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Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority (CIRTA)

February 9, 2021 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Held virtually via zoom and uploaded to Facebook

**Board Members Present:**

Nathan Messer

Christine Altman

Jerry Bridges

Andy Cook

Bill Ehret

Mark Richards

Linda Sanders

Robert Waggoner

Dan Woo

Larry Hesson

Greg Henneke

Cam Starnes

Andy Klineman

Marta Moody

**CIRTA Staff Present:**

John Seber

Jennifer Gebhard

DeAndre Rhodes

Sarah Troutman

The meeting was called to order by B. Ehret at 9:02 AM with a quorum.

**Introductions**

Introductions were made by the Board members, CIRTA/Commuter Connect staff and the public.

Introduction of newest board member Nathan Messer.

Consent Agenda Items presented for consideration:

Consideration of Memorandum of Regular Board Meeting of December 8, 2020

 Accounts Payable Voucher Register

Financial Report

**Consideration of Resolution #2021-02-9-01 – Adoption of Consent Agenda**

*J. Bridges made a motion to accept the consent agenda items. L. Sanders seconded. The motion was approved by all in attendance.*

B. Ehret explained to N. Messer that this goes fast and furious at the beginning but if he ever has any questions do not hesitate to ask them.

**Resolution #2021-02-09-02 – Resolution of Altman Pointdexter & Wyatt Invoices**

*R. Waggoner made a motion to approve the resolution, M. Richards seconded.*

*C. Altman abstained*

**Resolution #2021-02-09-03 – Resolution to Allow Designation of Approval of Resolutions.**

B. Ehret requested J. Seber to comment further.

J. Seber explained under the current COVID directive we all have challenges getting documents back and forth and there are sometimes delays of getting the approval signed off. This allows us to use the details we are gathering here by the board members voting and using the actual board meeting and minutes to utilize those resolutions and approves. This allows us to take what is voted on and document it and note that in for you as part of your signature approving or not approving. This speeds up the process under this current time frame. If we go back to in person meetings this will go easier. This will help for now and prevents the chaos of back and forth.

G. Henneke said it sounds like a good idea.

A. Klineman wanted to clarify the minutes will document the board members present that approved it.

J. Seber stated this will do away with electronic signatures and staff sending it out to have members sign it and send back. We will document here and send those back out to the board for review and finalization. It is a quicker way to get this done.

*G. Henneke made a motion to approve the resolution, M. Richards seconded. The motion was approved by all in attendance.*

**Resolution # 2021-02-09-04 Resolution Confirming 2021 Election of Officers**

B. Ehret moved to have positions stay the same for another year.

President: B. Ehret

Vice-President: M. Richards

Secretary: J. Bridges

Treasurer: L. Hesson

*L. Sanders made a motion to approve the resolution, M. Moody seconded. The motion was approved by all in attendance.*

**Resolution # 2021-02-09-05 Resolution Authorizing 2021 Signatories for Banking Purposes**

B. Ehret requested background information on this resolution.

J. Gebhard stated with John being full time Executive Director for CIRTA it would be most appropriate that we get him added to the bank account with herself. This is giving him the opportunity as the Executive Director to also be able to sign for checks in the case where two board members are not available to do so.

 B. Ehret asked if we have the standard, which we passed a couple of years ago, with certain caps.

 J. Gebhard stated that is correct. There have been caps set in the past. Jen’s cap is $10, 000.

 G. Henneke asked if we should add caps to this motion and if so, what would it be?

B. Ehret stated there are caps in place, he was not sure exactly what they are, but they are in line with an organization this size. The board passed it a couple of years ago.

G. Henneke asked if there is a separate finance committee from the executive committee?

B. Ehret stated there is not a separate finance committee.

*G. Henneke made a motion to approve the resolution, M. Richards seconded. The motion was approved by all in attendance.*

**Resolution # 2021-02-09-06 Resolution to Delegate Authority to the Executive Director to Enter into Contracts and Agreements on Behalf of the Board up to $30,000.00**

B. Ehret requested background information on this resolution.

J. Seber stated this would primarily be for small contracts for doing daily business and a lot with facility related issues, small annual contracts like insurance or small items that are under that dollar amount. Obviously if it went up to $30,000 there was a larger contract of some sort, he would still discuss with the Executive committee what we are doing but this is primarily for the small little things that go through.

