Working Group to Identify Lake County Paratransit Lead Agency

March 11th, 2020
600 West Winchester Road, Libertyville, IL Main Conference Room
1:00pm

Meeting Minutes

Working Group Members Present: Steve Carlson, Lake County Board; Jessica Hector-Hsu, RTA (Advisory Member); Kathleen O'Connor, Libertyville Township (Working Group Vice-Chair); Shane Schneider, Lake County/LCDOT (Alternate Member); Linda Soto, Lake County Director on the Pace Board (Working Group Chair); Bethany Williams, Lake County Partners

Working Group Members Absent: Mayor Leon Rockingham Jr., City of North Chicago; Terry Wilke, Lake County Board

Other Attendees: Emily Gelber-Maturo, LC Health Department; Jennifer Serino, LC Workforce Development; Kisha Hearn, Pace; Gary Scott, Pace; Shirleyann Russell, Dimensions HHC; Kevin Carrier, LCDOT; Joe Surdam, LCDOT

1. **Call to Order & Introductions**

Linda Soto called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. Before getting into introductions, Linda proceeded onto agenda items two and three. After completing agenda items two and three, Linda proceeded with introductions by giving the meeting's guest from McHenry County, Scott Hennings, an opportunity to introduce himself. Scott works for McHenry County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) and noted that his colleague, Susan Borcuki, who was unable to attend the meeting, prepared the materials and MCRide presentation. Susan is involved in the day-to-day work for the MCRide program. Self-introductions for the Working Group members shortly followed.

2. **Agenda Changes & Announcements**

Linda Soto asked the Working Group for any agenda changes or announcements. No changes to the agenda or announcements were raised.

3. **Approval of the Meeting Minutes from January 21, 2020**

Linda Soto asked for a motion on the approval of the meeting minutes from January 21st, 2020. A motion was made by Kathleen O'Connor with a second by Steve Carlson. On a unanimous voice the meeting minutes were approved.

4. **MCRide Presentation on Paratransit Service and Group Discussion**

Scott Hennings began the presentation by delving into how he is going to discuss the MCRide program, beginning with an overview on how the program works and how it is different from surrounding County paratransit systems, followed by transitioning into the history of how they arrived to the current state of the program, and close with some of the program's successes and hurdles. MCRide is pronounced "M-C-Ride" and stands for McHenry County Ride. With MCDOT

serving as the staff lead, the program is primarily a curb-to-curb service, demand-response, and allows for door-to-door service if a rider requests additional help. Flexible routing and trip reservation in advance are provided as well. The program is different from other surrounding County programs in that the service is provided to seniors who are 60 years of age and older, individuals with disabilities ,and what the program terms the general public as, which includes anyone who is not a senior or an individual with a disability. The program does not discriminate based on sponsor or age either. The program does not limit trip purpose, meaning individuals can use the service for any means, and shared rides are included as well. Regarding the program's hours of operation, the program does not operate 24/7, only operating from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Weekdays and from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Weekends. Steve Carlson asked if there is an income eligibility criterion for the program. Scott answered that there is no income requirement existing today but noted that there have been discussions held on an income requirement, but the County Board has not decided to implement it.

Scott Hennings transitioned to a map displaying MCRide's service area. The areas of the County shaded in color represent the program's service area. The program is not a truly countywide program currently. The areas colored green indicates the service is available for anyone to use. The origin and destination of a rider's trip must be within the areas colored green. The areas colored tan indicates which townships are participating in the program. The service is only available to seniors and individuals with a disability who are within a participating township. In summary, there is a two-tier service area or level and there is a greater geographic coverage for seniors and individuals with a disability. Kathleen O'Connor asked how the areas colored green were determined and whether they were based on population. Scott responded that these areas were not based on population and that the participating cities were typically recruited by MCDOT and took on the responsibility of providing service to the general public for the cities. For several of the major roadways in the County, MCDOT buffered some of the corridors because there were already bus services going along the major roadways. It made sense for MCDOT to provide service to the people along the major roadways. The decision to have the program provide service to the cities was made in 2010. Cities are brought in a as a general public service and if a township joins the program, they are typically brought in providing service to their respective seniors and individuals with a disability. Bethany Williams asked what do the stars on the map represent. Scott responded that the stars represent point destinations. Point destinations give riders the opportunity to travel to a specific location that is not within the service area. Majority of the point destinations are conservation district properties. Point destinations are typically added one-at-a-time as well.

