AFFORDABLE FARES IN THE DENVER METRO REGION

2016 UPDATE
WHY AFFORDABLE FARES?
WHY? LISTEN TO OUR COMMUNITY.

• **RTD’s low-income riders** tell us…
  the cost of fares is too high and that they are **forced to make choices**
  between riding the bus and **paying for meals, medicine and other necessities**

• **Neighborhood residents** tell us…
  fares are unaffordable and that they **might choose to ride** transit if it were more cost effective,
  but currently use poor quality vehicles or rely on others for transportation

• **Employers** tell us…
  transit prices are too high for their lower wage workers and many employees do not take transit, creating **congestion and parking pressures** in job centers

• **Nonprofits** tell us…
  their limited resources can only go so far and they **can only meet a small fraction of the need**
  for subsidized transit for those experiencing homelessness, the unemployed searching for jobs, and others who cannot afford to pay anything at all
WHY? A DISPROPORTIONATE NUMBER OF RTD RIDERS ARE LOW-INCOME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percent of RTD riders</th>
<th>Percent of individuals in the district</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15K</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 to $20K</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 to $25K</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25K to $30K</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30 to $35K</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 RTD Customer Satisfaction and U.S. Census 2012 PUMS

These riders are RTD’s customers.
WHY? PRICES ARE GOING UP FOR THOSE LIVING IN THE CORE URBAN AREAS AND GOING DOWN FOR THOSE IN WEALTHIER SUBURBS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rail (local)</th>
<th>Rail (regional)</th>
<th>DIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single boarding</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>$5.20</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25.3% increase for “2-zone” and 29.3% decrease for previously “3-zone”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bus (local)</th>
<th>Bus (regional)</th>
<th>DIA* (SkyRide)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single boarding</td>
<td>$2.60</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass</td>
<td>$5.20</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$171</td>
<td>$171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.5% increase for previously “2 zone” and 35% decrease for previously “3 zone”
12.5% increase for routes previously “3 zone” and 10% decrease for routes previously “4 zone”
15.5% increase for previously “local” and 35% decrease for previously “express”
12.5% increase for routes previously “express” and 10% decrease for routes previously “regional”

*SkyRide moves to a flat $9.00 from the current $9 from Stapleton, $11 from downtown Denver, and $13 from suburbs

All fares are cut in half for seniors, students, and disabled

$0.25 discount per one way fare with smartcard
WHY? MORE ACCESSIBLE TRANSIT LEADS TO BETTER ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL OUTCOMES.

- Social inclusion and enhanced quality of life
- Access to employment opportunities
- Retention/lower frequency of unemployment
- Emergency room visits for routine medical care
- Use of non-emergency Medicaid transport
- No-show rates at medical appointments such as primary and prenatal care
BACKGROUND:
AFFORDABLE FARES TASK FORCE
Mile High Connects

To ensure that the Metro Denver regional transit system fosters communities that offer all residents the opportunity for a high quality of life.

- Engaging Residents
- Influencing Policy
- Leveraging Resources

MileHighConnects.org  www.milehighconnects.org
WORK OF AFFORDABLE FARES
TASK FORCE

• Worked with RTD staff to create and host education sessions on budget, structure, programs, governance and other elements of transit agency for nonprofits

• Participated in all 11 public input opportunities in fare study in 2014 and hosted four focus groups with nonprofit partners for RTD staff

• Engaged in extensive research and vetting of program alternatives through partner Colorado Fiscal Institute

• Participated in 15 of 16 public input opportunities in fare study in 2015, as well as Local Government Committee

• Put forward specific low-income fare and pass program recommendation to RTD in February 2015

• Also provided sub-recommendations for improvements to Nonprofit Program, EcoPass, Neighborhood EcoPass and Student Pass

• Began working in partnership with staff in late March 2015 on pursuing low-income fare and pass program

• Attended all Customer Service and Operations Committee and RTD Board Meetings to follow conversation