B. Ehret asked how this compares to our previous resolutions where the Executive Director has caps on contracts like this?

 J. Gebhard stated that we had a similar agreement with Lori Kaplan previous director with the exact same dollar amount and same authority.

*J. Bridges made a motion to approve the resolution, R. Waggoner seconded. The motion was approved by all in attendance.*

**Resolution # 2021-02-09-07 Central Indiana Regional Transportation Authority 2021/2022 Salary Schedule**

B. Ehret turned over conversation to J. Seber.

J. Seber stated we are going back through as we are putting different policies in place, going through what is new this year and it looks like maybe 2020 this was missed. There was something done February 5, 2019 for 2019. What he did was include 2021 and 2022 because we are already into 2021. This takes us into 2022 with the salary ranges identified here. So that is what we are voting on today, to give approval of these ranges for this year and for next year.

B. Ehret asked if there were any questions.

*M. Richards made a motion to approve the resolution, J. Bridges seconded the motion. All in attendance approved the resolution.*

**Updates:**

**Legislative**

R. Cockrum said the Indiana General Assembly is in full swing notwithstanding the COVID crisis. They have made a lot of physical and process changes.  The committee testimony is done remotely via video cam.  Capitol Assets has reviewed over 1,000 bills to look at the impact to CIRTA and its members. A copy of our report has been submitted. In the Governor’s proposed budget, the Public Mass Transit Fund was flat lined which is good news. We expected cross the board cuts. There was an administrative cut last spring when the COVID crisis hit and we are trying to get it restored back to the original amount. The Ways and Means Committee releases their version of the budget this week and we are working with a coalition of transportation entities that communicate regularly to keep the funding level.  SB141 which penalizes IndyGo for failure to collect private donations is scheduled for a hearing.

G. Henneke asked Rick to remind us how much CIRTA gets of PMTF on a regular basis.

R. Cockrum stated he can give the generic amount at the state level was $44 million and by the time it breaks down to CIRTA someone else can answer that.

M. Henderson, CIRTA’s financial consultant, stated it is roughly between $27 -29 thousand in the last couple of years.

R. Cockrum then continued the 141 is being heard tomorrow. That is Freeman’s Bill to penalize IndyGo for not collecting the 10% private fare. It was in Transportation Committee, it got moved out and it got moved to appropriations Committee where it probably should have been in the first place because it is the case of notwithstanding the perception that the Conservatives run the Indiana Legislature. They are trying to appropriate local money, they are trying to control local zoning, they are trying to control local tax assessment and it is a big government move.

There is also a question, Senator Breaux had a bill also addressing the IndyGo distributions, but we are pretty confident that was just offered as a substitute for the Freeman. Hers is 2% his is at 10%. Negotiations continue with him between IndyGo, Indy Chamber, Us, and others. We will get a better feel tomorrow with what Chairman Mishler intends to do with it.

We are approaching a couple of key deadlines next Tuesday. Any bill filed in the House has to be out and on Thursday any bill filed in the Senate to be out of committee and at that point the list will drop off dramatically. We will continue to monitor amendments for these impacts. There was a bill beat yesterday that would have minimized CIRTA and everyone else having to advertise. Any public entity. The newspaper industry did not like it and it failed to pass which means it is eligible to come back for vote. There is also legislation dealing with electronic meetings and how those can be conducted go forward. We will continue to monitor those and keep you up to speed.

The impact to the members, there is everything from trying to limit you in what kind of pipe you use in construction, trying to limit local’s ability to require energy savings and building permits. They are trying to increase local truck weight for state roads which will put pressure on local roads. There is a bill again to give utilities more access to rights-of-ways and overriding local control. He thinks people remember what happened with the 5G towers and the fall out from that but that did not stop them from coming back and trying to open up utilities for broadband development, again without local approval. So, it is pretty much an onslaught on home rule, and we continue to work with AIM and AIC and every other local government entity to try to address those attacks.

B. Ehret asked for any questions from the board or any additional clarification? He asked what is the motivation behind the Freeman steps? It must be something other than just penalizing.

