San Luis Obispo County MSAA TMCC Project – Advisory Committee Meeting

Thursday, August 31, 2017 - RTA Conference Room

10:00 am – 11:30 am PDT

Skype Online Presentation View and Call: Join Skype Meeting

Conference Call Only: 1-866-515-8437, Access Code: 291238

Committee Chair: Mark Shaffer, Ride-On

AGENDA and NOTES (in italics)

1. **Welcome and Introductions** Mark Shaffer
   a. *Mark welcomed all members in attendance.*
   b. *Introductions: Mark Shaffer and Jason Portugal, Ride-On; John Osumi, Bishop Peak Technologies; Geoff Straw and Omar McPherson, RTA; Stephanie Hicks and Mallory Jenkins, SLOCOG; Teague Kirkpatrick and Todd Allen, Routematch.*

2. **MSAA Project Update** Mark Shaffer
   a. Revised Draft System Requirements – finalized in July
   b. High-Level System Design (the TMCC "how") Deliverable – in progress.
      i. Mark stated the System Requirements were approved by FTA in July. Mark also stated the project team is now in progress developing the draft High-Level System Design document. After its completion, a draft Implementation plan will then be developed.

3. **Vendor Demonstration** Mark Shaffer
   a. *Vendor Demonstrations. Mark stated that different vendors are being invited to provide an overview of their MSAA-related technologies for the committee. Over the next few months, the committee will receive these presentations from interested vendors. The first presentation is from Routematch's Teague Kirkpatrick.*
   b. Routematch – Teague Kirkpatrick, Director of Sales
      i. *Teague reviewed the following topics.*
         1. *Routematch company overview.*
         2. *FTA MOD Sandbox projects – overview.*
            a. *Teague discussed the 2016 FTA ITS grant and RouteMatch's new partnership with Valley Metro in Phoenix.*

b. *Geoff stated that each MSAA partner has different service parameters, including Runabout for the ADA. The MOD elements can be addressed (customer portal elements). The coordination of trips between providers will be a challenge.*

3. *Traditional Coordination Approaches.*
    a. *Vertical and Lateral. The vertical addresses a single agency sharing/coordinating paratransit trips with providers. The lateral addresses a "separate but equal" approach built for real-time services among multiple partners.*
        i. *Vertical Tools and Hurdles. CASD, tablets, and web portals (access between broker and provider). Hurdles are the need for real-time awareness/adjustments and typically is a rigid hierarchy.*
        ii. *Lateral Tools and Hurdles. Tools are API's and bi-directional interchanges (real-time information is assumed). Hurdles are CASD/ITS platform is required for each partner, data uniformity, and limits 3rd party inclusion.*
        iii. *Vertical Example. San Diego – 211 / FACT FTA ITS project. Teague discussed a new project in San Diego County that is a partnership between 211 San Diego and FACT that will allow 211 to share trip requests with FACT.*
        iv. *Lateral Example. NW Denver MSAA Project with Via Mobility. Data sharing between two separate providers.*
        v. *Geoff and Teague discussed trip sharing examples between RTA and local dial-a-ride agencies.*
4. *Current Tools.*
    a. *Agency/Provider. Technologies for the transportation agency and providers. Agencies use RM Demand CASD software, in-vehicle tablets, and expandable portals, including*
    b. *Riders. Teague discussed the new Amble platform's smartphone app and web portal that has a number of pieces based on local interest. Mobile payment and multi-provider trip scheduling are examples. Mobile payment is closed account-based (not anonymous) and connects to multiple payment platforms. Teague said the open payment method is very costly, data intensive, and is not used in transit. Mark referenced the Fun Ride mobile platform.*

i. *The Routematch system will also allow "unbanked" persons to visit a partner location to put money into an account.*

ii. *Geoff said that RTA uses PayPal to be sensitive to data security requirements. Teague said the Routematch system uses a 3rd party compliant payment system to manage the payment data and processes (i.e. accounting to providers, etc.).*

c. *API's. Teague said the industry is very small and API's built are traditionally between technology companies. At the MOD Sandbox project in Phoenix, Lyft has stated they expect partners to use their API.*

d. *Minimum technology requirements for the project. Jason mentioned the Technology Subcommittee has been discussing this topic for participation in the project.*

e. *Ventura Transit is using Limo Anywhere and Yellow Cab uses IT Curves software.*

f. *Pricing for the MSAA project. Teague said this type of project is hard for a vendor to provide a direct price based on the API's and potential for "scope creep." Teague discussed recent project scope requests through the project implementation.*

5. *Future of Transit.*

a. *Mobility. Teague discussed Routematch's is leveraging Amble to a new core Mobility system that is in development now to pull in multiple data sources for providers, allow the customer to seek and request trips from multiple providers, confirm/manage scheduled trips, and address payment. The process includes Hubs, Services, Riders, and Vehicles. API's will be required to connect with other partners using other technologies. It will be dynamic and provide a different view on coordination.*

b. *Hubs concept (fixed routes). Addresses current fixed route technology systems in the local area – if available. Teague stated the data would be included from fixed route, intercity bus, Amtrak, and other provider data. John said that Bishop Peak could provide data to this type of system. Mobility is flexible and would provide what the local agencies/riders need.*

c. *Example – Florida agency. Using Mobility platform to provide veterans transportation services.*

d. *Teague stated the Routematch is discussing Mobility with Kern Regional Transit at Lake Isabel. It is conducive for first mile/last mile services in urban and rural areas.*

e. *Omar said the need to know cost information for these types of services. Mark said this information will be included in the High-Level System Design documentation. Teague said that a clear scope for this project is important for vendors to know what the committee intends for the project. Mark said the HLSD proposes to show current technologies in the market. Teague recommended asking the vendors the "Cadillac" vision cost to start and what scaled back pieces are available.*

4. Questions and Comments Committee Members

5. Next Steps Mark Shaffer

a. MSAA Technology Subcommittee – meeting at 2:00 pm, 8/31/17, @ Ride-On
   i. *Mark said the components and vendors will be discussed this afternoon.*

b. Continue working on High-Level System Design components.
   i. *Mark referenced this draft document is in development. Now we are in the "how to do this" phase of the project.*

c. Continue "Ride to Coordination" document.
   i. *Mark referenced this draft document is in development.*

d. Next Meetings: TBD

6. Closing Remarks Committee Members