• Supported improvements to Nonprofit Program

• Began active fundraising outreach in September 2015

• Began outreach around income-verification and data partners December 2015
## REGIONAL AND DIVERSE TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AARP</th>
<th>Energy Outreach Colorado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams 12</td>
<td>Enterprise Community Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams 50 School District</td>
<td>Federal Partnership for Sustainability, Region 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayaud Enterprises</td>
<td>Focus Points Family Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County Local Coordinating Council</td>
<td>FRES: Good Jobs Strong Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder County Transportation</td>
<td>Gary Community Investments/Piton Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Valley School District</td>
<td>Groudwork Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield County Local Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Jefferson County Department of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BuCu West Development Association</td>
<td>Jefferson County Local Coordinating Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Work Education and Employment</td>
<td>Livable Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lakewood Probation Division</td>
<td>Mi Casa Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Center on Law and Policy</td>
<td>Mile High Business Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Coalition for the Homeless</td>
<td>Mile High Connects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Cross Disability Coalition</td>
<td>Montbello Organizing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Fiscal Institute</td>
<td>National Multiple Sclerosis Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Jobs with Justice</td>
<td>9to5 Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Enterprise</td>
<td>P2P Ability Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Department of Environmental Health</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Housing Authority</td>
<td>Rocky Mountain MicroFinance Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Human Services</td>
<td>SEIU Local 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver American Indian Commission</td>
<td>Servicios de la Raza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Indian Health and Family Services</td>
<td>St Charles Town Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Indian Family Resource Center</td>
<td>St. Francis Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Kids</td>
<td>The Arc of Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs</td>
<td>The Delores Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Office of Anti-Discrimination</td>
<td>The Denver Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Office of Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>The Starting Place, Our Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Office on Aging</td>
<td>Together Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Public Schools</td>
<td>Transportation Solutions Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Shared Spaces</td>
<td>Urban Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Regional Mobility and Access Council</td>
<td>Via Mobility Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver's Road Home</td>
<td>Volunteers of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County Transportation</td>
<td>West Colfax Business Improvement District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eGo Car Share</td>
<td>WorkLife Partnership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Community Representatives, Involved with Nonprofit Boards and Committees But Representing Themselves

16 Nonprofit, Foundation and Public Sector Agencies Who For Organizational Policy Reasons Could Not Be Listed Individually
RECOMMENDATION FOR AFFORDABLE FARES AND PASSES
Offer 50% Discount Fares and Passes to Riders Making 150% of Federal Poverty Level or less, matching the discount currently offered to seniors, students and those with disabilities
There are 390,000 adults in the RTD that would qualify, assuming that 26 percent are RTD users and a take up rate of 60% then RTD would offer about 40,000 discount passes.
OUTSIDE AGENCIES CONDUCT INCOME VERIFICATION AND ISSUE DISCOUNT CARD

Federal Poverty Level

- Medicaid Adults: 138
- Pregnant Medicaid: 195
- Low Income Energy Assistance Program: 150
- Reduced Price School Lunch Program: 185
- Free Priced School Lunch Program: 130
- Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: 130
- TANF: 228
- Section 8 Housing (1 person): 193
- Section 8 Housing (2 person): 172
- Section 8 Housing (3 person): 158
- Section 8 Housing (4 person): 146
- Section 8 Housing (5 person): 137
- Section 8 Housing (6 person): 137
Students, ages 6-19: current student ID or proof of current school enrollment. Applies only to students in elementary, middle and high school.

Seniors, age 65+: photo ID showing passenger's age, Medicare card or RTD-issued Special Discount Card.

Individuals with disabilities: RTD-issued Special Discount Card or Medicare card.

Income-qualified.
HOW DO RIDERS BUY THEIR FARES AND PASSES?

Riders show card and purchase discount wherever fare media are sold

- On the bus
- At rail stations
- At RTD
- Grocery stores
WHY NOT JUST HAVE THE NONPROFIT PROGRAM?

Existing Nonprofit Program

Improved Nonprofit Program

Current Discounts Only Cover a Fraction of Rides Taken by Low-Income RTD Users

4,247,523 Rides a Month on RTD by Low Income Users

- No Discount: 68.1%
- 23.3% Discount
- 3.1%
- 8.6% Non-Profit Discount Monthly Pass
- 5.5% Non-Profit Discount 10-Ticket

Adding $1 Million a Year to the Non-Profit Program Still Leaves Two-Thirds of Low Income Riders without Discounts

- No Discount: 65.3%
- 23.3% Senior, Student, Disabled Discount
- 8.6% Additional $1 million to Non-Profit Program
- 2.8% Non-Profit Discount

Nonprofit program is still not sufficient in scale and does not address the needs of working adults not receiving other assistance.
OTHER MEANS OF AFFORDABILITY

The Affordable Fares Task Force continues to believe that other exiting RTD programs can also be part of the solution to affordability challenge and have specific recommendations around:

- EcoPass and FlexPass
- Neighborhood EcoPass
- Student Passes

We have shared these in the past with RTD staff and look forward to participating in broader conversations regarding pass and discount programs.
COST AND FUNDRAISING
WHAT IS THE PROJECTED COST?

