

San Luis Obispo County MSAA TMCC Project – Advisory Committee Meeting
Tuesday, December 5, 2017 - RTA Conference Room (1st Floor)
10:00 am – 11:00 am PST
Conference Call: (866) 730-7512; Access Code: 236145#

Committee Chair: Mark Shaffer, Ride-On

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mark Shaffer

- a. *Welcome. Mark welcomed all members to the committee meeting and thanked RTA for hosting.*
- b. *Introductions. Mark Shaffer and Jason Portugal, Ride-On; Geoff Straw and Omar McPherson, RTA; Gamaliel “G” Anguiano, City of San Luis Obispo; Todd Allen, Routematch; Mallory Jenkins, SLOCOG; Bobby Babaeian, Yellow Cab/Ventura Transit; and John Osumi, Bishop Peak Technologies.*

2. MSAA Project Update

Mark Shaffer

- a. High-Level System Design Deliverable – status update
 - i. Draft in development.
 - 1. *Mark stated the High-Level System Design (HLSD) is in development and the full draft should be completed this month - based on today’s discussion and alternatives feedback from the committee.*
 - ii. Continued project research and outreach.
 - 1. *Ride-On has continued to contact vendors to determine those with technologies that may be options for TTT consideration. Mark stated that responses to his requests for information have been limited.*
- b. “Road to Coordination” Deliverable – status update
 - i. Draft in development.
 - 1. *Mark stated this document is in development and he passed around a hard copy of the draft Table of Contents as information. Mark stated the intent of this document is peer knowledge transfer and to share the project team’s experiences in developing the TMCC.*
- c. Implementation Plan Deliverable – status update
 - i. *To be developed after the HLSD, Mark stated the Implementation Plan is proposed to include three phases for project development. Phase 1 is proposed to be low/no cost items the committee can address over the next*

year; Phase 2 are additional measures preparing for Phase 3; and Phase 3 is full implementation of the TMCC (“Cadillac”).

- d. 2017 CalACT Fall Conference & Expo – research and discussions held
 - i. *Mark, Omar McPherson, and Todd Allen attended the 2017 CalACT Fall Conference in Monterey last month. Mark and Omar attended a session on mobility management innovation, the Transportation Camp, and vendor expo. Except for the vendors who have presented to the Advisory Committee, Mark stated the TMCC project’s paratransit component is unique and there are no vendors who illustrated having existing products similar to the TMCC’s requirements. This project is very innovative and ground breaking.*

3. High-Level System Design Deliverable

Mark Shaffer

- a. Preliminary draft Alternatives and Cost – review and comment
 - i. *Based on recent extensive industry research, Mark stated the Project Management Team developed draft alternatives and cost components for the Committee’s review and comment.*
 - ii. *TTT Customer and Staff Portals. Mark reviewed the Customer and Staff Portals’ three alternatives narrative document and draft costs matrices. Mark stated that these two portals are very similar and generally their login authentication separates them from one another (i.e. a general public customer versus a DRT staff).*
 - 1. *Open Source Licensing. The Committee discussed the difference between commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) and open source licensing. John Osumi encouraged open source license agreements be reviewed in detail – as some licenses may impact use of the technology.*
 - 2. *Ruby/Rails. John and Jason Portugal said this is dated developer code in use by the open source community and no longer preferred today.*
 - 3. *Alternative 1 – COTS. Geoff Straw stated that RTA prefers Alternative 1 due to their ability to capitalize the cost of the initial procurement for 3-5 years. Geoff stated it is easier for RTA to access capital funds. Federal/State/outside funds will be needed to assist the project’s funding. Geoff stated that the local agencies should discuss the project and funding to be included in their capital prioritization process.*
 - 4. *Fare Management.*
 - a. *Geoff stated that RTA uses PayPal for data security (PCI compliance) with their pass sales.*
 - b. *Alternatives’ Cost Estimate. Todd stated that Routematch offers RMPay a new stand-alone fare management system that an integrate with alternatives 2 and 3. Alternative 1 is*

considered “inclusive” as this technology is incorporated into this option and addresses mobile payment requirements. Information for alternatives 2 and 3 was provided by Teague Kirkpatrick, Routematch. Mark stated that he has contacted other vendors to inquire about their fare systems and most only provide fixed route fare systems and others were unresponsive.

- iii. *TTT Provider Portal.* Mark stated the research to date has not identified any commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) vendor technology that provides all elements of the Provider Portal – as discussed in the System Requirements. Mark stated there are some COTS elements available, such as Routematch’s Provider Portal in use at FACT in San Diego County, when coupled with a locally developed secure e-mail or other solution that may address the System Requirements. Mark invited the Committee to share any other ideas and/or suggestions.
- iv. *TMCC Website.* Mark discussed the three alternatives and said that alternative 1, utilizing the 511 website for the TMCC, still required additional cost information from Rideshare. Mallory Jenkins said the 511 website was mostly developed by staff and there would be minimal cost to link a TTT COTS system to the website. Mark will follow-up with Mallory to discuss the alternative and seek any potential cost elements for inclusion in the evaluation.
- v. *TMCC Mobile APP.* Mark reviewed the three draft alternatives for the TMCC mobile APP. Mark stated the TTT COTS alternative (#1) would provide a locally branded APP as part of the proposed cost and the other options would require a new APP to be built. Mallory said Rideshare previously evaluated an APP for 511 and decided on a mobile-enabled APP. Mallory stated that Rideshare has experienced a 50/50% use of the website versus mobile-enabled APP.
- vi. *Comments on draft proposed alternatives and costs.* Mark invited comments from Committee members by December 15, 2017. Mark stated this information would be utilized in developing the recommendations in the draft HLSD.

4. Implementation Plan Deliverable

Mark Shaffer

a. Preliminary draft Implementation Phases - review and comment

- i. *Mark shared a preliminary draft implementation matrix highlighting the three phases and proposed actions. The phases do not have specific dates in mind. Geoff asked if action plan dates will be developed in the Implementation Plan. Todd said they will be inserted. John said the technology elements should be implemented in the next few years as they will become outdated.*

5. Questions and Comments

Committee Members

- a. *No additional comments.*

6. Next Steps

Mark Shaffer

- a. Complete draft High-Level System Design (December).
- b. Continue “Ride to Coordination” document.
- c. Next Meeting: January 2018.
 - i. *January 23, 2018 – 10:00 am at RTA. Mark will send out a “save the date” announcement by e-mail.*

7. Closing Remarks

Committee Members