Scott Hennings transitioned to the PowerPoint slide titled "How do I Schedule a Trip?". Riders must call the coordinated call center, located in the City of McHenry, to schedule a trip. The coordinated call center is shared with Lake County Services and there is one phone number riders are instructed to call no matter where they reside in the County. The general public can reserve up to two days in advance of a trip and seniors or individuals with a disability can reserve up to a week in advance of a trip. The program does allow same day reservations if there is space available, but it is preferred that riders call for a reservation at least 24-hours in advance. For individuals with a disability, the program has no policy in place on what is considered a disability as well. All riders that have a disability is self-reported.

Scott Hennings transitioned to the PowerPoint slide covering MCRide's fares and hours of operation. The program's Pace fare structure is distance-based and charges half-price for riders who are seniors or an individual with a disability. For general public riders, the fare is $3.00 for the first five miles

and $0.25 for each additional mile after the first five miles. The program is not in operation for roughly five or six holidays throughout the year. The program only accepts cash-payments, but fare cards are available for purchase through MCDOT. Fare cards are sold at $3.00 apiece.

Scott Hennings transitioned to the PowerPoint slide titled "What Else Should I Know". MCRide's service is provided through buses and taxis. Steve Carlson brought up a scenario-related question on what will happen if a senior thinks their trip is under three miles but the trip itself turns out to be five miles and the senior only has $3.00 on-hand. Scott responded that when riders call the coordinated call center, the call center calculates the cost of the trip for the rider allowing the rider to know in advance how much their trip will cost. If a rider does not have enough money for their scheduled ride, Scott believes that Pace won't turn the rider away, especially in a scenario that involves getting a rider back home. Regarding the program's subscriptions, the program does allow riders who need daily rides whether for work or medical-related trips. The program imposes a limitation on the number of subscription trips however. Subscriptions allows a rider to have the service set up to pick up the rider at the same time everyday and take the rider to the same destination during the weekdays instead of having to call every day to schedule a trip. Steve asked if the rider's ability to be picked up every day and taken to the same destination is reliable. Scott responded that it is reliable and believes approximately 40% of trips taken are for work purposes. Although reliable, Scott noted that he doesn't believe it is convenient due to a lot of riders still having to call every day to schedule a trip until they are able to get a subscription offered to them. There are some instances where the bus service runs late as well. Shane Schneider asked who is responsible for making the decision on whether a bus of taxi is assigned to pick up a rider. Scott responded that when a rider is screened over the phone for any mobility limitations and no limitations are found, Pace will then determine the lowest cost between using a bus or taxi and select the lower costing vehicle to pick up the rider. If a rider is in a wheelchair, Pace will only send a bus to pick up the rider. There is a secondary screening that entails which provider is cheaper at the time as well. Scott noted that a lot of taxis are used for longer trips due to cost-efficiency.

Scott Hennings transitioned to the PowerPoint slide titled "Our Riders". General public riders account for approximately 27% of the total trips. Scott noted that the client type data is dependent on the riders self-reporting and stating whether they are a senior or have a disability. Scott believes that a good portion of riders who are classified as general public are seniors or do have a disability. The program accommodates for a large variety of trip purposes as well.

Scott Hennings transitioned to the PowerPoint slide titled "Expenses & Such". MCRide's annual service cost is roughly $2.2 million, and roughly half of the amount is covered by Pace subsidy. The average cost per ride is roughly $20.00. When the program originally started, the County paid great attention to the farebox recovery ratio. The ratio currently has been less of a factor to the County however.