R. Cockrum answered from what I can gather Bill he’s not happy with some of the engineering designs for Washington Street. That does not mean he doesn’t also feel this other provision should be implemented. To refresh your memory, that 10% non-fare contribution came as a subsidy. In 2014 the Senate Republicans had a proposal to raise income taxes on corporations to pay for mass transit and the House said no way so their response was okay then we will create this foundation onset to raise money privately as there were no ramifications if you don’t do it, it virtually sat ignored for a few years and then Freeman came after it last year trying to force IndyGo to go out and get money from the private sector. As you recall it died on the last day, the last minutes of the session literally it died at 11:55 on the last night but it is back. We will start to sort out tomorrow. I know the IndyGo lobbyists and the Chamber and others are continuing to work on it. I think this is one, and I know Jen’s been involved, where Grassroots could really make a difference. Part of the problem is it is targeted at Marion County and as you can see in other legislation, they are targeting Marion County. They override the Governor’s veto yesterday to supersede Marion County ordinance on landlords. They have a lot of legislation trying to determine zoning to townships. There is a pretty big onslaught, not just on local government but much of it is specifically targeted towards the city of Indianapolis.

G. Henneke stated it seems to me that 10% was always a really high bar but I think the previous administration at IndyGo didn’t do anyone any favors by not even getting started on setting the foundation up and not trying. It made them awfully vulnerable and that is a shame. I hope the Chamber can win the day.

R. Cockrum replied it would be worth some thought, and was discussed back in 2014, is this a possible role for CIRTA to be an intermediary or fiscal agent to help do that with IndyGo or on behalf of IndyGo if they don’t have the resources or expertise to do it. But certainly, a way for CIRTA to try and look at adding value but it’s a really good point. Mark Fisher at the Chamber and I attempted two or three times over the last few years to try and put an amendment in just to repel that section, but at the same time, we were trying to be cautious to not call a lot of attention to it for what’s just happened.

G. Henneke stated it seems to me a reasonable solution could be to lower that bar to something that might be achievable and then whatever we can do to help IndyGo really get on it. Because raising money is hard any time, especially now and especially for a cause like this.

B. Ehret stated this is Segway into the next update. There were discussions recently like a month or so ago where CIRTA potentially having a role and clearly from my chair we are not a fundraising organization. It is really hard to fundraise. But we are a supportive organization so I’m turning this over to Jen and then John will add his report some of the things that CIRTA has done to help support IndyGo in this process.

**Public Relations**

J. Thomas started with a point of clarification, today is Tuesday so that Senate hearing is on Thursday. The Chamber and MIBOR and other groups that you might recall during the referendum operated under Transit Drives Indy has really rejuvenated itself and they’re asking for organizations to sign on to a letter that John signed onto on behalf of CIRTA. The letter says that they support the law in place, that overturning it would be a bad idea. We can share that language; you probably want to see that. We’ve done some social media posts supporting transit it general without getting to in the weeds, because she thought Greg is right there are a lot of things IndyGo could have done to help itself but from what she understood talking with folks from IndyGo, Senator Freeman’s also got a bug in his ear on West Washington St. There is a small but vocal group of small business owners who don’t like the center running lanes and they have organized and are chatting up those Senators who have decided this whole thing will hurt small businesses. So, there is organized opposition that has gotten in his ear and I think that’s tiny part of why this is happening.

G. Henneke stated the center running lane was an issue for part of the Purple Line too and that got negotiated between the Councilors for that neighborhood and DPW was very involved in that and IndyGo and they finally worked that out so there may be some compromise that can be made there. The center running is so much cheaper than the outside running and that is why they’re doing it that way. I also think to judge IndyGo, judge the Ride Line as if COVID did not happen is really unfair.

J. Thomas agreed. One of the tactics they are using is all the infrastructure Dan Parked was quoted as saying on Washington Street alone, $90,000 worth of infrastructure alone comes with this transit investment.

G. Henneke asked $90 million?

J. Thomas answered sorry $90 million, yes, so if they want their roads repaired and sidewalks, which they do, they cannot have it both ways.

