economic now are hurting businesses, but the C-pass program will enable the workers to return to work at some point.

Mr. Reiner stated that the outside funding obtained is very impressive. His question is what is the possibility of that type of grant funding continuing in the future?

Mr. Rayburn responded that they are hopeful the funding will be available in the future, but the issue is Dublin will compete with other entities in need of such funding. We may not receive the same level consistently in the future. Therefore, staff is looking at other grant opportunities such as to AARP for senior/disabled shuttle services. It appears that the workforce grant can be extended through the end of 2020. The other strategy is to leverage partnerships and other funding into the future.

Mr. Reiner stated he is curious what is occurring with the COVID situation. He assumes it is greatly impacting the ridership on these shuttles. He agrees that a lot more data is needed to make a firm judgment on this. Avondale Senior Living likely has a concierge handling these arrangements, but maybe others do not. Much of the marketing is likely not reaching all of the senior living facilities.

Mr. Rayburn commented that an important note about Avondale is that they do not have access to COTA fixed route services. They are more than a mile out from it and the ability to use the COTA Mainstream ADA service. It is important, moving forward, to understand the other services available to these communities.

Ms. Fox agreed. If the City does not extend the contract on the workforce shuttle, it is possible we would give up significant grant monies.

Mr. Rayburn stated that the City has spent \$81,000 of the \$250,000 grant to date.

Ms. Fox stated that because we are combining this, the monies support both programs. If we discontinue the workforce shuttle, some of the monies would not be available.

Mr. Rayburn stated that is correct. It is important to note that the current contract with SHARE has a bank of hours. Over 6 months, there are 2,300 hours to use for both services. Typically, the senior/disabled uses two-thirds of those hours. If we continue to work with ODOT and COTA, there could be opportunity to seek another OTC2 grant. If

we change providers to COTA Plus, we may not be eligible to obtain the 50 percent funding portion for workforce shuttle. Perhaps a hybrid could be considered, as well.

Ms. Fox directed the committee to the questions that staff has posed.

Feedback on Strategic Priority Areas

Five strategic mobility priority areas were developed:

1. Shuttles and circulators – micro-transit;
2. Bike share – shared micro-mobility;
3. Wayfinding;
4. Concepts for mobility hubs;
5. Complete and smart streets.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that after the experience with the Bike Share program, similar to what other communities experienced, she would not advocate this as a top level at this point. With the current reality, it is unlikely people will want to share bikes. Regarding shuttles and circulators, she wants to consider the timing so that we can maximize those funds. She is aware that some of this service and funding was used for delivery of goods and services for people during this pandemic. The mobility hubs concept is very interesting and will likely increase the use by the riders. People are not accustomed in Dublin to riding buses, but the mobility hubs are an interesting item and she would prioritize this. To summarize, she would prioritize nos. 1 and 4 on the list. For mobility hubs, it is important they be smart hubs, including the technology available.

Mr. Reiner stated that he supports focusing on the shuttles and circulators for seniors and disabled. Linking the senior facilities and building awareness is critical for effectiveness. He supports the hub concept. However, back to the Bike Share priority, he has used that program. He likes the concept of grouping the bikes in an orderly way to facilitate riding bikes to work, to downtown, to dining. He would like it set up in such a way that the bikes are not littered across the community. The COVID-19 gives pause to people's willingness to share bikes. He remains very interested in the bike share program as a priority.

Ms. Fox stated that most important strategically is to obtain much more data – who is using the shuttles, who is not, how to use them more flexibly, and from that develop more interest from funding partners. She would like to see more businesses using the workforce shuttle. Given the pandemic, Bike Share is important, but not within the next 6-12 months. Wayfinding is important as people are now walking the bikepaths, using their bikes and need more wayfinding. The mobility hubs are very important and we should concentrate on these in the next few years. The City should partner with COTA on how to improve public transit. Most people are not even aware the COTA bus operates in Dublin. She visited the websites for other cities to see how their shuttles are advertised and marketed. Our website is outdated, as it was last updated on this item in January of 2018. The information is about the whole program and not how to use it. It would be helpful to collect marketing info from other communities on their websites, as they are much more informational about the shuttles. For the elderly, they do not feel

comfortable using apps to make the reservations. If it requires someone else making a reservation for them, that is problematic. They should be able to make the reservation easily. Ease of use is another strategic priority for her.

Ms. Fox asked if there are presentations regarding mobility hubs and wayfinding?
Mr. Rayburn responded that tonight's agenda focused on micro-transit given the large amount of information. Staff would like to return to the committee to address the other strategic priority areas.