Scott Hennings transitioned to the PowerPoint slide titled "History of MCRide". Before the program began there were a lot of dial-a-ride services in place within cities and townships, but the services did not allow for a rider to travel beyond their respective city or township. In 2008, the County Board started to get more involved in transit with the help of a few township supervisors who were interested in transit issues. Scott noted that most of the County services reside in the City of Woodstock, no fixed-route services are in place, and only a few buses operate during peak hours. Dial-a-ride was essentially all the County had regarding bus service and limited options were available for riders to travel from city to city. In response to the County's existing state of transit,

MCDOT with the help of their steering committee known as the Implementation Task force overlaid their pilot program on top of City of Crystal Lake, City of Woodstock, and City of McHenry dial-a-ride services. The purpose of the Implementation Task Force was to implement a transit plan conducted in 2010. The County committed to paying for the cost of trips taken between the three cities. If the origin and destination of a trip remained within a single city, the respective city would be responsible for covering the cost of the trip. The overarching reason the County overlaid their service with the three dial-a-ride services was to get an understanding on the demand for transit between the cities. The County discovered that the demand was expensive. Between 2010 and 2012, the County had a well-understanding of how many residents wanted to travel between the cities. Scott believed the costs were roughly over a half-million annually for the County. In 2012, the County felt comfortable with having enough data collected and moved forward with rebranding. The County service overlaid with the three cities' dial-a-ride services was rebranded into MCRide. The consolidation of the services led to one phone number, one call center, and streamlining of the fare structure. The rebranding phase was important due to the County holding Intergovernmental Agreements with Pace and the service being provided locally. MCDOT was essentially the liaison between Pace and the local cities. Serving as a liaison resulted in requiring significant staff time and effort for MCDOT. MCDOT had a dedicated staff member work through the issues and conduct billing. At the time, Pace would send MCDOT a bill and MCDOT would have to determine how much of the bill is attributable to the local cities. To determine how much of the bill is attributable to the cities, MCDOT would have to calculate how many trips were taken within the cities, apply MCDOT's federal funds received to deduct the billing cost from the city's share of the cost, and following up through sending the cities a bill. Scott noted this process took time to complete, considering MCDOT had a federal grant and County service to keep track of in addition. Scott added there were instances where it would take himself a week to complete all the billing and manipulate the data to create an invoice for one month's worth of the service. Steve Carlson asked whether a city was billed for the point of origin only. Scott responded that a city was billed for both the point of origin and destination if the trip's point of origin and destination were both within the rider's respective city. If the origin of the rider's trip was in one city and destination was in another city, the County would then be responsible for covering the cost of the trip. Scott noted this payment structure was in place from 2012 to 2015. In 2015, there was a lot of demand from small cities that wanted to participate in the program, but these cities didn't have many destinations for riders to travel to. MCDOT understood that if the same payment structure continued, majority, if not all trips originating in these smaller cities would have a destination in another city that was larger and having more destinations, resulting in the smaller cities not having to be responsible for the cost of trips since the County covered the cost of inter-community trips. To avoid the dilemma of smaller cities not being responsible for covering the cost for majority of the trips, MCDOT had to change the existing payment structure. With consideration of a fair cost for the smaller cities, MCDOT changed the payment structure starting out with charging the smaller cities based on population. Scott believed the cost attributed to the cities was $1.00 per capita. No limitations were imposed on the number of trips taken for cities who payed their population fee. Scott noted basing the payment structure on population worked out okay, but there were many cities who weren't as wealthy as others, resulting in some cities being unable to afford the $1.00 per capita fee. In response to the financial struggle for some cities, MCDOT looked to Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) who had developed cohorts assessing the financial need of communities in the region. With influence from CMAP's cohorts, MCDOT developed a sliding scale based on how wealthy the community was. For example, with the sliding scale in place, wealthy communities (classified as a low need community) were paying $1.45 per capita whereas the not-as-wealthy communities (classified as a high need community) were only paying $0.85 per capita. The program is currently

still using population as a stand-in for transit demand but with recognition that not all communities can afford the same fee. Steve asked if there is a cutoff for when communities are eligible to receive a discount on the program's fee. Scott responded that the discounts were based on CMAP's cohorts and added that the sliding scale of the community's payments did result in tough questioning from the communities.