Jennifer continued, on the Commuter Connect side, Jennifer and I have been really focused on trying to keep our commuters, people who are still going to work in offices and work sites engaged with us. They are doing a heavier emphasis on social media and doing monthly contests. This month is a big one. We are running a contest around Facebook about what you love about your commute or did you find love on your commute. People who share a story will be entered to win, at the end of the month, an overnight stay at the new Bottleworks Hotel, which is coming out of our marketing budget, actually out of JTPR’s contract so that’s a big prize. Usually, we don’t have prizes that big, but we felt this one would generate some interest because it’s hot and new and it has. We are also in conversations with INDOT about what Commuter Connect can do during the North Split Project. If you’re not aware, they’re going to shut down, INDOT will shut down part of I70 and I65 through downtown and Jennifer and she had a call with the project managers and they have already included our information on carpools and vanpools in their mobility management plan but it is passive and they’d like to do something more direct about this is going to cause pain for those people still going to work and this would be a perfect time to try carpooling, if this affects your commute. They are working out exactly what that could be. There are funds to do advertising and they would love to co-op with them on that.

And then finally, they talked about in March or April doing a survey of the employers. There are 700 plus in the Commuter Connect database and they would like to do some sort of survey that would help them learn about their return to the workplace plans. Jennifer thought the question is how soon to do that because a lot of organizations still do not have plans. But she would like to get that information and then perhaps if there is a good response, share that information as a community resource since we are experts in how people get to work and when they are going back.

R. Cockrum stated if I might interject, I think that on the 141 issue of IndyGo funding it is critical that CIRTA is engaged. It sends a signal to the Statehouse that it’s more than just an Indianapolis issue, we are a regional transportation authority, and it doesn’t stop at the county line. Our job is to move people, and this impacts CIRTA and CIRTA impacts it. So, it is important that the CIRTA board and CIRTA be engaged in this as we have been.

B. Ehret stated again, I can only report that every step of the way we have been supportive so with that said any questions for Jen or any questions or comments about CIRTA’s role in supporting this?

J. Thomas stated I will put in the chat the link to the letter that MIBOR and the Chamber are sending out inviting organizations to sign on to.

B. Ehret stated the ask from the Board is if you are able to as an individual or as part of your organization be able to support the letter please do so.

R. Cockrum added I might recommend push it out to the employers that we work with. They are going to make a difference.

J. Thomas stated that would really help CIRTA become even more valuable to the players over at all of the organizations.

B. Ehret asked Jen and Sarah to follow up with recommendation in getting that support letter out to the employers they are working with.

**Commuter Connect**

J. Gebhard stated our outreach team for the last month has been herself and Sarah as we have one open position with the agency and Molly is on maternity leave. We are still doing events. Since our last board meeting, we have done employer events in the region. Considering activity has been slow with COVID and we have registered three new employers. Last quarter alone, out of our eight current vanpools, three of those started as brand-new vanpools, never on the road before. Right now, we are focused on networking, getting into employers as much as we can where social distancing can occur, and doing virtual meetings.

The last three weeks in December we did a Facebook ad campaign as a part of a previously budgeted contract with Affirm and we saw some great takeaways with that. In three weeks, we served 463,000 plus impressions, the number of times ads were seen by users who were not familiar before with Commuter Connect. Those ads generated 2,489 click throughs to our website to the Register Now page. Cost per click on the ads was $1.43 per click which is lower than the average which is $1.72. The ads generated 73 new likes to the Commuter Connect Facebook page.

Right now, we are continuing to network and looking at what we can do to partner with folks in the community for the summer and as people start to get back into the office.

**Mobility Management**

B. Ehret reminded the board these reports are in the electronic version of the packet and the resolutions are attached.

D. Rhodes started with the general information about the mobility management. The north/south Workforce Connector weekend service started on November 7th and ended on January 10th. That is seasonal. He and John are looking at running weekend service in the future throughout the year. They did see a little bit of success with ridership in November and December. At the end of December beginning of January, they saw a ridership dip because of the temporary workers were laid off right before and right after Christmas. Normally they work well into January, but it seems like they let them go early. DeAndre was not sure if that had to do with COVID or not.

They put out an RFP, coordinated admin and technology, that was published February 1st on Indy Star, Indystar.com, Recorder, Cirta.us, and it is also posted Transit Talent and will run through February 25th.