Feedback on Subsidizing and Sustainability of Micro-transit Services

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated she believes the senior circulator concept is important and she would prioritize workforce movement within and across the City during mid-day as well as pick-up. She has been working with COTA on having more service to and from Dublin, as frequency is critical. If not frequent, the service is not reliable. She would prioritize workforce, as it will be essential moving forward. We have a lot of data coming from other municipalities, and this will help with understanding the services. One of the challenges of obtaining repeat grants through ODOT is there are many competing for those grants. She is not certain of Dublin receiving these grants in future years. She would advocate the C-pass and getting employers involved in some of these others, as transportation is a benefit for workers. Finding a service that is used by many is important so that we can leverage it for purposes of sustainability into the future.

Mr. Reiner congratulated staff on seeking these grants, especially for disabled. He encourages them to stay aggressive in seeking grants. He agrees with the other members that in the future, we will need to look at businesses to get their employees into Dublin from remote areas. Perhaps the businesses would be willing to subsidize this. It will require reviewing the data to understand all of the information.

Ms. Fox stated that she believes the City can participate in subsidizing. It is important to sustain micro-transit services. Her sense is that subsidizing is based on evidence supported by data that we are spending the monies in an efficient manner and that we are growing the objectives of economic development, public health, access to many. If we continue to subsidize, we need to do the methodology of evaluation, which is why the data is needed. Success can only be measured with the data.

Extension of SHARE's contract

Vice Mayor De Rosa asked if we have grants in place, what is the true cost for Dublin to extend this contract to the end of 2020, given the demand is less due to the pandemic?
Mr. Rayburn responded that the current contract is for six months at 2,300 hours of service and that is being charged at \$80 per hour, totaling \$184,000 for six months. If it were to be extended to December 31, 2020, he would not expect the same terms – the cost and hours would be revisited due to the market changes. The hours for the first six months likely will not be used, and we are only billed for hours of services. We may want to scale down the contract, based on the hours expected to be used.

Vice Mayor De Rosa agreed that the demand will be much less, given that the social distancing rules allow only two people to ride the shuttle currently. She supports the

extension, but would like to understand the costs and best approach, given the pandemic.

Mr. Rayburn stated that the challenging part is that with the grant, the monies are provided only in reimbursement. The City has to front the monies at the outset. With respect to the remainder of 2020, Ordinance 10-20 provided reimbursement monies from grants be placed back in the Mobility Program funding. Combined with the \$53,000 balance, the \$50,000 from the 5310 grant, the program is in good shape to be extended to the end of 2020.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated it is important to be prudent on how that is structured, given the reality of the limitations due to the pandemic. If we will not use the hours, we should not contract for them unless there are some other deliveries or social services that can be provided through SHARE. In essence, she supports extension of the contract through the end of 2020.

Mr. Reiner stated that, given the current situation, it is difficult to know what will occur in the upcoming months. What of the \$81,000 remains and what is the status of its use? Mr. Rayburn stated that prior to COVID, they were averaging about \$16,000 per month for the senior/disabled shuttle and about \$10,000 per month for the workforce shuttle. It is definitely under \$10,000 at this point. They will continue to monitor to determine the right amount moving forward.

Mr. Reiner stated that he supports continuing the contract through 2020. He is hopeful that the seniors who are shut in will be able to have deliveries through the shuttle services for the duration.

Ms. Fox asked what is the flexibility within the program parameters on utilizing SHARE shuttle for others aside from seniors/disabled and workforce.

Mr. Rayburn responded that the grant monies do have limitations. For the 5310 fund, the grant limits on use are to enhance mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities. Staff did confirm with MORPC that the grant monies could be used toward delivery of essential goods and services to these groups. With the workforce grant, it was specifically geared for the workforce shuttle. Dublin is viewed as a trailblazer using technology and other elements to deliver a new transportation service. Moving forward, we will see if more of the monies are focused on sustaining programs or ways to innovate transportation funding.

Ms. Fox stated that she understands that the only way to do this more cost effectively is to have a circulator that is not reserved. She recalls that people at the Metro Place were interested in a shuttle for lunch transportation. If the City were to use a shuttle in a different way for the workforce, it would require paying for every hour the shuttle is operating for this purpose, correct?

Mr. Rayburn responded affirmatively. Staff could check with COTA and ODOT to see what the flexibility is for workforce shuttle costs. He mentioned that a lunchtime shuttle operated last summer, but was paid through private sponsorships from the DEC.

Ms. Fox agreed with extending the SHARE contract through the end of 2020. Mining the data is important to determine how the use can be increased by other seniors. She would like to see more seniors using the service.

Mr. Reiner stated that is an interesting point about having other people pay to ride the shuttle. Perhaps if the funding from outside sources is not available, others might want to pay to use the service.