Scott Hennings continued with the payment structure of MCRide noting communities with Pace legacy subsidies changed when the Village of Huntley, who did not have a Pace legacy subsidy and has a large senior population, participated in the program. In 2015, the County made it a priority to remove Pace legacy subsidies communities had. The subsidy provided currently is a MCRide subsidy. The previously existing Pace legacy subsidies were consolidated into one large pot of subsidy money, totaling approximately $1.2 million to this day. Steve Carlson followed up asking whose decision it was to consolidate the Pace legacy subsidies. Scott responded that MCDOT advocated for this change and the communities who had Pace legacy subsidies understood the fairness of the change. Kathleen O'Connor asked about the process of the subsidy change and who initiated the change. Scott responded the change never reached the elected officials and was primarily carried out at the MCDOT staff level. MCDOT staff led the effort working with municipal staff, who in turn were able to sell the change to their respective elected bodies. Kathleen followed up asking of any issues occurring when communities who did not want to be part of the change to the subsidies and what was Pace's position in terms of if a community not wanting to participate taking their subsidy with them. Scott responded that the communities who originally had a Pace legacy subsidy never once expressed the desire to leave or not be part of the program. Scott added that there was one village who pulled out of the program for financial-related reasons and one township who pulled out roughly a year or two ago for similar reasons. Referred by Scott as the "Big Five", which includes City of Crystal Lake, City of McHenry, City Woodstock, City of Harvard, and City of Marengo. The Big Five, who had Pace legacy subsidies never expressed a desire to leave the program with the change and were ecstatic that the service exists. Linda Soto brough up a scenario-based question asking if she is a Village of Lakewood (non-participating community) resident and calls the one phone number all riders are instructed to call regarding scheduling trips, what will she be told. Scott responded that if a resident from Village of Lakewood is a senior or individual with a disability, they are still able to receive a ride due to the Village of Lakewood residing in being a participant in the program. In the same scenario, if the resident is not a senior or an individual with a disability, they will be told that they are not eligible for the service. If the non-senior or individual with no disability were to walk within the service's coverage area, they can then schedule a trip however. MCDOT advises residents who reside in non-participating communities to reach out to their respective village board expressing desire for their community to become a participant in the program. The program is an opt-in model, meaning the community must want to become a participant in the program and to pay into the program. The program is not based on residency, allowing for residents residing in non-participating communities to be eligible for the service so long as they request to be picked up within the service's coverage area. Steve asked if proof of residency is required. Scott answered that no proof is required. Linda followed up asking an additional scenario-based question, asking if a resident is located in Algonquin Township (non-participating member) and called to schedule a trip, what would happen. Scott responded that the call center would state the service is unable to provide service to the rider and recommend that the resident talk to their township about participating in the program. In situations where residents reside in non-participating communities or townships, the call center will often refer to calling MCDOT staff, who in turn suggests to the resident to reach out to their respective community or township about participating in the program. Scott added that this has been effective in getting communities and townships to join the program.

Linda Soto asked if MCDOT is doing all the billing. Scott Hennings confirmed this is the case and added that the work required to complete the billing now is easy but was difficult from 2012 to 2014 due to MCDOT having to attribute all the trips taken within communities and townships. The change to the population-based model to attribute the costs of trips has worked out greatly from a staff perspective. Steve Carlson followed up asking if any villages extrapolate how much they are paying into the program and only having a certain number of rides. Scott confirmed that the villages do extrapolate but noted it hasn't been a reason for why communities or townships drop out of MCRide. Scott continued with stating the program provides service in Kane County due to the Village of Huntley requesting to have their entire village be covered by the service. The program provides service in Lake County through point destinations as well. Kathleen O'Connor followed up asking what the County budget is. Scott responded that the County budget is $1.2 million annually for their local share of costs. Pace bills the County approximately $80,000 monthly. The County's $1.2 million annual budget is allocated towards the $80,000 monthly bills issued from Pace. The County gets reimbursed from participating cities, townships, and the Section 5310 Federal Grant. Steve followed up asking what percentage the County gets reimbursed. Scott answered the cities, townships, and the Federal Grant reimburse most of the cost and noted that the County's final share of the total cost has been roughly $100,000 to $200,000 annually over the past few years. Prior to the past few years, the County's share of the total cost was significantly higher as well. Scott added that the reimbursement doesn't account for MCDOT's staff time and roughly one full-time staff person is required to complete the billing, answering phone calls, marketing, giving presentations, and creating Intergovernmental Agreements. Kevin Carrier followed up stating the County's cost fluctuates over ridership. Scott confirmed that this is the case and noted that the cities do have certainty in the cost with the population-based model. If ridership doubles in a year, the cities remain responsible for only covering the cost associated with the population-based model. The additional costs associated with the doubling of ridership in a year is to be covered by the County. The budget allocated by the County annually includes the RTA Sales tax as well. Scott continued with noting that townships are under the population-based model but there is no need-based formula available for the townships due to data being non-existent. Steve followed up asking whether MCDOT bills the townships and the cities within the township. Scott confirmed this is the case. Kathleen raised a question about who would assume the costs in unincorporated areas. Scott responded that it varies on who assumes that cost.