CIRTA is in the process of developing four new Connector Routes which are just in the discovery stages right now. John and DeAndre have had some presentations and seeing what people are needing and their wants are. They are hoping to get two of those out this year.

Ridership in south Plainfield for January 2021- 1333 Riders. 1568 Riders in December 2020. Slight decrease of 14.9%. Ridership in north Plainfield for January 20201-157. December 2020 riders-395. 60% decrease. Walmart HR did state they let a lot of people go early. Looking at trends from the first of February, it looks like the riders have picked back up in north Plainfield. Whitestown ridership for January 2021 was 500. December 2020 ridership was 724. 30% decrease. Looking at the trends nationally, COVID is continuing to impact ridership. Overall, we are below average nationally for decrease of ridership. We are 16% decrease and nationally it is 32% decrease. They are looking at ways to increase ridership and restructuring routes by adding some businesses to those routes, like the new Walmart Distribution Center that wants to be added to the north Plainfield route.

N. Messer asked with the EID, the process to set it up is hard and to expand it you have to redo it. Has the CIRTA board thought about being proactive and legislating that would allow a super voluntary annexation into an EID? We for example have people who have built after the fact and we have expanded our town borders and brought in new industrial areas and we are setting up separate deals. I think it could be beneficial to Plainfield also as it expands and businesses want to come in, we can get them as part of the EID and move forward. Obviously, that would require special legislation changes.

B. Ehret stated he will defer to J. Seber and R. Cockrum on how we might do that on a go-forward basis, but strategically it is the right question to ask and the right thing to try and approach.

J. Seber stated that is the challenge we are at now. Working with multiple counties and some new Connector services and they are all in different processes of the EID experience and has you know that can take some time to put together. We are looking at alternatives to that approach. Basically, what you are saying is how can we be more proactive in helping and reaching out and trying to establish this. This all just came to light within the last month, trying to look at other ways of doing this. We are going to have to dig further both legally and per Rich legislative basis on what action can we take but I think that is great. That is the challenge I see. CIRTA can obtain funding for their portion of the services and it is just working with these counties to help them and where that local match will come from. There is some homework we have to do in getting through this yet, but I like that approach in trying to move this forward.

B. Ehret stated to the board, the pilot programs for Workforce Connector we can come in with certain funding with a goal of having the timeframe to move to an EID like we did in Whitestown and Plainfield. If we can expedite it great, but there is still the vehicle so to speak to do these pilots where the need is with a good understanding there is support to create the long-term funding sources that are needed. Others on the board might want to comment with their experiences but I think that’s critical when we go to new areas, we have to make sure the long-term funding mechanisms are in place.

A. Cook stated three years ago we looked hard into trying to put together an EID and of course at that time legislator changed the rules which made it very difficult. I’m all-in favor of trying to overcome those obstacles. I know there was quite a bit of interest here in Westfield in that really brief time we tried to survey a lot of businesses. But the challenge we have for example here in Westfield is that we don’t have a few large employers. A good part of our business is hospitality which means we have a lot of restaurants and hotels that need workers badly but to corral the property owners with that many different businesses to buy into it is nearly impossible. Any clarifications or strategies that we could develop has an organization to help all these various communities wade through this EID process, I’m all on board with that.

B. Ehret replied well said. Any other comments?

R. Cockrum stated I like the idea. We do have to be careful as Mayor Cook pointed out that legislation three years ago was to abolish EIDs and we were able to fight that off and leu of abolishment they did add restrictions, but I’m intrigued by the idea being able to expand it particularly if it’s a request by an employer, we should pursue that. I think Buchanan has Whitestown and is Representative Shively your House member?

A. Cook answered if you’re taking about Westfield, yes, the west side of Westfield is Shively

B. Cockrum asked who’s the Representative for Whitestown?

N. Messer answered we have Shively and Buchanan.

B. Cockrum replied right. Either one of those, maybe you and I can talk offline, put something in a tax bill that quietly says if an employer wants to join an EID voluntarily here is how they do it. We don’t want to use the term annexation because that’s contaminated as the Mayor can affirm but if someone wants to join an existing district voluntarily why would the legislator not.