Ms. Fox stated that the grant monies are limited to use for seniors and disabled transportation enhancement. There are many more seniors, however, to access and more study is needed.

Mr. Rayburn stated that there may be opportunity in the AARP grant for more flexibility. Staff will keep the Committee apprised of the status. There is an interest for transportation for social visits and non-emergency medical appointments. They have also been asked about transportation to churches for worship, but that will need to be revisited, given the considerations.

Ms. Fox stated that if the SHARE contract is extended, a negotiation consideration should be that the cost of fuel is half what it was and fewer people can ride it. The goal would be to extend the use of the grant dollars so the program can continue for a longer period.

Vice Mayor De Rosa stated that the challenges for SHARE and other providers is that they are start-up businesses. Some of them may not survive due to the economic conditions. They will have to have some minimums just to stay in business and pay their employees. It is a challenging time to be doing this. There needs to be mutual support or the operators will not survive long term.

Ms. Fox agreed it is a challenging time, but the gas prices are a savings for them. Council needs to understand that the grant funds are what feeds the program – there is not an additional amount of money coming from the General Fund.

Input and Feedback Regarding Publication of RFP by June 1, 2020 to select a micro-transit service provider for Phase 4 commencement.

Ms. Fox asked what Phase 4 will include.

Mr. Rayburn stated that Phase 4 was to commence in the spring, but was postponed due to the circumstances. They had discussion with COTA and SHARE about delaying the RFP until later in the year when there is more capacity for response. If the City does consider different providers, these companies have one way of operating, planning and implementing their micro-transit service. It requires about six months of work to do. With a six-month extension of this contract, providers will be in a better position to provide response to an RFP issued by the City. If we do want to go with another provider, we want to have adequate time to transition and implement their service.

Ms. Fox asked if this goes hand-in-hand with the fifth item of consolidation of existing funding for mobility projects and proposed spending plan in 2020? If an RFP is postponed for micro-transit service, wouldn't this fifth item come into play?

Mr. Rayburn responded that no. 5 speaks more to the bike share implementation monies that was slated for this year. Staff wanted to discuss using that money for micro-transit, as the source of the funding must be identified by the City before the reimbursement for services can occur through the grants. By using some of the bike share implementation monies, this would ensure good standing for the next couple months of the year.

Ms. Fox stated that by utilizing the bike share money to front the micro-transit service, it could continue through 2020 and the monies would be reimbursed through grants, and thereby the bike share monies would be reinstated. Is that correct?

Mr. Rayburn clarified that staff was proposing using this bike share funding for micro-transit, as implementation of any bike share program will not occur for two to three years. The monies could be used this year for micro-transit and bike share revisited later.

Vice Mayor De Rosa requested a simple one-page schedule of the monies in hand, what is projected to be needed, and some of the phasing – she is not sure what the committee is agreeing to do. She supports flexibility with the funding, but it would be helpful to see this on one page – dollars being rolled over, what is projected to be used from the workforce grants, and what we are not certain can be utilized from these funds. It would be very difficult to issue an RFP right now, as it would be difficult for anyone to respond. So delaying the RFP for a few months makes sense. She emphasized that having this information on one page would be very helpful – the funds available, the services to be delivered, and the timeframe associated with that.

Mr. Reiner stated he cannot envision the financial status of these services, perhaps due to the current situation. Instead of accessing such a large portion of the bike share monies for two years, he would prefer to review the situation again in a year or 18 months. He agrees with Vice Mayor De Rosa that it would be important to review on one schedule the monies, how they are being utilized, what portion is from grants and other sources. He does not understand the complete picture and therefore cannot make a judgment on this portion.

Ms. Fox agreed with the committee members about seeing the entire financial picture. She understands the bike share monies may not be used in the near future, but there might be other uses for it such as wayfinding. The current situation allows time to understand the financial picture and to have a plan in place to collect the data, advertise the services to more people and do marketing. She would like more financial information as discussed and more data about the people and use of the services.

Mr. Reiner asked if the program can be renamed to something such as “Go Dublin” or “Travel Dublin” or is it always tied to a company? Maybe it is a contract issue.

Mr. Rayburn stated they can revisit general branding for the service – it could have a Dublin name, with a tagline of “powered by X company,” for example.

Ms. Puranik noted that because this is a pilot program, it meant that talking with companies about using the shuttle was somewhat challenging. It was also challenging in terms of marketing and naming of the program, given it was only a pilot.

Ms. Fox agreed with Mr. Reiner that the SHARE program name does not encompass all that it provides and a name change would help to market the services.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Clerk of Council