Scott Hennings transitioned to the PowerPoint slide titled "Operational Performance Metrics". MCDOT is working with Gary Scott, Kisha Hearn, and Pace on how to keep Pace on task and completing tasks the County Board would like to see carried out. No performance measures tracking MCRide's service exists to this day but is being discussed for implementation going forward and establishing steering committees that are responsible for covering trip durations, trip denials, and the installation of new technologies is being considered. Steve Carlson followed up asking why the program would deny a trip. Scott replied that there are three different types of denials; Eligibility, Capacity, and Adversarial are the three types of trip denials. Scott added that not a lot of new technology has been implemented into the program. Kathleen O'Connor followed up asking if there is anything Scott had wished been done differently if given the option. Scott responded that there is an issue that one village board member can hold up an entire village from participating in the program and that the program is dependent on cooperation from village bodies, resulting in the program being unable to expand as much as they would like to. Kathleen followed up again asking a legislative-related question and whether municipalities should be obligated to unincorporated areas. Scott responded municipalities being obligated to unincorporated areas could be one solution

but noted that there is no perfect solution. Scott added that there have been discussions among elected officials and MCDOT about forgetting the entire payment structure of the program and having the County cover the entire local match of the Pace subsidy going forward. Steve followed up asking if a countywide system were to be incorporated and forgo municipal Pace subsidy what would the additional capacity service cost be. Scott responded that MCDOT does have estimates for this situation but couldn't give an exact figure at the time. Steve followed up again asking if MCDOT has reached out to large employers or medical facilities about participating in the program. Scott responded that he doesn't believe the private sector would contribute toward the program's funding. Linda Soto followed up asking if McHenry College is a point destination. Scott replied that the college is within City of Crystal Lake and that the service's coverage area includes the college and noted that there is a lot of ridership that travels to the college and is a major destination. Scott added Walmart, Jewel Osco, and Metra Stations are major destinations as well. Scott emphasized that the program is unique in that the program does not have sponsors and is truly a service for all individuals. Kathleen followed up asking if there are any issues with local services being a competing service. Scott answered that this is an issue but not necessarily a problem. Scott added that one of the reasons why communities are supportive of the program is that the cost of their own bus service in the past was roughly double the cost of the program's bus service and that communities are not always having to address questions posed by their residents related to the service, which is taken care of by the call center, Pace, and MCDOT. Linda followed up asking when the program became MCRide, how much was put into marketing. Scott responded that there is always more that they can do when it comes to marketing and noted MCDOT has one staff member, Susan Borucki, dedicated to these kinds of tasks. Linda followed up again asking what Pace does to help with marketing. Scott responded that the program does have a Community Relations Representative that attends Council of Government and village board meetings to give presentations. The RTA has an outreach person in Lake County and that staff member will often work with the Community Relations Representative as well giving presentations to community groups and senior centers. Scott noted that there is a MCRide brochure available and MCDOT has a webpage with information pertaining to the program. Shane Schneider followed up asking if MCDOT staff takes all the calls, what is the call number. Scott responded that the call center takes all the calls and then MCDOT staff takes all the calls that the call center cannot address. MCDOT staff will take calls that are not related to setting up a ride, more so on calls involving questions about the service. Steve followed up asking a scenario-related question that if Scott was on the Working Group panel what advice he would give regarding chronology and where the Working Group and RideLakeCounty is currently at and to reach where MCRide is now. Scott responded that the only way the County got heavily involved in transit back in 2010 was due to having a very active County Board and Chairman. Scott did note that it would take a County Official, a Mayor, or a Pace representative to make some changes. Linda followed up noting that one of the challenges the Working Group has on deciding on who is to pursue the changes and completing billing is that Lake County communities don't have bus services available. Kathleen noted that there are some municipalities who provide bus service for RideLakeCounty Central, there are fixed routes on the east side of the County, and that the west side of the County has been a challenge. Linda followed up noting there are communities with difficult budget challenges as well. Scott shared that communities in McHenry County share similar challenges and emphasized there needs to be a way to figure out for residents to travel to Lake County and for residents in Lake County to travel to McHenry County. Steve followed up asking if anyone has any idea on how many McHenry County residents work in Lake County and vice-versa. Linda replied believing roughly half of McHenry County residents must work in Lake County or must travel through Lake County to reach suburban Cook County. Jessica Hector-Sue followed up asking if there is another tax Scott would like to discuss. Scott responded that the County levies a small property tax annually called the Senior