N. Messer stated you can start a small one and then slowly expand that making it easier to meet those hard requirements. We struggled and we were in the eleventh hour and not sure if we were going to make it or not. It’s definitely hard to do. Having that ability to expand, we had to miss out on all of the real estate, retail, hotels, we just couldn’t get them fast enough to put it together. But now they all want in so if we could have established it and then slowly add them in it would have really opened it up.

A. Cook stated the irony on all this, that I hope we can play on, is that the legislator in its anti-transit mode, has basically said to us all we don’t believe in public funding of transit so therefore if you guys want transit it needs fair, supported, and/or user supported in some way. They also give us this tool to in essence take it, so it is funded the way they wish but at the same time they make the rules harder and harder.

G. Henneke stated it sounds to me like theres a better chance of something happening if it’s not connected to downtown Indianapolis.

B. Ehret stated great discussion. Thanks for those comments. John, I’m going to flip it back to you. We may run over this hour timeframe, be patient with us.

**Executive Director**

J. Seber stated keeping our discussion going on some of these new contracts that DeAndre was talking about, he wanted to talk about 5307 as we sit today. Last week we had our first meeting with IndyGo to discuss our split letter for this year. He felt it went very well. They heard what we had to say, and this includes the three new routes we want to roll out and it goes back to what we were just talking about with EID development and where people are along the process. What he needs to come back with on his next meeting with IndyGo is letters of intent from some these counties of their commitment portion of the contributions. There not balking at what we’re asking for and they understand what we’re doing but what he is trying to do is get a year of funding upfront because some of these may start in July, some might be in October or December as well as January and John doesn’t want to get to January where someone is ready to go and then we’re back discussing next year’s split letter and he doesn’t have funding. John thinks it looks positive right now but some of the roadblocks are exactly what we were just talking about. Working with these counties he can see some that are more receptive in pushing the EID and others that, when we’ve had discussions are a little more hesitant. We are working on some other options and hopefully next meeting he can share a little more.

The 53 allocation, almost a two-year project, and some recipients that the IMPO has been leading with the counties. IMPO hosted on February 2nd a tech meeting and it was the final review of the RLS audit and the IMPO input on what the allocations look like for the counties as well as the timeline implementation once an administrator is picked and what needs to happen from there. During this meeting, John asked a question to the IMPO if it was properly vetted, meaning that both county commissioners and the county providers were included in this. My first meeting was my third day on board with CIRTA back on September 30th. He joined that meeting about 10 minutes late but when he did join it was very chaotic and the providers were speaking up even then that they were still confused on how the funding looked, how it would work as well as they weren’t sure if their counties even wanted to be a subrecipient and if they’ve had those discussions. The IMPO did respond to my question, they said since then they have been properly vetted. They have had group meetings and they’d be surprised if there were any additional questions. Right after that Gary Poole from Hancock County spoke up and said they weren’t sure they wanted to be a subrecipient and wanted to know what his options were and understand the financial side as far as what they were getting. The IMPO came back said there is still time to discuss that and they gave direction to the providers last year to reach out to the commissioners. The document the IMPO put out last week on Tuesday, on page 43 it states that all subrecipients should be identified by the end of 2020. John’s concern is that there is still some confusion by some of the providers and understanding what that allocation looks like as well as potentially all the commissioners haven’t been involve. There is a procurement timeline that needs to happen in March and April. Maybe this wasn’t completed properly in identifying who that was, and it may put it behind and push people quicker through this year. John stated if he were heading that, last year he would have had group meetings with everyone and broke it out into sections. Here is the allocation by county, do you agree with option A, B, or C? What do you think works best? Are you going to be the subrecipient and if so, who is your finance team? It will be interesting to see what comes of that. For the administration piece, John had a call last Friday that had the providers on the call, and they had 15 minutes to ask questions. There were basic questions asked. If you remember our board meeting in November taking about our administration and what we would include at the cost for doing the administration and some additional services, we would provide to help. IndyGo then came back after that change with what they had initially stated saying that would do it for free. We received notice late last night the IMPO, based on their review with the providers, is recommending IndyGo for the administrator on a 3 to 1 vote. That will be determined on the IMPO February 17th policy meeting along with the final allocation and subrecipients document that was sent out last week. John was disappointed if it does come to this vote because he was looking forward to helping these providers, being in the communities and really understanding what they need, the resources, and everything we could work together on.