THE NUMBERS

Support for 40,000 riders = $12 million in lost revenue annually

$6 million RTD investment in program

$6 million philanthropic, private and other public sector investment match

External investment goal: $30 million over 5 years
WHAT DID WE EXPLORE WITH RTD DURING THE FARE STUDY PROCESS?

- Re-instituting zones on rail as part of core structure (occurred but revenues went to a different purpose)

- Charging for in-district parking (legislative change)

- Charging differently for other pass programs (occurred for some but revenues went to a different purpose)

- Charging higher rate for airport rides
WHAT IS THE SCALE OF THIS COST?

RTD Total Budget

- Cost to Fund 50/150 Discount Fare Program: $12 million
- 2015 RTD Operating and Capital Budget: $2.38 billion

RTD Operating Budget

- Cost to Fund 50/150 Discount Fare Program: $12 million
- 2015 RTD Operating Budget: $518.5 million

Source: Overview of Adopted 2015 Budget
WHAT IS THE SCALE OF THIS COST?

Very Minor Fluctuations in Projected Fare Revenue and Sales Tax Revenue in 2015 Could Fund Low-Income Discount Program for 2016

Cost to Fund 50/150 Discount Fare Program
$12 million

$535 million revenue was projected from RTD sales tax in 2015. If actual revenue comes in even 2% higher than projected, RTD would have $10.7 million revenue than estimated.

Source: Overview of Adopted 2015 Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Fundraising: What Types of Prospective Investors Are We Approaching for Match?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• National foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local impact investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local chambers of commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local major employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County and city agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERNAL FUNDRAISING: WHAT IS THE PROPOSAL FOR MATCH?

Phase 1: Grant/ Venture Investment
• No return
• Evaluation of outcomes

Phase 2: Investment Vehicle/PRI
• Low return based on outcomes
• Continued evidence base

Phase 3: System Absorption
• Cost avoidance/cost savings to system
• Sustainable revenue stream
WHAT IS EARLY STAGE FEEDBACK FROM PROSPECTIVE INVESTORS?

- Multiple potential investors willing to consider.
  - One bank partner invited us to make a proposal for early stage (small) capital to indicate interest
  - One national funder, two local funders and one impact investor have said no, it is not a fit
  - All others are playing out as you would expect in early stage fundraising of this scale

- From all: Economic, health and social outcomes are critical for investment support
  - More specificity is needed around which outcomes will be measured and how

- From all: Program needs to be more fully developed – unlikely to be able to leverage external investment as such an early stage in planning
  - Partnerships for data collection and income-verification need to be established

- From national investors: Questions around why other places (Seattle, Twin Cities, etc.) have been able to launch more quickly and without substantial outside investment

- From private sector and impact investors: Want to invest in something dynamic, innovative and especially technology related
  - Would be interested in supporting other line items that could offset this expense

- From multiple: Need more confidence in RTD’s internal commitment
  - Statements in public forums by RTD staff and board have lessened confidence
  - Lack of funding commitment by RTD in budget, lack of board vote of support for concept, and lack of specific timeline for launch concerning
    - Note: Several potential investors also told us not to approach them until a permanent GM was named
CURRENT REQUESTS
CURRENT REQUESTS OF RTD STAFF AND BOARD

• Continue to work closely with the Affordable Fares Task Force and maintain commitment to figuring out “how” not “whether”

• Invite member(s) of Affordable Fares Task Force to participate in broader pass program review process to ensure alignment and consistency

• Ensure RTD internal commitment is included in annual priorities and strategic budget plan

• Speak positively about the emerging program in public contexts to assist with external fundraising and actively support external fundraising as needed

• Set timeline and date for board vote and target program launch