Service Grant Levy which collects approximately $1.7 million annually. The Levy's mission is to fund services for seniors. The County Board has a commission they appoint who determines how the Levy's funds are allocated. From 2010 to 2016, the program did receive some funds from the property tax. In 2016, the program received $30,000 from the property tax and decided to discontinue receiving funds due to the billing. The program currently doesn't utilize the property tax. Steve suggested using the Winchester House Levy on Winchester Road. Scott continued noting that the big piece on how the program was able to overcome hurdles was done through the federal grant they received. Without the RTA and Section 5310 Federal Grant, the program wouldn't be able to charge communities and townships a low fee to be part of the program. Following the conclusion of the presentation, Linda opened the room for additional questions. Shirleyann Russell brought up Algonquin Township wanting the township to get on board with the program. Scott responded that MCDOT does reach out to them about participating in the program.

5. **Recap Previous Presentations and Discuss Next Steps**

Linda Soto transitioned to agenda item five and noted the Working Group has heard from all the other County programs and that there are no other guests she believes the Working Group can invite to the Working Group meetings at this time. Linda continued that she and Shane Schneider attended a recent meeting with County Board Chair Hart discussing the direction Lake County is going in regarding paratransit and a timeline. Linda noted that with the purpose of the Working Group being to provide a recommendation on what organization should be the Lead Agency, this task can be completed potentially through having one more Working Group meeting with a roundtable discussion. Shane followed up noting that the recommendation on the Lead Agency is something the Working Group must be comfortable with giving over the next two months until the next Working Group Meeting and stated LCDOT is going to process everything that has been learned at the Working Group meetings and outreaching for feedback going forward. Shane believes LCDOT is comfortable presenting to the PWPT Committee and hopeful in receiving County support for implementation. Shane expressed from his perspective that the new County model needs to maximize the buy-in from all parties and stakeholders that will be approached on joining the service. Shane noted at the start of the new County model there may not be a countywide service but that should be the framework and goal to strive for. Steve Carlson followed up stating the solution needs to be clear to the County Board, Municipal League, and communities. Steve suggested the Working Group needs the County Chair or County opinion leaders at the Working Group meetings to get more insight as well. Kathleen O'Connor followed up saying education and fostering good relationships is crucial towards moving forward, getting all parties and stakeholders to have a shared vision, and overcoming the perception that it is more difficult than it really is to achieve a new County model.

Jessica Hector-Sue noted that from hearing from the other County programs is that they are all different and suggested that Lake County needs to take multiple elements from the other County programs including being a transportation-provision model and a model that incorporates the needs of veterans and better human services. Jessica continued noting that it may be better to separate the provision of the service from who is purchasing the service when determining the structure of the new Lake County model. Jessica further suggested not to require everyone to contribute at the geographic and functional level, but rather separating the two. Kathleen O'Connor followed up stating positive things she found with MCRide including the service being transparent (noting the Lake County's current model is complicated) and suggested to think about an outcome the Working Group would like to see, whether it is a model that is more transparent or not. Kathleen noted Lake

County's current model is unable to provide communities who are looking to join the service on how much it would cost to participate and that there is no evident path to becoming able to do so. Bethany Williams followed up stating that from the Workforce Transportation perspective there is always the initial first few months of hire and the challenge of getting to a more sufficient state. Bethany added the first initial period has the potential to be a good learning tool going forward when leveraging other partners. From a private-sector perspective, Bethany noted the idea of a general public service and new County model being able to get anyone anywhere would be compelling.