B. Ehret wanted to clarify what J. Seber meant by the providers. There were four service providers that were on the call Friday. That was Sycamore in Hendricks/Morgan, Access Johnson County, Janis in Hamilton County, and Hancock Senior Services. Those four providers were asked to make a recommendation and that vote was 3 to 1 based on IndyGo saying they could do it for $0 and we were charging an administrative fee that was just our true cost to provide manpower and resources. What I think we’ve all learned since this came out late last night, is that the commissioner by not be aware of that vote. Not sure where it goes from here. If Hamilton County says they prefer CIRTA that they can bifurcate. It’s not a majority vote, one or none. Let’s get some input from the board.

C. Altman stated she is confused because she knew nothing about that vote or that they were even having a meeting. It has to be predatory on this process. Hamilton County has firmly said we want CIRTA to administer. Who was the No vote, John? Do we know?

B. Ehret replied Janis voted no.

C. Altman replied okay, that is consistent with what commissioners want to do. I would suggest all representatives talk to the commissioners if you’re not a sitting commissioner with this group because there’s all kinds of stuff going on behind the scenes that commissioners are being excluded and the commissioners are the executive of the county. I find it offensive.

G. Henneke stated the good news is, especially if people make sure their representatives on the policy committee and MPO know your feelings, the policy committee in my experience has always been pretty good at vetting things and putting them where they should be regardless of what technical committee or even staff says. I have a lot of trust in that policy committee.

L. Hesson replied I had a conversation with Bill last night after he had received the letter from Anna, and I contacted the President of Hendricks County Commissioners to ask some questions advise her what happened, and I was advised the Board of Commissioners was not involved in the selection of an administrator. Sometime back in the summer, the director of the provider did advise the commissioners there would be a change in the funding, how it was distributed and so forth, but nothing since then. It came has a surprise to her to learn that Hendricks County had decided to go with IndyGo. She asked that I contact the county Executive Director this morning, so I went to Danville first thing this morning to talk with him. He confirmed there had been no decision made by the commissioners and no information provided to the commissioners since that meeting back in the summer. I agree with Christine, I think this is a travesty that the commissioner who only ones authorized to enter into any contract by statute have been bypassed. I’m concerned about the process.

J. Bridges replied I had similar concerns and we had discussions at the Executive Committee and also offline. The concern I had tasked John to do a short quick summary of the commissioners after Christine had brought this item to our attention and all of them had the same story. I think the other thing about it is if you look at the resolution that the Tech Committee passed for IMPO it’s basically a cart blanch in terms of the authority that could be exercised by the Executive Director and I have a real issue with that considering that it’s impacting at this time four counties and the decision makers who sign those contracts at the county level have not be apprised to what’s going on. We’re the administrator for the service for our county and we have a contracted provider. We would never do that in terms of not going to the commissioners and getting input because they have to approve it. They know in advance. We give them basically monthly updates now in terms of service, that is one of the new requirements. This is a small point as well, but part of that 5307 money is in the southwestern portion of Madison County and there was no discussion about that in the report. Nor where is that money going to end up. From our prospective, and I can’t specifically say this for commissioners, but I think they would agree, if that money is not going to stay in Madison County then it needs to go to CIRTA because IndyGo is never going to provide service up here. We do get service from CIRTA. It’s not a large amount of money but it’s been basically idled. I will tell you at times, even though we get alone with our peer fairly well, they do things like that. The report was miss in regard to that as well.

B. Ehret stated there was also a letter that we sent, because again with this timing thing with IMPO’s calendar and these meetings, John sent is February 2nd and there was this thing on Friday and prior to that I was under the impression some of this stuff would be handled on February 17th so we sent a letter out. IMPO responded to that also in the email last night and John has forwarded that to each of you and in that letter the IMPO does say that they the service providers would communicate with the commissioners. They didn’t’ see that as their rule. They felt like that process had been handled by the service providers in the counties. Any other questions or comments? I wanted to put some context around that for you John, in the timing and I do know, again, this board in its representation of the region in mass, is very important to do the communication from what we know today going forward until this thing finally gets resolved.

G. Henneke stated I’d like to add one thing Bill. This has been confusing, having these people go from rural funding to urban funding, which it’s been in the past just 5307 just shared by IndyGo and CIRTA but don’t forget this is just about the administration of the money that has been previously done on the rural side by INDOT. It’s not providing the service it’s administering the money.

B. Ehret replied Greg makes a great point and that’s one of the things I want to say, too, this is administration of the money. Good point Greg. As CIRTA has grown into its role that it is designed to fill throughout the region this issue becomes very relevant to how CIRTA’s role should be perceived in the region as an administrator.

C. Altman stated it is just inconceivable to me that IndyGo first wants to charge a fee and then says oh we’ll do it for free when it has competition. There has to be some underlying reason why we have this anti-competitive action and that’s all I can describe it as. Anti-competitive and offensive. It’s not like out of the kindness of their heart, the whole thing appears to be orchestrated which raises a big red flag to me. So, someone needs to explain how this doesn’t ultimately drive down to some other benefit.

J. Bridges stated there are two other IMPOs that are on this board. The MPO’s role is program money. It’s not to administer this type of money and it never has been. I’m not going to tell you that might not happen in some other regions. SANDAG is involved financially in regards to transit but SANDAG contracts service providers and has a huge staff and that’s San Diego’s MPO and it operates substantially different than any MPO that we have in Indiana. Their role is to program it, not to distribute it and it’s not to make that determination. I’d like to just throw out an ideal that CIRTA should be one of the entities or at a minimum all the entities should sit down and look at the allocation and approve annually what the split should be and they can keep track of the data and they can do it all their self. The MPO’s do that and I don’t know why you can’t do that with this as well.

B. Ehret replied in defense of the IMPO, I will tell you they don’t want to be in this position as a referee between IndyGo and CIRTA on administration funds and 5307 funds. For the Board, the IMPO has been put in this position, we’re not sure if all the communications have been verified, probably has not, and I think that Jerry, your idea getting a small group in a room and figuring it out going forward is the right path. I’d like to recommend that Mayor Cook and I and Anna and John and a couple of people from IndyGo have an opportunity to do that so it’s in the best interest of the region.

J. Seber stated that he wanted to talk about the RFP that DeAndre was speaking about. The RFP was just put out and we are going to be working with a contract for consulting firm that will be working with all the counties and providers in efforts to identify dispatching, scheduling, tracking, fare collection, real time software options that can be used throughout the region. This goes back to our original five-year plan with the centralized dispatch, but not centralized dispatch being people sitting in a CIRTA office dispatching everything. Along with this, part of this review is also reviewing the provider strength and weaknesses identifying opportunities for training or sharing of staff between the agencies in a cooperative effort to reduce deficiencies and improve the efficiencies. DeAndre and John have spent time out and understand what software they’re using, how they are using it, the good bad and difference and they have reviewed twelve new software programs just to get an idea of what’s out there. The scope of this will be to identify the challenges the counties have, to identify software needs-what the minimum requirements are, and trying to find a cost-effective program that can be shared throughout the region that has modules built in. Using mobile tablet or if they are still doing stuff with paper manifests, they can add those in as they develop and grow. We are trying to find that resource and knock it down to a couple, three software programs with pricing. The idea then would be to meet with providers and see what they like and then another potential RFP down the road for procurement of the software and they would pay their portion of that program. Right now, each county will often send a vehicle into another county because they have to drop someone off and dead heads back. This is not efficient use of the vehicle or time. The dispatch portion will make it more efficient and improve communications between the counties. This will also improve the passenger experience being able to see real-time where the vehicle is. John and DeAndre hope to award this sometime in April with findings later this year hopefully around September or October and then budget accordingly the following year. John is happy to be a part of this working with the counties.

B. Ehret stated this was a fantastic conversation/discussion and he appreciated all the board input and support as we continue to improve mobility options in our region.

**Adjournment**

*Motion to adjourn meeting by G. Henneke and seconded by J. Bridges at 10:17am.*

*All in attendance were in agreement.*

‘