Steve Carlson asked Jennifer Serino from Lake County Workforce what resources are available when working with companies on problems when residents can't reach a destination. Jennifer responded that getting to work and retaining workers is part of Lake County Workforce's solution and that childcare and transportation are the two biggest issues for any level of employee. Jennifer added that there is no perfect solution and that Lake County Workforce has looked at other examples of solutions around the country. The Lake County Workforce is communicating with surrounding County Workforces to get more insight and that they are working on an Uber and Lyft solution currently. Steve followed up asking Scott Hennings if MCDOT works with McHenry County Workforce or an equivalent partner. Scott responded that MCDOT does work with equivalent partners giving presentation on MCRide so that they are aware of how the program works and are able to communicate that to their respective employees. Scott has heard the perception of the program is not as reliable as they would like from an employee perspective, however.

Linda Soto continued with stating that the Working Group is tasked with determining who the Lead Agency will be and asked which way the group was leaning, specifically either the County or a 501C3 agency. Shane Schneider followed up stating that through the Working Group meeting discussions he has not seen a 501C3 agency that would be appropriate for the Lead Agency nor one that is available. Steve Carlson expressed if the Working Group recommended the County being the Lead Agency, no one would be surprised of the decision and emphasized that the recommendation needs to be stressed that is possible for the County to be able to handle being the Lead Agency. Shane followed up stating one of the key things discussed a few weeks prior to the meeting was the role and responsibilities and that the definition of who the Lead Agency is has changed since the start of the Working Group meetings. Shane stressed the importance of delineating the responsibilities and from his perspective the County model will be a joint venture between Pace and the County. Shane continued that a lot of the staff work MCDOT conducts shouldn't be carried out by LCDOT. Kathleen O'Connor followed up stating that she believes that the role of the Working Group is to make a recommendation and that the specifics would be handled at the County level. Agreeing with Kathleen, Shane added that before the proposal for a new County model is taken to the County Board, it will need to be explained what the County is approving. Kathleen suggested reviewing the descriptions, roles, and responsibilities be an item for the next Working Group meeting. Shane followed up noting that there will be something sketched out for everyone to discuss and review at the next Working Group meeting. Steve requested to see some mechanism or sales presentation by the end of the next Working Group meeting. Steve continued with the opportunity to utilize the Winchester House Levy, which is dedicated to senior services as well.

Linda Soto noted how the sliding-scale MCRide uses to determine costs for each community is transparent. Shane Schneider responded that assistance from Pace would be needed to put together a sliding-scale for Lake County. Shane added that he feels the County will have the role as Executive Sponsor. Additional discussion on alternative names for the title of Executive Sponsor

followed. Linda followed up by going back to the discussion on costs for the community. Kathleen O'Connor noted that there are challenges with Vernon Hills becoming a member of the County service due to having trouble collecting information on how much it would cost for them to join the service. Kathleen suggested bringing some working definitions for Executive Sponsor to the next Working Group meeting. Further discussion on the framework of the new model and how to present it took place.

6. Suggested Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

Shane Schneider suggested to bring a presentation or framework to the next meeting to share and discuss, which will be put together by LCDOT. Linda Soto followed up asking if there were any other requests or jobs the Working Group needs to complete. No other requests were made. Shane followed up informing the Working Group that LCDOT is scheduled to meet with the Pace Chair the following week (Meeting was cancelled due to the COVID-19 situation) to brainstorm ideas. Linda followed up suggesting keeping in mind potential questions that could arise when presenting the new County model to the County Board.

7. Public Comment

Linda Soto opened the floor for public comments. Emily Gelber-Maturo stated how the MCRide presentation was presented through a transportation perspective while the other County presentations given prior to the meeting were through a service delivery perspective.

8. Reminder

Linda Soto gave a reminder that the next Working Group meeting is set to take place **on Wednesday, May 13th, 2020 at 1:00 p.m. at Lake County Division of Transportation's Main Conference room**.

9. Adjournment

Linda Soto made a motion on adjourning the meeting with a second by Bethany Williams. On a unanimous voice the meeting was adjourned at 3:06 p.m.